



The mediating effect of real life encounters in co-writing tourism books



Nina K. Prebensen

UiT, The Arctic University of Norway, School of Business and Economics, University of Tromsø, 9037 Tromsø, Norway

HIGHLIGHTS

- A book seminar enhance authors motivations to write.
- Writing includes autotelic and instrumental motivations.
- Writing may be done solitary or with others.
- Combining motivations and behaviours gives different writing categories.
- Academic institutions should provide for encounters to fulfill individual and institutional goals.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 February 2017

Accepted 12 March 2017

Keywords:

Co-writing
Book seminar
Motivation
Structure
Interaction
Academic book

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the effects of meeting in a relevant empirical setting with the purpose of co-writing an academic book. A writing seminar is used to explore how such encounters impact scholars' motivations and actions regarding writing. Data were collected through participant observation, discussions, and in-depth interviews. Based on experiential and learning theories, the study led to the identification of four categories of academic co-writing, reflected through data from formal and informal meeting contexts: writing to process information; to develop knowledge; to play, socialize, and have fun; and to present oneself. The study findings suggest that academic institutions should arrange and support scholarly meetings to fulfill goals such as knowledge building, publication, and networking. At the individual level, being together and discussing and clarifying topics, constructs, and ideas motivate scholars to write and to publish.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Tourism is about enjoying and learning through meetings and interactions. Academics try to understand the dynamics of such encounters from different perspectives, utilizing well-known and accepted academic methods and designs to explore, describe, and test their ideas and research questions. Nevertheless, learning and writing about lived experiences without partaking in them are challenging. This paper addresses the imperative of being present, discussing, and learning from the actual environment when scholars aim to co-write edited books in the tourism context. In particular, we focus on authors' motivations and behaviors during such encounters.

Science has been characterized as a “big, noisy dialogue that

takes place mainly through scholarly journals and books” (Nygaard, 2008). Trying to make sense of – and being heard in – this boisterous environment involves mainly the learning and communicating of new ideas and concepts, and the exploration, delineation, and testing of relationships among relevant constructs. Although writing plays a significant role in academic communication, many scholars have found – and continue to find – writing and being productive in a peer-review context to be challenging (Yuksel, 2003). Numerous volumes and research papers have been dedicated to the topic of “how to write,” with various strategies recommended (Becket, 1986; Goodson, 2013; Murray, 2013). Central concerns regarding scholarly writing are how and why academics partake in this negotiation, and whether the idea of meeting in person in empirical contexts such as tourism amplifies the motivations and actions taken to collaborate.

Traditionally, a scholar with the idea of editing an academic book approaches other scholars regarding their participation in the

E-mail address: Nina.prebensen@uit.no.

co-writing of chapters and co-editing of the book. Due to the lack of resources such as time and the implications of cost and physical distance, authors often communicate by mail, particularly email, and telephone. They also utilize Skype and other communicative media, which allow them to work and interconnect from their home offices. This working structure may be effective, as we have experienced and its effectiveness is reflected in the production of high-quality books (on various scholarly topics) through the use of this structure. However, inspired by social constructivist theories of learning, which state that learners should construct their own knowledge in active learning environments, scholars have integrated small-group learning by introducing tutorials, seminars, and group practicals (Dennick, 2008). This form of collaborative learning provides scholars with opportunities to discuss and improve their knowledge regarding complex issues, learn how to solve problems, and reflect on their attitudes and feelings (Dillenbourg, 1999).

Drawing on learning theories, including Dewey's learning process and the Lewinian experiential learning model (in Kolb, 1984), the present work aims to demonstrate that meeting and the creation of a platform for mutual understanding and having fun helps authors write creative and complementary chapters that support and develop the common ground of an academic book. We utilize the case of a writing seminar arranged as part of the process of co-writing of a scholarly book in tourism. By meeting in a touristic setting and communicating about tourism issues and the book's main concept and chapters, the authors found common ground for discussions and thoughts about the topic of the book, namely "value creation in tourist experiences." Although this work is set in the context of this specific research field, the findings are relevant for editors and researchers aiming to co-write books in other fields. In particular, this paper focuses on the benefits of personal interaction, which functions as a mediator in academic writing. By analyzing motivations and behaviors in this participatory setting, we address new ideas about important aspects of scholarly writing. Accordingly, the present study provides a theoretical foundation that is applicable to the development of various practices aiming to support academic writing for policy makers, academic managers, research students, and academics.

2. Theoretical perspectives

2.1. Reasons for co-writing of a book

One obvious reason that scholars write chapters in edited books is that this practice is part of the academic profession and the scientific environment. Consequently, an academic scholar writes because he or she is expected to do so. Writing in an academic context may lead a scholar to gain new knowledge, a promotion, and, furthermore, inner growth. Although the writing process may be challenging and tedious, it can also produce pleasant experiences. In a performance situation in which the person's skills match the challenges, feelings described as "flow" may occur (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Csikszentmihalyi (1990) introduced the flow concept to describe an experience that is very satisfying beyond a sense of having fun. Thus, academic writing may be placed within the experiential learning outlook (Kolb, 1984), in which emotions are important work motivators (Seo, Feldmann Barret, & Barunek, 2004). Recent research has argued for the importance of work-related emotions (e.g., Ashkanasy, Härtel, & Zerbe, 2000); the writing of a book chapter in a scientific context encompasses feelings and experience value, such as having fun and a sense of flow, as much as it reflects utilitarian objectives and rational goals.

Other important aspects of writing are time, effort, and

assessment of value. Along with factors such as knowledge, skills, and monetary resources, time to write is often scarce and contributing to bottleneck effects in academia. In addition, writing a chapter for other scholars to edit may be viewed as of lesser value than is writing a paper for a peer-reviewed journal. This perceived value discrepancy is due to the requirements of various accreditation systems. Despite this issue, edited books are popular in academia, calling for explorations and justifications of the underlying motivations and structures for such work to emerge.

Academics write for instrumental reasons and to move toward future goals, such as promotion, recognition or placement of themselves on the "academic scene," the acquisition of more knowledge in a certain academic field, and even the development of relationships and networking with other scholars. Academic writing can also be performed as a form of reciprocity, i.e., in an "I write for your book, you write for mine" type of agreement. These instrumental reasons reflect structural and systematic issues in the broader higher education sector, where growing market competition has generated great interest in the search for and measurement of global academic quality (Dill & Soo, 2005). An example is the use of impact factors in academia; Hall and Page (2015) have discussed the paradox inherent in such systems, and problems that arise when they are not implemented with care.

University ranking systems have various sets of criteria, with certain similarities and differences among countries. A study comparing the rankings produced by the Shanghai Jiao Tong University, the Times Higher Education Supplement, World Universities by the Cybermetrics Lab at the Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), the Higher Education and Accreditation Council of Taiwan, and the Centre for Science and Technology Studies at Leiden University found the largest differences between the Times Higher Education Supplement and the World Universities by the Cybermetrics Lab at CSIC (Aguillo, Bar-Ilan, Levene, & Ortega, 2010). Despite these differences, research on academic quality measures has highlighted some core criteria shared among various systems; in particular, different research disciplines have adapted and responded based on the core criterion of the quality of research produced by faculty members (Aguillo et al., 2010; Buela-Casal, Gutiérrez-Martínez, Paz Bermúdez-Sánchez, & Vadiello-Munoz, 2007; Dill & Soo, 2005; O'Connell, 2013).

Writing may be seen as a social activity, in that people write to communicate with other people. However, writing in itself is not necessarily social. Hayes and Flower (1981; Flower & Hayes, 1981) defined two basic components of writing: 1) the social component, including the audience, the social environment, and the reading of other texts; and 2) the physical component, which is the text.

Writing skills are enhanced through the practice of writing, in addition to learning through semantic knowledge about a particular subject and experienced events. Learning may happen by practicing a skill, developing habits, sense making, classical conditioning, and perceptual representation (Maia, 2009). As various aspects of life make us remember and produce new knowledge, the recognition of various aspects of this creative process would help authors and others be open to learn not only through reading and writing, but also through the co-creation of academic experiences. Kolb (1984) suggested experiential learning, described as a "holistic integrative perspective on learning that combines experience, perception, cognition and behavior" (p. 21), as a supplement to behavioral and cognitive learning theories. He emphasized the fundamentality of the concrete, "here-and-now" experience for the validation and testing of abstract concepts:

"immediate personal experience [is] a focal point for learning giving life, texture, and subjective personal meaning to abstract concepts and at the same time providing a concrete, publicly

shared reference point for testing the implications and validity of ideas created during the learning process” (Kolb, 1984, p. 21).

Kolb points to the imperative of learning as an autotelic action, one that is performed in the moment, alone or in collaboration with other people. To experience may therefore be a solitary or collaborative action, in addition to one performed for instrumental reasons or for enjoyment in the moment.

2.2. Collective writing

Persons writing a book together are motivated to do so. However, as described in the preceding section, people have different kinds of motivation, which may vary in strength. Ryan and Deci (2000) outlined this variation in terms of level and orientation, i.e., the type of motivation, or the underlying attitudes and goals, that drives the action. Motivation is an internal state that arouses learners, steers them in particular directions, and keeps them engaged in certain activities (Ormrod, 2008). It often regulates whether and to what extent people really learn challenging tasks, especially when the cognitive and behavioral processes necessary for learning are voluntary and under their control.

Sawyer (2006) put forward the psychology of creative writing and outlined three lessons of writing: 1) it is hard work, 2) it is conscious and directed, and 3) it is a collaborative and socially embedded activity. In academic work, which involves writing, the two first lessons are obvious. The third lesson seems to vary according to the scholar's working situation and experience (i.e., time, economic resources, and skills). Therefore, if working hard, consciously, and directly is accepted as learned behavior, the impact of the third lesson should be examined further. A book seminar may function as an arena to work and socialize. Accordingly, a book seminar may function as a mediator of the fulfillment of the authors', editors' and/or organizations' requirements.

As reciprocity in teamwork reflects the ideas of mutual exchange and fairness, the fundamental motivation to join a network of persons writing a scholarly book is to receive a fair portion of the synergistic effects that are co-created. In a network composed of academics and their organizations, goals and motives are expected to differ among stakeholders. An obvious goal for all stakeholders would, however, likely be the strengthening of the value and recognition from their respective organizations.

Academic writing, particularly which is creative, often involves the collaboration of scholars who form networks. Networks include people and their relationships, knowledge, interests, involvement, and power, through which they operate to attain their goals. Personal networks can influence performance directly and indirectly. Researchers have discussed how network members can motivate an individual's performance by providing standards and expectations; the quality of network relationships can also affect the likelihood that goals will be pursued (Eggens, Van der Werf, & Bosker, 2008; Ryan, 2000; Wentzel, 1999; Wentzel, Barry, & Caldwell, 2004). In the scholarly context, the various stakeholders in a co-written book influence the results of the process and are of great importance in terms of how values are created within and among academic structures and scholars.

Social network studies have acknowledged the effects of actors and their positions in interdependent environments and further examined how actors' positions in networks influence their opportunities, constraints, and behaviors (Wasserman & Galaskiewicz, 1994). Network analysis aids the understanding of how relationships influence the creation of value by providing a system for the examination of the “interaction of interactions” (Nohria, 1992). Relationships and networks play fundamental roles

in “assessing, combining, recombining and coordinating the activities, resources and outputs of people and firms” (Wilkinson, 2008, p. 23), and “are the means by which the knowledge, skills and resources required to develop, exploit and commercialize new ideas are marshalled and coordinated” (Wilkinson, 2008, p. 25). Consequently, networks of employees are essential for most organizations, including academic institutions, in that they add value for the organizations and their stakeholders.

2.3. Co-writing and learning

Multiple theories of learning can aid the recognition of empirical phenomena, such as how and why scholars write books together (as editors and authors). Schön's (1984) work on the reflective practitioner reveals the importance of real practice to the improvement of learning. Other research has outlined the importance and benefits of an “experiential” learning environment (Higgins, Aitken-Rose, & Dixon, 2009; Lang, 1983). Within experiential learning theory and the constructivist approach, learning is defined as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 38). Accordingly, learning happens through a process of experience and reflection, in which abstract ideas are framed through abstract conceptualization (Demirbas & Demirkan, 2003; Kolb, 1984). The effect of peer interaction on learning (c.f. Piaget, 1972) empowers scholars to develop new meanings within the fuller context of learning with others (O'Donnell & King, 1999).

These theories posit that learners are members of communities with the common ground of new knowledge creation (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). Wenger (2000) suggested that learning communities must balance core processes that enable deep learning in specific areas (e.g., focusing on agreeing on the definitions of core concepts) with structured processes of knowledge production (e.g., emphasizing multiple interests and a variety of perspectives). In the works by Wenger (2000) and Wenger et al. (2002), constructivist, experiential, and social learning theories emerge as the most relevant. Each of these theories recognizes the importance of individual experience and the benefit of allowing it to guide each participant's growth and learning.

Scholars have utilized exploratory approaches and pedagogical models in the examination of practical education situations. For instance, Schön (1984) documented the process of learning by analyzing interactions between instructors and students. During these interactions, students develop a language that they can use to communicate their ideas. Schön (1984) also denoted the reciprocity of dialogue and sketching in the translation of knowledge (personal experience) and feedback (from the instructor) into action (ideas).

A fundamental idea in the field of constructivist learning is that practical activities connect learners' experiences and knowledge. In this manner, knowledge is constructed into something more meaningful at a personal level (Walker, 2002). Social activities are considered to enhance learning due to individuals' engagement with others (Savery & Duffy, 1996; Walker, 2002) and knowledge of self in relation to others (Giddens, 1991; Packer & Goicoechea, 2000). Participation in various types of relevant practical activity may also function as a means to develop knowledge (Oxman, 1999; Wenger, 2009).

In classroom settings, Grant and Manuel (1995) found that working in networks could empower students to reach higher achievement levels. Shaffer (2007) even proposed the concept of “social interaction as pedagogy” (p. 121) because of student learning. Aspects deemed important for the improvement of learning include creating a sense of belonging, developing critical thinking, and instituting a feeling of accountability (Dunlap & Grabinger, 1996; Michaelson, Knight, & Fink, 2002; Savery &

Duffy, 1996).

In a writing seminar, social learning occurs in conversations among scholars in various settings (e.g., during coffee breaks, sightseeing excursions after seminars, and working sessions). In a writing seminar conducted with contributors to an edited book, participants observe one another, put forward ideas for chapters, ask questions and provide input in discussions, and present analyses of the excursions. Thus, the writing seminar could be studied as a process of social learning through dialogue and mutual experience by exploring the actors' purposes and structures while participating.

3. Method

3.1. Setting

The author of this article is working as a professor for a university in Norway. The author's research focus is tourism marketing and management. The author hosted a 4-day writing seminar in a small city in northern Norway, as part of a research project examining value creation in tourist experiences, one intended product of which was a scholarly edited book. She was deeply involved in the book project, serving as lead editor and chapter author. She lives in the area where the seminar was held, and is familiar with its climate, geography, and the experiences planned and provided for the participants. Twenty-four scholars from 11 countries attended the seminar and writing chapters. The seminar included both formal and informal activities. The informal part of the seminar included various touristic activities, which also provided them with experiences relevant to the topic. The formal part of the seminar included meetings, discussions and workshops to fulfill the aim of co-writing the book in addition to meet other scholarly intentions, such as discussing, learning, networking, and publishing.

The proposed book had two sections addressing the structural and environmental aspects of tourism experiences and the psychological aspects of consuming tourist journeys, respectively. Although these two dimensions are linked, research on them is often based on different theoretical perspectives. A foundational idea of the seminar was to provide the opportunity for participants representing the various perspectives to discuss and expand their understanding of the topics.

In the seminar, the participants introduced themselves and presented their research foci, and the editors presented the book concept and their thoughts thereon. Then, the authors presented their abstracts (prepared before the seminar) for the book in terms of theoretical and practical angles. Chapter contents, structures, definitions, and core ideas were subsequently discussed and streamlined in accordance with the book concept. The book concept was also adjusted accordingly. The touristic and novel activities included in the seminar experience to drive creative and analytical discussion included cooking a meal together with high-end chefs, sightseeing (e.g., whale watching), and visiting a herring factory to taste raw fish. The seminar ended with a visit to the local university to meet other scholars and colleagues, and the administrators at the university.

The writing seminar was deliberately designed to provide a phenomenological pedagogy that would, according to Mohaly-Nagy in Findeli (1990), "help shorten the road to self-experience" (p. 9). This "shortened road" was a key objective in the attempt to create a brief, yet meaningful, experience platform for the authors. The writing seminar included aspects that would:

- 1) provide condensed knowledge of the book concept to the authors,

- 2) make the act of writing more accessible to less-experienced authors,
- 3) provide a real setting for the exploration of chapter examples and cases related to value creation in tourism, and
- 4) create an engaging problem context that enabled the development of new perspectives and ideas for the various book chapters.

3.2. Study design and data collection

Given the lack of theoretical insight into the importance of physical meetings with the intention of book co-writing, an exploratory design was chosen. The collection of data through real-life experiences, observations, and in-depth interviews was considered to be appropriate to gain a rich dataset. The writing seminar was judged to be a suitable setting for the exploration of academics' purposes and structures related to their participation in the co-creation of a book about tourist experiences. The present work describes participants' experiences, thoughts, and discussions at the writing seminar and between formal sessions, i.e., during meals and the nature- and culture-focused activities arranged for the group. These data reflect participants' lived experiences by accessing their inner thoughts and feelings during their stay (Escalas & Bettman, 2000; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998).

Qualitative methodologies are concerned with gaining an understanding of lived experience, largely through the voices of those whose experiences are being explored (Markwell & Basche, 1998). The emphasis of the analysis is on individual purposes and structures presented through the authors' expressions in quotations taken from in-depth interviews. The interviews lasted about 1 h each. The participant observation and discussions continued throughout the four day seminar and was performed by the author of this article.

In this article, these quotations are organized according to the purpose and structure of seminar participation.

The researcher functioned as an observer, interviewer, and narrator providing verbal data about her own and others' experiences. In management and marketing research, this process is referred to as introspection: "an ongoing process of tracking, experiencing, and reflecting on one's own thoughts, mental images, feelings, sensations, and behaviours" (Gould, 1995, p. 719). The major advantage of introspection lies in the power of considered observation. As stated by Hixon and Swann (1993), one can never know as much about another's inner states as about one's own. Being part of the whole process gave the researcher access to a vast amount of cognitive and sensory data that could not have been obtained from the other subjects alone (Gould, 1995). Introspection may reveal mental and emotional processes that produce novel insights into how and why academics participate in processes such as the co-creation of a book about tourist experiences.

3.3. Validity of the data

This work aimed to meet the requirements of validity: authenticity, plausibility, and criticality (Golden-Biddle & Locke, 1993). The performance of in-depth interviews and participant observation provided authenticity, i.e., the ability of the interviews and participation observation to reproduce the authors' and editors' actual lived experiences. To achieve plausibility, ensuring that the research is of general interest, the interview data were compared with the aim of grasping important aspects revealing new insights into the phenomenon of being present and participating at a book seminar and to identify atypical experiences. Similarities and differences reflected in quotations were then organized according to

participants' purposes and structures of participation and interaction in the seminar. To achieve criticality, or the ability of the information collected to encourage readers to reconsider taken-for-granted ideas and beliefs, both the formal and informal activities during the seminar were examined to reveal aspects of purposes and structures involved in book co-writing. These aspects were further validated by referring to existing research.

3.4. *Trustworthiness of the study and the findings*

The use of multiple data collection techniques in this research was expected to increase the reliability and validity of the findings and allow for "converging lines of inquiry" (Yin, 1994, p. 92). Given the researcher's personal involvement in the book project, the study findings should be interpreted with caution. Still, the data are of value for the gaining of an in-depth understanding of how in-person meetings influence academics' motivations and actions in book co-creation. The criteria for trustworthiness in qualitative research include dimensions such as credibility, transferability, confirmability, and integrity (Rolfé, 2006).

Credibility refers to the extent to which the reported results appear to be acceptable representations of the data. Although interview data formed the core of information gathered about the scholars' motivations and behaviors, participant observations and discussions throughout the 4-day seminar also helped to build knowledge about the topic. As a result, emergent ideas and questions were altered and expanded upon. In addition, all participants in the book seminar were approached and 20 of 24 participants were interviewed, providing insight into diverse meanings and attitudes.

Transferability reflects the extent to which findings from one study in one context are applicable to other contexts. In this research, data collection methods were based on theoretical underpinnings regarding on-site experiences and their influences on motivation and behavior. The classification of various learning situations may be of value in other academic settings and activities other than the writing of a scholarly book.

Confirmability refers to the extent to which interpretations stem from the participants and the phenomenon, rather than researcher biases. Discussions and reflections in the seminar meetings and informal experiences functioned as a learning process and platform. Each day, more in-depth knowledge about participants' motivations and behavior was gained.

Integrity refers to the extent to which interpretations are influenced by participants' provision of misinformation or their evasion. As the researcher collected data, she ensured that no informant evaded a particular issue or question.

4. Findings

4.1. *The motivations and actions of scholarly writing*

When scholars meet, social learning occurs in various ways. People interacted and had discussions during the formal and informal parts of the seminar. In the formal part, the scholars negotiated about various issues, ranging from the conceptualization to the execution of their chapters (some as co-authors and some as single authors). The informal part of the seminar balanced academic learning and discussion objectives with experiences of new environments and people. During the presentation of the abstracts, the authors asked questions and debated different theoretical perspectives. Work on the chapters continued during the seminar and after participants returned to their everyday working environments. Hence, the seminar functioned both as an experiential setting and as an instrumental process aiding the production

of high-quality chapters for the book. Although authors may experience different degrees of stress while writing, team-based learning during the seminar increased the motivation to write. In particular, the issue that the authors spend time and energy acknowledging thematic and content variance and making important decisions related to the book, made a common platform for the book and motivated the authors to finish their respective chapters.

In their everyday working environments, scholars bond over common struggles and challenges that occupy most of their time during the semester, including those of meeting academic requirements, i.e., publishing in journals with high impact factors (Hall & Page, 2015). The collaboration and competition inherent to the academic world were somewhat stimulated in the writing seminar, due to factors such as the common goal of book co-creation by including all authors' knowledge and the uniqueness of each scholar's chapter ideas and final version. Conversations thus tended to be welcomed in the formal and informal parts of the seminar. Even though dialogues during the writing seminar was more effortful, they were highly appreciated. As the social environment of the seminar differed clearly from participants' everyday working environments, social learning facilitated self-awareness, identity formation, and, ultimately, learning (Wenger, 2000). These effects are reflected in the quotations presented below.

Combined consideration of two conceptual dimensions – the motivations or purposes and the structure or actions of writing – aided the organization of data on how the different aspects of writing and/or creating text may happen. In terms of structure, writing consists of direct actions (engagement in the act of writing) and relational actions (communication with other scholars, in which meeting and mingling serve as focal resources). Writing can be an end in itself (an action, being in the situation) and a means to further ends (an instrumental action). The combination of these two dimensions locating four dissimilar actions of writing: writing to process information; to develop knowledge; to play, socialize, and have fun; and to present oneself (e.g., networking, enhancement of one's reputation). The categories are presented in the figure (Fig. 1) and in the text below.

4.2. *Writing to process information*

Writing to process information is a solitary act with a focus on the situation as 'here-and-now'. This category reflects the purpose of learning for its own sake because it is valued (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). This category reflects the processes scholars underwent to make sense of and respond to the editors' calls, and to form a knowledge platform. In this situation, the scholars wanted to learn and structure knowledge to obtain

		Purpose of writing	
		Autotelic	Instrumental
Structure Of Writing	solitary	Writing to process information	Writing to develop knowledge
	collective	Writing to enjoy and to have fun	Writing to present oneself / networking

Fig. 1. Dimensions of scholarly writing.

overviews of various theoretical perspectives relevant to the book's topic. As such, this category reflects how the interpretive frameworks that the authors applied to engage writing structured their experiences of writing. Writing is constituted not only by formal rules of theories and methods, but also by the wide variety of conventions, habits, strategies, and styles on which academics draw (Swindler, 1986). The academic world provides scholars with intersubjectively shared perspectives through which they can make sense of situations, roles, actions, and objects in that world, as well as constructing a framework that orients their actions (Geertz, 1973). The following quotations exemplify how academics participating in the writing seminar used interpretive framework, of solitary behavior to process information.

"I found the seminar to be very useful in understanding other perspectives on the topic of co-creation. I think that understanding of that nature allows one to develop a more holistic understanding of a particular topic. It is the first time I have been to a seminar for a book and I found it to be an enriching and a learning experience" (participant 1).

"Absolutely, being my first book seminar of this kind. I must say that it was a fantastic experience on many levels; you get a firsthand feeling of the 'whole' book (what is the essence), you meet fantastic people, and you also get inspiration for your own writing" (participant 4).

"I liked that we spent time both at the remote island and at the university. That was a good way to both get away and highlight the host of the event and the project. The whole way, it was masterfully put together and it was important for actually experiencing the 'co-creation of value.' Brilliant (participant 18).

4.3. *Writing to develop knowledge*

Writing to develop knowledge is a solitary and instrumental act in which writing is a means to achieve something else. This category reflects the methods used by the scholars to enhance the perception that valued chapters written by other (invited) scholars helped to build their identities or self-concepts (Rosenberg, 1979). In contrast to writing to process information, writing to develop knowledge was pursued to facilitate the symbolic use of the final result of writing, e.g., to be part of creating a high-quality book and to develop knowledge and skills for academic achievement. Scholarly co-writing practices may include methods by which academics become competent participants in the social world of academia. Methods such as making the time and effort during the writing seminar to talk, discuss, compare, suggest, and give feedback were part of the integration process. In this way, scholars learned and "played the roles" of academic writers, as defined by the academic world. Participation in the book seminar influenced the scholars feeling of being in control in writing their chapters. Nevertheless, the feeling control of the chapters and the overall book, would vary among the authors due to the existence of different types and levels of knowledge, mental and geographic distances, and individuals' attention to and interest in the work. The writing seminar may have helped to reduce the participants' perceived lack of control through discussions and negotiations. The following quotations reflect this condition.

"I think the book seminar was very important for Dr. A. and me to write the chapter together while we are thousands of miles apart. Our ideas and complete framework evolved out of our face-to-face discussion and the lively group discussion during

the three intensive days. It made our working together much more efficient (participant 6)"

"I found it to be very helpful, participating in the book seminar. There are several reasons for this. It was fun and interesting to meet other tourism researchers. Participating in the book seminar led me to rethink my chapter so that it became a better chapter. It was very useful to listen to what the various authors intended to write about. Without the book seminar, I would probably have written a chapter that would not fit well into the book. Participating in the book seminar also helped motivate me to finish the chapter, even though I was skeptical as to whether I had time to do it" (participant 9).

"I thought the book seminar was very important as well as a wonderful experience. The purpose was very clear right from the beginning and it was met with a well-planned structure of the seminar. Getting to know all of the contributors and individuals' research standpoints to the book topic was the most valuable and greatest learning point for me. This has enabled me to be able to join in creating a harmonious voice in the book" (participant 10).

Writing to present oneself/networking refers to the ways in which scholars use written text, and even being contributors to a book, as a way to present themselves to relevant others. This practice serves to build affiliation and enhance distinction (Holt, 1995). Scholars' ways of writing as a social experience are experiential and participatory practices by which they communicate with other scholars. However, to network through scholarly writing, seminar participants first had to establish the nature of their relationships to the book's concept and plan (e.g., through their theoretical perspectives and chapter ideas). They conveyed the meanings of actions to others through participation in agreements, envisaging, mentoring, and expressing knowledge and thoughts at the seminar. Because agreements and bonds were made open at the seminar, they may have served as symbols of the quality of, trust in, and value of co-creation of an academic book. The following quotations reflect participants' writing to present themselves and/or to network.

"The book seminar was an eye-opener for me – an intellectually rich experience that has been pure pleasure to be a part of. I met people who worked in areas that were new to me, yet we were all talking about similar things (like co-creation and value). It made it possible to have challenging and stimulating discussions both in the meeting rooms and beyond that made me itch to get writing! I can hardly wait to read the finished book, because I want to see how our discussions turned into chapters and how our strong editors turned our chapters into a coherent story" (participant 3).

"The book seminar was a unique opportunity to bring together all contributors. This is a rare event that allowed us all to better know and understand each other with respect to our respective disciplines and with respect to our respective approaches towards the book. The Q and A sessions following each author's presentation were very instructive and enlightening" (participant 16).

"Edited books rarely have the 'gel' that makes all chapters well connected to one another. The seminar created that gel and I look forward to reading the final product. Beyond the intellectual benefits, it was also very valuable socially to be together, as a relatively small group, for four days. I am only hoping that the dynamic that was created could be kept alive for future projects" (participant 19).

4.4. *Writing to enjoy oneself and to have fun*

Writing to enjoy oneself and to have fun involves direct engagement in writing and interaction with fellow scholars, which becomes a mutual experience (Simmel, 1950). The authors may talk and share ideas, discuss the content of the book, and enjoy doing so. Communing and socializing is an important aspect of writing as an enjoyable act (Holt, 1995). Scholars commune when they share theories, methods, and experiences with each other. The book project becomes a mutual experience in which they can discuss and debate. When in company with other scholars, interactions occur, however they may be more or less important to the various scholar. Group interactions have been described as powerful (Belk, Wallendorf, & Sherry, 1989), and this seems to be true also in academic group situations. The following quotations reflect participants' enjoyment while interacting with other scholars during the writing seminar.

"I really liked the seminar. The best thing for me was to be together with a big group of international consumer behavior marketing and management professors. We all have the same research interest and it was great to meet and discuss it in this nice and informal context. In addition, the setting was fantastic. Good arrangements and it has been a nice and smooth process with the writing" (participant 5)

"The discussions were very well guided. I liked the flow of the schedule, and particularly the editors created a work environment with an appropriate and appreciated blend of drive, intellectual openness, and play" (participant 15).

5. Conclusions and implications

Examination of this case of a writing seminar conducted as part of the co-creation of an edited book led to the identification of four dimensions of academic writing, which focus attention on the collective autotelic and instrumental aspects of writing while acknowledging its solitary aspects. In the global higher-education sector and in the context of the growing competition that results from the search for academic quality across different nations, classifications adopted by governments and institutions emphasize the significance of faculty members' writing and high productivity in this endeavor. A better understanding of the collective autotelic and instrumental aspects of the process can deepen our understanding not only of academic writing, but also of its theory-driven practical implications for relevant policy makers. We consider two specific theoretical grounds to underlie the proposed framework, composed of four dimensions of academic writing: on-site lived experience and collective identity.

A central finding of this research is that all scholars recognized synergies of being at the writing seminar as a way to learn, socialize, enjoy, and present themselves. The results reveal that the members of this network focused not only on the utilitarian and instrumental purpose of book production, but also on the hedonic and autotelic aspects of physically meeting. Trust and commitment depend on interpersonal contact, which the findings show to be of importance for the achievement of the desired results.

The co-writing of this academic book was to a great extent about confirming, composing, decomposing, and restructuring identities. These issues were affected by two interwoven factors: the societal conditions that provided a framework and shaped individuals; and

the individuals' capabilities, capacities, inclinations, and interests. In the complex process of identity formation, societal influences and individual dispositions met and generated an internal process that affected the formation and manifestation of identities.

Academic writing, particularly at the faculty level, is shifting to the public domain in the contemporary climate of academia, wherein different governments and tertiary educational institutions adopt various classifications of quality and value (Light, 2002). Furthermore, the search for public policy-driven results – the "changing meaning of academic autonomy" (Henkel, 2005, p. 173) – demonstrate that the nature of identity with respect to academic writing is shifting to a more collective domain (described in Fig. 1 as collective instrumental). This shift at the faculty level is comparable to that observed for students; Lea and Street (1998) described student writing as an issue of "epistemology and identities, rather than skill or socialization" (p. 159).

The findings of this study indicate that academic institutions should take various actions to ensure the production of practical as well as theoretical publications. To meet the needs of institutions and scholars working at them, academic administrators and management should recognize that people behave differently and have various motivations for participation in various scholarly works. The case presented here shows that the inclusion of relevant practices in a seminar experience helps to create a common platform for the task at hand, allowing scholars to build identity and have fun, as well as to focus on the co-creation of a book. Thus, academic managers must understand the importance of hedonic motivations (i.e., enjoyment) and eudaimonic motivations (i.e., enjoyment of learning and the process of creating knowledge), in addition to the results of such co-creation.

As academics write book chapters for a variety of reasons and in different ways, they may find it challenging to gather at a writing seminar and work collectively with a book idea. The present work aids recognition of the variety of structures and purposes operating in an academic working environment, which may support future academic collaborations and work. Book editors might therefore seek to achieve a balance between working with the content of the book and structure-wide processes of knowledge. From the theoretical perspectives employed in this study, writing seminars encompass major aspects of constructivist and experiential learning, and provide rich opportunities for peer and team learning. In addition, the informal part of the seminar provided opportunities for social learning. A combination of formal and informal learning activities may allow for the meeting of different purposes of writing for edited books.

This study revealed an interdependence between work structures and individual self-definition processes. Individuals are agents of society who reflect actively on external conditions (Giddens, 1991). Thus, writing a chapter in an edited book forms the individual, but at the same time, the individual forms the writing processes and structures. In this sense, the collective autotelic and instrumental dimensions of writing may share certain bases with solitary dimensions. Further research is needed to explore whether solitary autotelic and/or instrumental dimensions share more-or-less fundamental bases with the collective dimensions.

Additional research on the relationship between interpersonal contacts and various types of knowledge building in scholarly networks should be undertaken. Research on network behavior and motivation among scholars and academic institutions should also be conducted, with a particular focus on the various phases of networks (e.g., nascent versus maturing). In the contemporary transnational world of research and higher education, an understanding of various institutional types based on their cultural

compositions could widen and deepen knowledge creation. Further development of knowledge about the potential and, more importantly, the desirable combinations of different kinds of relation in an international context, in terms not only of their strength, but also of their practical and strategic implications, would be valuable. Finally, a crucial topic for further research is the investigation of other sources and means for academics to develop and implement new knowledge.

Acknowledgement

The research in the present study is part of the research programme “Service Innovation and Tourist Experiences in the High North: The Co-Creation of Values for Consumers, Firms and the Tourism Industry”, financed by the Norwegian Research Association, project no: 195306/140.

References

- Aguillo, I. F., Bar-Ilan, J., Levene, M., & Ortega, J. L. (2010). Comparing university rankings. *Scientometrics*, 85, 243–256.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Zerbe, W. (2000). *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice*. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Becket, H. S. (1986). *Writing for social scientists. How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Belk, R., Wallendorf, M., & Sherry, J. (1989). The sacred and profane in consumer behavior: Theodicy on the odyssey. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(June), 1–38.
- Buela-Casal, G., Gutiérrez-Martínez, O., Paz Bermúdez-Sánchez, M., & Vadillo-Munoz, O. (2007). Comparative study of international academic rankings of universities. *Scientometrics*, 71(3), 349–365.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Demirbas, O., & Demirkan, H. (2003). Focus on architectural design process through learning styles. *Design Studies*, 24, 437–456.
- Dennick, R. G. (2008). In D. Matheson (Ed.), *Theories of learning: Constructive experience. An introduction to the study of education* (pp. 50–52). London: Routledge.
- Dillenbourg, P. (1999). What do you mean by collaborative learning. In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), *Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and computational approaches* (pp. 1–19). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Dill, D. D., & Soo, M. (2005). Academic quality, league tables, and public policy: A cross-national analysis of university ranking systems. *Higher Education*, 49, 495–533.
- Dunlap, J., & Grabinger, R. S. (1996). Rich environments for active learning in the higher education classroom. In B. G. Wilson (Ed.), *Constructivist learning environments: Case studies in instruction design*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology.
- Eggen, L., Van der Werf, M. P. C., & Bosker, R. J. (2008). The influence of personal networks and social support on study attainment of students in university education. *Higher Education*, 55(5), 553–573.
- Escalas, J. E., & Bettman, J. R. (2000). Using narratives to discern self-identity related consumer goals and motivations. In S. Ratneshwar (Ed.), *The why of Consumption: Contemporary perspectives on consumer motives, goals and desires*. London: Routledge.
- Findeli, A. (1990). Moholy-Nagy's design pedagogy in Chicago (1937–46). *Design Issues*, 7(1), 4–19.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College composition and communication*, 32(4), 365–387.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. (1993). Appealing work: An investigation of how ethnographic texts convince. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 595–616.
- Goodson, P. (2013). *Becoming an academic writer: 50 exercises for paced, productive, and powerful writing*. London: Sage.
- Gould, S. J. (1995). Researcher introspection as a method in consumer research: Application issues and implications. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2, 719–722.
- Grant, J., & Manuel, P. (1995). Using a peer resource learning model in planning education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 15(1), 51–57.
- Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2015). Following the impact factor: Utilitarianism or academic compliance? *Tourism Management*, 51, 309–312.
- Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. (1981). Uncovering cognitive processes in writing: An introduction to protocol analysis. In L. Gregg, & E. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 3–30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher Education*, 49, 155–176.
- Higgins, M., Aitken-Rose, E., & Dixon, J. (2009). The pedagogy of the planning studio: A view from down under. *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, 4(1), 8–30.
- Hixon, J. G., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1993). When does introspection bear fruit? Self-reflection, self-insight, and interpersonal choices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 35–43.
- Hollbrook, D., & Hirschman, E. D. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(September), 132–140.
- Holt, D. B. (1995). How consumers consume: A typology of consumption practices. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22, 1–16.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lang, J. (1983). Teaching planning to city planning students. An argument for the studio/seminar approach. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 2(2), 122–129.
- Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157–172.
- Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative Research: Reading analysis and interpretation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Light, G. (2002). From the personal to the public: Conceptions of creative writing in higher education. *Higher Education*, 43, 257–276.
- Maia, T. V. (2009). Reinforcement learning, conditioning, and the brain: Successes and challenges. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9, 343–364.
- Markwell, K., & Basche, C. (1998). Using personal diaries to collect data. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1), 228–245.
- Michaelson, L., Knight, A. B., & Fink, L. D. (2002). *Team-based learning, a transformative use of small groups*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Murray, R. (2013). It's not a hobby: Reconceptualising the place of writing in academic work. *Higher Education*, 66, 79–91.
- Nohria, N. (1992). Is a network perspective a useful way of studying organisations? In N. Nohria, & R. G. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and Organisations: Structure, form, and action*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Nygaard, L. (2008). *Writing for scholars. A practical guide to making sense and being heard*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- O'Connell, C. (2013). Research discourses surrounding global university rankings: Exploring the relationship with policy and practice recommendations. *Higher Education*, 65, 709–723.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2008). *Human learning* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Oxman, R. (1999). Educating the designerly thinker. *Design Studies*, 20(2), 105–122.
- O'Donnell, A., & King, A. (1999). *Cognitive perspectives on peer learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Packer, M. J., & Goicoechea, J. (2000). Sociocultural and constructivist theories of learning: Ontology, not just epistemology. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(4), 227–241.
- Piaget, J. (1972). *The principles of genetic epistemology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rolfe, G. (2006). Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: Quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 53(3), 304–310.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger.
- Ryan, A. M. (2000). Peer groups as a context for the socialisation of adolescents' motivation, engagement, and achievement in school. *Educational Psychologist*, 35, 101–111.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78.
- Savery, J., & Duffy, T. (1996). Problem based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. In B. G. Wilson (Ed.), *Constructivist learning environments: Case studies in instructional design*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology.
- Sawyer, R. K. (2006). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1984). The architectural studio as an exemplar of education for reflection-in action. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 38(1), 2–9.
- Seo, M. G., Feldmann Barret, L., & Barunek, J. M. (2004). The role of affective experience in work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 423–439.
- Shaffer, D. W. (2007). Learning in design. In R. Lesh, E. Hamilton, & J. Kaput (Eds.), *Foundations for the future in mathematics education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Simmel, G. (1950). In K. Wolff (Ed.), *The sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press.
- Swindler, A. (1986). Culture in action. *American Sociological Review*, 51(April), 273–286.
- Walker, D. (2002). Constructivist leadership: Standards, equity, and learning—weaving whole cloth from multiple strands. In L. Lamber (Ed.), *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Wasserman, S., & Galaskiewicz, J. (1994). *Advances in social network analysis: Research in the social and behavioural sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, 7(2), 225–246.
- Wenger, E. (2009). A social theory of learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning*. New York: Routledge.

- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge—seven principles for cultivating communities of practice*. HBS working knowledge. Harvard Business Review. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1999). Social-motivational processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding motivation at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*, 76–97.
- Wentzel, K. R., Barry, C. M., & Caldwell, K. A. (2004). Friendships in middle school: Influences on motivation and school adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *96*, 195–203.
- Wilkinson, L. (2008). *Business relating business: Managing organisational relations and networks*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). Discovering the future of the case study method in evaluation research. *Evaluation practice*, *15*(3), 283–290.
- Yuksel, A. (2003). Writing publishable papers. *Tourism Management*, *24*(4), 437–446.



Nina K. Prebensen, Ph.D. (nina.prebensen@uit.no) is Professor at UiT, The Arctic University of Norway. She has published books, book chapters and papers in various tourism and marketing journals. Her research highlights particularly the tourist decision and experience processes, where co-creation of value for hosts and guests are in focus.