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Writing out on a limb: integrating the creative and academic writing identity

Joanne Yoo

School of Education, Australian Catholic University, Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT

Academic writing in higher education research is commonly perceived as the process of ‘writing up’ knowledge rather than exploring ideas. As a result, the potential to use creative writing approaches to develop and relay meaning has often been overlooked. This article investigates creative writing as a rich and meaningful mode of representation in academia. It argues how dominant institutional discourses inhibit personal voice by favouring objectivity, and further affirms that researchers need to oppose the pressures of academic writing by ‘coming into’ one’s creative writing voice and consciousness. It is anticipated that using literary and poetic devices to relay the writer’s personal and creative voice can generate research that encompasses the full richness of human experience.

Writing to discover the creative writer

‘I know something is there, something important. I have sifted through the workshop observations and the teachers’ reflective responses multiple times, but no clear picture is forming. Everything appears significant but unrelated. What are these teachers trying to say?’ I stare, unblinking, at my notes from a teacher professional development workshop. I click open a document filled with insightful quotes from teachers. At this point I would normally start fiddling away, highlighting, grouping and ordering with excitement, but today I feel something akin to resignation. This situation is uncommon, as most times I would pursue fleeting intuitions until a picture painfully emerges. But today I dread having to generate words from an empty screen. All the information appears unrelated and I don’t know how to bring everything together. As I develop as a writer, I am finding the writing process increasingly difficult; the uncertainty of writing is particularly problematic as I battle with time constraints and the pressure to publish. What content should I focus on and how should I present it?

Academics may experience similar angst as they engage in the problematic craft of writing. Richardson (2002) has frequently written about the challenges of sociological research and describes a self-reflexive moment when she was haunted by three simple but provocative questions, ‘What to write? How to write? For whom to write?’ (Richardson 2002, 416). I am increasingly confronted by these theoretical and inherently ethical questions
as I struggle to write up my research. There are too many ways to interpret everything. Richardson’s second question on the hows of writing particularly troubles me as I question the rigidity and sterility of academic writing. The question of how to ‘best’ represent thought is an on-going struggle in my writing. This struggle has been broadly referred to in the literature as the postmodernist movement’s ‘crisis of confidence’. Ellis, Adams, and Bochner (2011) argue that postmodernism has led to the reformation and reconceptualisation of inquiry through generating scepticism of grand narratives. Postmodernists present knowledge as being ‘constructed’ within a particular context; they question the notion of a single ‘truth’ and acknowledge the existence of multiple realities (Ellis, Adams, and Bochner 2011). As researchers increasingly adopt postmodernists’ principles, they depict their inquiry through a creative and literary medium to highlight the possible interpretations of ‘truths’.

Postmodernism embraces the inherent open-endedness of knowing. This open-endedness similarly applies to the writing process, in which the destination is often equally unknown. Donald Murray, who often wrote about his lifelong passion for writing, compares writers to artists who are driven by the unexpected. Murray regards writers as ‘rationalisers of accident’, who come to their writing through the act of writing itself (1984, 1). As I seek to write up my article about the teaching workshop, the ‘research’ continues late into the evening as I ponder ways to interpret the data. I sense that this hesitation is valuable. Instead of launching into my theorising, I wait to see what emerges from my reflections. Badley (2009) speaks about this struggle to find the best words to ‘describe, interpret and analyse’ our observations of the world (211). Dewsbury (2014) explains how this sense-making process is difficult as it involves understanding how to live, ‘[to acquire] some grip on the world, to know how to go on, to write to others, perhaps as pleas for help in trying to work out how to go on’ (150). How does the writing act embody the writer’s sense-making process?

The way in which we present our research indicates the kinds of knowledge we value. Richardson (2014) explains how the ‘rhetorical and literary writing practices’ within sociology represent particular claims to knowledge, such as the way feminist-poststructuralism teaches her about legitimisation and how postmodernism exhorts her that to ‘doubt the truth-value of every theory, technique, and method could be a creative force for revisioning sociological telling … [and that] one could build a bridge between science and literature and get over it’ (2014, 416). She demonstrates how our writing style reflects our values and our worldview. Clough (1996) similarly identifies how we frame the world through our personal perceptions, as she relates, ‘we never come innocent to a research task, or a situation of events; rather we situate these events not merely in the institutional meanings which our profession provides, but also constitute them as expressions of ourselves’ (74). As we undertake research through our personal frames of reference, our inquiry advances human knowledge through ‘deepening meaning, expanding awareness, and enlarging understanding’ (Eisner 1997, 5). This view is shared by theorists who propose that ‘truths’ are deeply interrelated to the paradigms and words used to represent research (Rorty 1982). I also seek to creatively interpret and depict my view of the world, but feel less able to do this in my scholarly writing. Richardson (2001) relays this view, stating, ‘I was taught, though, as perhaps you were, too, not to write until I knew what I wanted to say, until my points were organized and outlined’ (35). Like Richardson, I attempt to question what I have been taught to believe about ‘good’ scholarly practice.
The tension between creative and academic writing

This tension between my natural inclinations towards creativity and the pressure to conform to academic discourse pulls me in two separate directions. Which of these sides should I write from? Can I merge the different forms? Dewsbury (2014) identifies these two opposing sides as the ‘will’ and the ‘desire’; he describes the former as the ‘external, institutionalised demand’ and the latter as the ‘internal and personal’ drive to write (148). He compares the ‘will to write’ to ‘writing for production or as a means to an end’, which objectifies the process of thinking and turns it into ‘a gravestone for the thoughts that we were having’ (Dewsbury 2014, 150). The two ends of this divide have been termed as ‘authoritative’ and ‘internally persuasive’ discourses (Bakhtin 1981, 342). Bakhtin (1981) describes the ‘authoritative’ discourse in terms of the academic language of the disciplines, which derives power from previously established authority. He refers to ‘internally persuasive’ writing as something that is ‘denied all privilege, backed up by no authority at all, and is frequently not even acknowledged by society’ (342). My aim is to write authoritatively by following an internally persuasive discourse. Is this even possible considering the differences between the two?

This new-found desire to communicate creatively has disturbed my writing path. I rebel against the institutional discourses that silence my own voice. Badley (2009) critiques authoritative discourses for making writing ‘boring, de-personalized, and homogenized’ and for limiting the writer’s power by stripping away their personal style and sense of self (211). Externally and institutionally driven writing revolves around the ‘writing up’ of post-research data rather than the creative meaning-making process; it is used as a ‘means to an end’ rather than as something that is pursued for its own purposes (Richardson 2000; Colyar 2009). This mechanistic approach opposes my lived experiences of writing, which often places the value on how an encounter is interpreted rather than the actual encounter itself. Norton (2013), a lecturer of English, asserts that institutionally driven writing rewards academics who are able to engage in scholarly and academic writing rather than the creative non-fiction writing that she identifies with. She draws our attention to the ‘tacit binary oppositions between the scholarly and the creative and the intellectual and the artistic’ (70) and argues that this divide is superficial and nonsensical as our academic identities are informed by our creative pursuits, as she states, ‘creative writing is the artistic manifestation of disciplinary engagement’ (72).

The tension between the academic and creative writer identity is vividly explored by Bochner (1997), who writes about his father’s death in It’s About Time: Narrative and the Divided Self. He describes these two identities as struggling and competing against each other for ‘supremacy’. He argues that these selves would not be able to meet each other as academic writing, which is based on theory and objectivity, is far removed from the ‘ordinary, experiential self’ (421). His father’s death triggers a moral crisis that alerts him to the incoherent and conflicting identity caused by the gap between his personal and his professional life. He wonders whether this happened over time as he unconsciously adopted academic discourses to survive and thrive in academia. Coles (1989) similarly discloses how academics inevitably adopt the theoretical language of disciplines to succeed in these spaces. Bochner (1997) concludes his article with a challenge for readers to resist the ‘orthodox academic practices to discipline, control, and perpetuate ourselves and our traditions, stifling innovation, discouraging creativity, inhibiting criticism
of our own institutional conventions, making it difficult to take risks, and severing academic life from emotional and spiritual life’ (433). He urges us to consider alternative approaches to research and writing that allow the academic and the personal to integrate, harmonise and converse with each other.

**The creative writing style**

An increasing number of theorists are following Bochner’s lead by resisting canonical ways of representation through experimenting with creative writing approaches (Spry 2001). Richardson (2002) urges writers to consider how qualitative content matter and knowledge require creative forms of presentation that move ‘beyond social scientific conventions and discursive practices’ (414). Denzin (1997) equally reflects on the advantages of certain types of representation for qualitative inquiry and proposes that creative writing is a better tool for depicting the lived experiences of participants. One example is Richardson’s *Dynamics of Sex and Gender: A Sociological Perspective* (1988), which was written simply and clearly so that students would ‘want to give [it] to their mothers’ (2002, 414). She represents a growing number of theorists who attempt to ‘transform the contents of our consciousness into a public form’ to ensure greater accessibility (Eisner 1997, 4). Badley’s (2016) article ‘Blue-collar Writing for Fruitful Dialogue?’ similarly explores ways to make academic writing more comprehensible and engaging for others. Researchers such as Richardson and Bradley conduct and represent inquiry through literary rather than objective forms to make their research more accessible (Ellis, Adams, and Bochner 2011).

Accessible writing involves open-ended and less structured forms of representation that are characteristic of creative writing. Richardson (2002) incorporates such a writing style by positioning readers as meaning makers who actively engage in her words, by ‘breaking paragraphs at unconventional places so that the reader would write the next sentence, making sense of the materials along with me’ (416). She makes her writing accessible by inviting readers to follow and complete her chain of thought. *Meaning lies not just on ‘what’ is said, but also on ‘how’ it is said and understood. Inviting readers to engage as active participants acknowledges the valuable role they play in the meaning-making process.* Elbaz-Luwisch (2002) similarly relates the need to write creatively to avoid the passive ways of responding to authoritative discourses, which ‘lull us into particular forms of reading as well as writing’ (420). Unfortunately, as ‘academic’ readers and writers, we have become accustomed to passively engaging in texts that espouse scientific ‘truths’ by accepting meaning at ‘face value’.

Autoethnography is one research methodology that embodies the researcher’s personal voice and caters for open-ended forms of representation. The term autoethnography itself highlights this personal focus, as it describes a methodological approach that allows researchers to analyse or study (graphy) personal experience (auto) to make sense of one’s own cultural experiences (ethno) (Ellis 2004). It integrates elements of ethnography and autobiography to convey the individual’s experience of research (Ellis and Bochner 2000). It has similar qualities to autobiographical writing, as it engages readers through aesthetic and evocative language and the conventions of narrative, which include characters, a plot and a scene. Autoethnographers adopt creative writing techniques, such as drawing readers into the scene by providing thick descriptions of the research context,
engaging characters in conversation and by altering authorial points of view (Ellis and Bochner 2006). Although there are many vivid examples, Andrew Sparkes’ (1996) ‘The Fatal Flaw: A Narrative of the Fragile Body-Self’ provided a strong model for me to follow. Sparkes explores the emotional and physical implications of a chronic back injury on his professional and personal identity. The picture that he paints resonates with the complexities I faced ‘performing’ as an academic who was also nursing a debilitating back injury.

**Evaluating creative writing**

If I was to evaluate Sparkes’ autoethnography, I would do so through its impact on my writing and understanding of research rather than through scientific standards of objectivity. Autoethnography requires such alternative criteria as it has a different purpose to traditional academic discourses (Ellis, Adams, and Bochner 2011). Richardson (2000) argues that creative research approaches are valid if they have aesthetic merit and emotionally resonate with the audience. Interpretivist researchers, such as autoethnographers, consequently use alternative questions to evaluate their work, including: ‘Does the research support positive change? Is it catalytic, liberating, and transformative? Does it empower?’ to assess the validity of qualitative and creative inquiry (Piercy and Benson 2005, 110). Since creative writing acknowledges multiple forms of ‘truth’ and depicts ‘truth’ as being ambiguous and highly subjective, the criteria used to assess validity focus on the writers’ internal compass, such as ‘how does it “look to your mind’s eye”? Does it “satisfy your sense of style and craftsmanship”? Do you “believe it”, and does it “appeal to your heart”?‘ (Clough 1996, 75). Autoethnographers acknowledge how they construct ‘truth’ through the fabrication process. Badley (2009) regards fabrication to be an ‘honorable metaphor(s)’ as it takes into account the creative process of writing (213). He draws attention to the root meaning of the words maker and fabricator:

An archaic meaning of ‘maker’ is that of poet, someone who especially deals in metaphors and other images in order to illuminate and communicate an understanding of some aspect of the world. Similarly, ‘fabricator’ derives from ‘faber,’ a skilled worker … (Badley 2009, 213)

Rather than following traditional approaches to assess research validity, creative inquiry measures relevance through its impact. This approach acknowledges how readers, with their equally unique lens on life, can interpret the metaphors and imagery in literature in multiple ways. Creative writing takes into account the co-construction of meaning with the reader. It also goes against dominant academic, scientific and objective discourses that perceive ‘truth’ as residing in the ‘single, unambiguous voice’ (Richardson 1988, 201). Bochner (2000) argues that our ‘preoccup[ation] with rigor’ leaves us ‘neglectful of imagination’ (267) and proposes that we fearfully limit our choice and our capacity for human expression when we become overly fixated on rigour. Creative writing has a powerful impact on readers as its tools of imagery, metaphor and allegory can ‘form lasting impressions and to inspire vivid mental imagery’ (Wallach 2008, 40). These impressions or images can evoke emotional responses that remain with us long after we have finished reading. As a lecturer in teacher education, I vividly recall a student’s assessment that was presented as a short story rather than the ‘assigned’ essay. The student had argued that his ideas about transition, the loss of hope and disillusionment
after graduation would only make sense narratively. His writing was difficult to assess, but had the strongest emotional impact. I remember it vividly although I read it over a decade ago. His identity confusion powerfully resonated with the questions I had about being an ‘academic’ writer. As an academic I have also felt the same disillusionment about what to research and how to convey it meaningfully. I equally rebel against the formal structures of the ‘essay’ and wish to package my academic writing as a story.

**Coming into our creative writing voice**

The desire to reclaim, to derive confidence in and to develop one’s voice is the beginning of coming into one’s own writing. Elbaz-Luwisch (2002) chronicles the moment she begins listening to her own voice as she attempts to break free from the ‘tyranny of the academic expectation’ that we always have the answers (415). The writer’s voice challenges the homogenisation of academic writing, which requires writers to speak from the ‘omniscient voice of science or scholarship’ (Richardson 2001, 34). Theory should support rather than speak for our narratives of experiences, but even as I write this article, I find myself hypocritically slipping into the omniscient academic voice. What does it mean to have voice when we speak within and from pre-existing discourses? This article explores this idea of ‘coming into writing’ to access our voice; this phrase is used by Elbaz-Luwisch (2002) as she reflects on whether it is possible for herself and her teacher education students, ‘to go beyond these fixed plots and to develop an internally persuasive discourse’ in their writing (420). This article investigates this ‘sense-making’ process as it depicts writing as a way of connecting to ourselves and the world.

Letting voice emerge through the creative writing process requires openness and discernment. Murray (1982) describes the creative process of writing as an obscure and muddy process and explains how writers come into their writing by manoeuvring themselves intuitively, ‘follow[ing] thinking that has not yet become thought’ and reading ‘patterns and designs – sketches of possible relationships between pieces of information or fragments of rhetoric or language’ (141). He identifies the writer as an explorer or a map-maker who follows a trail that surfaces as a fleeting sensation. Dewsbury (2014) portrays this first hint of meaning as an ‘effervescent buzz’ that spurs the writer towards illumination, describing how:

… thought comes alive, directing you and not you it, and in seemingly effortless ways writing folds the past, present and future in the here and now of those keyboard taps as sentences start to shape up and fill the screen. (148)

The writer does not passively wait for the meaning to unravel but is attuned to and willing to follow the faintest glimmer of clues. Murray (1984) also depicts how writing is an act of revelation and surprise as writers ‘develop and exploit the surprise that was only a hint, a revealing snap of a twig, a shadow in the bush before the writer pounced’ (6). Creative writing therefore requires emotional openness, and mental agility and creativity as writers need to pounce upon one revelation after another to enjoy a continuous unraveling of surprises (Cloutier 2016, 79). Dewsbury (2014) acknowledges a similar sense of coming into one’s writing; he settles on the word ‘apprehensive’ to highlight the opportunities presented. Rather than dwelling on the negative fearfulness of not knowing, he frames ‘apprehension’ through a state of possibilities, ‘… to apprehend, but not be
certain; to be apprehended, to arrest, to be arrested, to be caught dumbfounded in the flow of someone else, something else, a breeze, a warm glow of sunlight – affect: to understand, practically, not intellectually’ (148). A creative writer’s skill lies in this ability to discern patterns and to courageously uncover their ‘voice’.

Voice is inherent to all our writing although it may be hidden by our theorising. Murray (1991) proposes that all writing is autobiographical and that we come to know ourselves through how we use language. *Both my writing style and choice of subject matter reveal something about me, such as my passion to express myself creatively.* Murray (1991) explains how most writers only have a few writing topics that they write about; his favourite topics include: family, childhood, death, illness, religion and war. He is drawn to these topics as a source of ‘understanding and hope for a compassion that has not yet arrived’ (67). I am equally drawn to write about my identity. My most recent publications relate to topics that are most relevant to my life, such as physical illness and the casual academic identity. Both aspects present a strong source of tension as incompatible with my desires to be a reliable and autonomous professional. We write about our experiences and practices to better understand them, and by doing so, we connect ourselves to others. Richardson (2002) relays these views by asserting how ‘personal narration, reflexivity, and contextualization’ are invaluable ways to conceptualise and relay meaningful and impactful research, as they can ‘demystify authority claims, enlarge disciplinary boundaries, and contribute to the writing of a socially useful, culturally critical, publicly available, and vibrant knowledge development’ (216). The value of authentic connections has also been discussed by Sparkes (1996), who presents a narrative account of his struggles with a chronic lower back problem to ‘take readers into the intimacies of [his] world’ and to help them reflect on their lives in relation to his experiences (467).

Writers become lifelong learners as they continue refining their abilities to creatively encounter, to make sense of, to engage and to depict life. Murray (1992) reflects on his ongoing process of reacting to and paying attention to his reactions to the world; he regards himself as a ‘student’ of life as he engages the world creatively and lets his emotions ‘ignite his thoughts’ (15). He pays careful attention to emotions and describes how beginner writers ‘do not value’ their reactions as they regard them as everyday, ordinary and unimportant. He suggests that writers need to have an ‘essential innocence or arrogance’ to declare that their ‘experience – observation, thought or feeling – has not existed until I write it’ (Murray 1992, 15). Murray conveys writing as an ongoing declaration of one’s thoughts and an expression of one’s being, where writers continue to shape themselves as they shape their writing.

**The creative writing community**

Although there is no blueprint for writing, the steps taken by others have created this natural pathway for me to follow. Richardson’s words immerse me in her rich and deeply nuanced world. She writes about a curious range of subjects that speak ‘about’ her and ‘of’ her, such as her fears about falling in her reflections on retirement and her work in a hospice (Richardson 2011, 2014). *I seek out such writing as their clear voices affirm my attempts to find my own.* I compare the evocative autoethnographies I read to articles written from the ‘omniscent voice of science or scholarship’ (Richardson...
There is no comparing which articles have the greater impact. I can only finish reading the articles that resonate with ‘truth’ by clearly embodying the author’s voice. Gun-tarik, van de Pol, and Berry (2015) similarly reflect on ‘truth’ as they admit that they, ‘sometimes find a struggle between fact and truth. … [as] facts alone rarely tell the whole story, the whole truth. … [which is revealed in] moments of imaginative place, a kind of improvisation and space’ (7). They argue that ‘truthful’ writing can be anything that matches up with a reader’s internal discourse and consolidates his or her understanding of the world.

Our voices do not speak in isolation, but are further strengthened by being heard, validated and legitimised within a community of like-minded individuals (Cloutier 2016, 72). The conversations generated within such writing communities act as a connective chain, in which writers seek to answer their problem, questions or challenges through combined efforts of reading, researching and writing. Badley (2009) refers to Dewey’s (1991, 15) view that meaning ‘grows out of a series of natural chains or threads or connections’ as ‘our (de-constructive) reading and (re-constructive) writing’ act as tools for investigating our questions. Cloutier (2016) similarly proposes how our ‘creative energy’ lies at the point of writing and non-writing, as we feed our inspiration through other sense-making activities such as reading, drawing and talking (79). As a ‘sense-maker’, I spend much of my time perusing creative books, articles and resources outside my discipline that trigger similar such writing. Writing as a form of discussion implies that ‘content that does not invoke further conversation is of no interest’ (Hudd, Sardi, and Lopriore 2013, 37). As writers share their perspectives, they enable others to come to terms with their own lives.

As a creative writer’s voice merges with the others, these combined voices acquire a deeper and shared creative consciousness. For example, a sociological perspective entails a special ‘cognitive ability’, where individuals look at the world through the particular framework or lens of sociological imagination. Through writing within this paradigm, sociologists can develop their eye for observing unique patterns of behaviour. In this same way, writers can refine their tools of discernment and vigilance as they approach writing from the creative writing paradigm. They can develop an artistic eye to notice the harmony, holism and beauty in their work as they craft their words aesthetically using skills such as ‘sensibility, imagination, technique, and the ability to make judgments about the feel and significance of the particular’ (Eisner 2002, 382). By accessing ‘carnal knowledge’ or their ‘inner’ artist, writers may achieve subtlety in ‘matters of timing, manner and tone’, and attain greater fluidity in their writing and within their lives (Eisner 2002, 382). Murray (1992) describes such joys of a vibrant, active and awake state of mind, as he comments, ‘I am never bored, because I am constantly observing my world, catching, out of the corner of my eye, the revealing detail, hearing what is not said, entering into the skin of others’ (14). Rodgers and Raider-Roth equally acknowledge how writing enables individuals to attain a sense of presence or a keen alertness to one’s environment, which they describe as, ‘a state of wide-awakeness … a plane of consciousness of highest tension originating in an attitude of full attention to life and its requirements’ (2006, 268). As writers perceive the possible creative reconstructions of one’s encounters, they may be able to adopt the creative consciousness that underlies such writing.
Conclusion

The process has been slow, but I feel like I am getting closer. But unlike my student who wrote a story because it ‘felt right’, I cling to the safe confines of academic writing. I struggle with the ‘authoritative’ and ‘internally persuasive’ discourses discussed by Bakhtin (1981) as I feel that I have little choice but to adopt the academic writing style to have my work published. Norton (2013) proposes how writers who succeed in the academic world are able to perform according to expectations by, ‘theoris[ing] or contextualis[ing] from a refined distance’ (69). I write in this way but feel restless. I am dissatisfied with my lack of voice and wonder about more holistic ways that integrate the creative and academic writing forms. This article describes this struggle between my ‘will’ and ‘desire to write’ with ‘writing for production’. It seeks to integrate the two aspects by exploring writing for a scholarly audience that embodies my personal writer’s voice. Bochner (1997) argues that we need to find more meaningful approaches to research, such as creative writing, to avoid an ‘unfulfilled life of the mind’ and ‘a life time of emotional fall-out’ (430).

As I reflect on the challenges of ‘coming into’ my own personal writing voice, I look for examples to follow. Ellis, Adams, and Bochner (2011) depict autoethnography as an approach to research and writing that challenges canonical approaches by using personal experience to shed insight into broader cultural experience. Autoethnography does not adhere to academic writing’s preoccupation with validity and measurability as its aim is to change the experiences of readers and writers for the better (Holman Jones 2005). Through exploring such creative writing approaches in my academic writing, I can sense my personal writer’s voice getting stronger. I am more discerning about what I choose to write and how I wish to depict it. Badley (2009) speaks about a writer’s formative growth as they engage in, ‘learning by doing, learning by trying, learning by experimenting, in order to set down, what we think we know and understand by the questions posed’ (215). He proposes that these writing acts are visible and honest attempts to uncover an answer to the dilemmas, challenges or questions that reside deep within us, which drive us to create, to speak and to fabricate meaning. In our discussions on valid, credible and valuable approaches to research and writing, our focus must return to the heart of inquiry, which is to ‘keep the conversation going’ in ways that enrich and deepen human understanding.
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