



Article

In pursuit of sustainable co-authorship practices in doctoral supervision: addressing the challenges of writing, authorial identity and integrity

Lokhtina, Irina, Löfström, Erika, Corner, Solveig and Castello, Montserrat

Available at <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/34144/>

Lokhtina, Irina ORCID: 0000-0001-5223-3779, Löfström, Erika, Corner, Solveig and Castello, Montserrat (2022) In pursuit of sustainable co-authorship practices in doctoral supervision: addressing the challenges of writing, authorial identity and integrity. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 59 (1). pp. 82-92. ISSN 1470-3297

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1799839>

For more information about UCLan's research in this area go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/researchgroups/> and search for <name of research Group>.

For information about Research generally at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [policies](#) page.



In pursuit of sustainable co-authorship practices in doctoral supervision: addressing the challenges of writing, authorial identity and integrity

Journal:	<i>Innovations in Education and Teaching International</i>
Manuscript ID	RIIE-2019-0301.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Areas of Interest: Keywords:	co-authorship, supervision, doctoral students, identity, integrity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

In pursuit of sustainable co-authorship practices in doctoral supervision: addressing the challenges of writing, authorial identity and integrity.

Abstract

Developing an authorial voice along with co-authorship practices can be an important pathway towards building one's professional identity and career. However, challenges may arise when contributors have different expectations about co-authorship conventions and are accountable to different stakeholders. This article aims to explore co-authorship practices between doctoral students and supervisors by drawing on four dimensions that highlight professional challenges across disciplinary and national contexts: 1) supervisors' writing and co-authorship, 2) strategies and activities to support writing, 3) authorial voice, and 4) integrity and (the risk of) plagiarism. The article summarises practices and suggestions for academics and policymakers on how to create and promote an ethical and sustainable approach to co-authorship in supervisory context.

Keywords: co-authorship, supervision, doctoral students, identity, integrity

Introduction

An understanding of co-authorship practices develops during doctoral studies, and writing collaborations between doctoral students and supervisors has become an important pathway towards building one's academic identity and professional record (Kamler, 2008). Indeed, in academia today, it is virtually impossible for researchers to operate without scientific collaboration (Henriksen, 2016) and co-authoring (Acedo et al., 2006). Co-authorship between doctoral students and supervisors has become increasingly relevant through the tendency in many institutions to encourage article-based doctoral dissertations.

While authorship attribution is an increasingly important 'currency' of academia (Macfarlane, 2017), it is not only a reward but also a responsibility of participating authors (Smith, 2017) that involves establishing and maintaining effective communication, agreeing on work expectations and meeting deadlines (Conn et al., 2015). These often depend on the nature of collaborative relationships between doctoral students and supervisors, as well as on their approach to managing authorship.

A growing number of studies explore the grounds for co-authorship (Cutas & Shaw, 2015; Leane et al., 2019; Selbach et al., 2018). With this article, we wish to build specifically on research addressing challenges in co-authorship among doctoral students and supervisors (cf. Kamler, 2008). This article presents a synthesis of the central perspectives on co-authorship in a supervisory context that each of us has identified from our interdisciplinary research areas, including writing, ethics, well-being and academic identity. We recognise that the four dimensions we have chosen, though highlighted by research as crucial, are not exclusive, and other disciplinary approaches may identify other challenges and solutions as well. Rather than an ad hoc combination of existing literature, this synthesis based on the collected findings from the authors' recent research is an attempt to take part in the discussion on writing in doctoral education in an era of 'publish or perish' discourse (cf. McGrail, 2006). In doing so, we emphasised the importance of considering the four sustainable practices, so co-authorship in supervisory context could become a much more fulfilling experience for all concerned in different disciplinary and national context.

The synthesis is based on literature reviews and results presented in our research on writing, authorial voice (Castelló & Donahue, 2012; Castelló et al., 2013; Nelson & Castelló, 2011; James & Lokhtina, 2018) and integrity (Löfström & Pyhältö, 2012; 2014; 2015; Löfström et al., 2015; Löfström et al., 2017). The article does not present a literature review *per se*, but the reader is referred to the above-mentioned studies. Moreover, we wish to

1
2
3 explicitly acknowledge the importance of the work of Kitchener (1985, referred to in
4 Löffström & Pyhältö, 2012; 2014; 2015), East (2010), Valentine (2006, referred to in
5 Löffström et al., 2015) and McAlpine & Amundsen (2009, referred to in James & Lokhtina,
6 2018) for our prior research. Here we bring together what we have identified, based on the
7 studies listed above, to be relevant dimensions of co-authorship in the context of supervision
8 in doctoral studies, and elaborate on those dimensions. While many practices around
9 both supervision and co-authorship are contextual and field-specific, we aggregated the four
10 dimensions of the writing process that are of interest across disciplinary and national
11 contexts, consisting of:

- 12 1) supervisors' writing and co-authorship, (González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018; Inouye
13 & McAlpine, 2019);
- 14 2) strategies and activities to support writing (Castelló & Donahue, 2012; Castelló et al.,
15 2013; Castelló et al., 2017; Florence & Yore, 2004);
- 16 3) authorial voice (Nelson & Castelló, 2011; McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; James &
17 Lokhtina, 2018); and
- 18 4) integrity and (the risk of) plagiarism (Löffström & Pyhältö, 2012, 2014, 2015;
19 Löffström et al., 2015; Löffström, et al., 2017).

20 We conclude by summarising practices and suggestions for academics and
21 policymakers on how to create and promote an ethical and sustainable approach to co-
22 authorship in a supervisory context.

23 **Supervisors' writing and co-authorship**

24 Whereas research on doctoral students' writing has been extensive and growing over the last
25 two decades (Caffarella & Barnett, 2000; Carlino, 2012; Castelló et al., 2009b; Castelló et al.,
26 2013; Inouye & McAlpine, 2019; Kamler, 2008; Kamler & Thomson, 2014), studies focusing
27 on supervisors' writing and even on faculty or experienced researchers' writing have been
28 scarce (Florence & Yore, 2004; Iñesta & Castelló, 2012). Yet, in discussing co-authorship
29 practices between students and supervisors, it is important to understand supervisors' writing
30 experiences and expectations. The evidence from studies that focus on this area sheds light on
31 three complementary aspects.

32 Firstly, writing difficulties do not disappear after doctoral graduation and even
33 experienced researchers struggle with writing, specifically to adjust different genres to their

1
2
3 disciplinary discourses (Emerson, 2012; Iñesta & Castelló, 2012; Tardy, 2003; Swales, 2009).
4
5 What is different from students' perspective is how supervisors tend to deal with the
6
7 challenges and make strategic use of their knowledge and rhetorical strategies to position
8
9 themselves as authors in the scientific community (Iñesta & Castelló, 2012; Florence & Yore,
10
11 2004).

12
13 Secondly, there is some evidence regarding how perceived competence, attitudes and
14
15 especially feelings towards writing mediate or interfere with researchers' genre preferences.
16
17 Those researchers that consider writing as a demanding but also rewarding activity are more
18
19 able to engage in research and scientific writing than those who perceive research writing as
20
21 non-relevant or unsatisfactory (Bazerman et al., 2012; Gallego et al., 2016).

22
23 Thirdly, highly productive researchers and writers tend to be active members in their
24
25 disciplinary and scientific communities and demonstrate deep knowledge not only of the
26
27 rhetorical requirements of written genres, but also of the research field-related dynamics and
28
29 social relationships among authors. This knowledge is demonstrated through their strategic
30
31 decisions regarding how to write and interact with other authors through citations, peer
32
33 revision processes and journal selection and publication (Dressen-Hammouda, 2008;
34
35 Emerson, 2012).

36
37 Research supports the idea of writing as a developmental process related to research-
38
39 related competences and identity development (e.g. Ivanic 2005; Castelló, et al., 2017;
40
41 Inouye & McAlpine, 2019), that requires emotional engagement (Aitchison et al., 2012) and
42
43 is socially situated (Prior, 2013; Castelló, et al., 2017; Iñesta & Castelló, 2012). At the same
44
45 time, in a collaborative context, this process is filtered and influenced by the supervisors'
46
47 writing habits, prior experiences and strategies, as well as their position within the discipline
48
49 or research area.

50 51 **Strategies and activities to support writing**

52
53 Research on how supervisors support writing has mainly focused on the identification and
54
55 analysis of the supervisory strategies to support student writing and on how these strategies
56
57 and other types of writing feedback are perceived both by students and, to a lesser extent,
58
59 supervisors. More recently, the impact of supervisory writing support strategies and feedback
60
on students' development and learning as writers and researchers has been also investigated.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
Research on supervisory feedback on writing has revealed that supervisors are often unaware of the particular challenges that their students experience when having to write in unfamiliar genres, such as articles or doctoral dissertations, as well as the difficulties they face in publishing their research (Caffarella & Barnett, 2000; Bitchener et al., 2010; Maher et al., 2014). Studies have repeatedly demonstrated that a high number of doctoral students and even postdocs hold maladaptive conceptions about writing that may result in them procrastinating and experiencing writing blocks, especially if they are perfectionists (Lonka et al., 2014; Cerrato-Lara et al., 2017; Castelló et al., 2017). However, students' challenges as writers are quite unknown to supervisors. There is abundant evidence from research, but also from supervisory daily work and training, that highlights supervisors' concerns when they realise that students are apparently unable to learn simply from text corrections or that they do not just write and submit their texts in due time (Lee & Murray, 2015). While supervisors may believe that they contribute substantially to the students' writing process as well as learning process, the students might, at the end of the day, find themselves struggling alone to understand the genre, the expectations and the nature of relationships formed around the writing.

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
Subsequently, supervisors offer different types of writing support to help their students to deal with their writing difficulties. In a recent study, González-Ocampo & Castelló (2018) identified three categories of writing support that varied in terms of supervisors' involvement. The first category consisted of telling the students what to do, how they should write and what good research texts and genres look like (e.g. offering them good models). Supervisors representing the second category usually reviewed and edited students' texts, since, as experienced writers, they are supposed to know and manage genre conventions. In these cases, supervisors hope explicit corrections would be enough for their students to learn to deal with these conventions and their dynamics when facing particular writing situations. The third category consisted of a group of supervisors who were concerned about teaching research writing to their students and thus tended to write and discuss texts collaboratively with their students. Moreover, research has repeatedly demonstrated that the different types of writing support that supervisors are able to offer relate to their own conceptions on how writing works and the role that they attribute to writing in their activity as researchers (Coterall, 2011; Lee & Murray, 2015; González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018).

57
58
59
60
Available evidence on the impact of different supervisory support strategies on students' writing, although limited, points in the same direction. Strategies that involve supervisors and students at different levels of collaborative writing have been found to be

1
2
3 useful not only in developing efficient and effective writers, but also in contributing to the
4 students' knowledge of their respective disciplinary research communities. These strategies
5 account for the social dimension of writing, in many cases unknown to the students, and can
6 be promoted not only through the supervisors' explicit and contingent comments throughout
7 the writing processes, but also by involving other researchers with different levels of
8 experience and with different roles in the process of planning, writing, revising and
9 publishing (Aitchison & Guerin, 2014; Guerin et al., 2017; Florence & Yore, 2004;
10 González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018, Lee & Murray, 2015; Paré, 2011; Kamler, 2008). Thus,
11 in relation to the doctoral students' writing process, supervisors may take a number of
12 decisions, make suggestions and initiate supportive steps in certain directions, but the
13 underlying justifications and the aims of these activities remain implicit and non-transparent
14 to the students.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Supporting authorial voice

30
31 Despite the nature of supervisory support for writing, which is often implicitly assumed, the
32 choice of writing strategies for constructing academic texts exemplifies how doctoral students
33 engage in dialogue with the discourses and establish connections with other authors' texts
34 (Ivanic, 2005). These connections may encompass formal rules that provide some sort of
35 order associated with authority and authenticity in academic writing (Nelson & Castelló,
36 2011).
37
38
39
40
41

42 Whereas academic writing conventions seem to be relatively invariant across
43 European countries (Kruse et al., 2016), there might be tensions between dominant
44 supervisory writing strategies and the expectations of doctoral students about the writing,
45 which may influence students' authorial identity. Authorial identity as a facet of academic
46 identity may exemplify academics' authorial voice (Inouye & McAlpine, 2019; McAlpine &
47 Amundsen, 2009), which is mediated by the text (Castelló et al., 2009b).
48
49
50
51

52 It is thus not surprising that writing an academic text as an ongoing, object-directed
53 and dialectically-structured activity (Russell, 1997) may involve asymmetric relations
54 between gatekeepers and 'less powerful' academics (Burrough-Boenish, 2003). In such
55 circumstances, doctoral students can continually negotiate their authorial voice as they
56 engage in their respective disciplinary communities (Castelló et al., 2009a). These
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 negotiations can variously influence the textual choices made by doctoral students, who may
4 retain partial ownership over their writing strategy. This highlights how authorship and
5 writing practices can be complex and present challenges for doctoral students in determining
6 how they see themselves and are perceived by others within their disciplinary communities
7 (James & Lokhtina, 2018).
8
9

10
11 Hence, with regard to doctoral students' writing practices, education interventions
12 concerning writing in groups (e.g. among doctoral students or with supervisors) may provide
13 them with access to legitimate participation within communities in which doctoral students
14 may claim membership. From an educational perspective, such formally structured activities
15 and engaging in dialogue about them can be viewed as a tool to help doctoral students to
16 increase their awareness of different voices and other authors' contributions to the text, as
17 well as a way to learn to negotiate their authorial voice and academic identity.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Integrity and dealing with (the risk of) plagiarism**

28
29
30

31 While co-authorship provides a space for negotiating the individual authorial voice, the voice
32 also stands in relation to "other voices". It is important, even at an early stage, to openly
33 discuss principles of co-authorship, e.g. who is an author and author order (Hakkarainen et
34 al., 2014; Johansen et al., 2019). Challenges and problems arise when contributors have
35 different expectations about co-authorship conventions. One of the major problems that arise
36 in the case of multiple authors is inappropriately assigning authorship credit or failure to
37 assign credit when due, giving a false impression of the true contribution (Macfarlane, 2017).
38 Supervisors sometimes struggle with how extensive a contribution they should make to
39 student articles for these to still be considered the students' work (Löfström & Pyhältö,
40 2012). In contrast, doctoral students may be perplexed by what counts as a sufficient
41 contribution by the supervisor (Löfström & Pyhältö, 2015).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Plagiarism may constitute another challenge for co-authorship. Codes of conduct for
51 researchers define plagiarism as research misconduct along with falsification and fabrication
52 (e.g. ALLEA, 2017). Yet, many authors view plagiarism as a developmental issue, or an issue
53 arising from cultural and ideological differences, or simply different expectations rather than
54 a moral transgression *per se* (e.g. Pecorari, 2003; Hayes & Introna, 2005; Angelil-Carter,
55 2005; Valentine, 2006; Abasi & Graves, 2008; East, 2010). Individual supervisors may
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 represent different takes on this question, and their stance is likely to influence their
4 supervision practices (e.g. Löfström et al., 2015).

5
6 The responsibility for the integrity of the work presented in a publication extends to
7 all authors (e.g. the Vancouver Protocol, ICMJE), and the fact that supervisors are
8 responsible as co-authors of the writing they publish together with their doctoral students
9 may cause some supervisors to be cautious in co-authoring with their supervisees. However,
10 supervisors can also be guilty of plagiarising the writing of their doctoral students (cf.
11 Löfström & Pyhältö, 2014). The expanding use of text-matching software is changing the
12 landscape of supervision and writing (Löfström et al., 2017). It may add a safeguard against
13 plagiarism, but it may also signal distrust towards doctoral students.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Co-authorship practices: The future**

25 This article has explored co-authorship by drawing on four dimensions of the writing process
26 and identified a number of challenges that both doctoral students and supervisors may
27 experience in different disciplinary and national contexts. Key challenges and sustainable co-
28 authorship practices that can address these challenges include:
29
30
31

32 1. *Helping supervisors to support early career researchers' writing development*

33 We identified the idea of writing as a developmental process related to research competences
34 and identity development as a challenge in supervisors' writing and co-authorship. We
35 further identified the supervisors' own conceptions on how writing works and the role they
36 attribute to writing in their activity as researchers to be a challenge in connection to strategies
37 and activities to support doctoral students' writing.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 2. *Supporting doctoral students in adopting a long-term developmental diversified* 47 *approach to writing*

48 Learning to write in academic genres requires a sense of self as a writer. Writing retreats for
49 doctoral students may offer opportunities not only for writing but also for reflecting on their
50 writing strategies. As supervisors' writing practices may shape their supervisory practices,
51 supervisors may benefit from opportunities to reflect on writing and authorship, some of
52 which might take place together with doctoral students.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3. *Helping students to develop and support their own voice in writing*

We identified the importance of raising awareness among doctoral students of the authorial identity that they project in their own writing. It may be important for doctoral students to be involved in *writing communities*. This may help them to grasp the nature of the educational relationship in which they engage with supervisors and fellow students. In doing so, doctoral students may have an opportunity to explore collaborative writing approaches and to understand how their participation in writing communities may help them negotiate issues of co-authorship and support their own voice and identity (cf. Aitchison & Guerin, 2014; Lokhtina, 2018).

4. *Strengthening integrity and trust*

In order to preserve trust, it is vital that the practices employed are transparent and protect the rights of both doctoral students and supervisors (Hakkarainen et al., 2014). Most recognised journals nowadays use text-matching software to ensure the originality of the work they publish. It may be important for doctoral students to learn that everybody's writing is subjected to the same procedure in the publication phase, irrespective of academic rank and position. Guidelines for authorship and identifying when and how to negotiate it (e.g. Finnish National Board on Research Integrity, 2018; ICMJE, 2018) provide a basis for both supervisors and doctoral students to negotiate co-authorship on equal grounds.

While higher education institutions are keen on increasing scientific publication output, institutional support for doctoral students in developing their authorial voice and strengthening solid practices for authorship and co-authorship may not be the primary targets of investments. A discourse of 'publishing or perishing' permeates much of academia (McGrail et al., 2006) but we do not identify a similarly powerful discourse relating to sustainable writing practices, authorial voice or integrity. Therefore, we hope that this synthesis serves to instil an alternative discourse about writing with focus on development of authorial voice, support, and integrity. Development of resources and programmes to realise these important aspects of writing may require reconsideration of the role and practices of writing as well as institutional support mechanisms. Increasing support for doctoral students in navigating authorial identity and integrity alongside writing instruction is bound to strengthen writing communities in the long run.

References

- 1
2
3 Abasi, A. R., & Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and plagiarism: Conversations with
4 international graduate students and disciplinary professors. *Journal of English for*
5 *Academic Purposes*, 7(4), 221-233.
6
7
8 Acedo, F. G., Barroso, C., Casanueva, C., & Galán, J. L. (2016). Co-Authorship in
9 management and organisational studies: An empirical and network analysis. *Journal of*
10 *Management Studies*, 43(5), 957-983.
11
12 Aitchison, C., & Guerin, C. (Eds.) (2014). *Writing groups for doctoral education and*
13 *beyond: Innovations in practice and theory*. Routledge.
14
15
16 Aitchison, C., Catterall, J., Ross, P., & Burgin, S. (2012). 'Tough love and tears': Learning
17 doctoral writing in the sciences. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(4),
18 435-447.
19
20
21 ALLEA (2017). *European code of conduct for research integrity*. Revised
22 edition. [http://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/ALLEA-European-Code-of-](http://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/ALLEA-European-Code-of-Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017.pdf)
23 [Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017.pdf](http://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/ALLEA-European-Code-of-Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017.pdf).
24
25
26 Angelil-Carter, S. (2000). *Stolen language?: Plagiarism in writing*. Pearson Education.
27
28 Bazerman, C., Keranen, N., & Encinas, F. (2012). Facilitated immersion at a distance in
29 second language scientific writing. In M. Castelló & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University*
30 *writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp.235-248). Brill.
31
32
33 Bitchener, J., Basturkmen, H., & East, M. (2010). The focus of supervisor written feedback to
34 thesis/dissertation students. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 79-97.
35
36 Burrough-Boenish, J. (2003). Shapers of published NNS research articles. *Journal of Second*
37 *Language Writing*, 12(3), 223-243.
38
39
40 Caffarella, R., & Barnett, B. (2000). Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers:
41 The importance of giving and receiving critiques. *Studies in Higher Education*,
42 25(1), 39-52.
43
44
45 Carlino, P. (2012). Helping doctoral students of education to face writing and emotional
46 challenges in identity transition. In M. Castelló & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University*
47 *writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp.217-134). Brill.
48
49
50 Castelló, M., Bañales, G., Iñesta, A., & Vega, N. (2009a). Writing academic texts:
51 organization and structure, authorial voice and intertextuality.
52 [http://www.sinte.es/joomla_cast/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&I](http://www.sinte.es/joomla_cast/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&Itemid=47)
53 [temid=47](http://www.sinte.es/joomla_cast/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&Itemid=47).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Castelló, M., Iñesta, A., & Monereo, C. (2009b). Towards self-regulated academic writing: an
4 exploratory study with graduate students in a situated learning environment. *Electronic*
5 *Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 7(3), 1107–1130.
6
7
8 Castelló, M., & Donahue, C. (Eds.) (2012). *University writing: Selves and texts in academic*
9 *societies*, Vol.24: Brill.doi.org/10.1163/9781780523873
10
11 Castelló, M., Iñesta, A., & Corcelles, M. (2013). Learning to write a research article: Ph. D.
12 students' transitions toward disciplinary writing regulation. *Research in the Teaching of*
13 *English*, 442-477.
14
15
16 Castelló, M., McAlpine, L., & Pyhältö, K. (2017). Spanish and UK post-PhD researchers:
17 Writing perceptions, well-being and productivity. *Higher Education Research &*
18 *Development*, 36(6), 1108-1122.
19
20
21 Cerrato-Lara, M., Castelló, M., Garcia Velazquez, R., & Lonka, K. (2017). Validation of the
22 writing process questionnaire in two Hispanic populations. *Journal of Writing*
23 *Research*, 9(2), 151-171.
24
25
26 Conn, V. S., Ward, S., Herrick, L., Topp, R., Alexander, G. L., Anderson, C.
27 M.,...Georges, S. (2015). Managing opportunities and challenges of co-authorship.
28 *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 37(2), 134-163.
29
30
31 Cotterall, S. (2011). Doctoral students writing: where's the pedagogy? *Teaching in Higher*
32 *Education*, 16(4), 413-425.
33
34
35 Cutas, D., & Shaw, D. (2015). Writers blocked: On the wrongs of research co-authorship and
36 some possible strategies for improvement. *Science and engineering ethics*, 21(5), 1315-
37 1329.
38
39
40 Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2008). From novice to disciplinary expert: Disciplinary identity and
41 genre mastery. *English for Specific purposes*, 27(2), 233-252.
42
43
44 East, J. (2010). Judging plagiarism: A problem of morality and convention. *Higher Education*
45 59, 69-83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9234-9>
46
47
48 Emerson, L. (2012). The life cycle of the scientific writer: An investigation of the senior
49 academic scientist as writer in Australasian universities.
50 In C. Bazerman, C. Dean, J. Early, K. Lunsford, S. Null, P. Rogers & A. Stansell (Eds.),
51 *International advances in writing research: Cultures, places, measures. Perspectives*
52 *on writing* (pp.355-420). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (2018). *Agreeing on authorship.*
4 *Recommendation for research publications.* [https://www.tenk.fi/en/tenk-](https://www.tenk.fi/en/tenk-guidelines)
5 [guidelines](https://www.tenk.fi/en/tenk-guidelines).(accessed 24/06/2019).
6
7
8 Florence, M. K., & Yore, L. D. (2004). Learning to write like a scientist: Co-authoring as an
9 enculturation task. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(6), 637-668.
10
11 Gallego, L., Castelló, M., & Badia, A. (2016). Faculty feelings as writers: Relationship with
12 writing genres, perceived competences, and values associated to writing. *Higher*
13 *Education*, 71(5), 719-734.
14
15 González-Ocampo, G., & Castelló, M. (2018). Writing in doctoral programs: Examining
16 supervisors' perspectives. *Higher Education*, 76(3), 387-401.
17
18 Guerin, C., Walker, R., Aitchison, C., Mattarozzi Laming, M., Chatterjee Padmanabhan, M.,
19 & James, B. (2017). Doctoral supervisor development in Australian universities:
20 Preparing research supervisors to teach writing. *Journal of Academic Language*
21 *& Learning*, 11(1), 88-103.
22
23 Hakkarainen, K., Hytönen, K., Lonka, K., & Makkonen, J. (2014). How does collaborative
24 authoring in doctoral programs socially shape practices of academic excellence? *Talent*
25 *Development & Excellence*, 6(1), 11-29.
26
27 Hayes, N., & Introna, L.D. (2005). Cultural values, plagiarism, and fairness: When
28 plagiarism gets in the way of learning. *Ethics & Behavior*, 15(3), 213-231.
29
30 Henriksen, D. (2016). The rise in co-authorship in the social sciences (1980-2013).
31 *Scientometrics*, 107(2), 455-476.
32
33 ICMJE International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2018). *Recommendations.*
34 <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/>
35
36 Inouye, K., & McAlpine, L. (2019). Developing academic identity: A review of the literature
37 on doctoral writing and feedback. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 14, 1-31.
38 <https://doi.org/10.28945/4168>
39
40 Iñesta, A., & Castelló, M. (2012). Towards an integrative unit of analysis: Regulation
41 Episodes in expert research article writing. In C. Bazerman, C. Dean, J. Early, K.
42 Lunsford, S. Null, P. Rogers, & A. Stansell (Eds.), *International advances in writing*
43 *research: Cultures, places, measures. Perspectives on Writing* (pp.421-448). *The WAC*
44 *Clearinghouse; Parlor Press.*
45
46 Ivanic, R. (2005). The discorsal construction of writer identity. In R. Beach, J. Green, M.
47 Kamil & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research*
48 (pp.391-416). Hampton Press.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 James, N., & Lokhtina, I. (2018). Feeling on the periphery? The challenge of supporting
4 academic development and identity through communities of practice. *Studies in the*
5 *Education of Adults*, 50(1), 39-56.
6
7
8 Johansen, B. T., Olsen, R. M., Øverby, N.C., Garred, R., & Enoksen, E. (2019). Team
9 supervision of doctoral students: A qualitative inquiry. *International Journal*
10 *of Doctoral Studies*, 14, 69-84. doi.org/10.28945/4177.
11
12
13 Kamler, B. (2008). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the
14 thesis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3), 283-294.
15
16
17 Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for*
18 *supervision*. Routledge.
19
20
21 Kitchener, K. S. (1985). Ethical principles and ethical decisions in student affairs. In H. J.
22 Canon & R. D. Brown (Eds.) *New directions for student services: Applied ethics in*
23 *student services* (pp. 17-29). Jossey-Bass.
24
25
26 Kruse, O., Chitez, M., Rodriguez, B., & Castelló, M. (2016). Exploring European writing
27 cultures. Country reports on genres, writing practices and languages used in European
28 higher education. Winterthur: ZHAW. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/55329646.pdf>.
29
30
31 Leane, E., Fletcher, L., & Garg, S. (2019). Co-authorship trends in English literary studies,
32 1995–2015. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(4), 786-798.
33
34
35 Lee, A., & Murray, R. (2015). Supervising writing: Helping postgraduate students develop as
36 researchers. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52(5), 558-570.
37
38 Löffström, E., Huotari, E., & Kupila, P. (2017). Conceptions of plagiarism and problems in
39 academic writing in a changing landscape of external regulation. *Journal of Academic*
40 *Ethics*, 15(3), 277-292.
41
42
43 Löffström, E. & Pyhältö, K. (2012). The supervisory relationship as an arena for ethical
44 problem-solving. *Education Research International*, article ID961505, 1-12.
45
46
47 Löffström, E. & Pyhältö, K. (2014). Ethical issues in Doctoral supervision - The perspectives
48 of PhD students in the natural and behavioural sciences. *Ethics & Behavior*, 24(3), 195-
49 214.
50
51
52 Löffström, E., & Pyhältö, K. (2015). “I don’t even have time to be their friend!” Ethical
53 dilemmas in PhD supervision in hard sciences. *International Journal of Science*
54 *Education*, 37(16), 2721-2739.
55
56
57 Löffström, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M., & Shephard, K. (2015). Who teaches academic
58 integrity and how do they do it? *Higher Education*, 69(3), 435-448.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lokhtina, I. (2018). Gaining legitimacy: Mentoring as an avenue to navigate the transition
4 into a new academic workplace. *Journal for the Study of Education and*
5 *Development/Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 41(3), 581-618.
6
7
8 Lonka, K., Chow, A., Keskinen, J., Hakkarainen, K., Sandström, N., & Pyhältö, K. (2014).
9 How to measure PhD. students' conceptions of academic writing—and are they related
10 to well-being? *Journal of Writing Research*, 5(3), 245-269.
11
12 Macfarlane, B. (2017). The ethics of multiple authorship: Power, performativity and the gift
13 economy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(7), 1194-1210.
14
15 Maher, M. A., Feldon, D. F., Timmerman, B. E., & Chao, J. (2014). Faculty perceptions of
16 common challenges encountered by novice doctoral writers. *Higher Education*
17 *research and Development*, 33(4), 699-711.
18
19 McAlpine, L. & Amundsen, C. (2009). Identity and agency: Pleasures and collegiality among
20 the challenges of the doctoral journey. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 32(2), July
21 2009, 109-125.
22
23 McGrail, M. R., Rickard, C. M., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of
24 interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research and*
25 *Development*, 25(1), 19-35.
26
27 Nelson, N., & Castelló, M. (2012). Academic writing and authorial voice. In M. Castelló &
28 C. Donahue (Eds.). *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp.33-
29 51). Brill.
30
31 Paré A. (2011). Speaking of writing: Supervisory feedback and the dissertation. In L.
32 McAlpine, & C. Amundsen (Eds.), *Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for*
33 *doctoral students, supervisors and administrators* (pp.59-74). Springer.
34
35 Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second
36 language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317–345.
37
38 Prior, P. (2013). *Writing/disciplinary: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the*
39 *academy*. Routledge.
40
41 Russell, D. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society: an activity theory analysis.
42 Written communication. *Sage Journals*, 14(4), 504-554.
43
44 Selbach, H. V., Motta-Roth, D., & Schmidt, A. P. C. (2018). Academic Literacies: Appraisal
45 and social sanction about authorship and scientific integrity. *Revista Brasileira de*
46 *Linguística Aplicada*[online], 18(4),703-736.
47
48 Smith, E. A. (2017). Theoretical foundation for the ethical distribution of authorship in
49 multidisciplinary publications. *Kennedy Inst. Ethics J.*, 27, 371–411.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Swales, M. A. (2009). Dialectical behaviour therapy: Description, research and future
4 directions. *International Journal of Behavioral Consultation and Therapy*, 5, 164-177.
5
6 Tardy, C. (2003). Genre system view of the funding of academic research. *Written*
7 *communication*, 20(1), 7-36. doi.org/10.1177/0741088303253569
8
9 Valentine, K. (2006). Plagiarism as literacy practice: Recognizing and rethinking ethical
10 binaries. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(1), 89-109.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only