

Introduction

New Frontiers in Graduate Writing Support and Program Design

Steve Simpson, *New Mexico Tech*

As with contributors to Blanton and Kroll's (2002) *ESL Composition Tales*, many second language writing and composition scholars who work with graduate students come to this focus serendipitously. In an earlier work, I described my encounter with three international graduate students who wandered into a colleague's office in the writing program looking for a course to improve their scientific English (see Simpson, 2012). They had been pinballed from department to department on campus and were extremely frustrated. The ESL Department, while offering an ESL course for graduate students, told them they would need to work with their home departments on disciplinary discourse. Their home departments sent them to the university writing center, which told them that they were more suited to working with undergraduate writers. The students journeyed to both the graduate studies office and the international student office and received very sympathetic shrugs of the shoulders. While I worked with my colleague that summer to concoct a one-time summer course for these students, it was clear to everyone involved that their needs were falling in the cracks between these disparate departments and campus units.

Stories such as this one have pervaded professional conferences on writing or applied linguistics in recent years. At the 2014 Symposium on Second Language Writing in Tempe, AZ, we held the first meeting of the Consortium on Graduate Communication, an informal cooperative of writing and language specialists who have, by design or by default, found themselves in the position of providing graduate student

support. The stories participants shared, while diverse, clustered around a number of common themes. In some cases, participants worked in an English Department, an intensive English program (IEP), or a writing center and were deluged with requests from graduate students—international and resident—for writing support. Many of these participants spoke of difficulties communicating the need for graduate writing support to other departments or to their school's administration. Conversely, many participants reported being asked—or told—by university administrators to develop graduate writing support and were not sure where to even start. Interestingly, even veterans in graduate writing support have recounted similar stories in recent years. At the 2011 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), Christine Feak, co-author with John Swales of the highly popular series of resources for graduate student writers through the University of Michigan Press, reported an onslaught of L1 graduate students¹ requesting to take courses designed for L2 graduate students in the University of Michigan's English Language Institute, as they could not find other resources to suit their purposes.

These stories, which have surfaced at institutions worldwide, point to a convergence of phenomena pervading graduate education in recent years. On one level, the stories bear traces of a stubbornly persistent view that graduate students should have learned how to write earlier in their education, despite the fact that the genres they encounter in graduate school might be far different from any they have previously experienced. On another level, these encounters are emergent responses to deep structural changes in graduate education worldwide, changes being fueled by a range of economic and societal factors.

This book comes at a time when scholars across numerous fields—second language writing, composition studies, higher education research, just to name a few—have a renewed interest in graduate writing support and as universities worldwide have become highly interested in innovative graduate writing initiatives that help improve graduate students' completion rates and employability. While second language writing has much knowledge to contribute to these conversations from years of research and pedagogical practice, we also have much to learn about how student needs are changing.

¹ See pages 14–15 for a discussion of terminology.

The goal of this collected volume is to start conversations on these issues and to explore roles that second language writing specialists, IEP directors and instructors, writing center administrators, and others within writing studies might play in potential cross-campus dialogues on graduate student writing support. We hope for this book to be accessible both to researchers and practitioners and to be a useful resource when discussing these concerns with administrators and other university departments or service units.

This introduction begins with an overview of economic and societal concerns affecting discussions of graduate writing support. It then reviews recent work on graduate writing support that has emerged across related fields and concludes by identifying key areas of need in graduate writing research, pedagogy, and program design.

...The Changing Landscape of Graduate Education

While composition studies has just recently joined the conversation on graduate writing,² second language writing studies and other fields within applied linguistics and English language learning have researched graduate communication support for decades, as Lee and Aitchison (2009) point out in their contribution to *Changing Practices of Doctoral Education*. For example, second language writing researchers have developed a robust body of research on the process and politics of scholarly publication (Canagarajah, 2002a, 2002b, 2006; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Englander, 2009; Flowerdew, 1999, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Swales 1997, 2004; Tardy, 2004) and on graduate students learning the processes of writing for publication (Belcher, 1994; Casanave & Li, 2008; Dressen-Hammouda, 2008; Englander, 2009; Huang, 2010; Li, 2006a, 2006b; Simpson, 2013b; Tardy, 2005, 2009), particularly in contexts in which publication as a graduate student has become either a requirement or a strong expectation.

This wealth of research has also yielded practical and pedagogical texts on academic publishing and graduate-level English for academic purposes (EAP) classes. Scholars such as Casanave (2014), Casanave and Li (2008), Curry and Lillis (2013), and Paltridge and Starfield (2007) have

² Notable exceptions exist, for example, Blakeslee (2001), Rymer (1988), and Berkenkotter, Huckin, & Ackerman (1995). In the U.S. context, many writing researchers have focused more on undergraduate general education writing courses.

published accessible resources for graduate students learning the literacy practices of graduate school or for graduate advisors or supervisors working with non-native English-speaking graduate students. Further, our field has generated a bevy of textbooks and graduate student resources. The writing of this chapter comes just after the twentieth anniversary of the 1994 publication of Swales and Feak's *Academic Writing for Graduate Students* (2012), which is in its third edition. Swales and Feak's original companion book, *English in Today's Research World* (2000), has been divided into a series of resource books specializing on specific parts of the academic writing process, such as *Abstracts and the Writing of Abstracts* (2009) and *Creating Contexts: Writing Introductions across Genres* (2011). Other useful texts have emerged, such as Glasman-Deal's (2010) *Science Research Writing* and Wallwork's (2011, 2012) English for Academic Purposes series for researchers.

Considering this previous body of work, many in second language writing might assume a “been there, done that” attitude toward graduate writing support and research. However, the landscape in graduate education is swiftly changing, and new research and pedagogical innovations are needed to keep abreast of these changes.

From roughly the early aughts to the present, many within education internationally have called for structural changes in graduate education, prompted in part by high time-to-degree rates—ranging anywhere from six to ten years for doctoral degrees in U.S. institutions (Council of Graduate Schools, 2009)—and high attrition rates (Golde & Dore, 2004; Golde 2005). Of equal concern is the difficulty students have finding jobs in industry or academia, particularly when some might have accrued considerable debt in graduate school. Articles lamenting the overproduction of PhDs frequent periodicals such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (e.g., Vedder, 2011) and *The Economist* (e.g., “The Disposable Academic,” 2010) and cite U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports describing the number of PhDs working as adjuncts, cashiers, or retail salespeople (Vedder, 2011).

In the United States, these concerns about graduate education have prompted numerous educational initiatives and programs funded by public and private organizations. Examples include the National Science Foundation's Research Traineeship program (formally the IGERT program), the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation's Responsive PhD project, and the Council of Graduate Schools' PhD Completion Project. These same concerns pervade universities across Canada, Europe, and Australia. In Europe, for example,

the Bologna Process, in cooperation with regional policies enacted by the European countries involved in this reform movement, has set new standards for graduate programs intended to make graduate programs more efficient and graduate students more marketable. Countries such as South Africa that are looking to improve their PhD output have gone as far as to set ambitious output goals: South Africa's *National Development Plan: Vision 2030* (National Planning Commission, 2012) sets the mark of 5,000 new PhDs a year.

Naturally, a degree of skepticism is warranted in these discussions. If graduate programs are to remain rigorous, some attrition is to be expected. Further, while student marketability is always a concern, many argue rightly that graduate programs should not be solely concerned with industry demands. Nonetheless, we are still left with the question of how many of these concerns with graduate education are just part of the territory and how many can be mitigated or averted through strategically restructuring or retooling graduate programs.

Studies of graduate attrition and completion have indicated numerous ways this current system can be retooled, from better counseling at the admission stage, to more innovative cross-disciplinary programs, to supplementing advisory relationships (Bair & Haworth, 2004; Golde & Walker, 2006; Wuff & Austin, 2004). As Golde (2005) and Simpson (2013b) have indicated, graduate education has long relied on one-on-one mentoring between an advisor and a student as the primary mechanism of instruction in graduate school. While this apprenticeship system has numerous benefits, it has its drawbacks as well, in that graduate students' dreams can rise and fall based on the quality or the compatibility of their advisory relationships. Many students, such as Virginia in Casanave (2002), leave academia because they do not see eye to eye with their advisors.

Interestingly, communication support—and, more specifically, writing support—has emerged as one way to improve graduate student success. In the U.S., for example, the Council of Graduate Schools' (2010) report cites writing support at the dissertation stage as one way to help students complete their degrees efficiently. Not only does such support provide mechanisms for helping students power through critical academic documents such as articles for publication or dissertations, but it also has the potential to complement the advisory relationship and provide additional avenues for feedback and clarification. For this reason, graduate deans and university administrators have become interested in innovative programs to support graduate students' progress toward degrees. Many federal agencies in the U.S. such as the National Science

Foundation have similarly expressed interest in graduate communication support. The 2014 CFP for the National Science Foundation Research Traineeship grant, for example, required grantees to integrate explicit training in communication for all graduate students involved in proposed programs. Noted second language writing scholars such as Curry (2012) have capitalized on opportunities from these funding agencies to create innovative graduate-level science communication curricula.

Simultaneous to these efforts to reform graduate education are numerous social and economic factors encouraging increased diversification of graduate school and increased international student mobility, particularly from developing countries seeking to build their own education or industry infrastructures. In a press release, the Institute of International Education's 2014 Open Doors data showed that the number of international students in U.S. universities was at an all-time high, up 40 percent from a decade ago. While graduate student enrollment has not grown as quickly as undergraduate enrollment, it has continued to increase steadily, especially in science and engineering disciplines. In many cases, internationally mobile graduate students return to their home countries, particularly in cases such as Saudi Arabia, in which students receive government funding for education. In the United States, however, signs indicate that a growing number of international students receiving doctorates from U.S. institutions are joining the U.S. workforce. The National Science Foundation's 2014 Science and Engineering indicators, for example, reported that in 2010, 26 percent of U.S.-trained science and engineering doctoral holders in academia were foreign-born (rising steadily from 12 percent in 1973). Further, in 2010, 50 percent of U.S.-trained researchers in science and engineering post-doc positions and 75 percent of all U.S. post-docs were foreign-born. Thus, increased diversity in graduate education seems to be prompting growing diversity in academia and industry.

Further, within the U.S., efforts to increase retention of historically underrepresented minorities at the undergraduate level has the potential to increase the graduate-level minority population as well. As discussed in Chapter 8 of this book, Latina/o students in the U.S. have lagged behind all other minority groups in graduate enrollment. Contributions to Castellanos, Gloria, and Kamimura's (2006) *The Latina/o Pathway to the PhD* demonstrate that many of these students are first-generation college students and are either bilingual or report speaking Spanish as a dominant language.

Taken together, these trends show graduate education to be dynamic and exciting with a wide variety of research and pedagogical opportunities. The following sections identify some of the new research trends in graduate communication support, both in second language writing and in closely related fields, and identify new avenues of research and program design needed to address these emerging opportunities.

•••Recent Research in Graduate Communication Support

Numerous graduate student research initiatives within various areas of writing studies have emerged in response to these concerns about graduate education—some from within various areas of second language writing and composition studies, some in concert with graduate studies departments, and some orchestrated completely outside writing studies. One notably ambitious research effort was a cross-institutional study conducted by Doreen Starke-Meyerring, Anthony Paré, and a team of researchers from McGill University and the University of Alberta. This multisite study, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, involved extensive surveys and interviews with graduate students (both L1 and L2), supervisors, department heads, and writing center administrators at Canadian research universities. The study's primary goals were to take a systems view of graduate writing support and identify systemic obstacles to graduate support (Paré & Green, 2011; Paré, Starke-Meyerring, & McAlpine, 2009; Starke-Meyerring, 2011). (Chapter 2 recounts a similar study undertaken at George Mason University.) Additionally, researchers from Australian universities have contributed a wealth of research on various methods of graduate support such as graduate writing groups (Aitchison, 2010; Maher et al., 2008) and seminars on academic publishing (Aitchison & Lee, 2006; Aitchison & Paré, 2012; Kamler & Thomson, 2008; Lee, 2010; Lee & Kamler, 2008).

Further, a smattering of research in the U.S. and abroad have examined innovative mechanisms for supporting graduate writers. For example, Castelló, Iñesta, and Corcelles (2013) described a publication seminar at a Spanish university set up in response to new national laws “regulating the formation of PhD students with the objective of providing them with the necessary scaffolding of research and writing processes” (p. 447), national regulations not unlike others that have evolved in other European countries (Chitez & Kruse, 2012). Hanauer and

Englander's (2013) study of L2 writers in the sciences explored the attitudes and needs of writers in a Mexican university and at a Mexican research facility and then developed a trajectory of how writing support could be structured to support students all the way from undergraduate through graduate school. In the U.S., Jordan and Kedrowicz (2011) and Simpson, Clemens, Killingsworth, and Ford (2015) explored graduate writing fellows either embedded in an engineering discipline (Jordan & Kedrowicz, 2011) or functioning as a bridge between university disciplines and a university writing center (Simpson et al., 2015). Phillips (2012, 2013) has worked from a writing center perspective to explore the needs of native and non-native English-speaking graduate students.

In addition to this research on graduate writing and writers, numerous intriguing graduate writing resources have emerged amidst attempts to help graduate student completion, many of which has only started trickling into the research. For example, over the past decade, thesis and dissertation boot camps based on a model pioneered at the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Graduate Studies have grown very popular. A quick Google search at the time of writing this chapter yielded 40–50 similar programs, including a number of other writing retreats for graduate students such as the University of Oklahoma's Camp Completion. The standard boot camp model—which ranges anywhere from one to four weeks and consists of short-time management and writing workshops and long periods of distraction-free writing time—has become an easy, point-of-need resource that can be put in place quickly and inexpensively.

However, for as popular as dissertation boot camps have become, very little research has been conducted on their effectiveness, save for some notable pieces in non-peer reviewed (Lee & Golde, 2013; Mastroieni & Cheung, 2011) and peer-reviewed (Busl, Donnelly, & Capdevielle, 2015; Simpson, 2013a) publications. In many cases, information about boot camps passes through very informal channels, with existing boot camps providing materials and advice to developing ones through personal communications. Vestiges of the University of Pennsylvania's materials can be found scattered far and wide across the internet. What is missing is more robust research and discussion on just whether this resource has the effect we believe it does, and more important, how this key resource can be integrated with other graduate resources to provide a more holistic set of resources supporting graduate students from start to finish. Without that, we risk inadvertently confirming popular misconceptions of writing as something that happens quickly at the end of the

“more important” process of research. That is, we need to move from support that is local and tactical to support that is more broad-based and strategic.

...Needed Research and Innovation in Graduate Writing and Program Design

The emerging study of graduate writing programs has been fast and exciting, particularly in terms of the reception many of us have experienced with departments and administrators outside writing studies. In this sense, it is a promising field of study with the potential to enrich not only our own research and teaching but our institutions as well. However, the graduate writing program growth is outpacing the research, and while the practitioner knowledge that has been generated is valuable, more reflection is needed on how the parts that we have developed fit into a more meaningful whole. In this section, I identify a few areas of further need.

Graduate Writers: Their Emerging Needs and Experiences

As previously mentioned, we do have a healthy body of research describing the process of writing for academic publication more broadly, the experiences of graduate students who are writing for publication, and the genre and process of writing thesis and dissertations, but significant gaps still exist in our knowledge.

First, we must better account for how graduate student experiences and needs change with the economy and with the structural changes to graduate education that are underway. While graduate students might find many of their writing needs being met with new initiatives, they may also be experiencing gaps in coverage, particularly as some of these initiatives are met with resistance by some faculty who might bristle at change. Moreover, we must better account for the variety of ways in which graduate students will use the literacy practices acquired in graduate school. Currently, much of our research on how graduate students learn to write assumes a scholarly context for writing or assumes a trajectory from graduate school into an academic position (or fails to account for a trajectory at all). However, at least in the U.S., reports such as the National Science Foundation’s Science and Engineering indicators have shown that more and more industry positions have been available for

PhDs, and that both U.S.-born and foreign-born students educated in the U.S. are vying for these positions. Many graduate programs are recognizing this industry need and are restructuring their own graduate programs to better prepare students for these positions. Further, graduate-level professional programs have proliferated, thus introducing a wide array of communication genres and contexts that students must master. With some notable exceptions (e.g., Boquet et al., 2015; Hanauer & Englander, 2013), very little of our research examines this trajectory from graduate school to non-academic settings or examines any sort of school-to-work trajectory at all.

Second, within second language writing studies, our lens is often very focused on international students in the U.S. or other English-medium institutions or scholars in non-English medium settings needing to write for publication in English. This focus, while important, overlooks the needs of language minority students such as Latino/a students in the U.S., many of whom use other languages at home and come from very different home and educational contexts than many international students. Further, as we begin to see research in higher education circles that focuses a little more on L1 students (e.g., Lee & Kamler, 2008; Paré & Green, 2011), we must begin to ask about the degree to which writing initiatives can serve both L1 and L2 populations together. Often, this discussion assumes the form of strict either/or positions: either these students' needs are the same and can be met simultaneously or they are different and require different programs. Realistically, this situation is much more complicated and warrants a more sophisticated, researched understanding of the ways in which L1 and L2 students' needs overlap and the ways they are distinct.

Programmatic Responses to Graduate Student Support

Following from needed research in graduate writers, we need more research that takes a *programmatic* perspective on graduate writing support. While writing program administration research proliferates at the undergraduate level both in composition studies and second language writing, we very rarely discuss graduate support in the same way. As a result, many of our writing support mechanisms are tactical, point-of-need, and spread across an entire campus, as Caplan and Cox show in Chapter 1. As with undergraduate writers, graduate students are likely to need a variety of support at multiple stages in their trajectories, and given their other priorities and responsibilities, might need resources that are more

flexible than some undergraduate services. Further, we need to consider how these forms of support can be sensitive to the quirks of the advisory relationship and complement—not compete with—advisor feedback.

Cross-Campus Partnerships

Critical to taking the programmatic lens on graduate support, we also need more literature exploring cross-departmental responses. As I have written elsewhere (Simpson, 2012), graduate writing support is difficult for any one department or campus entity to shoulder, and well-structured cross-campus partnerships with good communication among resources can often help distribute the responsibilities in a more sustainable way. Further, such collaboration across disciplines and programs can enrich the experience for graduate students, demonstrating the harmony—rather than the disconnect—among academic units and areas of study. To date, much of our responses have been focused on support within a department or entity such as an IEP. Without a more holistic look at how graduate student needs are spread throughout the university system, our attempts to meet these needs with individual department responses might be inadequate. Further explorations of these cross-campus collaborations, in addition to discussions of how to find allies on campus, can not only expand our own field's sphere of influence but can often assist us with many of the logistical issues such as staffing and funding with which we all struggle in financially strapped institutions.

...What You Will Find in This Book

This book is designed both for writing studies researchers interested in new directions for graduate writing research and for practitioners or program directors looking for practical directions for their own programs. In this vein, we aim for the book's chapters to be robust enough to satisfy the needs of a researcher or graduate seminar, yet practical and down-to-earth enough to be fodder for brainstorming discussions among faculty, staff members, and even administrators. Also, we aim for these chapters to demonstrate the complexity of the discussions around graduate support. For example, readers will note that contributors to this book do not agree completely on the extent to which L1 and L2 student support can be combined. By airing these views, we aim to provide a more nuanced account of students' needs. Last, we incorporate a diverse chorus of voices on graduate writing support, both seasoned, well-known

researchers in second language writing and composition studies and fresh, new voices and perspectives. We also feature practitioners who have worked with graduate students for a long time but who might not have ever published on their programs.

The book is divided into three major sections. Part 1—*Graduate Writing Support: What Do We Know? What Do We Need to Know?*—takes a wide-angle lens on graduate writing support internationally, laying out what these courses and programs look like currently, what gaps exist in current program design, and what future work is needed. In Chapter 1, Caplan and Cox, co-founders of the Consortium on Graduate Communication, report preliminary findings from an international survey of more than 200 respondents from 160 institutions. These findings provide a textured account of the graduate writing support landscape internationally, identifying what form such courses and programs take, what departments or campus entities offer them, and what gaps exist in coverage. While the variety of courses and programs are astounding, we see clearly from these results that the fragmentation described in this chapter’s opening anecdote is not an isolated incident. In Chapter 2, Rogers, Zawacki, and Baker report on an institution-level examination of graduate writers’ needs. Not only do their methods demonstrate a needs analysis method that can be replicated at other sites, but their findings also present a complex view of the similarities and differences between L1 and L2 graduate students’ needs. In Chapters 3 and 4, two widely published scholars on writing for academic publication and graduate student literacy practices offer reflections on areas of need in the field. Curry’s thought piece pushes us to look beyond language as the primary concern in graduate writing support and focuses on L1 and L2 students’ common experiences learning the genres for their academic and industry pursuits. Casanave explores some of the more complex aspects of the student-advisor relationship and directs attention to some of students’ “invisible struggles.” Her chapter, while addressing advisors, is also useful for graduate support providers who often find themselves caught in the middle of these complex advisor-student dynamics.

Part 2—*Issues in Graduate Program and Curriculum Design*—explores the nuts and bolts of graduate writing support at both the classroom and program level. While we do feature specific programs offered from a variety of academic units—IEPs, English or communication departments, writing centers, etc.—the goal for this section is to focus more on principles of design and concerns (academic, administra-

tive, budgetary, etc.) to consider in one's own institutional setting, and, when possible, to illuminate contributors' thought processes behind their program designs. In Chapter 5, Mallett, Haan, and Habib describe an innovative academic bridge program for international graduate students created at a large public university in response to growing international student populations. In Chapter 6, Fairbanks and Dias describe the processes of converting an EAP course intended originally for L2 graduate students into a course sequence intended for both L1 and L2 students. In Chapter 7, Phillips argues for the distinct needs of graduate students in writing centers and describes her experiences using an internal university grant to convert an undergraduate writing center into a space available to both graduate students and undergraduates. In Chapter 8, representatives from three Hispanic-Serving Institutions³—The University of Texas at El Paso, New Mexico Tech, and the University of New Mexico—describe graduate communication programs built from external development grants obtained through the U.S. Department of Education. By design, these programs met the needs of U.S. resident minority students but were executed in such a way that all graduate students—U.S. minority, international, monolingual U.S.-educated—benefitted from the support. Last, Chapter 9 concludes Part 2 with a cautionary tale from the University of Kansas, where Sundstrom and her colleagues built a dynamic cross-institutional graduate support program that was unexpectedly defunded. This chapter provides critical insight into some of the structural and political challenges of program building in tough economic times.

The program profiles in Part 3 are a direct answer to the request from many within the graduate writing community for more published examples of successful program models. We have chosen five programs from around the world that highlight particular ways programs were developed to meet specific institutional needs—the University of Delaware (Chapter 10), the University of Toronto (Chapter 11), the University of New South Wales (Australia) (Chapter 12), Chalmers University of Technology (Sweden) (Chapter 13), and Yale University (Chapter 14). While the particulars of these cases are useful in their own right, we hope that they showcase design principles that will be useful for others maintaining or developing their own graduate programs. Most use-

³ Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) is an official U.S. Department of Education designation for U.S. universities with a Latina/o population of 25 percent or greater.

fully, we have asked for these authors to reveal their strategies for forging cross-campus (or cross-institutional) partnerships, interacting with school administration, and sustaining new programs.

In the Conclusion: Essential Questions for Program and Pedagogical Development, I reflect on some of the themes emerging throughout the book and offer strategies and tips for programmatic responses to graduate student needs.

There is tremendous potential for new development and new directions in graduate writing support, both in program and classroom design and in research. However, we must always move forward cautiously and strategically. These opportunities do not come without the pitfalls of local politics or the risk of extending oneself beyond what can be sustained. We aim for this book to provide ideas for moving forward purposefully and effectively.

...Terminology and Usage

I would like to end with a few notes on terminology and usage throughout this book. As language practitioners, we are all aware of the importance of language choice and of the politics of so-called “standard” and “non-standard” forms of English. Where possible, we have tried to be sensitive to these issues in this book, though we also felt the need to make some choices for the sake of clarity. Some clarification on some of these choices is provided here.

Multilingual–NES/NNES–L1/L2

This book’s editors are very aware of how problematic and ill-fitting labels can be for describing language use and experience. There is no good catchall set of terms. Terms such as *non-native English-speaking students* and *native English-speaking students*—while useful in a very practical sense in distinguishing generally between students who acquired English very early in their lives as one of their first languages and those who learned English later in life—can obscure the variety of language experiences that students bring to the classroom, such as students from Anglophone countries in Africa who have used English as an academic language for their entire schooling, or students from places such as India or Singapore who may have a complex spectrum of “native” languages. Similarly, the

term *multilingual*, while increasingly preferred by practitioners in second language writing, is at times confusing to researchers and practitioners outside writing studies who are unfamiliar with professional debates over language terminology.

All contributors to this book acknowledge the complex and problematic nature of any attempt to categorize language users. (See Curry's chapter for a discussion of this complexity.) As a general rule, we have left decisions on terminology up to the authors of the individual chapters, especially since preferred terms may differ internationally. In the Introduction and Conclusion, I use the terms *L1* and *L2* simply to refer to a distinction between students using a language that they would consider to be one of their "first" languages as an academic language and students who are using a language acquired later in life. This distinction seems necessary in describing the different audiences for graduate ESL courses such as those offered in traditional IEPs and courses intended for broader populations. I acknowledge the limited nature of this terminology, however.

Regional English Usage

This book features authors from a number of institutional settings beyond the United States. As much as possible, we have allowed authors to use spelling and terminology preferred in their settings rather than converting everything to U.S. preferences and have edited only for internal consistency within chapters. Thus, in some chapters readers will encounter *writing center* and in others *writing centre*. Most notably, readers will notice differences in preferred educational terms. For example, in the U.S., the professor or researcher charged with mentoring a graduate student is referred to as an *advisor*, while in many settings outside the U.S., this person is a *supervisor*. Further, U.S. readers accustomed to seeing *faculty* used to refer to personnel might be unfamiliar with the use of, for example, *Faculty of Engineering* in Europe or Australia, where *faculty* is used similar to how *college* is used in U.S. institutions to refer to groups of departments (e.g., the College of Arts and Sciences or the College of Engineering). Last, the use of *graduate student* in this book might cause some confusion. Throughout the book, *graduate student* is used to refer to students completing either master's or doctoral degrees. (In some contexts, a student working on a doctorate might be considered a *postgraduate student*.)

References

- Aitchison, C. (2010). Learning together to publish: Writing group pedagogies for doctoral publishing. In C. Aitchison, B. Kamler, & A. Lee (Eds.), *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond* (pp. 83–100). New York: Routledge.
- Aitchison, C., & Lee, A. (2006). Research writing: Problems and pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 265–278.
- Aitchison, C., & Paré, A. (2012). Writing as craft and practice in doctoral education. In A. Lee & S. Danby (Eds.), *Reshaping doctoral education: International approaches and pedagogies* (pp. 12–25). London: Routledge.
- Bair, C. R., & Haworth, J. G. (2004). Doctoral student attrition and persistence: A meta-synthesis of research. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XIX, pp. 481–533). New York: Springer.
- Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 23–34.
- Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T. N., & Ackerman, J. (1995). Conventions, conversations, and the writer: An apprenticeship tale of a doctoral student. In *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power* (pp. 117–150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blakeslee, A. M. (2001). *Interacting with audiences: Social influences on the production of scientific writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blanton, L.L., & Kroll, B. (Eds.). (2002). *ESL composition tales: Reflections on teaching*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Boquet, E., Kazer, M., Manister, N., Lucas, O., Shaw, M., Madaffari, V., & Gannett, C. (2015). Just care: Learning from and with graduate students in a doctor of nursing practice program [Special issue on graduate writing across the disciplines]. *Across the Disciplines*, 12(3). Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/graduate_wac/boquetetal2015.cfm
- Busl, G., Donnelly, K.L., & Capdevielle, M. (2015). Camping in the disciplines: Assessing the effect of writing camps on graduate student writers [Special issue on graduate writing across the disciplines]. *Across the Disciplines*, 12(3). Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/graduate_wac/busletal2015.cfm
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002a). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002b). Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1(1), 29–44.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589–604.
- Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Casanave, C.P. (2014). *Before the dissertation: A textual mentor for doctoral students at early stages of a research project*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Casanave, C. P., & Li, X. (Eds.) (2008). *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Castellanos, J., Gloria, A.M., & Kamimura, M. (Eds.) (2006). *The Latina/o pathway to the PhD: Abriendo caminos*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Castelló, M., Iñesta, A., & Corcelles, M. (2013). Learning to write a research article: Ph.D. students' transitions toward disciplinary writing regulation. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 47(4), 442–447.
- Chitez, M., & Kruse, O. (2012). Writing cultures and genres in European higher education. In M. Castelló & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp. 151–175). Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Council of Graduate Schools (2009). *Data sources: Graduate degree attainment of the U.S. population*. Retrieved from http://www.cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Data_Sources_2009_07.pdf
- Council of Graduate Schools. (2010). *PhD completion and attrition: Policies and practices to promote student success*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.
- Curry, M. J. (2012). Transcending “traditional academic boundaries”: Designing and implementing a science communication course for science and engineering PhD students. *Journal of the IATEFL ESP SIG*, 40, 4–7.
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 663–688.
- Curry, M.J., & Lillis, T. (2013). *A scholar's guide to getting published in English: Critical choices and practical strategies*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- The disposable academic: Why doing a PhD is often a waste of time. (2010, Dec. 6). *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/node/17723223>
- Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2008). From novice to disciplinary expert: Disciplinary identity and genre mastery. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(2), 233–252.
- Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English-speaking scientists as a consequence of the social construction of revision. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 8(1), 35–53.
- Feak, C. (2011, April). Academic writing for graduate students: It's not just for international students any more. Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Atlanta, GA.
- Feak, C.B., & Swales, J.M. (2011). *Creating contexts: Writing introductions across genres*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 123–145.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 127–150.

- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 1–16.
- Glasman-Deal, H. (2010). *Science research writing: A guide for non-native speakers of English*. London: Imperial College Press.
- Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(6), 669–700.
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2004). The survey of doctoral education and career preparation: The importance of disciplinary contexts. In D. H. Wulff & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty* (pp. 19–45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Golde, C. M., & Walker, G. E. (2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanauer, D. I., & Englander, K. (2013). *Scientific writing in a second language*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Huang, J. C. (2010). Publishing and learning writing for publication in English: Perspectives of NNES PhD students in science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(1), 33–44.
- Institute of International Education. (2014). *Open doors data 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data>
- Jordan, J., & Kedrowicz, A. (2011). Attitudes about graduate L2 writing in engineering: Possibilities for more integrated instruction. *Across the Disciplines, 8*(4). Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/jordan-kedrowicz.cfm>
- Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2008). The failure of dissertation advice books: Toward alternative pedagogies for doctoral writing. *Educational Researcher, 37*(8), 507–514.
- Lee, A. (2010). When the article is the dissertation: Pedagogies for a PhD by publication. In C. Aitchison, B. Kamler, & A. Lee (Eds.), *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond* (pp. 12–29). New York: Routledge.
- Lee, A., & Aitchison, C. (2009). Writing for the doctorate and beyond. In D. Boud & A. Lee (Eds.), *Changing practices of doctoral education* (pp. 87–99). New York: Routledge.
- Lee, A., & Kamler, B. (2008). Bringing pedagogy to doctoral publishing. *Teaching in Higher Education, 13*(5), 511–523.
- Lee, S., & Golde, C. (2013). Completing the dissertation and beyond: Writing centers and dissertation boot camps. *The Writing Lab Newsletter, 37*(7/8), 1–5.
- Li, Y. (2006a). A doctoral student of physics writing for publication: A sociopolitically-oriented case study. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(4), 456–478.
- Li, Y. (2006b). Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 159–178.

- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. New York: Routledge.
- Maher, D., Seaton, L., McMullen, C., Fitzgerald, T., Otsuji, E., & Lee, A. (2008). Becoming and being writers: The experiences of doctoral students in writing groups. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 30(3), 263–275.
- Mastroianni, A., & Cheung, D. (2011, December 28). The few, the proud, the finished: Dissertation boot camp as a model for doctoral student support. *NASPA: Excellence in Practice*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityparent.com/mk/naspa/2012-NASPA-final.pdf>
- National Planning Commission. (2012). *National development plan: Vision 2030: Our future—Make it work*. Pretoria, South Africa: National Planning Commission.
- National Science Foundation. (2014). Academic research and development. *Science and engineering indicators 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind14/index.cfm/chapter-5/c5h.htm#top>
- Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (2007). *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language: A handbook for supervisors*. London: Routledge.
- Paré, A., & Green, A. (2011). Speaking of writing: Supervisory feedback and the dissertation. In L. McAlpine & C. Amundsen (Eds.), *Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for doctoral students, supervisors and administrators* (pp. 59–74). New York: Springer.
- Paré, A., Starke-Meyerring, D., & McAlpine, L. (2009). The dissertation as multi-genre: Many readers, many readings. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds.), *Genre in a changing world*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Phillips, T. (2012). Graduate writing groups: Shaping writing and writers from student to scholar. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 10(1). Retrieved from <http://www.praxisuwc.com/>
- Phillips, T. (2013). Tutor training and services for multilingual graduate writers: A reconsideration. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 10(2). Retrieved from <http://www.praxisuwc.com/>
- Rymer, J. (1988). Scientific composing processes: How eminent scientists write journal articles. In D. A. Jolliffe (Ed.), *Writing in academic disciplines: Advances in writing research* (pp. 211–250). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Simpson, S. (2012). The problem of graduate-level writing support: Building a cross-campus graduate writing initiative. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 36(1), 95–118.
- Simpson, S. (2013a). Building for sustainability: Dissertation boot camp as a nexus of graduate writing support. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 10(2). Retrieved from <http://praxis.uwc.utexas.edu/index.php/praxis/article/view/129/html>
- Simpson, S. (2013b). Systems of writing response: A Brazilian student's experiences writing for publication in an environmental sciences doctoral program. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(2), 228–249.

- Simpson, S., Clemens, R., Killingsworth, D.R., & Ford, J.D. (2015). Creating a culture of communication: A graduate-level STEM communication fellows program at a science and engineering university [Special issue on graduate writing across the disciplines]. *Across the Disciplines*, 12(3). Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/graduate_wac/simpsonetal2015.cfm
- Starke-Meyerring, D. (2011). The paradox of writing in doctoral education: Student experiences. In L. McAlpine & C. Amundsen (Eds.), *Supporting the doctoral process: Research-based strategies* (pp. 73–95). New York: Springer.
- Swales, J. M. (1997). English as “Tyrannosaurus rex.” *World Englishes*, 16(3), 373–382.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2000). *English in today’s research world: A writing guide*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2009). *Abstracts and the writing of abstracts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2004). The role of English in scientific communication: Lingua franca or Tyrannosaurus rex? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(3), 247–269.
- Tardy, C. M. (2005). “It’s like a story”: Rhetorical knowledge development in advanced academic literacy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(4), 325–338.
- Tardy, C. M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Vedder, R. (2011, January 5). Too many PhD’s and professionals? *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/innovations/too-many-ph-d-%E2%80%99s-and-professionals/28236>.
- Wallwork, A. (2011). *English for writing research papers*. New York: Springer.
- Wallwork, A. (2012). *English for research: Usage, style, and grammar*. New York: Springer.
- Wuff, D. H., & Austin, A. E. (Eds.) (2004). *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.