12-4-2017

Writing Goes Back to School: Exploring the "Institutional Practice of Mystery" in a Graduate Education Program

Rosamund K. Stooke

Kathryn Hibbert

The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Volume 8 | Issue 3 Article 14

December 2017

Writing Goes Back to School: Exploring the "Institutional Practice of Mystery" in a Graduate Education Program

Rosamund K. Stooke
University of Western Ontario, rstooke@uwo.ca
Kathryn Hibbert
University of Western Ontario, khibber2@uwo.ca

https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14

Writing Goes Back to School: Exploring the "Institutional Practice of Mystery" in a Graduate Education Program

Abstract
Drawing on a qualitative case study of writing practices and pedagogies in one Canadian graduate Education program, this article discusses roles and responsibilities of course instructors for teaching and supporting academic writing at the master's level. Data were collected through individual, semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 14 graduate students and eight professors and they were analyzed thematically. The discussion is framed by the academic literacies pedagogical framework (ACLITS). The data suggest that academic writing expectations can be sources of extreme stress for graduate students. The students and instructors lacked a common language to discuss student texts. In the absence of explicit academic writing pedagogies, students and instructors sometimes turned to simplistic advice received at school. The paper also discusses pedagogical challenges associated with the teaching of disciplinary writing genres in multi-perspectival fields such as Curriculum Studies.

Dans cet article, basé sur une étude de cas qualitative de pratiques et de pédagogies de rédaction menée dans un programme universitaire d'éducation de cycle supérieur dans une université canadienne, il est question des rôles et des responsabilités des instructeurs concernant l'enseignement et les travaux de rédaction universitaire de soutien au niveau de la maîtrise. Les données ont été recueillies à partir d'entrevues individuelles approfondies, semi structurées, auprès de 14 étudiants de cycle supérieur et de huit professeurs. Les entrevues ont ensuite été analysées de manière thématique. La discussion se place dans le cadre pédagogique des littéracies universitaires (ACLITS - Academic Literacies Pedagogical Framework). Les données suggèrent que les attentes en matière de travaux de rédaction universitaire peuvent être des sources de stress extrême pour les étudiants de cycle supérieur. Les étudiants et les instructeurs n'ont pas de langue commune pour discuter les textes produits par les étudiants. En l'absence de pédagogies explicites en matière de travaux de rédaction universitaire, les étudiants et les instructeurs se tournent parfois vers des avis simplistes obtenus à l'école. Cet article présente également les défis pédagogiques associés à l'enseignement des genres disciplinaires de travaux de rédaction dans des domaines qui présentent des perspectives multiples tels que les études du curriculum.

Keywords
ACLITS, graduate students, Curriculum Studies, academic writing

Cover Page Footnote
The authors wish to thank the students and instructors who participated in the study and to acknowledge the Western University Teaching Support Centre for funding the research.

Academic writing initiatives in higher education (HE) tend to proliferate during periods of program expansion. Witness the implementation of first-year composition courses in American colleges and universities during the 1960s (see Berlin, 1987) and the basic writing courses for students deemed "not ready" for the composition course (see Shaughnessy, 1976). At first glance, the current interest in graduate students' writing in Canadian universities follows a similar pattern. However, the expansion and internationalization of graduate programs in Canada are taking place alongside an expectation for graduate students to begin publishing earlier in their careers and an increased awareness that graduate level writing can be challenging for any student. The following passage is taken from a website published by the University of Toronto.

> Graduate students need to be able to communicate sophisticated information to sophisticated audiences. As you prepare to attend your first conference, to write your first proposal, or to publish your first paper, you will need stronger communication skills than those needed in undergraduate work. (University of Toronto School of Graduate Studies: Office of English Language and Writing Support, 2017, n.p.)

In this paper, we draw on 22 qualitative interviews with students and instructors in a Canadian Master of Education (Curriculum) program to discuss ways in which course instructors and thesis supervisors might support graduate students as writers. The study was conceived in response to our concerns about the number of requests we were receiving for individual assistance on written assignments in an Introduction to Curriculum course. We revised the course syllabus to include explicit instruction in the composition of academic text genres such as the abstract, the literature review, and the position paper and then applied for a small grant to study graduate students' needs for writing instruction and support. By listening to what students said about their experiences as writers and triangulating the data with input from instructors who taught Curriculum students, we hoped to find ways to better support our students. We asked: What did students find helpful? What responsibilities might course instructors and supervisors assume with respect to writing instruction and support?

The title of the paper, *Writing Goes Back to School*, is a play on words inspired by the number of comments our participants made about writing tips they had received much earlier in their academic careers. Our subtitle, *institutional practice of mystery* is borrowed from Writing scholar, Teresa Lillis (2001, p. 53) who used the phrase when reporting on research with "non-traditional" students in British undergraduate programs during the 1990s. Lillis wrote that she anticipated new students would find program expectations mystifying, but wondered if pedagogical practices in the programs were contributing to students' ongoing mystification (pp. 59-60). Like Lillis, we were motivated to learn what instructors could do to demystify program expectations and what part writing pedagogies could play in such a project.

Writing Studies researchers who take a sociocultural perspective (e.g., Hyland, 2011; Prior, 1998; Russell, Lea, Parker, Street, & Donahue 2009) have long argued that a "one-size-fits-all" approach to academic writing instruction and support will not suffice since writing practices are always situated in a social and disciplinary community with "distinctive ways of asking questions, addressing a literature, criticizing ideas, and presenting arguments" (Hyland, 2011, p. 12). These scholars contend that successful writing mediates a writer's participation in their chosen field. Consequently, instructors and thesis supervisors are well positioned to support graduate student writers. A problem that arises, however, is that many course instructors became successful writers without explicit instruction in writing. The prospect of taking on another responsibility can be daunting, especially when that responsibility seems only tangentially

related to the disciplinary content of the course. We are not writing scholars either, and we can relate personally to such concerns. We therefore conducted our literature review with the information needs of non-specialists in mind.

We will argue that supporting graduate student writers in any field is a complicated undertaking, but supporting Curriculum graduate student writers is more challenging yet. In the first place, interdisciplinary fields such as Curriculum do not have one set of distinct ways of "asking questions, addressing a literature, criticizing ideas, and presenting arguments" (Hyland, 2011, p. 12). In the second place, Curriculum Studies programs are most often found at the graduate level. Having appropriated writing practices associated with an undergraduate discipline, a graduate student of Curriculum might well experience the new writing expectations as threats to a hard-won academic identity. Becoming a successful writer of Curriculum texts could be an alienating experience.

What is Curriculum?

Curriculum is defined variously as the content of what is to be learned, a plan for teaching and learning, and the experiences and activities involved in formal and informal learning settings (Portelli, 1987, p. 387). From its beginnings early in the twentieth century, Curriculum evolved from a field focused on practical questions about the selection and development of content for the newly-established American public school system into an international field of inquiry that embraces theoretical and practical questions about any sector of education.

The transformation from Curriculum Development to Curriculum Studies began in the 1970s when a radical group of scholars known as Reconceptualists argued that Curriculum's exclusive focus on practical questions privileged the status quo in schools and served only "the interests of the most wealthy and powerful members of society" (Schubert, 2010, p. 230). The Reconceptualist movement opened Curriculum Studies to diverse social, political and economic perspectives as well as literary and arts-based inquiries, but the field's reluctance to police its disciplinary boundaries has been a source of mystification, even to Curriculum scholars. The acclaimed Canadian theorist, Kieran Egan, for example, complained that "one can do almost anything in education and claim plausibly to be working in 'curriculum'" (1978/2003, p. 14). We concluded that any effort to demystify writing for our graduate students must therefore involve a discussion about Curriculum as an interdisciplinary field.

Writing in Graduate School: Theory and Research

Studies of student writing in HE can be found in the literatures of many fields, including Anthropology, Communication Studies, Cultural Studies, Education, Literary Studies, Linguistics, Psychology, Sociology, and of course, Writing Studies (Prior & Lunsford, 2008). To learn about writing research in graduate programs, we reviewed studies conducted in graduate seminars (e.g., Stacey & Granville, 2009), explorations of students' preparation of articles for publication (e.g., Lavelle & Bushrow, 2007; Mullen, 2001; Paré, 2010), corpus analyses of texts such as PhD theses (e.g., Starfield & Ravelli, 2006), and ethnographic case studies of graduate student writing in disciplinary communities (e.g., Prior, 1998).

A meta-theoretical analysis of discourses on writing and learning to write by Roz Ivanic (2004) proved to be an invaluable resource. Ivanic identifies six writing discourses: skills, creativity, process, genre, social practices, and sociopolitical and then links each discourse to

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14

specific teaching and assessment approaches. She defines "discourse" as "recognisable associations between values, beliefs and practices which lead to particular forms of situated action, to particular decisions, choices and omissions, as well as to particular wordings" (p. 220), but notes that writers and teachers of writing almost always draw on more than one discourse (p. 224). Ivanic notes too that certain discourses such as creativity and writing process say little about instruction and assessment, yet these two discourses have been widely employed in school writing instruction. Her descriptions (which are summarized in Table 1) helped us to locate our own pedagogical practices and more importantly, they helped us to understand why writing for an interdisciplinary professional program can be so challenging for students.

Ivanic's (2004) interest in discourse is representative of a trend in Writing Studies linked to the "social turn" in literacy studies (Gee, 1999, p. 3). Until the 1980s, becoming a successful writer in HE happened "at a largely tacit level" (Badenhorst, Moloney, Rosales, & Dyer, 2012, p. 64). Writing support was offered to "struggling writers" and the skills discourse tended to dominate support services. During the 1980s, a growing number of researchers drew on sociocultural theory to reconceptualise writing as a form of social action and the quest for broadly applicable best teaching practices lost ground to "questions about the situated nature of teaching and learning as they are enacted amid competing political agendas, constructed subjectivities, social goals and structures, discourses, and value systems" (Smagorinsky, 2006, p. 12). Bazerman (2008, 2009), for example, explored the potential role of disciplinary genres in cognitive development, and Russell (1997) proposed a framework to account for "the macro-level social and political structures (*forces*) that affect the micro-level actions of students and teachers writing in classrooms, and vice versa" (p. 505). Relevant to our project are studies that explore ways in which writing mediates students' socialization in disciplinary communities (e.g., Prior, 1998) and the increased popularity of genre theory.

> A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. The rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style...In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience. (Swales, 1990, p. 58)

Compared with the creative self-expression and writing process discourses, the genre discourse appears "logical, systematic, down to earth, and teachable" (Ivanic, 2004, p. 234). Critics argue, however, that it is easy to focus on the formal characteristics of a genre at the expense of its social dimensions. This point is illustrated well by Medical Education researchers Lingard, Schryer, Garwood, and Spafford (2003) in their discussion of the student case presentation. Lingard et al. found that faculty and students shared an understanding of the form of the case presentation, but their understandings of its purpose differed dramatically. Instructors viewed the case presentation as an opportunity to pose questions that could help the student to grapple with uncertainty. Students, on the other hand, viewed the case presentation as a performance to "get through" and so they were unreceptive to instructors' questions. Lingard et al. advise instructors to be transparent about their reasons for assigning particular tasks and to solicit students' perspectives.

Table 1
Summary of Writing Discourses[1]

Discourse	Assumptions	Associated Pedagogies
Skills	Writing is a set of broadly applicable "linguistic 'skills' of correct handwriting, spelling, punctuation and sentence structure" (p. 227).	Writing and reading are taught separately. Skills are taught explicitly and not necessarily in the context of disciplinary studies.
Creativity	The emphasis is always on meaning. The goal of the writer is to arouse "the interest, imagination, or emotions of the reader" (p. 330). Self-expression is more important than accuracy.	Writers learn to write by writing and by reading high-quality literary texts. Instruction is rarely explicit. Assessment is more concerned with aesthetics than correctness.
Process	*Process* originally referred to processes in the mind of the writer (p. 231). Since the 1980s *process* has been associated with the visible, practical aspects of the *writing process* such as planning, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading.	The *process* and *creative* discourses are often employed together in school-based writing lessons. Students learn to follow a sequence of steps, but not necessarily the strategies that lead to success at each stage.
Genre	Text-based definitions envision writing as "a set of text types shaped by social context" (p. 232). "[T]exts vary linguistically according to their purpose and context" (p. 232). Good writing is "linguistically appropriate to the purpose it is serving" (p. 233). Writing mediates academic socialization. Text-based approaches were criticized by genre theorists. Later advocates of genre approaches advocate "releasing old notions of genre as form and text type and embracing new notions of genre as dynamic patterning of human experience, as one of the concepts that enable us to construct our writing world" (p. 573).	Instruction is usually explicit. "The 'target text-types are modelled…linguistic terminology is taught...and learners are encouraged to use this information about the text type to construct...texts in the same genre" (p. 233).

Social Practice	Foundational to the field of New Literacy Studies (NLS), the social practice discourse is commensurable with social understandings of genre and apprenticeship models of learning (see e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). It assumes that the social interactions constituting a writing event are "inextricable" (p. 234) from the composition processes and texts produced. "Writing events are situated within a broad set of social practices" (p. 234).	A social practice "perspective is "sensitive to the gulf between pedagogic and real-life settings" (p. 237). Instructors often feel "a good deal of ambivalence towards the teaching and assessment of writing" (p. 237). Learning to write should take place through participation in meaningful, socially situated events and products of writing should be judged according to their "effectiveness in achieving social goals, which can only be seen in the consequences of the writing, including its effects on other people" (p. 237).
Sociopolitical	The sociopolitical discourse shares ontological and epistemological assumptions with the social practice discourse, but adds an explicitly political and critical dimension. It argues that all writers draw on socially constructed semiotic resources, but differences in the availability of resources ensures that writing is never a neutral activity.	A sociopolitical discourse calls for a critical writing pedagogy in which instructors and student writers interrogate common sense ways with words and pay explicit attention to issues of power and privilege.

[1] Adapted from Ivanic (2004).

The differing understandings of a task described by Lingard et al. (2003) remind us that a writer's positioning within an institution can shape that writer's attitude to a task. Approaching a formative assessment task as a summative one is common among instructors and students alike, but the consequences of admitting to uncertainty can make the task much riskier for students. A reference to positioning that resonates strongly with our study is Stierer's (2000) report on writing in a graduate program for teachers in which he proposes that some students were uncomfortable being positioned as novice academics rather than expert professionals. Stierer argues that some student writing "failures" resulted from students' inability to "reconcile their own identities and purposes for studying, with the authority and control of the institution" (p. 200). His account pushed us to seek out an analytic framework that could accommodate tensions and contradictions in academic socialization. As did Stierer, we selected the Academic Literacies (ACLITS) pedagogical framework (Lea & Street, 1998, 2006) which is both analytically powerful and pedagogically useful.

The ACLITS Pedagogical Framework

The ACLITS framework is a product of research conducted in two British universities (Lea & Street, 1998). Lea and Street "examined the contrasting expectations and interpretations of academic staff and students regarding undergraduate students' written assignments" (p. 157). They identified "three overlapping perspectives" (2006, p. 368) toward writing pedagogy: study skills, academic socialization, and academic literacies.

Like the skills discourse described by Ivanic (2004), the study skills perspective conceptualizes academic writing as a set of broadly applicable skills and strategies. Study skills pedagogies focus on surface-level features of texts such as correct grammar and word usage and they are often employed in training programs and remedial workshops. The academic socialization perspective is "concerned with students' acculturation into disciplinary and subject-based discourses and genres" (Lea & Street, 2006, p. 369). As do some early instantiations of genre theory, one version of academic socialization assumes "that the disciplinary discourses and genres are relatively stable and, once students have learned and understood the ground rules of a particular academic discourse, they are able to reproduce it unproblematically" (p. 369). Lea and Street (2006) argue that this is rarely the case and they propose a version of academic socialization "concerned with meaning making, identity, power, and authority" (p. 369). Known as the academic literacies perspective, this version of academic socialization does not dismiss the teaching of skills, or the promotion of genre awareness, but it adds to these pedagogical approaches a concern "to cultivate critical awareness of the ways in which literacy practices are shaped by ever-shifting sets of economic, political, social, cultural and linguistic factors" (Kells, 2007 as cited in Black et al., 2014, p. 6). The academic literacies perspective resembles the sociopolitical discourse described by Ivanic (2004). Importantly, it recognizes writing as an identity practice; that is, it understands why a teacher who is used to writing "objective" statements on student report cards might feel uncomfortable writing personal reflections and why a teacher who has emphasized personal reflections in her language arts classes might initially resist writing an article summary without adding editorial comments.

Overview of the Study

Our study was conducted in a non-departmentalized Faculty of Education located in a large research-intensive, Canadian university. At the time of the study, 120 Master's level part-

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14

time and full-time students were enrolled in the M.Ed. Curriculum program and the Faculty employed 40 full-time, tenure-stream instructors, about one third of whom taught courses in Curriculum or supervised Curriculum research projects. We asked the following research questions.

> How do Curriculum master's level students conceptualize academic writing?
>
> What writing-related challenges do students experience in the program?
>
> What writing pedagogies have students and instructors found helpful?
>
> What challenges do students and supervisors encounter during the writing of student theses?

After receiving the requisite institutional and ethics approvals, all Curriculum master's level students and all graduate faculty employed in the program were invited to participate. Eight faculty members and 14 graduate students accepted the invitation. Eight of the 14 student participants were enrolled in an introductory Curriculum Studies course (first-term students) and another six student participants were in the process of writing a thesis (thesis students). Most participants were female (18 females, 4 males) and all were fluent speakers of English who had completed at least one degree with English as the language of instruction. It is worth noting, however, that six of the participants spoke English as an additional language. We invited each participant to suggest a pseudonym and refer to each of them using their pseudonym.

One section of the interview protocol addressed topics such as the respondents' preferred spoken and written language(s) and their fields of undergraduate study. We noted considerable disciplinary diversity among participants' undergraduate programs. However, all the faculty members had earned at least one graduate degree in Education at a Canadian university and all faculty participants had been employed as school teachers prior to earning an advanced degree. At the time of the study, two students were employed as instructors at the postsecondary level and all other students were employed as either part-time or full-time school teachers.

A second section of the interview protocol invited participants to share their thoughts about differences between academic, professional, and everyday writing, their perceptions of graduate students' needs for support with academic writing tasks, and the kinds of support they had personally found helpful in their writing careers. In recognition of each participant's unique positioning within the institutional context, we adapted certain questions as needed.

The interviews were conducted in face-to-face format, by telephone, or by email exchanges. All face-to-face and telephone interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed, anonymized, and returned to participants for member checking. The data were then analyzed thematically. Following Hamilton (1994), we aimed to put the insights and perspectives of participants at the centre of the analysis. However, themes and patterns in the data were also examined through a critical interpretivist lens (Alvesson & Billing, 2009, pp. 40-44). We aimed to understand participants' subjective perspectives, yet rejected "a non-evaluative attitude towards the meanings produced" (p. 43). To achieve this understanding, data were formatted into columns and independently reviewed multiple times by the researchers.

We began our thematic analysis by examining participants' representations of academic writing. Researchers made notes as they read, specifically in those moments where participants talked about their writing (past or present). Following this initial phase, we reviewed our

preliminary notes to find interpretive categories based on what we were seeing in the data. Categories were independently colour-coded and organized prior to meetings during which we shared our individual analyses. This third phase took an iterative approach; we looked for both consistencies and contradictions in the analyses. We challenged each other's assumptions, and then positioned our analyses alongside understandings gleaned from the literature review. We then identified some shared issues and attempted to locate them in the broader contexts of our program and pedagogies. This process allowed us to modify our collective analysis and to select dominant and salient themes. Here we discuss three themes: Representing Academic Writing, Writing Challenges and Helpful Pedagogies, and Writing Goes Back to School.

Representing Academic Writing

We began each interview by asking the participant: What is academic writing and how does it differ from other kinds of writing? All the participants described academic writing as more formal than everyday writing. They said that academic texts contain rare words, technical language and longer sentences. Academic writing can be experienced as inaccessible to outsiders. Hobbes, a thesis student employed as a Writing instructor in another faculty, told us that she reminds her students: "If you say *fix* in biology, you don't mean *repair*. You mean *attach*." Another thesis student (Alexis) observed that "the writing can become...convoluted and distracted by language that's relevant to the field, but the actual point of the writing isn't as clear" and Diane, an experienced scholar, complained about the obscure language in some academic texts. She said, "I'm a reasonably intelligent person. I should be able to understand it."

The need to cite sources was mentioned by most participants. Interestingly, this feature of academic writing was usually mentioned in response to a question about aspects of writing that participants had found challenging. Celia, for example, had many academic publications to her credit, but she spoke of feeling burdened by the need to "never say anything right outright...because maybe more data, more evidence, more research would show us to be correct."

Reflecting on the data, we inferred that the participants as a group found academic writing easier to recognize than to describe. We noticed, for example, that their comments about the characteristics of successful writing were rarely elaborated.

> Danielle (thesis student): I don't use slang anyway, so I don't know it, maybe because I'm coming from another country. I'm used to - not the academic – but formal language. But thinking about writing and words, [academic] words are a little bit more formal than the words that I use.
>
> Georgia (faculty member): There are rules that you need to be aware of and that you need to keep in mind when you're doing this writing.

Georgia's comments remind us that course instructors may be "unaware of the degree to which they have internalized discipline-specific expectations for 'good writing'" (Wilder & Wolfe, 2009, p. 196). Georgia did not name any rules. She said writing classes were unnecessary because students need to be "writing their way in it and through it." By contrast, Andrea (a first-term student) voiced a strong desire for explicit instruction. When an instructor described her writing as "awkward," she felt powerless and asked her brother to help out. She could see that his suggestions made the writing better, but she felt unable to articulate why and she continued to lack the confidence needed to edit her work independently.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14

What discourses on writing and learning to write (Ivanic, 2004) did participants' representations of academic writing reference? As might be expected, the study skills discourse was most popular, but there were many references to disciplinary genres and academic socialization. Hobbes' comments about the meaning of *fix*, for example, paid attention to sentence-level strategies, but acknowledged that word meanings are situated in disciplinary practices.

The many references to study skills included comments about the importance of "good grammar" (Celia) and a criticism of a convention commonly found in Education theses (Diane), both of which point to a desire for one set of widely applicable standards for successful writing.

> Diane (faculty member): Beginning every chapter [with] "In the first chapter of the thesis...In Chapter One I'm going to do this; in Chapter Two this; in Chapter Three this, in Chapter Four this...You do *not* have to do this!

The fact that references to writing as a form of academic socialization were made by thesis students and faculty members, but rarely by first-term students, suggests that immersion in disciplinary practices without explicit instruction can promote genre awareness. In the excerpt below, Donna described the first time she had paid attention to discipline-specific "ways with words" (Heath, 1983) and, more importantly, her first glimpse of writing as an epistemic activity.

> Donna (faculty member): [In high school science] we reproduced what we were told. There were no textbooks. So I thought the history teacher had given me everything [I needed to know], and I knew it by heart...and I reproduced it. And I didn't get the grades. And I remember thinking that maybe it was more than reproduction in history.

In a similar vein, Alexis described how preparing a thesis had allowed her to reposition herself in an academic community.

> Alexis [thesis student]: [H]ad you interviewed me during my course work, the writing would have been different. At that time the writing would be focused more on analyzing a particular author and analyzing that author's style. So much of the writing I'm doing now is based more on creating my own niche, my own writing style as a thesis student.

No description of academic writing explicitly referenced a sociopolitical discourse, but comments about writing challenges and helpful pedagogies corroborated Lea and Street's (1998, 2006) observation that academic socialization rarely proceeds unproblematically. Steve's recollections illustrate the complex nature of academic socialization in interdisciplinary fields and highlight the need for all writers to attend to the expectations of their readers.

> Steve (faculty member): As I was in History and Theory of Psychology, the mode of writing wasn't the traditional psychology experiment report. It was more of a humanities mode of writing. It had aspects of philosophy or history to it. And now in Education I find that there's the same thing. Some of the writing that I do is more like a psychology research report where I'm reporting an experiment using that traditional science format. You know: the introduction, the methods, the results, the conclusion. And some of the writing that I do is reporting on qualitative research: anecdotes and discourse and the

> interpretation of those. And some of the writing that I do is more theoretical stuff where I'm taking an idea and unpacking it and arguing for it.

From the positive tone of their comments, we inferred that Donna, Alexis and Steve had embraced the identity options afforded by academic writing. Several other participants told a different story.

Writing Challenges and Helpful Pedagogies

When we asked participants to tell us about writing advice they had found helpful in their careers, all but one student participant expressed a preference for explicit instruction over indirect approaches. Indirect approaches to writing instruction reference an unproblematized faith in academic socialization. They assume that given enough exposure to models of "good" writing and frequent opportunities to write, student writers will produce increasingly close approximations to the models (see e.g., Delyser, 2003; Montford & Reynolds, 1996). Indirect approaches are common in university classes, perhaps because, as we noted earlier, instructors have often achieved success without explicit instruction and they assume that students can do likewise.

> Celia (faculty member): I still find it a bit puzzling why people can't write. We make them read so much and you learn how to write by reading others and, and the fact that students don't get it. They don't see how people use evidence or citations, or whatever. I don't see how you can read it and not absorb it.

We suspect that Andrea was similarly puzzled by her inability to recognize rhetorical moves of successful writers and we suspect that her frustration is a common one. The lack of shared vocabulary for talking about writing is a potential source of mystification for both students and instructors. We wondered too about student participants' lack of familiarity with academic genres such as the thesis. Alexis, whose comments are cited above, was unique among the thesis students in recognizing the epistemic affordances of thesis preparation. Indeed, the thesis was a source of distress, even for students who had been successful in courses. Tracey told the interviewer, "You say to yourself, 'I don't know if this sounds right or what exactly is appropriate.' And no one really told you what is expected."

Bob taught technical writing in secondary schools, but he likened the experience of writing a thesis to "playing chess against a master player when you were only taught the basic rules - a long time ago."

Of course, knowing what is expected does not always solve a student's difficulties. We were especially concerned about some comments made by a first-term student called Suzanne. Suzanne described feeling totally overwhelmed by writing assignments. She told the interviewer that guidelines such as word counts and double-spacing were confusing and she was resentful about the requirement to support opinions with evidence from the literature. She said, "In the past I didn't even have to worry about supporting my ideas with somebody's sayings."

Suzanne's concerns alerted us to two important "take away" messages from our study: first, that graduate students are engaged in transitions that necessitate "significant psychosocial and cultural adjustments" (Vogler, Crivello, & Woodhead, 2008, p. 2); and second, that academic writing practices, no less than creative writing practices, are identity practices. Student writers are obliged to manage "the impressions that [they] convey about themselves in their

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14

texts" (Olinger, 2011, p. 273). In effect, a graduate student writer is required to create "a new identity which fits the expectations of the subject teachers who represent a student's new discipline" (Hyland, 2002, p. 352). No wonder Suzanne felt ambivalent about graduate school. A newcomer to Canadian university education, her motivation to appropriate a scholarly identity was diminished by feelings of loss and longing for the security of a familiar setting. Melissa too described her experience of writing in graduate school as one of loss. A graduate of an undergraduate English Literature program, she had tried to prepare herself for the new experience, but she felt she was giving up a valued part of herself.

> Melissa (thesis student): Some of my professors had been there through my first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year English courses. They were saying, "Do you know that it's very different than...[Y]ou have to get into that frame of mind when you get into the program. You can't just write how you write here."

The transition work undertaken by graduate students can be particularly disconcerting for students who are simultaneously employed in professions. Being repositioned as a student when one is used to being a professional may be experienced as a profound loss of status. As one first-term student put it, "Prior to this experience, I would have placed myself as good to very good...Right now...I am far less confident in my writing ability." We were reminded of a study conducted in England with adult education students (Burgess & Ivanic, 2010). Among the participants were some who seemed to resent being positioned as students. Although they were anxious to gain access to the employment opportunities afforded by participation, they did not enjoy being "constructed as 'someone in education'" (p. 230) and were "partially desiring and partially resisting" (p. 230) the student identity. We wondered if Suzanne and Melissa were "partially desiring and partially resisting" the graduate student identity. While each of them was already "someone in education" they may have been resisting the imperative to become "someone else."

Writing Goes Back to School

Our initial desire to learn how course instructors and thesis supervisors might support Curriculum graduate students as writers was grounded in a belief that all instructors should see themselves as writing instructors. In teacher professional discourse there is an aphorism – Every teacher is a teacher of literacy. It was not apparent to us at the beginning of the inquiry that the literacy instruction we had practiced in our professional careers as school teachers and literacy teacher educators would not suffice for our current project. We were used to comparing school literacy practices with informal, "out-of-school" literacies, but we conflated school literacies and with graduate school literacies. That is, we unwittingly privileged a static understanding of genre. Our literature review led us to problematize this understanding. Becoming a bona fide member of an academic community requires students to develop an awareness of disciplinary genres as situated forms of social action and to embrace the epistemic affordances of the writing process. In the words of one astute first-term participant, "Planning what you have in mind, so that you are very clear about where it is you're headed, [may not be] realistic in academic life."

Our "aha" moment is well documented in Writing Studies literature. For example, in their seminal text for undergraduate students, Giltrow, Gooding, and Burgoyne (2009) observe that writing practices acquired in school tend to address the purposes of schooling, not the purposes

of graduate education. Giltrow et al. also warn students that there are no hard and fast rules for producing successful texts.

> When people are looking for writing universals, they tend to come up with a structure, and, most often, it's the classroom that prompts the urge for such a form: something that can be taught and tested. It's not only teachers who want that structure. Knowing they are going to be tested, students are going to want to learn the form. (Giltrow at al., 2009, p. xi)

Unfortunately, student writers often encounter resources that simplify writing. Our Google search on the term "academic writing" retrieved a plethora of sites that reduced academic writing to the traditional five-paragraph essay taught at school. The advice that "if you can master the five-paragraph essay, then you can become Picasso" (Salas, 2009, n p) was typical. Similar advice was voiced in several interviews. Sounding remarkably like Salas, Chrissy (a faculty member) recommended that instructors go "back to the old school [where you] learned one style and the way to do it. Then you could fly after that." Sounding remarkably like Chrissy, Melissa (a thesis student) told us that an essay-writing tip she learned in grade nine continued to serve her well.

> Melissa (thesis student): Think of your arguments first...You put your second best argument under the first one, your weakest is the second one and your best is the third one. Even though I learned that in grade nine, it kind of stuck with me and I still do that to this day, even though the format has changed.

Our intention here is not to debate the worth of the five-paragraph essay as a teaching tool, but to reflect on reasons why participants looked so far back in their academic careers to find helpful strategies. Melissa was not too lazy to seek expert advice, but expert advice had not been easy to find. She complained about a professor from early in her undergraduate program who told the class, "Forget everything you learned in high school," but offered nothing in its place. Chrissy was sympathetic to the needs of beginning graduate students and recalled her own fears as a graduate student that she could be "writing like a grade three." We appreciate that Chrissy provided guidance to motivated and ambitious students such as Melissa although we are not convinced that "going back to the old school" will enable students to "fly" as scholars. In our final section, then, we consider what we might do instead.

Implications for Practice

Our study was initially conceived as a needs assessment, but it evolved into a Curriculum inquiry informed by the ACLITS pedagogical framework. The interview data do indeed corroborate two tenets of ACLITS: first that academic socialization rarely proceeds unproblematically, and second that writing practices are identity practices. We find it helpful to conceptualize "transition" as a verb. In a variety of ways, both student and faculty participants told us that successfully transitioning to graduate studies involves "psychosocial and cultural adjustments" (Vogler et al., 2008, p. 2) and that those adjustments can create anxiety about writing expectations. In various ways and to varying extents, students' descriptions of their writing experiences in the past and in graduate school reminded us that transitioning can evoke feelings of loss as well as desire. At first glance, it seems too obvious to say that our findings

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14

indicate a need for instructors to learn about their students' backgrounds. Yet we wish to underline that instructors in interdisciplinary graduate programs should recognize that students' descriptions of their disciplinary and employment backgrounds contain clues to understanding how instructors can support their learning. As instructors of an introductory course, we routinely look to the future as we set goals for student learning. We must remember to also look at the past.

We turn now to the question: What responsibilities might course instructors and supervisors assume with respect to writing instruction and support? The Writing Studies literature advocates for course instructors to guide students' participation in disciplinary conversations (Stacey & Granville, 2009, p. 330), but for instructors in interdisciplinary programs such as Curriculum, this is a tall order. Curriculum's constituent disciplines include History, Sociology, Philosophy, Psychology, and most recently Arts and Literary studies. How do disciplinary conversations overlap with and intersect with one another in Curriculum conversations? Must every graduate course instructor become a Writing specialist? In an effort to discover how others who work outside language-related fields approach Writing instruction and support, we surveyed "Writing Support" pages of numerous college and university web sites. We found several innovative initiatives, but have chosen to highlight initiatives at the Ontario College of Art and Design (OCAD) (Black et al., 2014) on the grounds that the challenges faced by visual arts instructors more than match our own.

The OCAD report does not recommend that every instructor should become a Writing specialist. It acknowledges that writing issues are a source of work intensification for instructors and recommends that instructors partner with Writing specialists for certain tasks. It provides a Writing assessment framework that does not employ technical vocabulary of the kind used by Writing specialists and proposes a way of dialoguing about writing that taps into each writer's disciplinary expertise. We were impressed by OCAD's decision to work with students' strengths. OCAD students are not asked to unlearn strategies they found successful in the past, but to build from what they know.

OCAD's decision to approach writing support through visual design concepts is well aligned with the ACLITS assumption that students perform identities in writing and bring to their writing "historically accumulated, culturally developed, and socially distributed resources that are essential for a person's self-definition, self-expression, and self-understanding" (Esteban-Guitart & Moll, 2014, p. 31). Esteban-Guitart and Moll call these resources "funds of identity" and they argue that when instructors pay attention to students' funds of identity, the students' practices, including practices such as looking back to school for advice, can be reconceptualized as resources for instruction.

We take heart from OCAD's example, for we too have been pushed to revise what we thought we knew about writing instruction and support and now understand that we do not need to forget everything we learned about literacy at school. Importantly, the inquiry provoked some lively dialogue with graduate students and colleagues across the university and it has brought our "research and teaching much closer" (Hyland, 2008, p. 543). We have welcomed these conversations and hope our paper will provoke further conversations among non-specialists, especially those instructors employed in professional and interdisciplinary fields.

References

Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. D. (2009). *Understanding gender and organizations*. London: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446280133

Badenhorst, C., Moloney, C., Rosales, J., & Dyer, J. (2012). Graduate research writing: A pedagogy of possibility. *Learning Landscapes, 6*(1), 63-80.

Bauer, L., & Theado, C. K. (2014). Examining the "social turn" in postsecondary literacy research. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 45*(1), 67-84. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2014.950869

Bazerman, C. (Ed.). (2008). *Handbook of research on writing: History, society, school, individual, text*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bazerman, C. (2009). Genre and cognitive development: Beyond writing to learn. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds.), *Genre in a changing world* (pp. 279- 294). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse. https://doi.org/10.4000/pratiques.1419

Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality; Writing instruction in American colleges 1900 – 1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Black, C., Ferguson, S., Brancato, E., Shakabati, A. S., Days, S., Glass, S.,...Wyman, J. (2014). *Task force on writing across the curriculum: Final report.* Toronto, ON: Ontario College of Arts and Design (OCAD).

Burgess, A., & Ivanic, R. (2010). Writing and being written: Issues of identity across timescales. *Written Communication, 27*(2), 228-225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088310363447

DeLyser, D. (2003). Teaching graduate students to write: A seminar for thesis and dissertation writers, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 27*(2), 169-181.

Devitt, A. J. (1993). Generalizing about genre: New conceptions of an old concept. *College Composition and Communication, 44*(4), 573-586. https://doi.org/10.2307/358391

Egan, K. (1978/2003). What is curriculum? *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 1*(1), 9-16

Esteban-Guitart, M., & Moll, L. (2014). Funds of identity: A new concept based on the Funds of Knowledge approach. *Culture and Psychology, 20*(1), 21-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X13515934

Gee, J. P. (1999). *The new literacy studies and the "social turn"* (Opinion paper). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED442118.pdf

Giltrow, J., Gooding, R., Burgoyne, D., & Sawatsky, M. (2009). *Academic writing: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Broadview Press.

Hamilton, M. (1994). Introduction, signposts. In M. Hamilton, D. Barton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Worlds of literacy* (pp. 1-14). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2002). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal, 56*(4), 351-359. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.4.351

Hyland, K. (2008). Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching, 41*, 543-562. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005235

Hyland, K. (2011). The presentation of self in scholarly life: Identity and marginalization in academic homepages. *English for Specific Purposes, 30*, 286-297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.04.004

Ivanic, R. (2004). Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and Education, 18*(3), 220-245. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780408666877

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Lavelle, E., & Bushrow, K. (2007). Writing approaches of graduate students. *Educational Psychology, 27*(6), 807-822. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701366001

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 157-172. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory into Practice, 45*(4), 368-377. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4504_11

Lillis, T. M. (2001). *Student writing: Access, regulation, desire*. London, England: Routledge.

Lingard, L., Schryer, C. F., Spafford, M. M., & Garwood, K. (2003). Talking the talk: School and workplace genre tension in clerkship case presentations. *Medical Education*, 37, 612-620. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2003.01553.x

Montford, R., & Reynolds, N. (1996) Rhetoric and graduate studies: Teaching in a postmodern age. *Rhetoric Review, 15*(1), 192-214. https://doi.org/10.1080/07350199609359214

Mullen, C. A. (2001). The need for a curricular writing model for graduate students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 25*(1), 117-126. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770020030551

Olinger, A. R. (2011). Constructing identities through 'discourse': Stance and interaction in collaborative college writing. *Linguistics and Education, 22*, 273-286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2011.04.001

Paré, A. (2010). Slow the presses. Concerns about premature publishing. In C. Aitchison, B. Kamler, & A. Lee (Eds.), *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond* (pp. 30 – 46). New York, NY: Routledge.

Portelli, J. (1987). Perspectives and imperatives of defining curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2*(4), 354-267.

Prior, P. (1998). *Writing disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Prior, P. A., & Lunsford, K. J. (2008). History of reflection and research on writing. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 81-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Russell, D. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society: An activity theory analysis. *Written Communication, 14*, 504-554. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088397014004004

Russell, D., Lea, M., Parker, J., Street, B., & Donahue, T. (2009). Exploring notions of genre in 'academic literacies' and 'writing across the curriculum': Approaches across countries and contexts. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds.). *Genre in a changing world. Perspectives on writing* (pp. 459-491). Retrieved from http://oro.open.ac.uk/17036/1/Russell_et_al_WAC_and_ACLITS.pdf

Salas, A. (2009). Graduate preparedness strategies for graduate writing. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, 19*(13), 28-30.

Schubert, W. (2010). Curriculum studies: Definitions and dimensions of. In C. Kriedel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* (pp. 230-237).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412958806.n128

Schryer, C. (2011). Investigating texts in their social contexts: The promise and peril of Rhetorical genre studies. In D. Starke-Meyerring, A. Paré, A. Artemeva, M. Horne, & L. Yousoubova (Eds.), *Writing in knowledge societies* (pp. 31-52). Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearninghouse/Parlor Press. Retrieved from: http://wac.colostate.edu/books/winks/

Shaughnessy, M. (1976). Diving in: An introduction to basic writing. *College Composition and Communication, 27*(3), 234-239. https://doi.org/10.2307/357036

Smagorinsky, P. (2006). Overview. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.), *Research on composition: Multiple perspectives on two decades of change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Stierer, B. (2000). School teachers writing at university: What kind of knowledge is at stake? *Teacher Development, 4*(2), 199-221. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530000200113

Stacey, J. D., & Granville, S. (2009). Entering the conversation: Reaction papers in advanced academic literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(3), 327-339. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510902898908

Starfield, S., & Ravelli, S (2006). "The writing of this thesis was a process that I could not explore with the positivistic detachment of the classical sociologist": Self and structure in New Humanities research theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*(3), 222-243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.07.004

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

University of Toronto School of Graduate Studies (n.d.). *English language and writing support*. Retrieved from https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/English-Language-and-Writing-Support.aspx

Vogler, P., Crivello, G., Woodhead, M. (2008). *Early childhood transitions research: A review of concepts, theory, and practice' Working Paper 48.* The Hague: Netherlands. Bernard van Leer Foundation. Retrieved from http://oro.open.ac.uk/16989/1/Vogler_et_al_Transitions_PDF.DAT.pdf

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932

Wilder, L., & Wolfe, J. (2009). Sharing the tacit rhetorical knowledge of the literacy scholar: The effects of making disciplinary conventions explicit in undergraduate writing about literature courses. *Research in the Teaching of English, 44*(2), 170-209.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.3.14