# CONTENTS

# Introduction
## *Writing Center Pedagogies and Practices Reconsidered for Graduate Student Writers*

Susan Lawrence and Terry Myers Zawacki

Origin stories matter, as Neal Lerner (2009) tells us; they authorize endeavors and institutions and define their missions. We begin this introduction, then, with the origins of our interest in investigating writing center support for graduate students, an interest that led first to a special issue of *Writing Lab Newsletter* we co-edited in 2016, and ultimately to this volume.

Our account opens in the writing center, from our own perspective on the ground. In 2013, as a new director of George Mason University's writing center, Susan noticed that over 25 percent of the tutorial sessions were booked by graduate students, almost two thousand appointments annually, with 70 percent of those being held by writers who identified their first language as other than English, a number that was not dramatically different from when Terry had directed the center over eight years before and that has held steady to the present. Our usage data also showed that many graduate students were booking multiple sessions, suggesting that we were providing something of value. Yet we also heard our undergraduate and English masters student tutors asking how to work, within the confines of a 45-minute session, with a writer who brings a thirty-page chapter from a thesis or dissertation; whether it was acceptable to work on local concerns exclusively with a dissertation writer; or how to address substantive concerns when the dissertation genre is unfamiliar and when the text's subject matter is so specialized as to defy comprehension. Our WAC-informed writing center served students in majors across the university, but the tutors' practice, so clearly developed for undergraduate writers and writing, was frequently challenged by the advanced graduate writers they met in sessions.

Our situation was not news to writing center professionals, of course. In the mid-1990s John Thomas Farrell (1994) and Judith Powers (1995) wrote in the *Writing Lab Newsletter* about an increase in consultations with

graduate students at their writing centers starting in the 1980s. And we ourselves had, before 2013, heard and responded to requests to serve graduate thesis and dissertation writers, supporting doctoral student writing groups in the mid-2000s and, more recently, offering weekly graduate student write-ins. But we hadn't taken stock; we hadn't asked how fully our existing practices and resources met—or didn't meet—the needs of the advanced graduate student writers who called on them. How could this group of writers be served with existing staff, pedagogies, and training structures? How would these resources need to be reconfigured, reinvented, or augmented to better meet the students' needs?

At almost the same time that Susan was reflecting on graduate students' use of the writing center, Terry, as then-director of Mason's Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program, was invited to a meeting of academic administrators to discuss concerns about high attrition rates and extended time to degree in our doctoral programs and to offer possible interventions, including those aimed at writing.[1] Before proposing any writing-related interventions, Terry suggested that a better understanding of the problem was needed, particularly related to doctoral students leaving as ABDs. Subsequently she and two colleagues received funding to study the challenges facing dissertation writers—both English L1 (first language) and English L2 (second language)—and their advisors and to provide data-driven recommendations (see Rogers, Zawacki, and Baker 2016). Among their survey, focus group, and interview findings was the discouraging, but not altogether surprising, general perception that the writing center could not adequately assist these writers with complex disciplinary tasks. While in focus groups many of the doctoral students who had sought assistance from the writing center said it was useful, they also felt the pressure to get their writing "fixed" and often minimized or failed to recognize the value of the higher-order generic and rhetorical writing instruction they described receiving.

The feedback we'd elicited from both our tutors and our graduate student clients made it clear that supporting graduate student writers would call for evaluating our existing practices. The student-centered, nondirective, generalist pedagogies that Linda Shamoon and Deborah Burns (1995) present as writing center "orthodoxy" (134) and that emerged as writing centers oriented to undergraduate writers seemed, as others have observed (Kiedaisch and Dinitz 1993; Mackiewicz 2004; Dinitz and Harrington 2014), not fully adequate for writers in the disciplines, much less for writers doing advanced disciplinary research and writing. Despite the apparent lack of congruency between orthodox writing center pedagogies and those potentially effective with advanced graduate writers, we

believe that writing center foundations do bring graduate students within the ambit of writing center work. For example, Muriel Harris's (1995) landmark article on what tutors can do for writers invokes a set of activities, needs, and goals we can easily see as relevant to graduate students: the acquisition of strategic knowledge; the move toward independence fostered by talk about writing; support with the affective dimension of writing; the illumination of tacit disciplinary conventions.

With these foundations in mind, we proposed and co-edited a special issue of *Writing Lab Newsletter* (2016) focused on writing center support for thesis and dissertation writers. The process of editing this special issue, for which we received many times the number of proposals that could be included as articles, led us to envision this volume, which explores how engaging with these thesis and dissertation writers can cause us to rethink and revise the principles and practices that have been definitional in writing center theory and pedagogy, and to examine how this endeavor complicates our already complex conversations about writing center identities, pedagogies, formats, and spaces.

## DEFINING IDENTITIES—GRADUATE STUDENT WRITERS AND WRITING

Writing center practices are necessarily responsive to the specific needs and circumstances of the students who lay claim to our attention. Before proceeding, then, we pause to reflect on the specific needs and circumstances of advanced graduate writers and writing, which, as we and the authors in this volume contend, call for a reconsideration of many of our core writing center practices.

As has been well documented in the literature, the development of writing expertise in a discipline is a gradual process (e.g., see Berkenkotter, Huckin, and Ackerman 1988; Carter 1990; Beaufort 2004; Thaiss and Zawacki 2006). Graduate-level writing, and theses and dissertations in particular, bring a degree of rhetorical and generic complexity that goes far beyond the simple application of general (and presumably already-learned) rules to new situations. Graduate writers, for example, must learn to pose an original question, narrow and pursue the question using appropriate resources and methods, and make original and appropriately supported claims, a set of tasks that cannot be accomplished at the level expected without a degree of knowledge transformation that far exceeds that required of most undergraduates. In addition to learning to make knowledge in their disciplines, graduate students must become familiar with the genres and moves that allow them to

craft knowledge in ways appropriate to the communities of practice in which they are writing. Along the way, they are expected to have acquired the confidence to project an authoritative scholarly identity to audiences who are often disguised as "any reader" or as an "evoked" or "implicated" reader by the students' advisors or committees (Kamler and Thomson 2008; Parry 1998; Paré, Starke-Meyerring, and McAlpine 2009; Rogers, Zawacki, and Baker 2016).

All of the developmental processes described here are, of course, more complicated and difficult for English L2 writers who are struggling to acquire the correct language—vocabulary, grammar, syntax, sentence structure—for the task along with the rhetorical, sociolinguistic, and genre knowledge appropriate to advanced work in the program and field (e.g., see Prior 1991; Riazi 1997; Dong 1998, Partridge and Starfield 2007; Tardy 2009).

Yet even as these advanced graduate writers, whether English L1 or L2, are still developing, they are assumed to have already learned to write at the level expected and may accordingly receive little instruction or guidance when it comes to negotiating these challenges (Duff 2010; Gardner 2010; Paré 2011; Kamler and Thomson 2006), or even acknowledgment that the challenges exist. Further, if graduate faculty have internalized this discourse knowledge themselves, as is often the case, they may not easily access or even acknowledge it; the rhetorical situatedness of the writing they do may have become transparent (Carter 1990; Russell 2002; Paré 2011), perceived as a "normalized practice" or a "common sense" skill (Starke-Meyerring 2011; Starke-Meyerring et al. 2014). Also often transparent or "occluded" and "out of sight" are the "systems of genres" or "genre sets" (Bazerman 1994; Devitt 2009; Autry and Carter 2015) that comprise a thesis or dissertation, and that are precisely the genres and subgenres that most challenge graduate writers. The consequences are multiple: first, faculty may expect that "good writing skills" alone are adequate to the task of writing in the discipline; second, faculty are unlikely to explicitly teach knowledge that, for them, lacks visibility; and third, when writing—its genres, subgenres, moves, and conventions—is seen as normalized, decontextualized practice, graduate student writers who have not achieved proficiency are perceived as deficient and in need of remediation, by the advisor and often by the students themselves who have internalized this view (Turner 2000; Starke-Meyerring 2011; Rogers, Zawacki, and Baker 2016).

We see gaps here that writing centers can help address, but if we do not shape practices in response to graduate writers' distinct circumstances, we risk alienating them in a context that may already have them

feeling alienated as writers. Enculturation must be a two-way street, as scholars focusing on English L2 graduate students have proposed: not only are graduate students enculturated into disciplinary communities; they too should transform the local academic communities in which they participate (see Leki, Cumming, and Silva 2008, 39–41, for a discussion of the literature on this issue, and Salter-Dvorak 2014 for a more recent case study), including their faculty's teaching and mentoring practices (Fujiyoka 2014). We want to think through positions and findings like this in a writing center context: by being open to changing our practices and identities in response to the distinctive qualities and needs of L1 and L2 graduate writers, writing centers can fulfill the mission of supporting them rather than leaving them to feel further estranged.

## COMPLICATING IDENTITIES AND PRACTICES—PEERNESS, PEDAGOGIES, INTERACTIONS, SPACES

We propose also that the benefit is mutual: that is, to develop targeted, intentional ways of serving graduate students, writing center practitioners can discover new avenues for conceiving of writing center theory and practice. Below we consider how the turn to working with advanced disciplinary writers can inflect ongoing writing center conversations about peerness and pedagogy, higher order concerns and lower order concerns, one-to-one tutoring, and writing center spaces. Specifically, we propose that turning to graduate students complicates simple notions of peerness, augments the repertoire of pedagogies tutors use in sessions, deconstructs the opposition between higher order concerns and lower order concerns, decenters individual tutoring as the core writing center practice, and simultaneously changes and expands spaces of writing center practice.

### Questioning Peerness

Already nuanced debates about generalist and specialist tutors acquire additional intricacy and depth when our clients are doing the advanced disciplinary research and writing that graduate students bring to the writing center. The shorthand "generalist/specialist" used to describe these debates can conflate issues of peerness and pedagogy, a topic Michael Pemberton addresses in his chapter in this volume, and we distinguish and treat these issues separately here. The issue of tutor identities and peerness is itself multi-layered: what does it mean, for example, to share a writer's disciplinary expertise when the research is highly specialized?

Even a tutor and writer in the same discipline may inhabit different subdisciplines, and of course most writing centers cannot hire tutors from every discipline on campus. For these reasons, Michael Carter's (2007) treatment of "metadisciplinarity" has been fruitful in theorizing and designing writing support for graduate writers, as Megan Autry and Michael Carter (2015) show. Another layer of disciplinary peerness arising with graduate writers has to do with research methods: disciplinary knowledge at the graduate level comprises research methods, and tutors who understand writers' disciplinary or even metadisciplinary methods are particularly valuable to those writers (e.g., see Phillips 2016). Yet another layer of peerness arises when we ask whether the tutor and writer are at the same degree level—is the tutor an undergraduate, masters student, PhD student in coursework, ABD (all but dissertation), or even faculty? These layers remind us how complicated the concept of peerness in the writing center can become when writers are doing advanced disciplinary work. Some of these complications are addressed in this volume in chapters by Pemberton and by Juliann Reinecke, Mary Glavan, Douglas Philips, and Joanna Wolfe.

## Enlarging Pedagogical Repertoires

Related to the question "who is the tutor?" but distinct from that question, is that of the pedagogies tutors draw upon when working with advanced graduate student writers, interactions that call for a greater repertoire of practices and approaches. The lengthy disciplinary texts graduate writers can bring, for example, put pressure on the practice, used in many writing centers, of having writers read their draft aloud at the beginning of a session, as Elena Kallestinova's chapter shows. Disciplinarity is a key issue here, too, and in the literature we see a variety of approaches that allow tutors who may not share a writer's disciplinary expertise to work productively with that writer, including those we would call generalist (e.g., see Barron and Cicciarelli 2016), genre-informed (Savini 2011; Devet 2014; Vorhies 2015), and L2 pedagogies, which include greater attention to local concerns, a topic we discuss in detail below, as well as greater directivity (Reid 1994; Thonus 2004; Williams and Severino 2004; Rafoth 2015, 131). These debates about directive and nondirective methods are also complicated and enriched by advanced graduate writers, for whom directive approaches may hold particular value, especially when the tutor is a specialist who can model appropriate practice. In their argument for the potential value of directive tutoring methods, in fact, Shamoon and Burns (1995) begin with paradigm cases of

graduate student writers who learned substantially from their advisors' very directive approaches to feedback (137–39). Christine Tardy (2005), too, found in her case study that heavy-handed advisors helped writers make leaps in rhetorical knowledge (331). In this volume, chapters that address pedagogies for working with advanced graduate writers on local concerns include those by Joan Turner and Michelle Cox.

If tutors need a greater repertoire of strategies for working with advanced graduate writers, then tutor training is essential—yet graduate tutors may receive less training than undergraduate peer tutors do (Phillips 2013; Summers, this volume). Even as the complexities of working with advanced graduate writers call for substantial training, the circumstances of employing graduate tutors can militate against providing such training: university financial structures along with graduate tutor commitments to their own disciplines (if they are not from writing studies) can limit the funding and time available for preparing them to tutor.

### Reprioritizing Local Concerns

On its surface, the rationale for prioritizing higher order concerns (HOCs) seems well grounded in common sense: these global dimensions of a text are important to the text's quality, and they are also "early-order" concerns that should be in place before writers edit paragraphs and sentences. But working with advanced graduate writers can prompt writing center practitioners to revisit this imperative and interrogate the binary it depends on, including the priority assigned to HOCs.

While writers at all levels may ask tutors to address concerns like "grammar" and "correctness," of course, graduate writers may have unique and pressing reasons for focusing tutors' attention on local concerns. Some graduate writers deliberately elicit different kinds of feedback from their faculty instructors or advisors, their colleagues, and writing center tutors; they may ask tutors to focus on "grammar" or language, and rely on faculty and colleagues to provide feedback on elements of the project that they see as calling for disciplinary expertise (Mannon 2016).

But the idea that so-called surface issues are distinct from larger issues of meaning is deeply problematic. Indeed, anyone who actually works in depth with advanced disciplinary writers on their texts can experience the intellectual pleasure of seeing this opposition practically deconstruct itself. For example, Joan Turner's (this volume) account of working with a dissertation writer ostensibly at the sentence level shows how she and the writer, as they work phrase by phrase, tap into and disentangle issues of theory, structure, and voice in the text. Indeed, research in linguistics

shows that word choice, for instance, a concern that falls decidedly within sentences, is not a local concern at all (Casanave and Hubbard 1992, 42). Choosing words, writers call on their strategic knowledge as well as intersentential and local knowledge of a text (Jonz 1990), and they deploy higher-order conceptual processing (Bachman 1982). Not surprisingly, then, Turner argues that "the [supposedly local] language work" writers and consultants perform on advanced disciplinary texts should be recognized for the "intellectual hard labour" it requires.

In addition, making missteps in so-called local features of a text may have higher-order *consequences* that are particularly salient for graduate writers. One such consequence concerns voice and disciplinary identity: subtle stance-taking moves and language, for instance, contribute to a writer's disciplinary voice and *ethos* as they arise from that writer's text (Lancaster 2014). Making these moves appropriately identifies writers as members of their disciplines, and missing the mark on such moves can identify writers as outsiders, as Michelle Cox (this volume) emphasizes in stressing the importance of teaching tutors to notice these often subtle features of professional and student texts. Again, professional identities are at stake when "correctness in writing [becomes] be a marker" of such identities—or lack of identity (Mannon 2016). These signals of appropriateness and correctness have material consequences as well: Phillips (2013) points to those visited on English L2 graduate writers, who, among all graduate students, "especially face discarded conference proposals, publication rejection, and roadblocks to dissertation completion" in fields where competition is high and fluency in language functions as a gatekeeper.

A related problem is that faculty may interpret nonstandard language use as evidence of a writer's cognitive deficiency (Zamel 1995, discussing L2 writers). Yet there is, as Leki, Cumming, and Silva (2008) write, an "enormous disparity" between language use and considerable "disciplinary knowledge and sophistication" for many L2 graduate writers on the path to acquiring English-language academic discourse (38). Twenty years later, however, researchers continue to encounter faculty informants who interpret L2 students' lack of written fluency as lack of comprehension (Zawacki and Habib 2014, 194–95) or even lack of effort (Ives et al. 2014, 219).

*Decentering One-to-One Tutoring as the Core of Writing Center Practice*

Definitional to writing centers is their identity as sites of individualized learning; that is, writers work one on one with a student peer or, in some

writing centers, a professional tutor, to receive feedback specific to the writing they bring to their sessions. Jackie Grutsch McKinney (2013) has argued that this thread of the writing center narrative, if it dominates the story of what writing centers are, can prevent us from fully exploring other modes of supporting writers as well as diminish the attention we might otherwise give the alternative formats we currently offer. For example, she observes, most writing centers offer workshops, but little writing center scholarship has been devoted to workshop pedagogies or practice (79).

We identify three aspects of graduate writers and writing that can prompt writing centers to explore formats beyond one-to-one consultations: first, writing centers can support graduate students' disciplinary enculturation by devising and facilitating forums in which writers can talk about writing with peers from their own disciplines (Boquet et al. 2015). Second, graduate student writers have evolving needs as they progress through a degree program, and these changing needs call for different modes of support that exceed individual consultations (Autry and Carter 2015). Finally, for graduate writers, writing will remain a high-stakes activity throughout their careers, and writing centers can help writers develop long-term habits of writing productivity. Again, such a goal may call for formats and forums that are not one-to-one conversations with a tutor.

These formats have included workshops, disciplinary and cross-disciplinary writing groups, and retreats, the latter two of which have been theorized and reported on in the literature (e.g., for writing groups, see Phillips 2012; Aitchison and Guerin 2014; Starke-Meyerring et al. 2014; Hixson et al. 2016; for retreats, see Lee and Golde 2013; Simpson 2013; and Busl, Donnelly, and Capdevielle 2015). In this volume, Steve Simpson and Elizabeth Lenaghan point to the specific benefits provided by the peer interactions that occur in such writing groups, benefits, as Simpson notes, especially valuable for L2 graduate writers. And chapters by Marilyn Gray and Ashley Bender Smith, Tika Lamsal, Adam Robinson, and Bronwyn Williams take up the benefits of workshops and writing retreats, focusing on how these forums can illuminate occluded dimensions of thesis and dissertation writing and support disciplinary identities.

*Scrutinizing the Spaces of Writing Center Work*
Working with advanced graduate writers has us casting a critical eye on commonplaces about writing center spaces as the center of writing center work. One such commonplace concerns access: writing centers

are for all students. Our discussion in this introduction presupposes, of course, that university or writing center policies actually permit graduate students to use those spaces, an issue raised in a recent issue of *Praxis* (Madden and Eodice 2016) focusing on access and equity in graduate writing support. In some universities graduate students may not be served because funding comes from undergraduate units, as Kristina Reardon, Tom Deans, and Cheryl Maykel describe in the preamble to their program description, because university administrators believe graduate students should already possess the literacies they need, or because other exigencies (staffing, space) preclude expanding services to these writers (Reardon, Deans, and Maykel 2016). One issue related to access is taken up in the chapter by Patrick Lawrence, Molly Tetrault, and Tom Deans, who prompt us to conceive of access in terms of quality as well as quantity. These authors propose that holding an orientation "intake" meeting with graduate students before they schedule consultations, a practice that can reduce access, ensures that the writers who do secure the limited number of sessions available bring needs the center can effectively address.

Another tenet having to do with space asserts that writing centers are cozy spaces with comfortable furniture, coffee pots, and other elements that make them homelike. Graduate writers may respond to writing center spaces differently than undergraduate writers do, however, and Grutsch McKinney (2013) reminds us that spaces that look inviting to some students may not appear as welcoming to others. Writing centers with well-worn couches and armchairs, for instance, may look cozy and homelike to (middle class, domestic) undergraduates, as Grutch McKinney notes, but for graduate student writers, they can operate as visible indications of a writing center's orientation to a different student population. Graduate students entering an ostensibly undergraduate-oriented writing center may feel not only out of place, but specifically inadequate or remediated, an issue raised by Laura Brady, Nathalie Singh-Corcoran, and James Holsinger in this volume. It's also possible that cozier spaces appear less than professional to students who, as Lawrence, Tetrault, and Deans (this volume) remind us, may place a high value on professionalism. Graduate writers may seek spaces that signify both warmth *and* professionalism.

As a metaphorical space, writing centers experience a tension between inhabiting a location suggested by the name "center," on the one hand, and a perceived place as supplemental either to core writing instruction or to education in the disciplines, on the other. Collectively, many of the authors in this volume move away from a center/periphery

configuration of space to envision the writing center as a key *node* in a network of graduate writing support that can include faculty advisors and program directors, upper administration, graduate student organizations, and other units on campus with a stake in graduate student success. The range and depth of the collaborations suggested in these chapters (Pemberton, Simpson, Perdue, and Brady, Singh-Corcoran, and Holsinger) may exceed those that writing centers serving predominantly undergraduate students have felt the need to develop.

\* \* \* \* \*

In this introduction, we've explored how the idea of a writing center is being reshaped in response to demands—institutional, faculty, student—to assist graduate student writers with high stakes thesis and dissertation projects. In the chapters that follow, the authors take up that exploration, detailing the ways in which our core writing center pedagogies and practices are complicated by our efforts to create intentional, targeted support that responds to the circumstances and needs of advanced graduate writers. We've organized the book into three sections: Revising Our Core Assumptions, with chapters intended to situate support for graduate writers within much-rehearsed writing center arguments around effective pedagogies and practices for what has traditionally been a predominantly undergraduate clientele; Reshaping Our Pedagogies and Practices, with chapters showing how some writing centers are adapting their scheduling and tutorial practices to accommodate the complex generic, rhetorical, and linguistic support needs presented by advanced graduate student writers; and Expanding the Center, with chapters pointing to the value of gathering institutional, departmental, and programmatic data on graduate student support and partnering with those programs and offices similarly concerned with providing that support.

It seems appropriate to begin with a prologue by Paula Gillespie, past president of IWCA and among the first writing center scholars to call for systematic attention to the distinctive needs of graduate student writers. In "Looking Back, Looking Forward," Gillespie reflects on the exigencies around graduate writing that motivated the 2005 Graduate Writing Consultants initiative she developed in partnership with the graduate school at Marquette University and her subsequent experience with trying to develop a similar program at Florida International University. Gillespie's account serves not only as an early why-and-how success story but also as a cautionary tale of how tenuous such initiatives can be.

We begin Part I: Revising Our Core Assumptions, with Michael Pemberton's chapter "Rethinking the WAC/Writing Center/Graduate

Student Connection," in which he revisits his argument in the 1995 *Writing Center Journal* landmark article "Rethinking the WAC/Writing Center Connection" that well-trained generalist tutors possess the necessary expertise to work with the kinds of generic academic writing typically assigned to undergraduates across the curriculum. As he admits, however, his article failed to consider whether generalist tutors, undergraduate or graduate, are likewise equipped to handle the more discipline-specific demands of graduate writing, particularly longer projects like theses or dissertations. In reconsidering his position, he issues a call for writing centers to become fully engaged "co-sponsors" of graduate student writing, a "literal center" for writing across the university that is inclusive not only of student writers but also of faculty and administrators who share our goals and concerns for graduate students' success.

In chapter 2, the focus shifts from Pemberton's vision of what graduate-serving writing centers can be and do to what they currently are, according to Sarah Summers's findings from her 2012 survey of twenty-five writing centers that identified themselves as "primarily dedicated to serving graduate students." In "The Rise of the Graduate-Focused Writing Center: Exigencies and Responses," Summers traces the rise of institutional interest in developing specialized graduate writing support to the perceived crisis in graduate student education and to an increase in international graduate student enrollments. Developing such support requires, as she shows, an awareness of local and national conversations about program attrition and time to degree, familiarity with the emerging body of research on graduate writers and writing, an understanding of the tutorial interventions that might best meet the needs of these writers, and a willingness to gather and share information on all of these areas.

As Steve Simpson points out in his chapter "On the Distinct Needs of Multilingual STEM Graduate Students in Writing Centers," one key topic in the conversation concerns the question of whether writing centers should differentiate the writing support they offer to English L1 and L2 graduate students or provide more holistic forms of support directed at the needs of all students using our services. There are persuasive arguments to be made for each position, he explains, with one of the most compelling being that offering combined support can "shift attention from points of difference (e.g., native language) to points of overlapping need." And yet, as he argues in this chapter, focusing on overlapping writing support needs risks overlooking the distinct needs of the international and resident multilingual graduate students whose writing struggles may look similar to those of L1 writers but which can derive from very different causes.

As the final chapter in this section, Joan Turner's "Getting the Writing Right: Writing/Language Centres and Issues of Pedagogy, Responsibility, Ethics, and International English in Graduate Student Research Writing" also takes up the need for negotiation around L2 language difference and the tutorial expertise required to mediate institutional expectations for "pristine prose" in graduate student research writing. The demand for "getting the writing right" she explains, is based on an overly simplistic understanding of writing as separate from meaning making. When understood this way, it seems appropriate to assume that the responsibility for fixing "deficient" writing (and student writers) lies with writing practitioners who are schooled in attending to the "surface" features of the text and the "mechanics" of standard academic English. Turner calls out writing center professionals for their role in maintaining this assumption through their pedagogical discourse of a hierarchy of writing concerns. Her larger argument concerns the "culturally habituated expectation of a smooth read," an expectation that is not sustainable given "the multiplicity of international voices in English" and English as the lingua franca in the contemporary global economy.

In Part II: Reshaping Our Pedagogies and Practices, we turn to chapters detailing innovative and sometimes unorthodox responses to the challenge of tutoring both English L1 and L2 graduate writers on the longer, more sustained projects they present. We begin with Patrick S. Lawrence, Molly Tetreault, and Tom Deans's "Intake and Orientation: The Role of Initial Writing Center Consultations with Graduate Students," which describes the intake consultations they developed at their writing centers at the University of New Hampshire and the University of Connecticut to manage the increasing numbers of graduate students who were signing up for tutoring, often with the expectation that the tutor would "fix" their text rather than engage in a conversation about writing. Acknowledging, however, that the required consultation might be seen by the graduate students—and other writing center professionals—as a way to restrict access, they elicited feedback from graduate students who participated in the intake consultations and report on their results in this chapter.

In her data-rich chapter "Hybrid Consultations for Graduate Students: How Pre-Reading Can Help Address Graduate Students' Needs," Elena Kallestinova proposes that a hybrid consultation model consisting of "pre-reading" followed by a face-to-face session is "optimal" for working with the longer discipline-specific projects that graduate writers bring to a session. In support of this claim, she offers evidence from a wealth of usage, client evaluation, and interview data, showing that consultants

and clients overwhelmingly prefer the hybrid sessions, and that issues taken up in hybrid sessions are different from those addressed in sessions that don't include pre-reading. She interprets her findings through the lens of research on reading comprehension and modalities. Kallestinova's chapter demonstrates the many ways that writing center usage and client report data can be mined to support arguments we are called on to make about the value of our graduate support services.

With Michelle Cox's chapter "'Noticing' Language in the Writing Center: Preparing Writing Center Tutors to Support Graduate Multilingual Writers," we return to a critique Turner raises in her chapter, and that we discuss earlier in this introduction, about the relevance for English L2 writers of a writing center pedagogy that privileges "higher order" or structural concerns over seemingly "lower order" or editing concerns at the sentence and language level. Drawing on the concept of "noticing" in L2 acquisition, Cox argues that working at the sentence-level with multilingual graduate student writers can honor a writing center philosophy of improving the writer, along with the writing, while at the same time promoting writer agency. She offers a range of tutor training resources in support of those goals.

The chapter "'Novelty Moves': Training Tutors to Engage with Technical Content" also concerns close attention to language, in this case the highly specialized language and content of the projects advanced graduate writers bring to the center and the demands these place on tutors. The authors Juliann Reineke, Mary Glavan, Doug Phillips, and Joanna Wolfe describe a genre-based "novelty moves" approach, adapted from John Swales's CARS model, which they train tutors to use as a question-generating heuristic in sessions with graduate writers. Drawing on interview data from tutors, the authors show that this approach allows tutors to engage with difficult technical content rather than turn to surface-level suggestions and corrections. Their findings suggest also that for tutors to be successful, they need intensive, scaffolded practice on when and how to use the novelty moves effectively, a training process the authors describe.

While writing centers have traditionally reached out beyond their walls to find allies and partner with other pedagogical initiatives to serve their predominantly undergraduate clientele, the chapters in Part III: Expanding the Center, taken together, make the argument that, for writing centers focused on graduate support, such allies and partnerships are crucial for initiating and sustaining their work, particularly given that funding can be so tenuous, as Gillespie's Prologue shows. Focusing on a partnership that will be familiar to most writing center practitioners,

Laura Brady, Nathalie Singh Corcoran, and James Holsinger's chapter "A Change for the Better: Writing Center/WID Partnerships to Support Graduate Writing" applies organization development theory to suggest a framework for change that can guide writing center directors in initiating and managing the programmatic growth that supporting advanced graduate student writers necessarily involves. They describe strategies for creating sustainable support for graduate writers, including collecting data from graduate students and faculty, analyzing organizational structures and local alliances, developing resources for tutors who work with advanced disciplinary writers, and creating opportunities for graduate faculty across the disciplines to reflect on their own scholarly identities, writing knowledge, and expectations for student writers.

In "'Find Something You Know You Can Believe In': The Effect of Dissertation Retreats on Graduate Students' Identities as Writers," Ashly Bender Smith, Tika Lamsal, Adam Robinson, and Bronwyn Williams show that focusing on graduate writers' scholarly identities may motivate writing centers to expand beyond individual consultations. The authors present findings from interviews with dissertation writers who attended a dissertation retreat; students reported that participating in the retreat made them more confident about their identities as writers and scholars, more reflective and conscious of their writing processes, and more aware of themselves as part of a community of scholarly writers. As the authors explain, their findings offer support for an approach to retreats that puts an equal emphasis on output, for example, number of pages written, and "less immediately tangible goals such as a more nuanced understanding of writing processes and an enhanced sense of agency as scholarly writers," with the latter crucial for doctoral students whose identities as scholars are still emerging.

In her chapter "More Than Dissertation Support: Aligning Programs with Professional Development and Other Doctoral Student Needs," Marilyn Gray makes a case for aligning the goals of graduate writing support with graduate student identities that go beyond the purely scholarly. In order to cultivate a broad base of support and funding, she recommends that writing centers demonstrate how the writing support they offer also contributes to academic progress, professional development, and well-being outcomes. To that end, she shows how writing center directors can explore a range of data on doctoral students' general support needs, including reports on students' perceptions and concerns about their own academic progress, mental health, and career prospects, as well as professional development competencies that are increasingly being adopted by institutions. Gray's chapter explains how

UCLA's graduate writing center, located in Student Affairs, has drawn on these data to inform their support initiatives, focusing in particular on discipline-specific dissertation retreats they offer.

Elizabeth Lenaghan's chapter "Revisiting the Remedial Framework: How Writing Centers Can Better Serve Graduate Students and Themselves" is similarly concerned with how writing centers frame the work they do with graduate writers. She argues against situating the need for support for graduate writing within concerns around program attrition and time to degree, as many centers—and chapters in this book—have done. She maintains that evoking these concerns as exigencies for our work with graduate writers risks confirming the already widely held perception of writing centers as remedial, product-oriented "fix-it" shops, a perception which, in turn, marginalizes the role centers can play in graduate student education. In her chapter, Lenaghan explains how she counters this perception in the development and marketing of graduate center services, including a well-funded Graduate Writing Fellows initiative. In support of her claims for the effectiveness of all of these efforts in changing perceptions of the center, she offers evidence from graduate client surveys, Fellows' session reports, and increasing numbers of students booking multiple appointments.

Many of the chapters in this collection, most notably the opening chapter by Michael Pemberton, address the need for writing centers to connect with faculty advisors who may perceive thesis and dissertation writing as merely a matter of "writing up" the research and who are often unprepared to give meaningful feedback on writing issues that go beyond surface-level fixes. We close, then, with an epilogue by Sherry Wynn Perdue that takes up the call for support for faculty supervisors as co-sponsors of graduate students' writing literacy development. In "Centering Dissertation Supervision; What Is, What Can be," Perdue describes the theoretical framework that guided her design and implementation of a dissertation supervision fellowship program she piloted through her writing center and her plans for an empirical investigation of how the program may have enhanced the faculty fellows' beliefs, supervision experiences, genre knowledge, and feedback practices—in sum, the degree to which interventions like hers might build upon the work presented in this and other scholarship on graduate writing support.

Collectively, the chapters in this volume suggest that advanced graduate student writers present an exigence for writing centers that differs from that presented by undergraduate writers, and that responding to this exigence has given writing centers the occasion to reconsider many

of the principles and practices that have emerged from our work with undergraduate writers. This kind of reconsideration, we propose, not only benefits graduate writers but also writing centers as we identify and pursue new possibilities for inquiry and practice.

## NOTE

1.   Conversations like this were also happening at the national (and international) level, precipitated by reports from the Council of Graduate Schools on its PhD Completion project (e.g., see 2008) as well as by universities' recruitment of increasing numbers of international graduate students as a part of institutional strategic goals, as Summers (this volume) discusses.

## REFERENCES

Aitchison, Claire, and Cally Guerin, eds. 2014. *Writing Groups for Doctoral Education and Beyond: Innovations in Practice and Theory*. London: Routledge.

Autry, Megan Kittle, and Michael Carter. 2015. "Unblocking Occluded Genres in Graduate Writing." *Composition Forum* 31. http://compositionforum.com/issue/31/north-carolina-state.php.

Bachman, Lyle. 1982. "The Trait Structure of Cloze Test Scores." *TESOL Quarterly* 16 (1): 61–70. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586563.

Barron, Paul, and Louis Cicciarelli. 2016. "Stories and Maps: Narrative Tutoring Strategies for Working with Dissertation Writers." *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship* 40 (5–6): 26–29.

Bazerman, Charles. 1994. "Systems of Genres and the Enactment of Social Intentions." In *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, ed. Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway, 79–101. London: Taylor & Francis.

Beaufort, Anne. 2004. "Developmental Gains of a History Major: A Case for Building a Theory of Disciplinary Writing Expertise." *Research in the Teaching of English* 39:136–85.

Berkenkotter, Carol, Thomas N. Huckin, and John M. Ackerman. 1988. "Conventions, Conversations, and the Writer: Case Study of a Student in a Rhetoric PhD Program." *Research in the Teaching of English* 22 (1): 9–41. https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/graduate_wac/busletal2015.cfm.

Boquet, Elizabeth, Meredith Kazer, Nancy Manister, Owen Lucas, Michael Shaw, Valerie Madaffari, and Cinthia Gannett. 2015. "Just Care: Learning from and with Graduate Students from a Doctor of Nursing Practice Program." *Across the Disciplines* 12 (3). https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/graduate_wac/boquetetal2015.cfm.

Busl, Gretchen, Kara Lee Donnelly, and Matthew Capdevielle. 2015. "Camping in the Disciplines: Assessing the Effect of Writing Camps on Graduate Student Writers." *Across the Disciplines: Graduate Writing Across the Disciplines* 12 (3).

Carter, Michael. 2007. "Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Disciplines." *College Composition and Communication* 58 (3): 385–418.

Carter, Michael. 1990. "The Idea of Expertise: An Exploration of Cognitive and Social Dimensions of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 41 (3): 265–86. https://doi.org/10.2307/357655.

Casanave, Christine, and Philip Hubbard. 1992. "Writing Assignments and Writing Problems of Doctoral Students: Faculty Perceptions, Pedagogical Issues, and Needed Research." *English for Specific Purposes* 11 (1): 33–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(92)90005-U.

Council of Graduate Schools. 2008. *PhD Completion and Attrition: Analysis of Baseline Program Data from the PhD Completion Project*. Washington, DC: Council on Graduate Schools.

Devet, Bonnie. 2014. "Using Metagenre and Ecocomposition to Train Writing Center Tutors for Writing in the Disciplines." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 11 (2). http://www.praxisuwc.com/devett-112.

Devitt, Amy. 2009. "Teaching Critical Genre Awareness." In *Genre in a Changing World*, ed. Charles Bazerman, Adair Bonini, and Debora Figueiredo, 337–51. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Dinitz, Sue, and Susanmarie Harrington. 2014. "The Role of Disciplinary Expertise in Shaping Writing Tutorials." *Writing Center Journal* 33 (2): 73–98.

Dong, Yu Ren. 1998. "Non-Native Graduate Students' Thesis/Dissertation Writing in Science: Self-reports by Students and Their Advisors from Two U.S. Institutions." *English for Special Purposes* 17 (4): 369–90.

Duff, Patricia. 2010. "Language Socialization into Academic Discourse Communities." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 30:169–92.

Farrell, John Thomas. 1994. "Some of the Challenges to Writing Centers Posed by Graduate Students." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 18 (6): 3–5.

Fujioka, Mayumi. 2014. "L2 Student–U.S. Professor Interactions through Disciplinary Writing Assignments: An Activity Theory Perspective." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 25: 40–58.

Gardner, Susan K. 2010. "Faculty Perspectives on Doctoral Student Socialization in Five Disciplines." *International Journal of Doctoral Studies* 5:39–53. https://doi.org/10.28945/1310.

Grutsch McKinney, Jackie. 2013. *Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers*. Logan: Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgk97.

Harris, Muriel. 1995. "Talking in the Middle: Why Writers Need Writing Tutors." *College English* 57 (1): 27–42. https://doi.org/10.2307/378348.

Hixson, Cory, Walter Lee, Dierdre Hunter, Marie Paretti, Holly Matsovich, and Rachel McCord. 2016. "Understanding the Structural and Attitudinal Elements That Sustain a Graduate Student Writing Group in an Engineering Department." *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship* 40 (5–6): 18–25.

Ives, Lindsey, Elizabeth Leahy, Anni Leming, Tom Peirce, and Michael Schwartz. 2014. "'I Don't Know If That Was the Right Thing to Do': Cross-Disciplinary/Cross-Institutional Faculty Respond to L2 Writing." In *WAC and Second Language Writers: Research towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices*, ed. Terry Myers Zawacki and Michelle Cox, 211–32. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Jonz, John. 1990. "Another Turn in the Conversation: What Does Cloze Measure?" *TESOL Quarterly* 24 (1): 61–83. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586852.

Kamler, Barbara, and Pat Thomson. 2006. *Helping Doctoral Students Write: Pedagogies for Supervision*. London: Routledge.

Kiedaisch, Jean, and Sue Dinitz. 1993. "Look Back and Say, 'So What?' The Limitations of the Generalist Tutor." *Writing Center Journal* 14 (1): 63–75.

Kamler, Barbara, and Pat Thomson. 2008. "The Failure of Dissertation Advice Books: Towards Alternative Pedagogies for Doctoral Writing." *Educational Researcher* 37 (8): 507–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08327390.

Lancaster, Zak. 2014. "Making Stance Explicit for Second Language Writers in the Disciplines: What Faculty Need to Know about the Language of Stance-Taking." In *WAC and Second Language Writers: Research towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices*, ed. Terry Myers Zawacki and Michelle Cox, 269–98. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.

Lawrence, Susan, and Terry Myers Zawacki, eds. 2016. Special issue *Writing Lab Newsletter* 40 (5–6).

Lee, Sohui, and Chris Golde. 2013. "Completing the Dissertation and Beyond: Writing Centers and Dissertation Boot Camps." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 37 (7–8): 1–6.

Leki, Ilona, Alister Cumming, and Tony Silva. 2008. *A Synthesis of Research on Second Language Writing in English.* New York: Routledge.

Lerner, Neal. 2009. *The Idea of a Writing Laboratory.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Mackiewicz, Jo. 2004. "The Effects of Tutor Expertise in Engineering Writing: A Linguistic Analysis of Tutors' Comments." *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 47 (4): 316–28. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2004.840485.

Madden, Shannon, and Michele Eodice, eds. 2016. "Access and Equity in Graduate Writing Support." Special issue, *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 14 (1). http://www.praxisuwc.com/new-page-29/.

Mannon, Bethany Ober. 2016. "What Do Graduate Students Want from the Writing Center? Tutoring Practices to Support Dissertation and Thesis Writers." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 13 (2). http://www.praxisuwc.com/mannon-132.

Paré, Anthony. 2011. "Speaking of Writing: Supervisory Feedback and the Dissertation." In *Doctoral Education: Research-Based Strategies for Doctoral Students, Supervisors, and Administrators,* ed. Lynn McAlpine and Cheryl Amundsen, 59–74. New York: Springer.

Paré, Anthony, Doreen Starke-Meyerring, and Lynn McAlpine. 2009. "The Dissertation as Multi-Genre: Many Readers, Many Readings." In *Genre in a Changing World: Perspectives on Writing,* ed. Charles Bazerman, Adair Bonini, and Débora Figueiredo. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Electronic version. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/genre/.

Parry, Sharon. 1998. "Disciplinary Discourse in Doctoral Theses." *Higher Education* 36 (3): 273–99. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003216613001.

Partridge, Brian, and Sue Starfield. 2007. *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A Handbook for Supervisors.* New York: Routledge.

Phillips, Talinn. 2016. "Writing Center Support for Graduate Students: An Integrated Model." In *Supporting Graduate Student Writers: Research, Curriculum, & Program Design,* ed. Steve Simpson, Nigel A. Caplin, Michelle Cox, and Talinn Phillips, 159–70. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Phillips, Talinn. 2013. "Tutor Training and Services for Multilingual Graduate Writers: A Reconsideration." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 10 (2). http://www.praxisuwc.com/phillips-102.

Phillips, Tallin. 2012. "Graduate Writing Groups: Shaping Writing and Writers from Student to Scholar." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 10 (1). http://www.praxisuwc.com/phillips-101.

Powers, Judith K. 1995. "Assisting the Graduate Thesis Writer Through Faculty and Writing Center Collaboration." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 20 (2): 13–16.

Prior, Paul. 1991. "Contextualizing Writing and Response in a Graduate Seminar." *Written Communication* 8 (3): 267–310. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088391008003001.

Rafoth, Ben. 2015. *Multilingual Writers and Writing Centers.* Logan: Utah State University Press.

Reardon, Kristina, Tom Deans, and Cheryl Maykel. 2016. "Finding a Room of Their Own: Programming Time and Space for Graduate Student Writing." *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship* 40 (5–6): 10–17.

Riazi, Abdolmehdi. 1997. "Acquiring Disciplinary Literacy: A Social-Cognitive Analysis of Text Production and Learning among Iranian Graduate Students of Education." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6 (2): 105–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90030-8.

Reid, Joy. 1994. "Responding to ESL Students' Texts: The Myths of Appropriation." *TESOL Quarterly* 28 (2): 273–92. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587434.

Rogers, Paul, Terry Myers Zawacki, and Sarah E. Baker. 2016. "Uncovering Challenges and Pedagogical Complications in Dissertation Writing and Supervisory Practices: A Multimethod Study of Doctoral Students and Advisors." In *Supporting Graduate Student*

*Writers: Research, Curriculum, & Program Design*, ed. Steve Simpson, Nigel A. Caplan, Michelle Cox, and Talinn Phillips, 52–77. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Russell, David. 2002. *Writing in the Academic Disciplines: A Curricular History*. 2nd ed. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Salter-Dvorak, Hania. 2014. "'I've Never Done a Dissertation Before Please Help Me': Accommodating L2 Students Through Course Design." *Teaching in Higher Education* 19 (8): 847–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.934344.

Savini, Catherine. 2011. "An Alternative Approach to Bridging Disciplinary Divides." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 35 (7–8): 1–5.

Shamoon, Linda K., and Deborah H. Burns. 1995. "A Critique of Pure Tutoring." *Writing Center Journal* 15 (2): 134–52.

Simpson, Steve. 2013. "Building for Sustainability: Dissertation Boot Camp as a Nexus of Graduate Writing Support." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 10 (2). http://www.praxisuwc.com/simpson-102.

Starke-Meyerring, Doreen. 2011. "The Paradox of Writing in Doctoral Education: Student Experiences." In *Supporting the Doctoral Process: Research-Based Strategies*, ed. Lynn McAlpine and Cheryl Amundson, 75–95. New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0507-4_5.

Starke-Meyerring, Doreen, Anthony Paré, King Yan Sun, and Nazih El-Bezre. 2014. "Probing Normalized Institutional Discourses about Writing: The Case of the Doctoral Thesis." *Journal of Academic Language and Learning* 8 (2): A13–A27.

Tardy, Christine M. 2005. "'It's Like a Story': Rhetorical Knowledge Development in Advanced Academic Literacy." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 4 (4): 325–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.07.005.

Tardy, Christine M. 2009. *Building Genre Knowledge*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Thaiss, Chris, and Terry Myers Zawacki. 2006. *Engaged Writers and Dynamic Disciplines: Research on the Academic Writing Life*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Thonus, Terese. 2004. "What Are the Differences? Tutor Interactions with First- and Second-Language Writers." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13 (3): 227–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.012.

Turner, Joan. 2000. "Academic Literacy and the Discourse of Transparency." In *Students Writing in the University: Cultural and Epistemological Issues*, ed. Carys Jones, Joan Turner, and Brian Street, 149–60. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/swll.8.14tur.

Vorhies, Heather Blaine. 2015. "Building Professional Scholars: The Writing Center at the Graduate Level." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 39 (5–6): 6–9.

Williams, Jessica, and Carol Severino. 2004. "The Writing Center and Second Language Writers." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13 (3): 173–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.009.

Zamel, Vivian. 1995. "Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESL Students Across the Curriculum." *College Composition and Communication* 46 (4): 506–21. https://doi.org/10.2307/358325.

Zawacki, Terry Myers, and Anna Habib. 2014. "Negotiating 'Errors' in L2 Writing: Faculty Dispositions and Language Difference." In *WAC and Second Language Writers: Research towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices*, ed. Terry Myers Zawacki and Michelle Cox, 183–210. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.