

Richard LaBontee

University of Gothenburg

## Doctoral Writing Supervision - The ASK Perspective

Doctoral education and supervision ideally involve pedagogical approaches that facilitate for the doctoral writer explicit understandings of implicit expectations on their work in areas of content knowledge, scholarly communities, and communication, to name a few (Kamler & Thomson, 2014). Academic writing is often used as the primary mode of communication for scholarly pursuits, including doctoral education, and the production of a dissertation and scientific articles for publication (Swales & Feak, 2012). However, despite its importance in researcher education and evaluation, and in being perceived as one of the most difficult tasks in researcher careers (Schimmel, 2011), academic writing is not always prioritized as a topic of explicit instruction or supervision for doctoral writers (Hyland, 2013).

At the Unit for Academic Language (ASK) at the University of Gothenburg, we approach doctoral writing as an articulation of thinking, and as an integral communicative ability that is continually developed throughout an academic career. As such, we offer a variety of activities for problematizing and supporting the development of academic writing for both doctoral students and supervisors. This practice presentation will outline common approaches and frame for our flagship activity, individual advising of doctoral writer's text.

The presentation will be divided by the three phases of supervision, each illustrated by examples from previous writing supervision sessions held at ASK:

1. We will discuss the dialogue process with doctoral writers seeking supervision on their text, engaging with their individual differences, writing and linguistic background, and gauging what meta-knowledge they possess about writing and the writing process.
2. We will present models for reading and

commenting on researcher text in terms of feedback focus and frames, crafting commentary, and formative feedback that consider the individual needs of the author and the text that were revealed from our dialogue process.

3. We will present the approaches for discussing our commentary on researcher text with the author and argue for the importance of face-to-face dialogue when negotiating text feedback. Here, we will engage with the risks of miscommunication in feedback, and the complexity of writing confidence, and identity-building in doctoral writing.

Through this presentation, we will argue for the importance of supporting doctoral writing from a supervisory perspective to facilitate long-term development in writing and communication, and discuss ways to incorporate our approaches into supervisory practices.

### References:

- Hyland, K. (2013). Writing in the university: Education, knowledge and reputation. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1-18.
- Kamler, B. & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write. Pedagogies for supervision*. London: Routledge.
- Schimmel, J. (2011). *Writing science: how to write papers that get cited and proposals that get funded*. Oxford [England]; New York, Oxford University Press.
- Swales, J. & Feak, C. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.