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**Context and Institutional Description**

Academic writing and teaching advanced writing courses such as writing for publication have been rather new concepts in the Czech Republic. However, not only Czech universities are looking for ways how to support early-career researchers/doctoral students in writing for publication (being more complex than academic writing), but the problem starts with a shortage of qualified teachers for courses on top of the debate what the contents of the courses should be.

Alena Kasparkova works at VSB-TUO, a Czech technical university, where a PhD Academy (doctoral school) was started a year and a half ago. She teaches a two-semester Writing for Publication course for the PhD Academy.

Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolova heads the Department of Language Studies and Center for Academic Writing at the Czech Academy of Sciences. She has developed and taught blended-learning courses of writing for publication for 10 years.

We joined forces with Dana Lynn Driscoll who in 2021 designed and since then taught the Writing for Publication: Teacher Training discussed herein. Dana Driscoll is the director of the Jones White Writing Center and teaches in the doctoral program in composition in Composition and Applied Linguistics at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

**Introduction**

Many countries have taught academic writing at the undergraduate level for decades. The US colleges and universities have had the longest tradition of compulsory First-Year-Writing or Composition and Rhetoric programs, a tradition spanning over 100 years with professional organizations, professional standards, and doctoral degrees in the teaching of college-level academic writing. As the 20th century progressed, writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the disciplines (WID) programs encouraged disciplinary faculty to teach writing along with disciplinary content; these programs are supported with collaboration of writing specialists and discipline experts (e.g. Bazerman et al., 2005; Zemlianski and Berry, 2017; Morrison et al., 2021). Universities have also set up Writing Centers that are meant to support writing programs, including those across the disciplines, especially in the USA (e.g. North, 1984).

In Europe, the teaching of writing usually does not take place in a separate course, but written assignments are often incorporated into disciplinary courses. Some European universities have also adopted the model of supporting writing through establishing Writing Centers but the services provided by European writing centers may differ to the ones in the USA. Not only the tutors in the European centers may be professional tutors (as opposed to students/ peers in the USA), as is the case at Coventry University (Ganobcsik-Williams et al., 2022), many centers also aim to support writing for publication, especially in English.

However, even though departments of English are often responsible for teaching introductory writing in the US, in many European countries we need to approach English as an additional language. This distinction is important because in Europe (and Asia) writing support is often offered in connection with supporting students or scholars in their writing in English through English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Specific Purposes (ESP), or even English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP). Apart from the dominant role of English as the Lingua Franca in the world of scholarly publishing, this trend is mostly related to the internationalisation of higher education and perception of English as a ‘hybrid language’ (House, 2003: 573).

When students do not receive any or little education/support in academic writing in their mother tongue/on the national level, the problem simply grows bigger when they become international students and study in English, and/or decide to pursue academic careers and start publishing in English, a language that is not their mother tongue. Apart from the lack of training in academic writing and/or writing for publication, students and researchers face different cultures associated with that language (Hyland, 2004; Hyland, 2015).

Although writing a thesis/dissertation is considered a sign of academic maturity, and certain level of independence is required (Wirenfeldt Jensen et al., 2022; Rapp et al., 2022), pressures for junior researchers and doctoral students to publish in high-ranked journals have increased worldwide. Doctoral students may not only write their dissertation by publication, in STEM fields they may be expected to have published extensively even before defending their dissertation, and often without any targeted guidance (Etchegoyen-Rosolova and Kasparkova, 2021).

In response to that, many universities and research workplaces face questions about how to support their doctoral students and early-career researchers, apart from the doctoral student-supervisor dyad. Apart from a number of activities offered through a writing center, e.g., consultations, workshops, writing camps, writing groups for doctoral students (Cui, Zhang, and Driscoll, 2022), many universities have started establishing doctoral schools. These offer courses in transferrable skills, but also workshops/courses on academic writing or writing for publication. The question is who should teach writing for publication if academic writing is considered a transdisciplinary field (Dryer, 2021), and writing for publication is even more complex. Not only research experience is recommended, the tutors need to keep abreast of the latest development in the world of scholarly publishing. Therefore, it need not be sufficient that such courses are taught by EAP teachers, applied linguists and/or language center staff because they are trained to teach English for Academic Purposes.

Academic writing and writing for publication are still new fields in Europe, European workplaces lack qualified academic writing teachers and do not provide specialized programs that would produce them. While the USA has had a long tradition of Rhetoric and Composition Studies which train faculty to teach writing, in Europe there is only one post-graduate study program “Academic Writing Development” at Coventry University in the UK (Ganobcsik-Williams et al., 2022). Even though we do not dispute the usefulness of short workshops on writing for publication, as workshops are frequently offered, we argue that long instruction is needed. Since it is not very likely that people interested in teaching writing take a full (post)graduate course (e.g. 2,5 years at Coventry University) irrespective of the usefulness of such studies, there is a need for shorter term, focused courses in teaching writing, particularly writing for publication. Such courses need not be reserved only for EAP teachers, but open to disciplinary faculty who are used to teaching writing in genres that they are specialized in.

Speaking of writing for publication support in English, we think it is advisable if a mix of staff are trained, both applied linguists and disciplinary experts. It is highly desirable that LSP/EAP teachers are involved in the training but after they have received adequate support to be able to support others. Moreover, it is advisable to take a lesson from the USA, and look for inspiration within the Writing-in-the-Disciplines approaches, when rhetoric and composition specialists work closely with experts from the disciplines to teach writing.

**(to be expanded with a Lit review** on training peer tutors, doctoral student support, but lack of teacher training (mostly online instruction to do with covid))

**Goal**

The goal of this article is to describe a model for writing for publication support that includes a teacher training course for faculty teaching a Writing for Publication course. We argue that teacher training in writing for publication needs to be pragmatic and focused, and help instructors step by step in their teaching. To demonstrate how this may work (not only in the Europe), below we describe an international, cross-discipline model we have designed. First, we introduce a Writing for Publication course for doctoral students which makes basis of the teacher training, second we present the design and focus of the Writing for Publication: Teacher Training course, and finally mention our action research study that explored the course and its efficacy.

**Writing for Publication course for doctoral students**

At VSB-Technical University of Ostrava (VSB-TUO) the efforts to support doctoral student writing led to the development of a two-semester Writing for Publication course in cooperation with the Center for Academic Writing of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague. The course is designed to meet a number of aims. First, it is designed to make writing strategies more explicit, and empower researchers as writers, with the focus on producing critical readers and ‘better writers, not better texts’ (North, 1984). The course is supposed to pave the way towards bigger self-reliance of the early-career researchers in their publication careers. Early-career researchers/ doctoral students need to publish research articles, but they also need to learn how to show they belong and can contribute to their research communities. Thus, the courses predominantly focus on the research article as a genre and follow the ‘genre pedagogies’ approach (Swales, 2004; Swales & Feak, 2004), which helps the course participants increase the academic, rhetorical, and linguistic proficiencies and self-efficacy (Negretti and McGrath, 2018). The participants learn to identify principles of effective writing and analyze already published models, and differentiate the more effective from the less effective ones (Booth, W.C. et al., 2016; Boxman and Boxman, 2017; Lindsay, 2011). Feedback they receive throughout the course then allows them to learn what experienced writers who had not received any systematic training usually acquire by trial and error (Murray, 2013).

Second, the course aims to contribute to building writing habits, developing efficient writing strategies, internalizing the need to write, and improving the early-career researchers’ time-management in writing for publication. To achieve this, the course builds on strategies by Belcher (2019) and Murray (2013). On top of writing, the course includes training in library literacy skills on working with journal databases, choosing the right journal, working with reference managers, etc. Students learn how to approach the journal peer review, how to communicate with the editor, how to present visual information, etc. This way, the courses intend to minimize ‘protracted, bruising interactions with gatekeepers’ (Hyland, 2015).

Third, the course should, in the long term, help early-career researchers beat the imposter syndrome and gain higher self-esteem. One of the recommendations for a successful completion of the courses is the development of a growth-oriented mindset (Powel and Driscoll, 2020; Dweck, 2008). The same is emphasized during the feedback sessions as feedback in the form of peer review is framed as a learning opportunity to make sure the publication is suitable for the readers of a particular journal and discipline (D'Angiulli et al., 2017).

**Writing for Publication: Teacher Training**

The virtual course “Writing for Publication: Teacher Training” was developed in the cooperation of Dr. Dana Lynn Driscoll from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA, VSB-TUO, and Center for Academic Writing with the Czech Language Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences. The course is unique in its focus, contents, and length; at present, there is no other course that would focus on training disciplinary faculty in writing for publication. It combines cutting edge research, theory, and practice in a two-semester sequence. The first semester is based on lectures, readings, tasks and feedback; the second semester offers participants hands-on teaching experience in the Writing for Publication course.

The first part of the course sequence is a 13-week blended-learning course that offers 10 asynchronous learning modules and 3 synchronous lessons through videoconferencing. The modules combine video lectures, reading materials, and assignments designed to support the application of research and theory to faculty participants’ immediate or future teaching. Participants get feedback on the assignments both from the other participants and the course facilitator each week. Once in three weeks, participants meet online to discuss the previous modules and to direct their future learning.

The 10 modules are:

Module 1: Threshold concepts: Threshold concepts (Meyer and Land, 2006) are transformed ways of understanding that allows individuals to successfully write for publication. Module 1 explores 10 threshold concepts for writing for publication including, “expert writers use writing to generate ideas”, “writing for publication requires that writers navigate and manage a range of emotional challenges”, and “expert writers engage in recursive processes that are required for the production of sophisticated texts”.

Module 2: The Writer: Module 2 provides information on expert writing processes, helping writers create productive writing habits, addressing time management and goal setting, supporting writerly development.

Module 3: Rhetorical and Genre Analysis Skills. Module 3 introduces teachers to a variety of rhetorical analysis and genre analysis skills that can be taught to analyze journal audiences, contexts, and purposes; offers pedagogical strategies for selecting and targeting academic journals.

Module 4: Plagiarism, Patchwriting, and Source Use: Module 4 offers discussions of teaching students to avoid patchwriting and plagiarism; teaching summary, paraphrase, and quotation, and explores cultural challenges with these concepts.

Module 5: Teaching the IMRAD Format: Writing Introductions and Literature Reviews. Module 5 covers how to teach literature reviews and introductions, including managing and synthesizing sources, building arguments, entry points and purpose statements.

Module 6: Teaching the IMRAD Format: Writing Results, Methods, Discussions, and Clarity. Module 6 explores the second half of the IRMAD article format and methods for teaching students to write methods, results, discussions, and also engage in clear and concise writing.

Module 7: Writing to Learn and Writers’ Workshops. Module 7 describes the concept of writing to learn, teaching and facilitating peer review, facilitating writers’ workshops on clarity, academic voice, argument, and other areas.

Module 8: Writing Conferences and Offering Feedback. Module 8 offers feedback strategies, theories, and models; discusses conference pedagogy as a core instructional strategy; and presents information on managing the reading load.

Module 9: Supporting the Publication Process. Module 9 covers how to help writers navigate the publishing process including common genres (editor letters, revision letters, abstracts), and also how to help writers navigate blind peer review feedback and revisions.

Module 10: Instructional Design and Technologies. Module 10 covers supporting long-term learning strategies and writing development through pedagogical practices such as scaffolding learning and reflective activity; covers online learning strategies.

After participants finish part I of the online teacher training course, they are invited to participate in the teaching mentoring option. Since the most difficult aspect of supporting writing for many is to learn to give constructive feedback, the course is complemented by a semester-long teaching practice at the Center for Academic Writing (CAP) with the Czech Language Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences. CAP has run Writing for Publication courses for over 10 years to support early-career researchers with the Czech Academy of Sciences. In this blended-learning course, teacher trainees teach 1-2 students in a real writing for publication course under the supervision of an experienced mentor. This is an opportunity for them not only to see how a writing for publication course may be designed, but mainly to learn how to support students on a longer-term basis through constructive feedback.

We have run the course 3 times so far. The pilot course was held in autumn 2021, and it was populated with 7 experienced writing developers and new colleagues to the field both from CAP and VSB-TUO. After piloting our teacher training course, we realized that more training is needed, and we offered participants to teach 1-2 students in a real writing for publication course under the supervision of an experienced mentor, which allowed us add the second part of the course. This way, course participants learn both to develop writing for publication courses for their own specific environments and workplaces as well as strategies to support student in their longitudinal writing, including feedback strategies.

The second run of the course was held in spring 2022 and was open to 6 disciplinary experts, colleagues from the Faculty of Economics at VSB-TUO. The last run is under way and it is attended by both applied linguists and disciplinary lecturers from 4 Czech universities.

**Action Research on the Teacher training**

**Methods**

We have designed an action research study to assess this newly developed course (and teaching practice) in Writing for Publication: Teacher Training. Not only we wish to evaluate how we need to adapt the course for both writing/language specialists and disciplinary teachers, we are also interested in their beliefs about writing and expectations about the course, and their progress in the course. This helps us tailor the course to the needs of future participants who are from different backgrounds, institutions, and schools of thought.

The research is based on data collected from:

1. an online pre-course survey

2. pre-course interviews

3. mid-course survey (interview)

4. an online post-course survey

5. post-course interviews/focus group interviews

6. LMS - researchers can also access the course materials and assignments.

7. post teaching-practice interviews

The study has human ethics IRB approval from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA (IRB #21-160).

During the surveys and interviews, we aimed to identify the participants’ beliefs about teaching writing, learning writing, beliefs about the overall importance of writing, and experiences with learning to write, and their own experiences with advanced academic genres like writing for publication and dissertation/thesis writing. We were also interested in their motivation and expectations about the course. Finally, we were interested in their experiences in teaching writing, disciplinary writing, or writing for publication, including giving and receiving feedback, teaching experience and experience with teaching writing. The surveys and interviews can be found in Appendix A.

During the course, we focus more on asking about the design of the course and feedback provided. Finally, after the course and hopefully after the teaching practice, we wish to learn how they benefited from the course and teaching practice, and what changed if anything.

**Data analysis**

Coding of the qualitative data

(Statistical analysis of a larger set of data collected over time)

**Very preliminary results**

So far, 18 people have taken the course, out of which 11 agreed to take part in the research.

Autumn 2021 - all 7 participants gave consent to the research

* academic writing teacher (PhD from the USA in history)
* academic writing teacher in training (PhD student in linguistics)
* 2 academic writing teachers at a technical university (language teachers by education)
* language teacher (PhD in linguistics)
* English language teacher
* teacher of pre-sessional courses (preparatory courses for international students in the UK)

Spring 2022 - 6 participants – only 3 gave consent to the research

* 1 economist (with a PhD)
* 1 mathematician (with a PhD)
* 1 system engineer (associate professor)

Autumn 2022 - 5 participants – only 1 gave consent to the research

* applied linguist (with a PhD)

On top of that, 4 participants from the pilot course have completed the teaching practice in CAP, and three from the current one plan to do so in 2023.

We still have very little data to draw any general conclusions on the changes in the course respondents’ beliefs on academic writing/writing for publication. Nevertheless, since this is an action research study to get feedback on a real course, we have already used some findings to improve the course. Most importantly, we started offering the teaching practice. Next, we offer participants LMS courses on library literacy. And finally, we see more overall benefits than drawbacks in combining the language teachers with researchers in the same group.

**Positive experience**:

* the blended-learning format
* highly useful content
* platform to share experience
* learning from each other’s tasks and feedback
* constructive feedback from the teacher on each task
* real-life materials and preparation for future lessons

Despite the excellent backgrounds in the language skills, teaching, and feedback skills, language teachers lack **experience with research, publishing, and review process. They need to continue learning about:**

* the understanding of the genre of a research paper
* experience in genre analysis
* experience with judging the quality of a journal, and published research
* experience with research databases

Some even expected a different content.

Contrary to the language teachers, some researchers feared inadequate language skills, but had:

* high motivation to learn (teach writing and publish)
* desire to provide support to their (PhD) students
* eagerness to incorporate the principles into their undergraduate (disciplinary) courses

**Discussion/Implications:**  Offer a discussion about general practices for how these trainings can work and considerations:

—Online or face to face

—Bringing on people with specialist/insider knowledge

—How long is reasonable for faculty

—Theoretical and research foundations

Although the study participants all evaluated the online course in a positive manner, those who took the teaching practice said that the experience was transformative to them. During teaching the real course, the teachers realized the value of constructive feedback and how all the aspects discussed in the LMS course are interconnected. Extra support is needed for language teachers without a PhD on the basics of research and publication.

Even in the US, there is almost no training for disciplinary faculty teaching advanced writing, like writing for publication. This way, faculty may have very little training in teaching writing at any level, and the more advanced the writing, the harder it is to teach.

**Ongoing improvements to the course**

Collaboration with the VSB-TUO Library and PhD Academy– LMS courses on working with the databases

A follow-up one-semester mentored teaching practice in the Centre for Academic Writing (Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague) – participants learn to give on-going constructive feedback

Extra workshops for disciplinary teachers in academic writing (VSB-TUO) and writing for publication will be offered.

Overall, it is very enriching for all participants to have participants from mixed backgrounds – they need to cooperate and learn from one another. Many of the participants of the course have been supporting both undergraduate or graduate students in writing, often both in Czech and English, and we see this course as a way to supplement and extend the work that they have already been doing. Plus, we aim to provide them with a large set of new tools for them to be more effective, and more efficient with their time, and to increase the repertoire of tools to help their students.

**Conclusions**

This study is important because it will allow universities to envision ways how to train new writing teachers who may subsequently teach courses in writing for publication to doctoral and early-career researchers.
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**Appendix - Interview protocols – Semi Structured**

All interviews and focus groups take place via Zoom.

**Prior to the course**

The questions we are asking aim to identify your beliefs about writing and expectations about the course, and thus will help us tailor the course to the needs of participants who may be from different backgrounds, institutions, and schools of thought. If you have responded to the pre-course survey, we will follow up on your survey answers with some of the questions here.

Follow-up from the survey questions:

1. For teachers -- probe into their teaching experience and experience with teaching writing (most likely general writing, e.g. FCE essays)
2. For people with research experience -- probe into what they have researched, how extensive is that experience and how they connect their view of research and research writing?

Reasons to participate in the course/ Expectations

1. Why are you going to take this course?
2. What do you already know about writing for publication/teaching writing for publication? / To what extent have you been exposed to any scholarly literature on writing? (we are trying to get at theoretical knowledge they might already have)
3. What do you expect to learn? (prompts: What topics do you expect to cover in the course? What skills do you seek to gain? What knowledge do you seek?)

Experience with writing

1. How would you explain writing for publication to others?
2. How would you describe yourself as a writer?
3. How important is it for you to be a researcher and a writer to be able to teach writing for publication successfully? Why?
4. Have you written any texts that would be considered ‘academic’? What were these?
5. What kinds of things do you remember struggling with when you last wrote something of importance (e.g. a grant application, research proposal, letter of recommendation, evaluation etc.)?
6. What kind of formal preparation did you receive to produce these texts? What did it look like?
7. In any case, what kind of prep would you have needed?)
8. What kind of feedback (if any) did you receive? (corrections/content analysis/mentoring…)

Experience with learning to write

1. How have you learnt to write academically? (What was/wasn’t useful/helpful?) [should we leave this open in terms of the language they choose to talk about?]
2. When did such learning start? What language?
3. Do you recall any milestones/eye opening moments that changed your knowledge/skills in how you write or how you think of writing? What were they and when did they occur?

Experience with teaching writing

1. How did you learn to teach writing? When did such learning start? What language?
2. How much writing in English have you taught (text types/genres)? How have you taught it (what did you need to pre-teach to your students to write the texts you asked them to write? How did you respond to their texts)?

Beliefs (beliefs about teaching writing, learning writing, importance of writing)

1. To what extent do you consider writing teachable? What can be taught? How?
2. What do you think you need to do well to produce a high quality academic text (e.g. an application for a teacher training course/grant/recommendation letter for your students-researchers -written evaluation etc.)?
3. What strategies have worked for you when you write academic texts in English?
4. How can you learn those strategies? When should this kind of learning occur? Where should it be embedded?
5. Briefly comment on the rankings of the features of academic writing in the survey (FOR THE INTERVIEWS: have the survey at hand) Why did you rank x as the most important and y as the least important.

**Mid-Semester Focus group interviews**

1. How are you doing in the course?
2. Are you getting what you expected?
3. What are the most important things you have learned so far?
4. Has any of the content covered so far surprised you? If so, what was it?
5. To what extent do you consider the format (blended-learning) effective? What do you like most about it? What do you like least about it?
6. What is your estimate of the time you have needed to put in the course on a weekly basis?
7. What have you found most thought-provoking so far?
8. What do you feel may not be so useful to you?
9. To what extent do you feel you have been learning the skills you need to teach writing? If not, what have you missed so far?
10. What would you like to see covered in the course that hasn’t been covered?

**Post-Course Interview Questions**

1. How have you benefited from the course?
2. What have you learnt?
3. What is academic writing (writing for publication) to you now?

i. Has the course altered any previous notions of learning to write you had?

ii. Has the course altered any previous conceptions/ beliefs about teaching writing you had?

1. How would you describe the course content to a colleague who has not taken the course?
2. Who would you recommend this course to?
3. Is there a research area within writing pedagogies you would like to further explore/conduct research on?
4. How did you perceive the course load, timing, tasks to do?
5. What was exceptionally useful?
6. What wasn’t particularly useful?
7. How do you feel about teaching writing at this point?
8. As you look ahead, how will you go about teaching writing? What issues may you encounter?

**Post-teaching practice experience questions**

1. To what extent was the teaching practice useful?
2. What was particularly useful?
3. How does the teaching practice allow you see the theoretical course in wider circumstances?/ How do you see the theoretical course now?
4. What (new skills) have you learnt in the teacher training?
5. What was inadequate/missing?
6. How do see the mentor’s role/work?
7. In what way the mentor helpful?
8. Did you miss any type of support?
9. If you were to design your own Writing for Publication course, what would it be like?
10. Did the Writing for Publication course you just taught meet your expectations of such a course?
11. In what way has your understanding of “Writing for Publication” and of how it should be taught changed?
12. How time demanding is teaching in a such course? Can you average the time you needed for one student?
13. How ready do you feel to teach writing for publication now?
14. In what aeras do you still feel you need to continue learning to be able to teach writing for publication in English?
15. What would you have missed if you hadn’t completed the course and the teaching practice?