Structured Mentorship: Guiding Students through the Academic Writing and Research Processes

ALEX MONCEAUX
TIEP at Lamar, Lamar University
Texas, USA

ABSTRACT

Over three semesters, researchers created a mentoring model to increase autonomous student research, model thesis/dissertation writing, and increase student's topical knowledge. To do this, instructors scaffold the writing and research process to individually guide a student through his/her individual challenges by addressing discrete performance issues. This involves the students selecting a topic, researching that topic, and producing five related papers under instructor mentorship and guided by a rubric set. This paper compares non- and mentored student writing to show the dynamic evolution a student can undergo through an instructor's structured mentorship. In this model, students' performance consistently demonstrated an increase in quality, even under greater demands for production, additional material, and a larger amount of integrated research indicating a positive average growth in the student's ability in both production as well as skill. The significance in students' production is exemplified by the following: students produced a total of 189 refined and polished pages (24-52 pages per student) over 140 (5.6 average) revisions in a progressively increasing production quantity – students began producing 2-3 pages and ended creating 7-17 pages for final projects.

KEYWORDS: Structured Mentoring, Academic Writing, Research, EAP

> There is no satisfactory explanation of style, no infallible guide to good writing, no assurance that a person who thinks clearly will be able to write clearly, no key that unlocks the door, no inflexible rule by which the young writer may shape his course. He will often find himself steering by stars that are disturbingly in motion.
> (Strunk & White, 1979)

Introduction

In March 2014, I stood inside MIT's Roger's building with group of MIT graduate students and a colleague who taught Korean language classes there. While the students gathered around and introduced themselves, we began discussing my trip to Cambridge, the conference at Harvard, and my research on a framework to mentor student academic writing via processed writing under professor guidance. Aside from one student's elitist comment that "University students should 'know how to write by the time they arrive at university' and time shouldn't be wasted on demystifying the process," most noted the general benefit many students would gain by an effective, intra-disciplinary writing instruction method. Wingate and Tribble (2012) contend that university students, across disciplines need academic writing support due to students' lack of understanding or ability to interpret expectations for their writing. It is from this gap that this paper arises.

I teach Academic English as a Second Language at Lamar University, Texas, U.S.A. A large portion of my students are 'confined' to my Academic Writing course due to insufficient standardized test results. These students are, to a large extent, intelligent, highly motivated, and completely understand their inability to 'write', but are faced with a decision to write a thesis/dissertation or not. Largely, this is due to a lack of confidence, writing and research skills, and a general knowledge of where or how to *start* writing.

In researching doctoral students' academic writing, several report that many graduate students are unprepared for research paper and dissertation writing as these students lack academic writing skills (Can & Walker, 2011; Surratt 2006; DeLyser 2003; Alter & Adkins 2006) with Social Science doctoral students being "far less successful in refereed publications compared to science doctoral students" (cited in Can & Walker, 2011, p. 509). Can and Walker also identify several issues like ineffective and inefficient writing strategies, planning and organizing problems, difficulties in transferring ideas into written form, generating focused and persuasive arguments, inexperienced approaches to revisions, and grammar, punctuation, and word choice problems. In addition, Wingate and Tribble suggest that, as problems related to academic writing are widespread, writing ought to be inclusive, not reserved merely for ESL or Developmental Student populations, and that writing be disciplined and context specific as these latter strategies merge writing instruction with content learning. However, many instructional faculty shy away from 'writing instruction', choosing to focus on teaching course content. Further, there is a dearth in scholarly literature to assist these faculty in helping students as research tends to focus on developmental or competency approaches to writing based on behavioral and skills based developmental literature, which may be ineffective without considering the writer's internal psychology and belief systems (Gardiner & Kearns, 2012). Other literature (Taylor, 1997; Grant et al., 2010; Grant, 2002, annotated bib; Grant & Cavanagh, 2011) points out that mentoring (including coaching) reduces anxiety and stress (Gyllensten and Palmer, 2005; Grant et al., 2009), produces greater collaboration (Kochanowski et al., 2010), self-efficacy (Evers et al., 2006; Leonard-Cross, 2010), goal attainment (Green et al., 2006; Spence & Grant, 2007; Spence et al., 2008; Grant et al., 2009), resilience (Grant et al., 2009), well-being (Grant et al., 2009), and reduced depression (Grant et al., 2009). In light of these issues, this paper presents a framework for mentorship that offers an interdisciplinary approach to engage in academic writing wherein the instructor can navigate the difficult landscape of 'writing instruction' by guiding the student through discrete content objectives in each step of the academic

writing process and encouraging student, peer, and teacher collaboration to produce high quality, and high quantity student academic writing through mentorship.

Academic writing

One consistent question within *Writing* pedagogy has been, "What *is* Academic Writing?" While there are many ways to conceptualize Academic Writing, many of which only lend to its complexity, three important conceptualizations essential to the writing process are style, creativity, and identity. Sword (2009) reports on multi-disciplinary survey findings of colleagues that position academic writing as clearly and succinctly expressing complex ideas, with originality, imagination, and creative flair. She suggests that the academic author conveys enthusiasm, commitment, and a strong sense of self in his/ her writing to harness a varied scholastic interest. She expresses further that the author should avoid excessive jargon and employ concrete examples and illustrations while demonstrating care for their readers. Interestingly enough, she argues that good academic writers ought to be able to tell a good story, while creating an image to draw in readers as the author weaves his or her tale (Sword, 2009). Several of these ideas stem from to McVey's (2008) argument that academic writing is a creative process. He affirms that: "writing … uses the raw materials of language, experience, knowledge, textual sources and the author's own ideas and imaginings to bring something into existence that did not exist before" (McVey, 2008, p. 289). Such can only be true as any author could attest to staring blankly at white pages, groping for some context to frame a dim, lurking thought and coax it from its hidden recesses of the mind. Nancy Mack stressed the importance of identity in research, highlighting that "identity is a complex concept: mediated through language, socially interpreted, embodied in experience, and materially situated… (and is) multiply conflicted, temporally developmental, and continually open to revision" (Mack, 2006 p. 58). Thus, language, experience, and knowledge frame the author's entry and exegesis on the page, as well as temper the student author's concept of who can successfully engage in the academic writing process. For instance, Clary-Lemon (2009) delineates the vast differences between Canadian and US academic rhetoric and discusses various themes that each culture uses to conceptualize its academic rhetoric. Hence, it can be construed that style, creativity, and identity define academic writing within the specific contextual system the writing evolves.

Problems encountered in academic writing

With such complex concepts of academic writing, it is apparent that several problems could arise while attempting to situate and acculturate students who vary in every possible way - culturally, socially, economically, experientially, as well as linguistically – into US academic writing styles while also empowering those students to actively engage in that academic system. Of the several approaches to academic literacy – Traditionalist, Skills-based, Text-based, Practice-based, and Social constructivist (Loads, 2007) – the text-based method serves emerging writers best as this method introduces the culture, conventions, and understandings the academia expects from the student when participating within the academic context. This method works well as it illustrates good examples for the student to read and model. However, this strategy of looking at other texts brings both instructors and students to a first problem – the ability to locate apt examples. Sword reports great difficulty in finding articles that follow the aforementioned academic writing conventions. She writes that most journals present a kind of "impersonal, impenetrable prose" (Sword, 2009, p. 319). These issues make it difficult to present effective academic writing models, and affect student engagement. As students find it difficult to read, understand, or enjoy the text, they may also fail to engage with a particular genre. They often see the task in its entirety as a chore – a chore to read and a chore to create (McVey, 2008). In addition to lowered interest in reading, many students (and academics) struggle to model these styles. Emerging writers' skill levels further complicate the issue – students struggling to articulate ideas clearly and succinctly struggle to engage with the writing they are expected to create – academic journals (Sword, 2009). In

addition to these formative issues, i.e., facing one's limited ability to write and willingness to engage in academic writing, there are other problems that extend beyond the writer's intellect, i.e creativity itself, confidence, and practical issues such as time (Antoniou & Moriarty, 2008). Many students do not understand writing as a recursive process, nor do they have the confidence or tenacity to begin that process. Moreover, as writing is a process, there is a huge time commitment that must be given to that process – many students find this very practical time management issue an onerous burden.

Solutions encouraging academic progress

However difficult academic writing may be, students must understand that academic writing, or writing in general, is a journey that offers a great deal of possibilities for those willing to engage in that process. Further, the benefits of engaging in the academic writing process are far greater than a student's immediate ability to gain academic writing skills. This process prepares students for both academic and employment success, as well as significantly affecting a student's self-identity (McVey, 2008).

Additionally, academic writing skills are perfected through practice, skill and confidence development, and a sense of community. First, the students must have the opportunity to write; the more one writes, the greater attuned one becomes to *good* writing (Antoniou & Moriarty, 2008). It is only in the process of writing that one can locate one's skills and one's weaknesses. However, writing alone cannot strengthen one's weak areas or build one's confidence in one's ability to write. It is in the recursive writing process, the process that encourages reflection and metacognition that one's skills are honed and one's confidence is built (Mason, Harris & Graham, 2011). Further, it is essential that students understand that writing skills are learned, and that anyone can learn those skills (Antoniou & Moriarty, 2008). An understanding that one can learn, and that the crux of that learning is within their own power can build confidence in their emerging skills. Additionally, writers must understand that writing is community – there is a crucial relationship between the reader and writer. Thus successful writing requires sharing and receiving feedback throughout the entire writing process (Antoniou & Moriarty, 2008).

Mentorship

Mentorship of academic students is one method of building a writing community, albeit a very specific and narrow type of community. Further, mentorship does not replace other types of communities, but rather creates a specific space where those other sources of community can be evaluated and synthesized under the tutelage of a more experienced individual for a specific purpose. Within the discussion and development of academic writing skills and performance, such a capacity can be especially helpful to mitigate self-, peer-, and teacher assessment on one's processes and progress and the mentor functions to lead the developing individual through a certain learning process in a directed, but personal way – the mentor guides the emerging writer's ability to communicate specific knowledge in specific ways to specific persons or institutions. Can and Walker (2011) point out that, often in academic writing, feedback generally comes from supervisors or instructional faculty. When examining instructor/student impact on feedback, 73% of questioned doctoral candidates report a willingness to re-write when given critical/negative feedback from a more knowledgeable other and a majority of those students appreciate clear, detailed, specific, and straightforward unbiased feedback that directs them to other sources (Can & Walker, 2011). While many give feedback, mentorship has added value where the student becomes responsible and responsive to the knowledgeable other to use offered feedback. This entails a dynamic process that opens avenues for conversation and discussion about specific points within a writer's text between the writer and his instructor – conversations on content and organization that foster the critical development of ideas in a written context. Thus, a systematic structured method that offers specific

avenues for discussion and feedback while fostering student/instructor relationship is necessary. Palmer and Smith (1990), building on Wooden's (1980) theories, suggest that a coaching style and the application of coaching in teaching offers several important aspects that are necessary for effective mentorship: be repetitious, explain, model, provide verbal encouragement, scold then reinstruct, teach students to avoid behaviours not the teacher, give corrections quickly.

Methods

Donovan's *The Sign of Four*, an article that serves as a practical approach to getting started in the academic writing process, suggests starting small and building (Donovan, 2011). I offered my Spring 2014 course a *program* that would foster mentored academic writing. Following is a narrative of the first of a two-fold process that began with a small project and built on that project larger projects, and culminated in larger work. The course consisted of ten students on several academic levels (number of students): doctoral (1), master (8), and bachelor (1) level student. These students could be categorized into three primary regions: India (7), Asian (2), and Mid-Eastern (1). The study sought two questions:

1) How often would student re-write when given the opportunity and feedback?

2) To what effect did they rewrite – quality and quantity?

Students were only *required* to submit a pre-write and revise that to a "C" level before moving to a final draft – they did not have to complete the other steps. If they chose to, they were assessed, given feedback, and were allowed to correct their documents an unlimited number of times. Some students chose not to not submit their work, and some began the work, but did not complete the project.

First, students selected a research topic from four recently published "Calls for Papers" with international venues related to social or educational issues. Then, students wrote a proposal in which they addressed their topic in four distinct ways: Process, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect, and Argumentation. This proposal introduced the general topic and then divided the topic into the four discussions and each discussion's societal relevance. Third, students produced four researched discussions on their formulated question specifically using the mode listed, i.e., Process, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect, and Argumentation. Students also compiled an annotated bibliography of each source used. This external process models a thesis or dissertation roughly, in that the student selects a topic, develops research questions, and carries out research to prove and discuss those questions. Each paper must meet minimal length and format standards – Proposal, 3 pages; Process, 750 words; Compare/Contrast, 1000 words; Cause/Effect, 1250 words; Argumentation, 1500 words (including only working text, not title page or references.) Thus, in minimum, students produced 17 pages of researched material over a 15 week period.

The second process is the mentoring process – it breaks the larger task into small, measureable units, under specific timelines and is repeated for each paper, thus in this study four times. Students are assessed using formative and summative assessments, as well as with self- and peer-evaluations. There are four formative steps - Pre-Write, First Draft, Revision, and Edit – and one summative step – Final Draft. The formative steps afford students unlimited revision, integrated with self-, peer-, and teacher assessment and are low-stakes assessments – as the student's production improves, the assessment "grade" does as well. The summative is the final step and the student must successfully integrate each of the components into his/her final version. The summative assessment is high stakes - its point value is equal to the four formative assessments together. The methodology seeks to compel the student to integrate feedback purposefully and beneficially. In both the formative and summative assessment, each assessed criteria is scaled "A+," "A," "B," "C," "D," "F," and not shown. Points provide a method of evaluating each step that mathematically reflects the assessment value of the work, but with varied criterion in each step. The *Pre-Writing* assesses the following criteria: research question, topic selection, thesis, topic, and

closing statements. The *First Draft* assesses formatting and organization structure of the introduction, body, and conclusion paragraphs. The *Revision* assesses evidence of revision, paper organization, paragraph structure, content: quality, quantity, and relevance. The *Edit* assesses unclear meaning, fragments, run-ons, comma splices, verb tense/form, singular/plural nouns and verbs, subject-verb agreement, noun-pronoun agreement, word choice, word forms, and word order, prepositions, articles, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The summative assessment assesses organization, structure (introduction, body, and conclusion), and content (quality, quantity, and relevance, grammar, punctuation, capitalization and spelling). The rubrics are presented in the appendix.

These processes are published at the semester's beginning on a rubric with each assignment and students' only receive a grade specific to the step they are working on. Thus, there is no grammatical feedback on a first draft; rather the student receives an evaluation of his/her performance on particular criteria. For instance, the *First Draft* (ability to produce an introduction) contains 1) a clear hook, 2) clear organizational structure - historical, dramatic story, etc., 3) introduces necessary background information: who, what, when, where, how, why..., 4) and ends with an emphatic thesis statement on the rubric. The student's paper will contain suggestions and questions to prompt revision using a word document edit tracker. This keeps each document dynamic until the final draft is submitted. Students are expected to use the rubric to re-evaluate their work using additional peer- and self – feedback. They are also encouraged to discuss issues with me via email or in person conferencing (some conferencing takes place in class, during peer reviews and lab work) and the university writing centre.

Results and discussion

Upon the semester's completion I gathered data from each student's performance and considered three aspects of the student's performance. First, I considered the summative grade for each assignment as a signal of the student's total learning. As each assignment required that the student learn a new writing mode and increase both word length, source material, and amount of in-text citations, a consistent grade should indicate growth in ability – the student is increasing performance in new material and at the same level of proficiency and is thus illustrating the ability to incorporate prior instruction to a greater level. Secondly, I considered the student's production – per assignment and in total. Each assignment required a minimal increased word production of 500 words (1 page = 333 words roughly). The first assignment was 600 words max (1.8), the second = 750 word minimum (2.25), third = 1000 word minimum (3), forth = 1250 word minimum (3.75), and the fifth = 1500 word minimum (4.5). Thirdly, I considered the student's frequency of revision. While it would seem that a decrease in revisions is "good," this would indicate less chance of reflection, feedback, and re-writing, and thus less practice, metacognition and ultimately less learning. Thus, it seems optimal that the student would revise 5 times – one time per step or at each stop gap. This would seem to indicate that the student is able to adequately uptake the feedback, and successfully move on to the next step.

How often would a student re-write when given the opportunity and feedback?

Table 1 illustrates each student's per assignment revisions and the student's and class' average revisions. Blank spots indicate that the student did not revise and either submitted the assignment from that point or did not complete the assignment.

Table 1. Assignment revisions

Student	Asgn 1	Asgn 2	Asgn 3	Asgn 4	Asgn 5	Average
1	2	6	6	7	2	5
2	2	3	3	5	4	3
3	2	3	-	-	-	3
4	5	13	5	6	6	7
5	5	13	5	6	6	7
6	4	8	6	4	6	6
7	4	7	3	1	-	4
8	1	6	7	5	8	5
9	7	8	2	1	-	5
10	4	9	2	10	7	6
Average	4	7	4	5	6	5

Asgn = Assignment

Table 1 further illustrates a student's production in respect to the student's willingness to revise. Five revisions would be the expected number as this is the number requested; however, the average number of class revisions is five. Many students re-wrote and reflected a great deal more than this – the highest per assignment revisions was thirteen times. This seems to indicate that students' willingness to re-write to improve his skills when upon receiving clear, specific, and detailed feedback. However, this number of re-writes also illustrates that a student may not "get it" immediately, and thus there is this great need for multiple revisions in order for the student to fill those learning gaps on an individual level and in a way that a class could or may not.

To what effect did a student rewrite – quality and quantity?

Table 2 illustrates each student's per assignment summative assessment grade on a 100 scale, the student's standard deviation from his/her average, as well as the student's and class average and standard deviation. Blank spots indicate that the student did not submit a completed assignment. The blue indicates static scores, while red equals a two stanine regression; orange equals one stanine regression, and yellow equals one stanine progression.

Table 2 shows assignment grades for the summative assessment. This should indicate the level of quality that the assignment contained. The standard deviation should indicate whether the student was performing within his/her personal domain. While there was some deviation, on the average, the class stayed within the central stanine. However, several students' performance consistently increased in quality, even under greater demands for production, new material, and more integrated research. These scores seem to indicate a positive average growth in the student's ability in both production as well as skill.

Table 2. Assignment grade

Student	Asgn 1	Asgn 2	Asgn 3	Asgn 4	Asgn 5	Med. Grd	Std Dev.
1	35	57	82	53	78	57	19.27
2	31	43	4			31	19.97
3	46					46	
4	88	86	91	85	89	88	2.39
5	85	76		62	72	74	9.54
6	99	90	85		85	88	6.6
7	89	67				78	15.56
8	95	89	92	89	90	90	2.55
9	86	Plagz				86	60.81
10	32	79		37	67	52	22.85
Average	69	73	71	65	80	72	17.73

Blue = 0 sig, Red = -2, Orange= -1, Yellow = +1

Asgn = Assignment, Plagz = plagiarized, Med. Grd = Median Grade, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation

Table 3 illustrates each student's per assignment production, total production, class average production per assignment and in total. It is significant to mention that each assignment, except the first and last assignments (the pre-write and Annotated Bibliography), was allotted three weeks for completion. The students only had two weeks to complete the first and last assignments. This volume of produced and polished text is significant – an average student production of 39 pages (with 3 of 8 students simply not producing included) and a production range of 2 to 52 pages. Adjusting for the five active students, students produced 189 total refined and polished pages (24-52 pages student) over 140 (5.6 average) revisions. More significant is the progressive production – student began producing 2-3 pages and ended creating 7-17 pages for final projects. This seems to again indicate students' willingness to respond to challenges when supported by timely and helpful feedback.

Table 3. Assignment length

Student	Asgn 1	Asgn 2	Asgn 3	Asgn 4	Asgn 5	AnBib	Tot.Pgs
1	2	4	5	6	6	10	33
2	2	5	6	-	-	-	13
3	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
4	3	8	7	6	17	14	55
5	2	5	-	6	8	11	32
6	3	5	5	-	7	7	27
7	2	4	-	-	-	-	6
8	3	5	7	6	9	12	42
9	3	6	-	-	-	-	9
10	2	4	-	6	7	-	19
Average	2	5	6	6	9	11	39

Asgn = Assignment, AnBib = Annotated Bibliography, Tot. Pgs = Total Pages

Limitations

This course demonstrates several limitations that others may not, i.e., this is not for credit, thus student assignment completion is almost entirely intrinsic and related to the student's perceived value in the work. First, being a non-credit course and carrying such a large research component necessitated that the students be hugely invested in the process. For some students, they found motivation in the chosen topic, others in honing specific research and writing skills, others in the

hopes of building research/professional relationships, and possibly publishing the finished product. These students worked diligently, and created good work, and developed greatly. Not one student finished the class suggesting that it had been easy; rather, many students discussed the level to which it challenged them. Other students begrudged the course work, the time commitments, and denied their need to learn and practice either researching or writing. These students had to attend the class due to federal regulations, but in general, made little to no progress. Thus you will notice, several students simply did not perform or quit performing. Without the student connecting to an intrinsic motivator, the student investment was largely lost. If the student did not perceive a value in the course or course work, s/he generally came to class, and sat and left quietly. No manner of persuasion seemed to motivate them to engage in the productions outside of class. Further research needs to be done on getting students invested in process that are essentially beneficial, but not to their liking or desire.

Conclusion

Some students offered narratives about their work often focusing on student identity and time constraints. For some students, investing in the class seemed to reinforce that they "did not know English." For several students, this was a major point of contention – they were international graduate level students, many having studied English throughout their primary and secondary schooling, and some even at an undergraduate level in the UK or Australia. Thus, for these students, being *remediated* was a disgrace. Thus, they resisted actively participating in the process. For other similar students, they adapted, and attempted to utilize the time to hone skills that they had not been able to focus on in other courses. These students suggested that they had come to the university to learn and be challenged. For many of these students, the rigour that they endured created beneficial study, reading, and writing habits they had previously not known that uniquely enabled them to excel. Additionally, these students have reporting earning higher grades in their advanced coursework, having a writing skills foundation that many of their graduate peers do not have, and benefiting from increased scholarship and funding opportunities via GA, TA, and RA positions at the university. For some students, they recognized the importance of the skills, but found that the bridge program created a kind of dilemma for them: the English Writing Skills course, while helpful and mandated, took a great deal of time and commitment, but did not affect their GPA; however, their graduate courses, were equally challenging and required an equal, if not greater, time commitment. Additionally, and importantly, those courses affected their GPA and ability to continue or be accepted for graduate level candidacy. Thus, several reported that they chose to not engage in the English course work as the time commitment and course loads were too great and there was not sufficient time to complete all the assignments. Further research needs to be done on mitigating these issues.

Students want to learn, but are looking for support and a challenge. When supported with clear, objective, feedback in a timely manner, students ask questions, develop peer support networks, and produce high quality work in high quantities. Student feedback concerning these instructional methods are that the scaffolding makes the task simpler and easer to accomplish, that being compelled to read and integrate peer-, self- and instructor feedback back into their own work helps them to dynamically improve their projects, which in turn creates a readiness to receive that feedback and integrate it into their work as the students perceives a growing proficiency in the acquiring the skills. Additionally, enabling student's greater freedom in re-writing comprehends that some students take longer to access the feedback – this is clearly visible during those re-write stages. One student will integrate feedback to perfect a paper in one re-write, other students may take two or more re-writes to achieve similar proficiency. This suggests that a repetition and revision process creates a unique space for an individual's metacognition of his/her personal skill needs, which will then enable the student to continually progress, even marginally, but to in time, be able to make significant progress.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 12th International Asia TEFL Conference and 23rd MELTA International Conference, held in Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia in August 2014, and published in the conference proceedings.

References

Alter, C., & Adkins, C. (2006). Assessing student writing proficiency in graduate schools of social work. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *42*(2), 337–354.

Antoniou, M., & Moriarty, J. (2008, April). What can academic writers learn from creative writers? Developing guidance and support for lecturers in Higher Education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 13*(2), pp. 157-167.

Can, G., & Walker, A. (2011, Aug). A model for doctoral students' perceptions and attitutdes toward written feedback for academic writing. *Research in Higher Education, 52*(5), 508-536.

Clary-Lemon, J. (2009, June). Shifting tradition: Writing research in Canada. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, *39*(2), 94-111.

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.

Donovan, S. K. (2011, April). The Sign of Four. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *42*(3), 382-386.

Gardiner, M., & Kearns, H. (2012). The ABCDE of Writing: Coaching high-quality high quantity writing. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 7*(2), 247-259.

Evers, W.J.G., Brouwers, A. & Tomic, W. (2006). A quasi-experimental study on management coaching effectiveness. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, *58*(3), 174–182.

Grant, A.M. (2002). Towards a psychology of coaching: The impact of coaching on metacognition, mental health and goal attainment. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, *63*(1), 6094.

Grant, A.M. & Cavanagh, M.J. (2011). Designing positive psychology: Taking stock and moving forward. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grant, A.M., Curtayne, L. & Burton, G. (2009). Executive coaching enhances goal attainment, resilience and workplace well-being: A randomised controlled study. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *4*(5), 396–407.

Grant, A.M., Green, L.S. & Rynsaardt, J. (2010). Developmental coaching for high school teachers: Executive coaching goes to school. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, *62*(3), 151–168.

Green, L.S., Oades, L.G. & Grant, A.M. (2006). Cognitive-behavioural, solution-focused life coaching: Enhancing goal striving, well-being, and hope. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *1*(3), 142–149.

Gyllensten, K. & Palmer, S. (2005). Can coaching reduce workplace stress? A quasi-experimental study. International *Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, *3*(2), 75–85.

Kochanowski, S., Seifert, C.F. & Yukl, G. (2010). Using coaching to enhance the effects of behavioural feedback to managers. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, *17*(4), 363–369.

Leonard-Cross, E. (2010). Developmental coaching: Business benefit – fact or fad? An evaluative study to explore the impact of coaching in the workplace. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, *5*(1), 36–47

Loads, D. (2007, April). Effective Learning Advisers' perceptions of their role in supporting lifelong learning. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *12*(2), 235-45.

Mack, N. (2006). Ethical representation of working-class lives: Multiple genres, voices, and identities. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Languges, Composition,and Culture, 6*(1), 53-78.

Mason, L., Harris, K., & Graham, S. (2011). Self-regulated strategy development for students with writing difficulties. *Theory into Practice, 50*, 20-27.

McVey, D. (2008, August). Why all writing is creative writing. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 45*(3), pp. 289-294.

Palmer, J., & Smith, B. (1990). What a Teacher Can Learn From A Coach. *Education, 110*(4), 516-520.

Spence, G.B., Cavanagh, M.J. & Grant, A.M. (2008). The integration of mindfulness training and health coaching: An exploratory study. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 1*(2), 145–163.

Spence, G.B. & Grant, A.M. (2007). Professional and peer life coaching and the enhancement of goal striving and well-being: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 2*(3), 185–194.

Strunk, W., & White, E. (1979). *The elements of style* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Surratt, C. K. (2006). Creation of a graduate oral/written communication skills course. American *Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *70*(1), Article 5.

Sword, H. (2009, May). Writing higher education differently: a manifesto on style. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(3), pp. 319-336.

Taylor, L. (1997). The relation between resilience, coaching, coping skills training, and perceived stress during a career-threatening milestone. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section B: Sciences and Engineering, 58*(5), 2738.

Wingate, U., & Tribble, C. (2012). The best of worlds? Towards an English for Academic Purposes/Academic Literacies writing pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(4), 481-495.

APPENDIX

1. Pre-Writing Rubric						
Criteria	**Grading Scale**					
	Excellent	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Improve**	**Not Done**
Topic: Student has selected a topic and several subtopics	**5**	**4.5**	**4**	**3.5**	**3**	**0**
Thesis Statement: Student has developed an emphatic thesis statement that includes subtopics and clearly shows the developmental pattern.	**5**	**4.5**	**4**	**3.5**	**3**	**0**
Topic Sentences: Student has developed clear topic sentences that include controlling ideas and logical organizational pattern.	**5**	**4.5**	**4**	**3.5**	**3**	**0**
Closing Statement: Student has includes a strong closing statement that clearly affirms his/her position and writing purpose	**5**	**4.5**	**4**	**3.5**	**3**	**0**
Totals	**20**	**18**	**16**	**14**	**12**	**0**
Percent (%)	**100%**	**90%**	**80%**	**70%**	**60%**	**0%**
Letter Grade	**A+**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**

2. First Draft Rubric						
Criteria	**Grading Scale**					
	50	**0**				
Minimal Requirements: 1) contains minimal word count 2) contains in text citations 3) contains work sited from academic sources	**Yes**	**No**				
	Excellent	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Improve**	**Not Shown**
Format: Student uses MLA format	**10**	**8**	**6.33**	**4**	**2**	**0**
Introduction: Student well-structured introduction evidenced by a clear hook, clear organizational structure - historical, dramatic story, etc., introduces necessary background information: who, what, when, where, how, why..., and ends with an emphatic thesis statement.	**10**	**8**	**6.33**	**4**	**2**	**0**
Body Paragraphs: Student begins each body paragraph with a strong topic sentence that: 1) connects the body to the thesis statement and the previous paragraph, 2) has controlling ideas, 3) uses at least three supporting details, 4) uses outside sources to support the topic sentence	**20**	**16**	**11**	**8**	**4**	**0**
Conclusion: 1) restates the thesis 2) restates each topic sentence 3) ends with a strong closing statement	**10**	**8**	**6.34**	**4**	**2**	**0**
Totals	**100**	**90**	**80**	**70**	**60**	**0**
Percent (%)	**100%**	**90%**	**80%**	**70%**	**60%**	**0%**
Letter Grade	**A+**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**

3. Revisions Rubric					
Criteria	**Grading Scale**				
Format & Minimal Requirements	**30**	**0**			
Essay has: 1) MLA formatting, 2) Minimal Words 3) Work Sited 4) In-text Citations	**Yes**	**No**			
	Excellent	**Good**	**Some Work Shown**	**Needs Work**	**Not Completed**
Evidence of Revisions: The student used comments and corrections on the first draft to substantially improve from the essay.	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Organization: The essay shows a clear organizational pattern	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Structure: The essay uses clear essay and paragraph structures.	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Content: Quality - The content matches academic style and value, i.e. the essay is not a personal, reflective, or subjective work, but is objective in nature and uses academic sources and rigor to support its purpose and point.	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Content: Quantity - There is sufficient content to introduce and to support the thesis and topic sentences.	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Content: Relevance - Each sentence is relevant to the topic.	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Totals	**60**	**48**	**42**	**36**	**30**
Percent (%)	**100%**	**80%**	**70%**	**60%**	**50%**
Letter Grade	**A+**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**

4. Edit Rubric						
Formatting & Minimal Requirements	**Yes**	**No**				
Essay Uses MLA format Essay Meets Minimal Word Requirements Essay Contains In-text citations Essay Contains a Work Cited Page	**20**	**0**				
	Excellent 0 Mistakes	**Very Good 1 Mistake**	**Good 2 Mistakes**	**Satisfactory 3 Mistakes**	**Needs Improvement 4 Mistakes**	**Poor 5+ Mistakes**
Unclear Meaning/Translation	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Sentence Fragment	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Run-On Sentence	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Comma Splice	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Verb Tense/ Verb Form	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Singular/Plural	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Subject-Verb Agreement	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Noun-Pronoun Agreement	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Word Choice	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Word Form	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Word Order	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Preposition	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Articles	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Punctuation	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Capitalization	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Spelling	**5**	**4.4**	**3.75**	**3.13**	**2.5**	**1.88**
Totals	**100**	**90.4**	**80**	**70.08**	**60**	**50.08**
Percent	**100%**	**90%**	**80%**	**70%**	**60%**	**50%**
Letter Grade	**A+**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**D**

5. Final Draft Rubric						
Criteria	**Grading Scale**					
Format & Minimal Requirements	**50**	**0**				
Essay is in MLA, Essay Meets Minimal Word Count, Essay is on Topic, Essay has a Work Cited, Essay has In-Text Citations	**Yes**	**No**				
	Excellent	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Needs Work**	**Not Shown**
Organization: Essay uses the appropriate mode, compare/contrast, cause/effect, argumentation, etc.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Introduction Structure: Essay contains a properly structured introduction	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Body Structure: Essay contains properly structured body paragraphs	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Conclusion Structure: Essay contains a properly structured conclusion	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Content: Quality - Essay is of academic quality	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Content: Quantity - Essay has sufficient support, but not too much support	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Content: Relevance - Essay contains only information that is relevant to the topic	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Grammar - Essay is free of grammar mistakes	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Punctuation - Essay is free of punctuation mistakes	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Capitalization & Spelling - Essay is free of capitalization & spelling errors	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Totals	**100**	**90**	**80**	**70**	**60**	**0**
Percent	**100%**	**90%**	**80%**	**70%**	**60%**	**0%**
Letter Grade	**A+**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**