WRITING HISTORIES: LINGUA FRANCA ENGLISH IN A SWEDISH GRADUATE PROGRAM

Thomas Lavelle and Alan Shima
Stockholm School of Economics

This chapter presents a case study and analyzes the institutional practices that affect the success or failure of multi-lingual masters students writing theses at a Swedish university in a history program where lingua franca English is the language of instruction. Drawing upon interviews, questionnaires, policy documents and the theses themselves, this analysis of a lingua franca writing environment examines the effects of policy on high-stakes writing, the value of aligning assessment policy and practices, and the function of support, expectations and supervision in a writing/learning community. The central argument is that in many respects this graduate history program succeeds in its educational mission, particularly its engagement with disciplinary writing, but in one key respect it fails. The principal failure is its relatively low and generally slow thesis-completion rate. The successes include reading and assessment strategies that both prioritize disciplinary knowledge making and remain consistent with lingua franca communication strategies, thesis supervision and topic selection that support a difference-as-resource culture and finally proactive support for a multilingual writing environment that includes not only instruction for student writers but also faculty-development initiatives for their teachers.

Roads to Democracy is an English-medium, two-year master's degree program offered by the Department of History at Uppsala University in Sweden. For successful candidates, the program culminates in the completion of a 60-80 page master's thesis. It is these theses and the institutional context in which they are written and assessed that provide the focal points of this study. An overwhelming majority of Roads to Democracy (Roads) students

are second-language writers of English, which in this setting functions as an academic lingua franca, not least because relatively few of them speak Swedish, the dominant language of governance, undergraduate teaching and routine administration at Uppsala. In this sociolinguistic context certain structural and curricular features of this program combine with its students' complex mix of backgrounds to foreground several key challenges facing both second-language disciplinary writers, in this case junior scholars of history, and the department committed to educating them. Therefore, in what follows we present the program as a case study in which we describe and analyze institutional practices that, in part, create the conditions under which second-language thesis writers work. As with other case studies, its value for writing scholars and writing-program managers rests upon the degree to which the challenges described and practices analyzed here prove to be relevant and transferable to other settings.

One such challenge revolves around assessment. The roots of this challenge lie ultimately in the decision by the History Department at Uppsala to offer an English-medium master's program. This has obliged the program faculty and leadership to articulate and enact a set of assessment criteria and priorities that, on one hand, maintain the academic standards of the department, the university and the wider disciplinary community and, on the other hand, fairly evaluate a student population that arrives in Sweden, largely from abroad, with many distinct types and levels of disciplinary, linguistic and general academic preparedness.

A second challenge concerns the relevant scope for disciplinary scholarship, simply put, what counts as a suitable thesis topic. Just as their earlier assessment practices had evolved largely in a monolingual and academically homogeneous setting, the selection of thesis topics and research questions in the Uppsala department also traditionally reflected northern European priorities and practices. Under the influence of a new student body and a new curriculum, thesis advisors from the Roads faculty have been obliged to reconsider these practices.

Along with assessing and framing the apprentice scholarship in Roads master's theses, the department faced the challenge of defining and implementing a suitable level of second-language writing support, a practice not widely established in Swedish universities when these efforts began. The relevant choices here involved the precise nature, structure and level of intensity for this support. This was a move into uncharted waters for a department of history and may represent a redefinition of the department's relationship with its students.

AIMS AND METHODS

Given these focal points, the overarching purpose of this chapter is to analyze departmental responses to the challenges outlined above, all of which emerge as a consequence of internationalized graduate studies conducted through lingua franca English, and where possible to trace the affects of those responses on the writing of master theses in English. In describing challenges and analyzing responses, we draw upon data collected over a year-long period during which our engagement with the Uppsala Department of History straddled emic and etic perspectives. With both authors working as visiting instructors in academic writing and one consulting with the department more generally on its transition from a monolingual Swedish to bilingual Swedish-English academic organization, our roles gave us access to students, faculty and program administrators, but it also made us participants in local efforts to improve student writing and to support departmental efforts to enhance student learning.

From this vantage point, we collected data of five types. One was a writing-inventory questionnaire distributed to 20 student writers that asked about their range of languages, their experience with using those languages academically and their academic or professional writing experience in English and in their other languages; 19 of 20 students responded anonymously. A second type consisted of face-to-face interviews with 12 students (eight women and four men), five of whom had not been asked to complete the writing inventory; these interviews were of limited value as the students saw us more immediately as instructors than as researchers and were reticent in expressing judgments about the program. A third was a series of five interviews with faculty members (five men and one woman), four face to face and one via email; all five are tenured at Uppsala University, three in the Department of History, two others belong formally to other departments but teach Roads courses and advise and assess theses; four are native speakers of Swedish and one a native speaker of English. A fourth data type was the set of all 15 theses completed and fully processed by the university (i.e. approved by the thesis advisor, graded by a faculty assessor, examined in a public seminar, and archived in the library); we read graded and archived copies, which proved to be valuable points of departure in interviews with faculty informants. Finally a fifth data source was documentary, the Roads curriculum and a series of departmental and university policy documents.

While our semi-embedded standing in the Uppsala History Department provided opportunities for data collection and dialogue, we chose this particular case study because it illustrates an increasingly important institutional context

for second-language disciplinary writing. In the Roads program English is a transnational academic lingua franca, a setting where "English is neither the local language nor that of most of the international students" (Maruanen, 2006, p. 125), and, in Roads, international students outnumber Swedes by far. It is in such settings that we can expect speakers and writers, listeners and readers to employ communicative strategies and exhibit attitudes ascribed to lingua franca users in contact situations, including flexible codes, semantic negotiations, tolerance of temporary unintelligibility and expectation management (Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011). Most generally, "the principle behind all these strategies is alignment. Multilinguals cannot come ready with all the codes they need for an encounter .... What multilinguals aim to achieve therefore is an alignment of the language resources they have with the purposes in question" (p. 5).

This setting, therefore, differs from the writing environments that most often frame studies of either discipline-specific student writing or the writing of second-language academic writers. Typically those studies address North American, Anglophone contexts, for instance the anthologized papers in collections (Belcher & Braine, 1995; Casanave & Li, 2008; Matsuda, Cox, Jordan & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2006; Zawacki & Rogers, 2012), reference guides (Bazerman et al., 2005), and individual studies (e.g. Connor & Mayberry, 1995; Janopolous, 1995; Magno & Amarles, 2011; Seloni, 2012). Some theoretical studies do adopt a more comparative and international perspective, particularly those addressing the role of genre in L2 and WAC (e.g. Hyland, 2003; Johns, 2011). And there are of course valuable case studies of WAC or disciplinary L2 writing drawn from outside North American contexts (Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Emerson, MacKay, Funnell & MacKay 2002; Li, 2010; Pedersen, 2011), but these studies describe and analyze either individuals or broadly homogeneous groups of academic writers. One notable exception is Harbord's study (2010) of L2 English writing programs in central and eastern European universities, but the scale of his study—eight universities in six countries—and its focal points—the evolution of programs and courses and their interplay with writing in the local language—lead to descriptions and findings of a markedly different character from the narrower, localized case presented here. In brief, this analysis of a lingua franca writing environment can add to what is already known from more familiar contexts about the effects of policy on high-stakes writing, the value of aligning assessment policy and practices, and the function of support, expectations and supervision in a writing/learning community. Our central argument is that in many respects the history program under description succeeds in its educational mission, particularly its engagement with disciplinary writing, but in one key respect it fails.

THE PROGRAM AND ITS STUDENTS

At the program-level this educational mission has three dimensions that in some respects dovetail well with its student body and in other respects do not. One is internationalism. A second reflects the objectives of traditional academic history, and a third can be characterized as a critical activist pedagogy applied to the study of democracy and democratic institutions.

The Department of History launched the program at a time when universities across Europe (European Higher Educational Area, 2006) and across Sweden (European Higher Educational Area, 2010) were compelled to internationalize. The internationalist dimensions of Roads' mission are evident in its organizational and curricular structure as well as in its student body. Uppsala developed and operates the program in collaboration with two partner universities, Coimbra in Portugal and Siegen in Germany. Each university grants its own degree for this program; however, free exchange programs, common on-line courses and a commitment across all three institutions to lingua franca English instruction underscore the international nature of Roads. A mandatory exchange underscores it further, requiring at least 15 credits (half a semester's full time study) of the 120 total from one of the partner universities (Uppsala University, 2011b).

The students successfully recruited to the program were even more broadly international. Most cohorts had no Swedes, and students enrolled from Albania, Armenia, Bosnia, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, China, France, Germany, Hungary, Iran, Italy, S. Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Turkey, and the United States.[1] With this internationalization came the need for lingua franca English, and Roads students entered the program speaking many different varieties of English and greatly varied kinds of experience with it.

As academic historians, the Uppsala faculty has a mission to train modern comparative historians, specialists in the complex field of democratic development. In Roads they aim to "give [students] insights into the development of democracies in Europe" and help them "develop a broad, comparative understanding of the mechanisms behind democratic transitions, [so they] will be able to assess present-day democratic developments on both the national and the supra-national level" (Uppsala University, 2011a).

The program also acknowledges that an understanding of democracy is multidisciplinary. The partner program in Siegen is run by the political science department and learning objectives for Roads theses explicitly call for interdisciplinary theorizing (Uppsala University, 2011b). This cross of disciplinary and interdisciplinary objectives complicates recruitment—an

undergraduate degree in history is not an admission requirement—and almost certainly means that Roads students come differently prepared for the task of writing a master's thesis supervised and assessed by a community of professional academic historians.

Beyond its internationalist and disciplinary mission, there are signs that the program also carries out a critical and activist educational mission. The program description identifies the aim of making students "aware of the fragility of democratic institutions and the importance of citizenship and participation in the democratic process" (Uppsala University, 2011b). Even more directly, one faculty informant explained in his interview that for him extending an historical understanding of democratic institutions to students from countries where democracy was relatively new, emerging, or still to come represented part of the program's raison d'être.

QUALIFIED SUCCESSES

The successes described next are qualified successes to be sure, but the analysis shows that history faculty and program managers in Uppsala largely succeed in creating an environment where diversely prepared students can learn and practice scholarly writing in a lingua franca setting. The principal qualification is that the program has a relatively low and generally slow thesis-completion rate. By spring of 2011, of 32 theses that could have been completed, only 15 had been fully processed by the university (a completion rate of roughly 47%), and it is that set of fifteen that provides the basis for discussing theses and their assessment. With a program launch in 2005, 2007 was the earliest projected completion date, and one thesis was completed that year, tellingly perhaps, by an American Roads graduate and L1 writer of English. Seven more were completed in 2008, three in 2009 and four in 2010.

As the following section on assessment shows, by establishing assessment priorities firmly anchored in disciplinary knowledge making, Roads faculty generally avoid narrow, surface driven ways of reading the students' work and the most damaging kinds of negative expectations associated with these ways of reading (Zamel, 1995; for a counterexample, see Craig's [this volume] discussion about the expectation for error-free English in theses written by Singapore students enrolled in the MIT-Singapore transnational master's in engineering program.) These ways of reading are consistent with lingua franca communicative strategies and also speak directly to the disciplinary mission of training apprentice historians. The section on thesis topics argues that the program uses the required theses to support a difference-as-resource

culture of the kind advocated by Canagarajah (2002). This happens largely by encouraging thesis research questions that both engage thesis-writers' national or cultural identity and utilize primary source material written in students' first (or other) language. In addition, by working with source material inaccessible to historians who read only English or Swedish, Roads thesis writers step into roles where they can make relevant contributions to a research community. Moreover, this engagement with primary material that addresses democracy in their own national context speaks directly to the department's critical/activist mission.

The section on lingua-franca-writing support follows the departmental leadership's trajectory of proactive support for their relatively new groups of students. This entails not only some explicit training in disciplinary writing for its graduate students, but also faculty development activities that prepare instructors for work with more diverse international students. The rationale for and limitations of this trajectory are described and discussed below, but irrespective of its limits, training of this kind promotes the kinds of teaching and teaching environments advocated by Zamel (1995) and Kim (2011) or anticipates the kinds of coping strategies described by Leki (1995) and thereby also promotes Road's internationalist mission.

QUALIFIED SUCCESS WITH THESIS ASSESSMENT: VALUES AND PRIORITIES

Fair and educationally relevant assessment transparently aligns intended learning outcomes with student performance (Biggs & Tang, 2007; Elmgren & Henriksson, 2010; Ramsden, 2003). The Uppsala history department articulates learning outcomes for Roads theses that follow straightforwardly from the overarching disciplinary objectives described above and project into a set of explicit grading criteria. Faculty assessors, who by rule cannot have supervised the thesis in question, then apply those criteria. The department's success lies in its having created an approach to thesis assessment—essentially ways of reading—that maintains quality standards, supports disciplinary learning and acknowledges the complexity of this group of writers.

The intended learning outcomes (ILOs) defined for a Roads thesis set a high disciplinary standard. They cover historiographical theories and methods, theoretical input "from other social sciences used in the study of democracy," the framing of research topics and questions, scholarly treatment of both primary and secondary sources, and writing in English "using correctly the various types of writing used in history and the social sciences" (Uppsala University, 2011b). Well aligned with these ILOs are seven published grading parameters: knowledge of historical context; research problem; theories and methods; source criticism;

contextualization of research problem; use of terminology; and textual features (Uppsala University, 2009). Prior to 2011 the department applied a seven-step grading scale, A through F and Fx, a version of Incomplete. Subsequently the university has reverted to the three-step scale long used in Swedish higher education, Pass with Distinction, Pass and Fail. The theses under review were all graded on an A-F scale, and in formulating and publishing descriptors for the seven parameters, the department elected to specify only the levels A, C, E and F. Faculty informants reported widespread confidence that assessors could identify B and D quality work inductively on the basis of the other descriptors. Finally the department applies the same grading criteria to all three of its master's programs, Roads to Democracy, Early Modern Studies, and a history specialization within a humanities program, and therefore in principle makes no distinction between theses written in English or Swedish.

In institutional terms, each thesis approved on the basis of these criteria is a success. They conform to university guidelines set by the Faculty of Arts and meet Department of History requirements. Moreover, their authors have earned their advanced degrees and continued their personal and professional pursuits, in several cases as PhD candidates in well regarded programs in the UK, in the US, in Sweden or in the thesis writer's home country.

Seen purely as textual artifacts, however, nearly all the theses reviewed are flawed. Most show a variously rich and variously dense set of surface errors. Some are repetitive. Some rely heavily on long quotations and summaries of source material. Many fail, at some point or points, to maintain the textual "flow" advocated in graduate writing guides such as Swales & Feak (2004, pp. 26-30). A few even adopt, in key passages, the homiletic stance or voice attributed by David Bartholomae (1985) to inexperienced American academic writers, suggesting that for some apprentice historians, especially those writing history in a second language or relatively new to scholarly writing, it remains difficult to consistently "take on the role—the voice, the persona—of an authority whose authority is rooted in scholarship, analysis, or research" (p. 136), even when their authority *is rooted in scholarship, analysis and research.* (See Lancaster [this volume] for a discussion of the role of stance-taking in creating authority in discipline-specific writing). In other words, these texts hold few surprises for writing specialists accustomed to working with L2 or lingua franca writers of English. What may be surprising is how these flaws are contextualized by academic historians in Uppsala.

In a lingua franca environment seeing theses purely or primarily as textual artifacts would be inappropriate, and readers in the Roads program contextualize them in richer ways, ways that downplay surface-level inaccuracies, coherence gaps and repetitiveness. The history faculty value theses as "evidence of

intellectual work," a term that does not appear in departmental documentation, but recurred regularly in faculty interviews. While difficult to define precisely, evidence of intellectual work encompasses writing and thinking that makes discoveries while conforming to disciplinary and linguistic conventions, but not in equal measure. In his interview the Roads program director, for instance, profiled the relative weight of these conventions when he described the role of a thesis advisor: "we help them to write a master's thesis that is recognizable as a master's thesis in English; this includes comments on language, but we can't be English teachers." By framing theses as evidence of intellectual work, Roads readers seem to contextualize them within processes of inquiry and discovery and express priorities that value the process over the product.

Arguably, the departmental grading criteria indirectly provide a partial blueprint for these contextualizations that, again, clearly prioritizes disciplinary learning over the textual artifacts themselves. Six of the seven parameters focus directly on disciplinary performance, and even when descriptors sometimes acknowledge the close relationship between disciplinary knowledge and its expression, the latter serves the former. The parameter for specialist terminology, for example, receives particular attention (Uppsala, 2009). The grading criteria rank writers' application of central terms on the basis of the intellectual work they do. In F-level application, disciplinary terms are "not defined" or "used arbitrarily" and without awareness that their multiple uses had "consequences for the analysis." E-level usage defines all key terms and uses them consistently, yet fails to problematize them. In C-level usage "the choice of definitions is discussed and motivated," and ultimately in A-level usage, a best-practice benchmark, "terms *and concepts ...* are *carefully* discussed, problematized and motivated" and used "stringent[ly] and consistent[ly] ... throughout to make *analytical points*" (2011a, emphases added).

The department's disciplinary and educational priorities also emerge, albeit indirectly, in the descriptors of textual quality, which bundle together an assessment of argumentation, formal conventions and linguistic accuracy. The formulation of these descriptors lacks the precision that applied linguists or writing specialists might give them, especially those addressing accuracy. Failing theses use "language [that] exhibits serious flaws" and "the grammar is poor" (2011a). The language and grammar of bare passes "reveals smaller flaws," and the grammar of solid Cs has "only a few isolated errors" (2011a). In best practice theses, the grammar is "free of errors" (2011a). This imprecision is fitting for a faculty that values theses not primarily as textual artifacts.

Although the Department of History has no explicit policy on how to apply its grading criteria, priorities do exist, and they are traceable in past practice, examples that illustrate which aspects of historical scholarship faculty members

value most highly in the writing of junior historians. The first such example is a thesis analyzing the political thought of Mehmed Sabahaddin, a member of the ruling family of the Ottoman dynasty who lived between 1877 and 1948, a period that saw the end of dynastic rule in Turkey. At 55 pages the thesis falls short of the 60-page length requirement, and, according to a faculty informant, it had serious shortcomings along several grading parameters. In his own words:

> ... This thesis was according to my view a little bit tricky. The problem was that it was not living up to the standard of an ordinary thesis. There were problems both with the formulation of the topic, which was actually not really made in a way that we historians like. It was done as a political scientist might do it. There were also problems with the historical context and not least with the timeline. However, I liked the thesis very much. The reason for this was that the author really made a very fascinating analysis. Exceptionally good at this level. That meant that I thought that even if he had made some rather fundamental mistakes, that in an ordinary thesis [would have been] very grave, he had in other areas [done] a fantastic job and therefore I gave him a top grade. Not an ordinary thesis but a very good one.

The priorities emerging here elevate "a fascinating analysis," clear evidence of intellectual work, above all other considerations. The assessor refers to "problems" with two disciplinary grading parameters, the research-problem's formulation and historical contextualization, and mentions his concern with the research question's disciplinary locus, yet he confidently subordinates those problems and concern to the findings that emerge from a strong analysis carried out by an apprentice historian. The thesis was awarded a grade of B, and assessed in terms that valued its intellectual strengths over its academic weaknesses.

A second example is a comparative study of affirmative action in Malaysia and the United States. In this case the faculty informant served as thesis advisor and not therefore the assessor. In discussing the thesis' strengths and weaknesses, he too was greatly impressed by the author's findings and subordinated his other concerns. Those other concerns dealt with the thesis as a written artifact, specifically language accuracy, and its lack of engagement with Malaysian archival source material because the thesis writer's application for access to the national archive was denied when the Malaysian authorities noticed the sensitivity of this study. The advisor's latter concern is particularly salient as the application of archival material to research questions plays a central role in

academic history and because another faculty informant, the program director, identified the single greatest challenge for Roads students as work with primary sources: "the problem is with primary studies; they [Roads student from other disciplinary backgrounds and some other history departments] don't know how sources help us answer questions." Like the previous example this thesis too received a grade of B, and like the previous faculty informant, this advisor valued primarily the creation of new knowledge about the history of democracy. In both cases those values seem to govern the assessment and grading of students' disciplinary writing.

These successful aspects of thesis assessment in Roads share two features with well documented lingua franca communication strategies. The first is explicitness (Kaur, 2011; Maruanen, 2006). In lingua franca communication linguistic codes do less meaning-bearing work on their own and are instead complemented with semantic negotiation, moves such as confirmation checks, follow-up questions, counter proposals and interactive repair (Maruanen, 2006). Almost paradoxically then successful lingua franca communication draws more support from explicitness than from tacit communication and conversational implicature (Grice, 1975), because explicit expression quite simply provides more common ground, more material, over which lingua franca interlocutors can negotiate. (Lancaster [this volume] describes a contrasting Anglophone environment where variations in largely tacit, discipline-embedded linguistic codes are identified as error and not as reason for negotiation.) In Roads this explicitness is particularly evident in the published assessment criteria that align learning outcomes and student performances. Published criteria of this kind have become commonplace at Uppsala and other Swedish universities, but that in no way detracts from the communicative function they play in the lingua franca Roads community.

Their reading priorities are a second feature of Roads thesis assessment that is consistent with lingua franca communication strategies. What these reading priorities and those communicative strategies share is that neither is overly concerned with linguistic code per se (Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011), but foreground and prioritize what is most expressive or valuable in a text or communicative act. In Roads thesis assessment, this seems to include the "let it pass" strategy that Firth (1996) established as a cornerstone of lingua franca pragmatics. Importantly, this strategy is not a passive move, but a strategy by which the hearer [or reader] "is actively *though implicitly* engaged in the task of attempting to *make* sense of what is being done and said" (p. 245, emphasis in original). For Roads readers this strategy entails the downgrading of linguistic flaws, rhetorical shortcomings and even some breaches of disciplinary expectation (such as the problem-formulation problem in the Ottoman-political-philosophy

thesis and the absence of primary sources in the affirmative-action thesis) in favor of a scholarly understanding of a writer's intentions and discoveries.

These two aspects of successful assessment, explicitness and let-it-pass reading priorities remain however incomplete successes. The Roads program could deploy these operational strengths to address its strategic weakness, its low and slow completion rate. For instance, there are at present no overt guidelines on how assessors should (or do) apply grading criteria. In the absence of such guidelines student writers might quite reasonably interpret the rather unsystematic descriptors on language and expression more literally than faculty members do, leading to an unnecessary focus on form as they work to produce a text that for some of them represents a first significant attempt at scholarly writing. Similarly, writers might complete more often or more quickly knowing that they will be read, interpreted and graded for what they have done most successfully and not dismissed for the weakest sides of their performance. While we recognize the difficulty involved in drafting explicit grading criteria for master's theses that explicate let-it-pass reading strategies, we also recognize that acknowledging a lingua franca approach to linguistic values and textual priorities would further support the multilingual academic writers in Roads.

QUALIFIED SUCCESS WITH TOPIC SELECTION: DIFFERENCE AS RESOURCE

A Roads to Democracy thesis carries 60 credits, half the two-year degree requirement. This curriculum does not however wholly backload this requirement into the program's second year. Instead, students take a thesis-methods course in semester one of year one, and time for thesis work is allocated throughout the program. This longitudinal approach to research writing pays dividends for the writers who complete; again those who do not complete remain a chronic challenge to the program's overall success. One such dividend affects topic selection, where longer-term planning and longer timelines facilitate thesis writers' framing of problems that are personally relevant and that draw upon the linguistic and cultural knowledge they bring to the program. More specifically, longer timelines are relevant to topic selection because if, hypothetically, a Cameroonian student wants to frame a problem addressing, say, the postcolonial unification of Francophone and Anglophone regions drawing on Cameroonian archives or other primary sources, longer timelines support the logistics of finding travel funding, planning the travel, acquiring access to archives and recruiting an expert, either in Cameroon or an Africanist in the Uppsala network, willing to serve as a thesis advisor or co-advisor.

Of the Roads theses defended through 2011, fully two-thirds, 10 of 15, frame and address a research problem of apparent personal relevance: an Italian student examines the inception of the Italian welfare state under fascism, a Chinese student addresses the "New Left" in China, a Swedish student contrasts Swedish and German urban planning and housing policy in the 1930s. In some cases the personal relevance is more than apparent. A Bosnian thesis writer explicitly merges personal and professional engagement by opening her thesis on nation building among Bosnian Muslims with a "personal reflection" on national identity. In a broadly similar vein there are references to personal relevance in a Korean writer's thesis on western perceptions of Korea between 1892 and 1936, a Portuguese writer's study of Portugal's immigration policies after the advent of democracy there and an Albanian writer's analysis of the media's role in Albania's "feeble" democracy. Given the low numbers and what has been said about the program's completion rate, this dividend too remains a qualified success. Nevertheless, at the very least this pattern shows that successful Roads writers emulate senior scholars who, as Hyland (2009) makes clear, often have a personal stake in their disciplinary writing.

Far beyond emulation another dynamic comes into play when thesis topics combine academic relevance and aspects of the writer's native culture, language and identity in a highly internationalized, multilingual setting. That dynamic is a perceptual shift, perhaps ultimately a cultural shift, whereby students move in Canagarajah's terms (2002) from perceptions of "difference as deficit" to perceptions of "difference as resource." As suggested above Roads students in some cases struggle with the program's demands because of their first languages and experience with English, because of their disciplinary backgrounds or because of their earlier educational cultures. Such students, we reason, experience their differences as deficits at times. Supporting that reasoning, in interviews some students reported feeling hamstrung by their English skills or hampered by their limited experience of academic history—particularly archival experience; more report feeling intimidated by the prospect of writing a long academic thesis. We postulate—because the writers of completed theses were not available for interviews or declined requests—that doing archival work on a topic of personal relevance with primary sources in the student's first language changes these self-perceptions. By extension, completing theses based on that archival work and those primary sources changes those perceptions further. By further extension, having those theses read appreciatively by faculty assessors and recognized as scholarly contributions changes those perceptions even further, and difference as deficit has become difference as resource. Finally when a number of thesis writers undergo this transformation, when personally

relevant thesis topics researched through L1 primary sources become a norm, a difference-as-resource culture has emerged.

This cultural point is necessarily speculative, but it has received indirect corroboration in four of the five faculty interviews, where informants express clear appreciation for, even professional pride in, the accomplishments of Roads researchers. Parallel to this appreciation is a recognition that this archival work, carried out on Albanian, Bosnian, Mandarin or Turkish sources, for instance, might not have been done or might not have reached international research communities were it not for the efforts of Roads graduates. These conditions and attitudes successfully create a context where multilingualism is an asset, not a deficit.

A balanced understanding of the Roads program's success with difference-as-resource culture may require drawing, however briefly, a conceptual distinction between two variants of difference-as-deficit expectations or experience. While richly international with regard to his multilingual writers, Canagarajah's (2002) initial work on difference-as-deficit attitudes toward academic writing foregrounds dominantly Anglophone settings where English functions as a hegemonic superstrate in academic language contact situations. Subsequent work in writing studies or in broader educational research (Cummins, 2003; Guo & Zenobia, 2007; Mitchell, 2012) also characterizes English as hegemonic in Anglophone settings. In contrast, multilingual Roads students in Uppsala meet a more balanced diglossic context, where Swedish functions as the local/national language and English as an international lingua franca. Neither therefore attains the hegemony that English holds in higher education in Anglophone countries.

Research in American settings has identified some of the roles both instructors and local students play in establishing and maintaining Anglophone hegemony. In a blatant example, a faculty informant described by Zamel (1995) requires that multilingual students employ English grammar accurately and deploy a grammatical metalanguage for talking about errors as an entry condition to substantive feedback and disciplinary engagement. In a study (Kim, 2011) where multilingual graduate students describe their teachers' behavior and its effects, one participant reports that "her name caused her to feel embarrassed because Americans could not say it correctly. Whenever American professors took roll, they mispronounced her name" (p. 289); as a solution one "professor suggested that she use an easier name or an English name" (p. 289), making clear just how completely these students were expected to adapt to Anglophone norms. In the same study, local students are also seen as reinforcing, perhaps unintentionally, the dominant role English plays through their performance in collaborative group work and group discussions, where local students "spoke

casual American English at fast speeds" and typically shaped conversations that shifted topics often, which made it difficult for multilingual students to follow the conversation and led to their contributions frequently being off topic (Kim, 2011, p. 287). The reported result of these kinds of interactions is one international student feeling, "I know they did not care about my opinion. They don't try to understand what my opinion is" (p. 287). Kim herself concludes that "professors and native students often did not understand the opinions of international graduate students, *nor did they see the need to include them in the discourse*" (2011, p. 287, emphasis added). (For further examples of English hegemony at work in US classrooms, see chapters by Phillips and Nielsen [this volume].)

Lacking extensive classroom observations, we cannot claim definitively that no such behavior takes place in Roads classrooms. However, there was no mention of it by the students interviewed. Moreover the sociolinguistic context speaks against such linguistic hegemony. Because English is an additional language for almost all the faculty and the vast majority of Roads students, it never attains the full status of a superstrate. Members of the Uppsala history faculty generally acknowledge their own status as L2 English speakers (in interviews and in faculty-development work describe below), and only one instructor (one of two native speaker of English teaching history in the program, but the only one interviewed) complained about accuracy levels in student writing or intelligibility in classroom discourse. Among Roads students themselves, neither the few Swedes nor the few native English speakers enjoy or exercise the same privileged position Kim attributes to the local American students in her study. The Swedish students, like their classmates, must adapt to instruction in English, the program lingua franca, and native English speakers must adapt to life as an international graduate student in a new educational culture.

Briefly then, the Roads program's success in supporting a difference-as-resource culture takes place in an environment relatively amenable to such a culture, a fact that again should not detract from the accomplishment itself. Nor does it color the qualification of that success. The upside of the Roads longitudinal and student-centered approach to thesis research and writing emerges in the program's difference-as-resource culture. The downside rests, according to the program director, in the supervision of these theses, or at least some of them. The Uppsala department cannot house all the expertise necessary to handle the geographic, cultural and linguistic breadth that opens up when Roads students pursue research problems across four continents; few departments could. As mentioned above, the department makes an effort to secure an advisor with expertise relevant to each writer's project. Those efforts however are not always

successful, and their limitations show in the thesis contrasting the development of American and Malaysian affirmative action legislation, which was supervised by a Swedish Americanist. That thesis nevertheless was successfully completed.

Even when the department can enlist international experts for Roads students' international projects, the program director explained, those external advisors vary greatly in their depth of commitment, experience with masters-level supervision and adaptability to Uppsala's standards and expectations. These shortcomings lead to predictable outcomes: the most experienced, most talented or most determined students succeed in completing their theses anyway. Those most in need of an advisor's support encounter delays. Concisely, what qualifies the Roads success with the framing of writer-centered, L1-inclusive research problems is that the department lacks the resources to advise on and supervise such a range of theses, and while it encouragingly looks outside the department for relevant expertise, there are no routines, no academic infrastructure, in place to coach those external experts into positions where they can consistently advise Roads writers to completion.

QUALIFIED SUCCESS WITH WRITING SUPPORT: PREPARING WRITERS AND READERS

Since 2003 the Department of History has planned and carried out a series of English-writing support activities, some of which were direct, aiming at student writers and their evolving skill sets, and others which were indirect, aiming at departmental faculty and their preparedness for teaching and reading in lingua franca English environments. Neither type of activity has been subject to systematic follow up or extensive evaluation, which makes it somewhat futile to address certain aspects of success. However both types of activity demonstrate an orientation in the Roads program's host department that is a prerequisite for success with multilingual writers. Essentially this orientation combines an awareness that diverse international students bring with them a new set of educational needs and a willingness to act upon that awareness. However intangible an orientation may seem, successful lingua franca communication rests, as pointed out above, in part on heightened "language awareness" (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 925) and "positive attitudes" (Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011, p. 2). (See Zenger et al. [this volume] for examples of how translingual values were infused into a course providing writing support for graduate students at American University of Beirut and into the revised general education curriculum.)

Direct writing support for the student authors of Roads theses grew out of the Department of History's decision to follow national and university-wide

trends towards internationalizing its educational offering, but to do so with an acknowledgement that enrolling international student entailed a commitment to supporting them. That decision unfolded at a time when the department also began internationalizing its mission more generally, particularly its research mission. This relatively broad-based approach to internationalizing the department's missions may help account for what is most successful about the department's L2 writing support, yet it may also be this same generality that also explains the limitations of those interventions in directly supporting Roads thesis writers.

The rationale for this support encompasses the role of English in published research as well as in graduate education. In an op-ed essay directed to Swedish scholars in the humanities, the director of the department's PhD program and a Roads thesis assessor (Ågren, 2005) makes a case for internationalizing Swedish humanities research. The core of Ågren's argument is that Swedish researchers "take as their points of departure internationally grounded theory building or research problems," and in doing so they "see themselves as participating in an international discussion" (p. 2, our translation). They do not however follow through completely in that participation because they "rarely report their results in an international arena" (p. 2, our translation). Ågren goes on to acknowledge that the difficulties of writing well in English represent an obstacle to be overcome if this internationalist turn is to be fully realized, and in a later publication, she extends that argument from an acknowledgment of difficulty to an action plan for addressing that difficulty (Lavelle & Ågren, 2010). The core of that plan consists of improving the English writing of graduate students in history and across the humanities. "PhD students need to be able to present their work in English, and since the PhD programs are too short to allow students to develop [English writing] skills there, it is necessary to start earlier, on the master's level at the latest" (Lavelle & Ågren, 2010, p. 203). On the basis of these rationales, the Department of History organized and in some cases funded three phases of direct English-writing support for its graduate students and a series of three activities for faculty aimed at helping them to teach in an internationalized, lingua franca English pedagogical environment.

The first intervention predated the Roads program and consisted of a modest half-day workshop in 2003 aimed primarily at raising awareness among graduate students, especially doctoral candidates, regarding what writing academic history in English entails and thus making it possible for them to consider writing dissertations in English.

By the time Roads students began arriving in 2005, the department had integrated regular writing-in-English seminars and workshops into the obligatory thesis-methods courses of its fledgling master's programs (eight contact hours

per cohort). These workshops were the interventions focused most directly on the needs of Roads students, and they were well received by students, who in traditional course evaluations characterized them as helpful. On the basis of those evaluations the department added in 2007 an elective course to its master's-level curriculum, Academic Writing in English, and discontinued the writing workshops in methods courses. In interviews, both students and faculty members refer to this course as a reason for improved writing outcomes, but there has been no discernible improvement in completion rates. Moreover, for a number of administrative reasons including break-even enrollment calculations, this course has been open at times to graduate students from across the university and at other times to students from across the humanities faculty. Therefore even though the course works with published historical scholarship as well as a range of student writing, the course description suggests that it focuses too little or too indirectly on the work of Roads thesis writing (Uppsala University, 2011b), perhaps because of cross-disciplinary enrollment. After early enthusiasm among Roads students and a peak in the fall semester of 2009 with eleven Roads enrollments across two sections, participation by Roads writers has declined to two Roads students in a single section in the spring semester of 2012, one Uppsala student and one exchange student from Siegen. As a corrective step the department will reintroduce a writing-in-English seminar to the obligatory thesis-methods course for Roads students from the fall of 2012.

These writing-support activities ran or run parallel to traditional in-course writing activities, which are of course also expected to help train student writers, perhaps reasonably expected to provide the bulk of a student's training in disciplinary writing. For the Roads program our interviews found that all master's-level history courses require written deliverables, some on a lesson-by-lesson basis. Some instructors interviewed also report that they employ a range of writing-based pedagogies, including reading logs, peer reviewing and process-driven revision activity.

Paradoxically, while it remains difficult to trace clear links between the Department of History's direct interventions and its greatest success factor, i.e. awareness of variable needs among student writers and a positive attitude towards linguistic differences, we can see a clearer relationship between the indirect writing support and that awareness and those attitudes. The largest of three faculty-development programs aimed at improving the ability of Uppsala's history faculty to work through English with multilingual, international students. It was organized and funded by the department as a voluntary in-service course consisting of 24 contact hours during the fall semester of 2009. Under the title English in the Classroom, its course description identified six ILOs, at least four of which bear directly on the development of awareness

and attitudes needed to create educational practices supportive of students like Roads thesis writers. Those six are:

1. Assess the impact, if any, of lingua franca instruction on a learners' classroom performance.
2. Lecture more fluently in English and adapt lectures for a lingua franca audience.
3. Lead discussions on academic topics in English while recognizing and accommodating participants' diverse communication strategies in discussions.
4. Produce supporting materials (slides, handouts, exercises, exams) in English.
5. Provide feedback for students in English.
6. State and defend a critical position on the question of assessing linguistic form vs. assessing underlying content in student work.

The four learning outcomes directly relevant to supporting lingua franca instruction and reading are 1, 2, 3 and 6. Beyond those a case can certainly be made that the learning of scaffolding strategies inherent in ILO 4 makes it highly relevant to multilingual classrooms as well. From a faculty of roughly 30, 19 teachers initially enrolled in the course and 13 completed it.

The second and third activities, both much shorter, functioned primarily as follow-ups to the course, but because participants included the sitting and pending departmental chairs and all graduate and undergraduate directors of studies, these activities seem to function too as manifestations of the departmental commitments and attitudes. The follow-up dimension focused upon two specific aspects of lingua franca education. One, a simple three-hour workshop, addressed assessment through lingua franca English, and according to the two interviewees who participated, the workshop reiterated and formalized some issues addressed above, including disciplinary reading priorities and let-it-pass approaches to many surface errors. This assessment workshop was attended only by faculty members who had completed the course described above, but the third activity was a two-day retreat for the entire department. The topic of the retreat was the formulation of effective course descriptions and learning outcomes in English with the aim of making these pedagogical documents effectively available to and useful for multilingual students. The content particularly relevant to lingua franca education, again according to the same two interviewees, addressed the identification of embedded (local Swedish) cultural assumptions, the reduction of overly bureaucratic language and the elimination of unintentional ambiguities.

In summary, the principal success of the Department of History's writing-support activities is that there *are* writing-support activities. In a context where

no or few such activities were taking place, the simple existence of English writing workshops speaks to a positive approach to multilingual writers. If the direct, student-focused interventions have become too general to help Roads writers optimally, it remains a problem open to correction. The indirect, faculty-focused interventions in many respects reflect and support the internationalist openness expressed in the Roads program's curriculum, reading strategies and handling of research topics. (In this volume, see Fredericksen & Mangelsdorf for an example of a graduate writing course enrolling students across disciplines and Craig for examples of direct writing support for a cohort of international students studying in the same field. Also see Lancaster and Cox for additional examples of faculty interventions.)

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS

Our case for the success of the Roads program's approach to writing rests largely on our analyses of three features of institutional context: assessment priorities or strategies that dovetail well with a lingua franca learning environment; the facilitation of thesis research projects that promote a difference-as-resource culture; and the existence (and on-going development) of activities supporting multilingual writers, either directly or indirectly. Our case for qualifying each of these successes begins with the program's low completion rate, but extends into each more positive feature of institutional context. Suitable and successful reading and assessment practices could be codified and through codification become, as we address below, more successful. Success with difference-as-resource research questions would also benefit from codifying or creating routines for recruiting and supporting external (co)advisors. Finally, while efforts to prepare faculty for international, lingua franca pedagogy appear to be succeeding and enjoying departmental support, it seems as though direct interventions for student writers would benefit from a more narrow disciplinary or thesis-directed focus.

Each of these qualifications merits further discussion, discussion that in other discourses might take the form of recommendations to the department under discussion or suggestions for further research. In what follows here we offer brief closing remarks that combine aspects of these two established moves.

In assessing Roads theses, the department has evolved a set of practices describable as lingua franca assessment strategies, yet none of the departmental documentation describes them as such or refers to lingua franca communication at all. Instead, when textual features of theses are mentioned, the vocabulary

remains in a traditional and pedestrian domain of *correct*, *grammar*, *flaws* and *errors*. While we believe student writers would benefit from a codifying of what we called above let-it-pass reading strategies and assessment priorities grounded in evidence of intellectual work, it is not obvious to us that the Uppsala Department of History should carry out this codification. Instead, we see this, at least in part, as the work of applied linguists and writing specialists, for whom a great deal of work, both theoretical and descriptive, remains to be done on academic lingua francas.

In our analysis above of thesis topics and their role in the promotion of difference as resource, we highlighted the function of external advisors because this is where faculty informants pointed us. Here too, however, a much richer network of practice could and should be explicitly described. This network ranges from the merely logistical arrangement of two-year longitudinal work with theses through the encouragement of internationally grounded projects to a tolerance of primary source material that in many cases faculty assessors cannot read. We interpret these practices as wholly consistent with and supportive of a Roads program mission that is explicitly internationalist, disciplinarily grounded and critically activist. Here the program or department itself is best equipped to re-see the practices that have evolved and articulate them as a part of a research-writing pedagogy for its master's students. However, as this case might illustrate, external actors such as ourselves can help guide the reflection necessary in order to articulate that pedagogy by holding up a mirror to practices that may have developed in silence. Such mirroring of course follows from descriptive or ethnographic research into institutional contexts of multilingual graduate writers and the departments hosting them.

Finally, the active interventions aimed at supporting thesis writers succeed in some respect simply through their existence. This however is too low a standard, and the decisions facing the Uppsala Department of History as it goes forward are familiar ones. Initially, it faces a classic make-or-buy decision (Balakrishnan & Cheng, 2005), where in this case it can either continue to produce its own graduate writing course and occasional workshops or instead buy from other parts of the university services that have come on line since launching its own course in 2007, including a generic course offered by the Department of English and tutorial services from a fledgling writing center wholly new to English writing support. Given that a shortcoming identified in existing support activities is that they have become too general to adequately help Roads writers, then one factor in answering that question is clear. However, even if the department continues on a "make" path, questions will remain regarding program-specific interventions and the internal competition

for resources between Roads and other graduate programs. If WID research at some point is able to illuminate the gains and losses associated with each of these decision paths, so much the better.

In closing and on balance, the factors qualifying the success of the Roads program in its work with multilingual writers seem familiar: scarce resources; a disciplinary conservatism that leads to an underselling of successful innovation and praxis; and a shortfall in the follow up and evaluation of departmental initiatives. In contrast the factors most relevant to the successes themselves are refreshingly new: assessment practices aligned with both learning goals and lingua franca communication; a research culture that values individual differences and multilingualism; and an institutional acknowledgement that enrolling international graduate students requires institutional change.

NOTES

1. There is no obvious way to explain why individuals from so many countries choose to study the history of democratic development in Uppsala, but one fact that may be relevant is that when the program was launched and this data collected, Swedish universities charged no tuition. This has subsequently changed and students from outside the EU and EES must now pay fees of 90,000 Swedish Crowns (c. $11,500) per year.

REFERENCES

Ågren, M. (2005). *Svensk humaniora på engelska—en svår men nödvändig kombination* [Swedish humanities in English—a difficult but necessary combination]. *Tvärsnit*, *2*, 11-13.

Bacha, N. N., & Bahous, R. (2008). Contrasting views of business students' writing needs in an EFL environment. *English for Specific Purposes*, *27*, 79-93.

Balakrishnan, J., & Cheng, C. H. (2005). The theory of constraints and the make-or-buy decision: An update and review. *Journal of Supply Chain Management: A Global Review of Purchasing & Supply*, *41*, 40-47.

Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write,* (pp. 134-165). New York & London: The Guiford Press.

Bazerman, C., Little, J., Bethel, L., Chavkin, T., Fouquette, D., & Garufis, J. (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press and WAC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/books/bazerman_wac/

Belcher, D., & Braine, G. (Eds.). (1995). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (3rd ed.). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). Lingua Franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 923-939.

Canagarajah, A. S., & Wurr, A. J. (2011). Multilingual communication and language acquisition: New research directions, *The Reading Matrix, 11*, 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/january_2011/canagarajah_wurr.pdf

Casanave, C. P., & Li, X. (Eds.). (2008). *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic acculturation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Connor, U., & Mayberry, S. (1995). Learning discipline-specific academic writing: A case study of a Finnish graduate student in the United States. In E. Ventola & A. Mauranen (Eds.), *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 231-253). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cummins, J. (2003). Challenging the construction of difference as deficit: Where are identity, intellect, imagination and power in the new regime of truth? In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 41-60) New York: Routledge.

Elmgren, E., & Henriksson, A-S. (2010). *Universitetspedagogik*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Emerson, L., MacKay, B. R., Funnell, K., & MacKay, M. B. (2002). Writing in a New Zealand tertiary context: WAC and action research. *Learning and Languages across the Disciplines*, *5*, 110. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/llad/v5n3/emerson_etal.pdf

European Higher Educational Area. (2010). *Bologna Process*. Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=3

European Higher Educational Area. (2006). Swedish national report for 2005-2007 Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Documents/National_Report_Sweden2007.pdf

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On lingua franca English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 237-259.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, (pp. 41-48). New York: Academic Press.

Guo, S. & Zenobia, J. (2007). Nurturing diversity in higher education: A critical review of selected models. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *37*, 29-49.

Harbord, J. (2010). Writing in central and eastern Europe: Stakeholders and directions in initiating change. *Across the Disciplines, 7*. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/harbord2010.cfm

Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 17-29.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London: Continuum International.

Janopolous, M. (1995). Writing across the curriculum, writing proficiency exams, and the NNE college student. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*, 43-50.

Johns, A. (2011). The future of genre in second-language writing: Fundamental, but contested, instructional decisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*, 56-68.

Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 2704-2715.

Kim, H.Y. (2011). The international graduate students' difficulties: Graduate classes as a community of practices. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16*, 281-292.

Lavelle, T. & Ågren, M. (2010). Academic writing in English—pedagogical answers to strategic challenges. In B. Johansson (Ed.), *Att undervisa med vetenskaplig föränkring —i praktiken!* [Teaching with a research foundation—in practice], (pp. 202-218). Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Leki, I. (1995). The coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 235-260.

Magno, C. & Amarles, A. M., (2012). Teachers' feedback practices in second language academic writing classrooms. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment, 6*, 21-31.

Matsuda, P. K., Cox, M., Jordan, J., & Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (Eds.) (2006). *Second-language writing in the composition classroom*. Boston & New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Maruanen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing miscommunication in lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 177*, 123-150.

Mitchell, K. (2012). English is not *all* that matters in the education of secondary multilingual learners and their teachers. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 14*, 1-21.

Pedersen, A.M. (2011). Writing across languages, disciplines, and sources: Second language writers in Jordan. *Across the Disciplines, 8*(1). Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/pedersen2011.cfm

Ramsden, P. (2003) *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Seloni, L. (2012). Academic literacy socialization of first-year doctoral students in US: A micro-ethnographic perspective. *English for Specific Purposes*, *31*, 47-49.

Swales, J. & Feak, C. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Uppsala University. (2009). *The grading criteria for student research papers required at the advanced level*. Retrieved from http://www. hist.uu.se/LinkClick. aspx?fileticket=cmvG6O we6W8%3d& tabid=2220&mid=5156&language=en-US

Uppsala University. (2011a). *Academic Writing in English*. Retrieved from http://www.uu.se/en/education/master/selma/kursplan/?kKod=5HA707

Uppsala University. (2011b). M*aster programme in roads to democracy*. Retrieved from http://www.uu.se/en/education/master/selma/program/?pKod=HVD 2M&lasar=12/13/2011

Uppsala University. (2011c). *Theory and methods in thesis work: Roads to democracy*. Retrieved from http://www.uu.se/en/education/master/selma/ kursplan/?kKod=5HA618

Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, *46*, 506-521.

Zawacki, T. M., & Rogers, P. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Writing across the curriculum: A critical sourcebook*. Boston & New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.