

ACADEMIC WRITING AND THE EXPERIENCES OF GRADUATE STUDENTS
AND SUPERVISORS/ADVISORS: THE CASE OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES



ZİYA TOPRAK

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2022

ACADEMIC WRITING AND THE EXPERIENCES OF GRADUATE STUDENTS
AND SUPERVISORS/ADVISORS: THE CASE OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Thesis submitted to
the Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Sciences

by
Ziya Toprak

Boğaziçi University

2022

Academic Writing and the Experiences of Graduate Students and
Supervisors/Advisors: The Case of Educational Studies

The Thesis of Ziya Toprak

has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Ayşe Havva Caner
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Fatma Gök
(Thesis Co-Advisor)

Assoc. Prof. Özlem Ünlühisarcıklı

Assist. Prof. Günizi Kartal

Prof. Ebru Oğuz
(External Member)

Assoc. Prof. B. Volkan Yücel
(External Member)

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Ziya Toprak, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date

ABSTRACT

Academic Writing and the Experience of Graduate Students and Supervisors/Advisors: The Case of Educational Studies

This study questions quality and experiences of graduate writing in the field of educational studies. A typical graduate work has three basic components; the writer, the advisor and the text. By using two-phase research, the present study investigates all three components. The first phase of the research examines the quality of graduate theses written in the field of education studies. The quality examination is done by using a plagiarism detection software with respect to two parameters; similarity and plagiarism. 600 theses and dissertations written in the field of educational studies are analyzed. Findings show that the mean similarity index of the sample is 28.58%, which is significantly higher than the mean threshold. The rate of theses and dissertation having high-level plagiarism is 34.5%. The second phase of the study deals with the experiences and perceptions of academic writing among graduate students, and advisors' perceptions of academic writing and their advising practices by conducting in-depth interviews. 12 advisors and 24 graduate students are included as participants. MAQXDA, a qualitative data analysis program, is used for the content analysis of interviews. Findings show that advisors and students have a difficulty in grasping requirements of academic writing. Participants regularize and understand from academic writing an epidemic conception of writing, which repeats itself across different cases while making limited contribution. It has been suggested that the genre qualities of academic writing in the field of educational studies can explain the theses and dissertations plagiarized and having originality issues.

ÖZET

Akademik Yazı ve Lisansüstü Öğrencilerin ve Danışmanların Deneyimleri: Eğitim Bilimleri Durumu

Bu çalışma, eğitim bilimleri alanında lisansüstü yazının kalitesini ve deneyimlerini sorgulamaktadır. Tipik bir lisansüstü çalışmanın üç temel bileşeni vardır; yazar, danışman ve metin. İki aşamalı bir yaklaşım kullanan bu çalışma, üç bileşeni de incelemektedir. Araştırmanın ilk aşaması, eğitim bilimleri alanında yazılmış lisansüstü tezlerin kalitesini incelemektedir. Kalite incelemesi bir intihal tespit programı kullanılarak, özgünlük ve intihal parametrelerine göre yapılmıştır. Eğitim bilimleri alanında yazılmış 600 tez ve tez analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, örneklemin ortalama benzerlik indeksi olan %28.58'in eşik değerin önemli ölçüde üzerinde olduğunu göstermektedir. Yüksek düzeyde intihal içeren tezlerin oranı %34,5 olarak saptanmıştır. Araştırmanın ikinci aşamasında, lisansüstü öğrencilerin akademik yazıya yönelik deneyimleri ve algıları ile danışmanların akademik yazıya ilişkin algıları ve danışmanlık uygulamaları, derinlemesine görüşmeler yapılarak ele alınmaktadır. 12 danışman ve 24 lisansüstü öğrencisi katılımcı olarak araştırmada yer almaktadır. MAQXDA yazılımı görüşmelerin içerik analizinin yapılması için kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, danışmanların ve öğrencilerin akademik yazının gerekliliklerini kavramakta güçlük çektiklerini göstermektedir. Katılımcılar, akademik yazıyı, sınırlı katkı sağlayan, farklı durumlarda kendini tekrar eden epidemik bir yazı tipi olarak anlamakta ve deneyimlemektedir. Eğitim çalışmaları alanındaki akademik yazının türsel niteliklerinin, intihal ve özgünlük sorunu olan tez yazımını açıklayabileceği öne sürülmüştür.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Ziya Toprak

Degrees Awarded

PhD in Educational Sciences, Adult Education Program, 2022, Boğaziçi University

PhD in Integrated Studies in Education, 2015, McGill University

MA in Educational Sciences, Adult Education Program, 2008, Boğaziçi University

BS in Computers and Educational Technology, 2005, Boğaziçi University

Areas Of Special Interest

Graduate Writing, Politics of Education, Social Foundations of Education, Sociology of Learning.

Professional Experience

Adjunct Faculty, Department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling, Medipol University, 2020-present,

Adjunct Faculty, Department of ELT, Aydın University, 2017-present,

Adjunct Faculty, Department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling, MEF University, 2019-2020,

Adjunct Faculty, Department of ELT, Kultur University, 2016-2018

Research Assistant, Department of Integrated Studies in Education, McGill University, 2011-2015

Grants

Grad Excellence Award in Integrated Studies in Education – McGill University.
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada - National Research Council

Graduate Excellence Fellowship – McGill University

Publications

Journal Articles

Toprak Z, ve Yücel, B. V. 2020. A peculiar practice of academic writing: Epidemic writing in the Turkish graduate education. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1774098. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1774098>

Toprak, Z. (2020). Performing Heteronormativity: The Discourse of the College Hook up Culture and Sexuality. *CINEJ Cinema Journal* 8(1), 124-140.

Toprak, Z. (2017). Türkiye’de Akademik Yazı: Özgünlük ve İntihal. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi* 34(2), 9-20. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/buje/issue/37026/424743>

Toprak, Z. (2017). The discourse of early childhood education and fashioning of modern mothers. *Journal of Early Childhood Studies*, 1(1), pp. 71-80. DOI: 10.24130/eccd-jecs.196720171122

Book Chapters

Toprak, Z. 2016. Toplumsal cinsiyete duyarlı bütçeleme: Bir pozitif ayrımcılık örneği olarak Kadının Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğünün bütçesinin incelenmesi. Volkan Yücel & Süleyman Öğrekçi (Ed.), *Ekonomi, Sosyoloji ve Kadın*. İstanbul: Kriter Yayınları, ISBN: 6054613991

Toprak, Z. 2016. Bitmeyen Kriz: 1970ler enerji krizleri ve Türkiye eğitim sistemine etkileri. Ağcakaya S., Afşar B., Öğrekçi S. (Ed.), *Disiplinlerarası Kriz*, Bursa: Ekin Yayınevi,

Toprak, Z. 2017. The Cloud Discourse: A proposal against the structural study of education. Volkan Yücel (Ed.), *Yapı ve Toplum*. İstanbul: Kriter Yayınları.


ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible if it was not for those who contributed much along the way. Starting with initially my supervisor then co-supervisor, Prof. Fatma Gök not only helped me during this journey but also, she shaped and deeply influenced my life for almost 20 years. I am very grateful for her leadership, support and above all friendship. Prof. Özlem Ünlühisarcıklı accepted me as an advisee in a difficult time and provided incredible support and understanding. I feel lucky to be one of her students. Assoc. Prof. Ayşe Caner welcomed me when I needed to another co-supervisor. Her practicality and work ethic were admiring, which contributed a lot to finish the study. I regret that I spent all these years without working with her. My committee members, Assoc. Prof. Günizi Kartal and Assoc. Prof. Volkan Yücel were very helpful and always provided me with constructive criticism. I am in their debt for their time and effort.

The seeds of this study were planted by Professor Doreen Starke-Meyerring, while I was at McGill University. Her passing was very saddening and it became a moral obligation for me to complete this work in order to honor her memory. I am truly lucky that I got to meet her and had her as my teacher. She changed the course of my career. She will always be remembered.

My friends and colleagues at Centre for Educational Policy Studies at Boğaziçi University, Dr. Melike Acar and Dr. Meral Apak provided me with resources and ideas to shape my study. I am very thankful to them.

And lastly, I reserve my deepest admiration to my incredible life partner Sati Tilbe who is always meticulous and there for me.



*Dedicated to those who still defend the sanctity of written knowledge on the
grasses...*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET	v
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Aim of the study.....	4
1.3 Research questions	4
1.4 Definition of key terms	5
1.5 Significance of study.....	6
1.6 Organization of dissertation	6
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE.....	8
2.1 Towards a philosophy of writing (theories of writing)	9
2.2 Pedagogical approaches to writing.....	13
2.3 Re-contextualizing writing and rhetorical genre studies.....	25
2.4 Academic discourse and graduate writing	31
2.5 Graduate writing	33
2.6 Quantifying the quality of graduate writing.....	35
METHODOLOGY.....	39
3.1 Phase I.....	39
3.2 Phase II.....	43
ORIGINALITY AND PLAGIARISM FINDINGS	48

4.1 Demographics	48
4.2 Originality Findings	49
4.3 Plagiarism findings	52
ADVISORS' ADVICES	55
5.1 Writing ideas	56
5.2 Advising practices	63
THESIS WRITING EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF GRADUATE STUDENTS	73
6.1 Reading/Writing experiences and perceptions of graduate students	74
6.2 Graduate students' perceptions of advisors' advice	82
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
7.1 Phase I Discussion	89
7.2 Phase II Discussion	92
7.3 Limitations and recommendations	101
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEWS FORMS	106
APPENDIX B: ETHICS APPROVAL	110
APPENDIX C: CODEBOOK	111
APPENDIX D: CODED EXCERPTS	112
REFERENCES.....	127

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write.....	15
Table 2. The Distribution of Theses and Dissertations	41
Table 3. Graduate Participants	44
Table 4. Advisors' Distribution per Title.....	44
Table 5. Text Types	48
Table 6. University Types	49
Table 7. Text Language.....	49
Table 8. Overall Index.....	49
Table 9. One-sample Test of Similarity Index	50
Table 10. Similarity Index per Text Type.....	50
Table 11. Similarity Index per University Type	50
Table 12. Similarity Index per Language.....	51
Table 13. Group Differences.....	52
Table 14. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism.....	52
Table 15. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism per University Type.....	53
Table 16. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism per Text Type	53
Table 17. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism per Language	54
Table 18. Epidemic vs Epistemic Writing	105

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The Writing Process 19

Figure 2. Coded Segments (Advisors) 56

Figure 3. Coded Segments (Graduate Students) 74



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The background of this study starts with a personal note. The story of this dissertation goes back to the time when I was starting to my career as a teacher. At the time, the ministry of education was promoting graduate education among the teachers by reaching out agreements with private universities. Teachers were in a rush in applying to graduate programs of educational administration. I was a graduate student at Boğaziçi University then. I knew of what it took to carry out a graduate project, especially of difficulties in writing. So, it sparked my attention. Knowing my colleagues at the time, I was highly doubtful of them in completing a thesis. The situation of teachers attending graduate studies went on and became a trend among teachers. Later on, I went on to complete my doctoral education in Canada where I had to take advanced written courses, which also helped me to understand the issue of writing from an academic standpoint, why graduate students face hardships in completing a graduate project and how it is normal and common to face difficulties. As time went by, my personal interest in writing grew as with the interest in graduate studies. Upon returning, I had started to dig the issue of writing, and formulated my interest in to a doctoral project of which the end product is this study.

Graduate studies are now wildly popular and this has been the case for quite a time. The number of graduate students in 2000 was 86.807 (65.068 Masters Students

and 21.739 students in doctoral education) whereas the number has raised to more than a half million; 549773 (454673 Masters students and 95100 doctoral students) in 2018 (OSYM, 2000; YOK, 2019). The number of graduates of these programs was 54.728 in 2017 which makes the graduation rate the north of 10%. The numbers imply there a hugely growing interest in graduate studies. However, these numbers show us only the quantitative growth of graduate studies. The question of quality of this growth remains unsolved since there is not much research about the nature of this quantitative increase. This study addresses the qualitative aspect of this increase by taking a hybrid approach to the study of writing.

The practice of academic writing seems to be undertheorized especially in relation to quality of it (Lundell & Beach, 2002; Paré et al., 2010). While there are different approaches to the action of writing (Ivanic, 2004; White and Arndt, 1991), the case for the quality of it remains obscure and underdeveloped. It seems utterly necessary to question the quality of academic writing now that there are technological tools to quantify the authenticity and originality of it.

Before even to begin theorizing academic writing there are several key issues to rumble upon. Firstly, academic writing is heavily influenced by the academic discourse. The success of an academic text is heavily related to how the text plays by the rules of academic discourse it wants to participate. A successful text (i.e., a published manuscript) means that the text is well-written enough to include what is expected from it by the academic discourse it wants to be a part of, which is never an indicator of quality of it. Academic discourse in its simplest sense is a set of implicit rules working to exclude those who are unaware of them. These rules work as micro-genres unique to pertaining academic discourses, which brings us the second issue that needs to be addressed. Academic writing is a matter of genres and sub-genres. In

this regard, writing is a historically exigent, situated and evolved practice that is regularized by countless repetitions. Academic writing has many distinctive genres and sub-genres unique to discourse communities. Among these, essay and thesis writing stand out. The focus of this study is thesis writing which is considered as “the ultimate student paper” (Paré et al., 2010, 179).

Writing is the ultimate tool and indicator of academic readiness, capability and proficiency. Moving from studentship to being an academician, professional progress, expertise, and authorship are all possible only via writing. Despite the centrality of academic writing to all academic processes, the attention focused on it is incomprehensibly low, especially in the Turkish academy. A quick research reveals that, there is no comprehensive study addressing the nature of academic and graduate writing in Turkey, experiences of graduate students and advisors’ advising practices. The present study is one of the first precisely addressing this issue.

This study questions the quality of writing in theses and dissertations, takes a closer look to the conditions in which these texts are produced. In this regard, the present study understands that theses and dissertations are outcomes of certain experiences and locales which are historically sedimented, sometimes ritualized and socially fermented to work as gatekeepers. The present study also understands that getting a graduate degree requires to take part in these experiences and to inherit the sense of those locales with specific subject personalities and social modalities. Therefore, it seems outmost meaningful to delve into how graduate students experience take part in these processes.

Academic writing, in itself, includes various genres like essay, proceeding and thesis writing. Among these genres, thesis writing stands out in the sense that it serves as a license to write and a tool of recognition by the external world (external

to writer). It is the first and the ultimate gate that needs to be passed through. And not surprisingly, it also happens to be a very difficult one to pass. The journey to the gate is equally important as the moment of passing the gate. It is a tough road and yet there is little evidence of how and why it is so. This study deals with this journey. It aims to map the topography of thesis writing, which includes three agents; the writer, the guide and the text. The present study examines this topography in two separated, yet related phases. The first phase focuses on the text in which I examine theses and dissertations quantitatively with respect to two parameters; originality and plagiarism. The second phase of the study centers on graduate students' experiences of thesis writing and advisors' advising practices.

1.2 Aim of the study

This study aims to identify the quality of academic writing and analyze the process of academic writing in Turkey in the field of education. The purpose of this study is to map the topography of academic writing in Turkey by identifying its smooth and rough spaces. The process includes the academic discourse about the writing, and how supervisors and students negotiate this discourse in the process of writing.

1.3 Research questions

In relation to my aim, specifically I ask the following questions:

1. What is the state of theses and dissertations written in the field of educational studies in terms of originality and plagiarism?
 - i. What is the similarity index of theses and dissertations written in the field of educational studies?

- ii. Is there a meaningful difference between theses and dissertations written at public universities and those written at private universities in terms of similarity index?
 - iii. Is there a meaningful difference between theses and dissertations written in Turkish and those written in English in terms of similarity index?
 - iv. Is there a meaningful difference between theses and dissertations in terms of similarity index?
- 2. What are the implications of the state of theses and dissertation written in the field of education with regard to the quality of academic writing in Turkey?
 - 3. How do supervisors and graduate students of education elaborate and experience the discourse of academic writing?

1.4 Definition of key terms

The following terms are frequently used in this dissertation; therefore, it would be useful to define these terms in the context of this study.

Academic Writing: The term is generally used refer almost all of writing practices within academy. In the context of this study, it is used to refer graduate writing in general and theses and dissertations in specific.

Graduate Students: In this study, the term is used to refer students of graduate level who have completed or in completion process of thesis writing.

Advisors: In this study, advisors refer to academicians who have theses writing students for them to advise at the time of this study conducted.

Field of Education: In the scope of this study, field of education includes every field of education that trains teachers of all level and educational sciences.

1.5 Significance of study

Writing is central to all academic endeavors. In fact, academia means writing due to the fact that it is the ultimate tool of communication. It works as the means of correct training, of dissemination, of to be judged by the external world, and of exclusion and inclusion. Therefore, the study of academic writing is a requirement to understand these mechanisms.

In countries like Turkey, where academia is developing quantitatively, the issue of quality is always a problematic. Determining the state of quality and devising potential ways to develop the quality of higher education have utmost importance in developing countries. Obviously, one of the important spaces to question the quality of developing higher education is academic writing, which is the ultimate product. Judging this product based on measurable metrics seems an ideal way to start and move beyond where contemplating on alternative ways of increasing the quality is a possibility.

Apart from measurable metrics, it seems equally important to investigate the experiences of actors who are central to thesis writing, i.e., graduate advisors and their students. Only such an investigation would help us to deepen our understanding of situations that result in texts examined in the scope of the present study. Besides, it might also help us to devise alternative ways to raise the quality of writing.

1.6 Organization of dissertation

This dissertation has seven chapters. After the present part in which the problem, aim and research questions are introduced, the next chapter deals with the conceptual framework. Regarding the framework, I basically address two fundamental issues

how to write and the meaning of writing academically. The third chapter introduces methodological tools used to investigate the quality of theses and experiences of graduate students and advisors. The fourth chapter presents findings regarding the quality theses and dissertations. The fifth chapter deals with advising experiences of advisors by analyzing conducted in-depth interviews. The sixth chapter investigates the writing experiences of graduate students. The last chapter discusses findings and presents alternative ways to address the problems raised in this dissertation.



CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE¹

This study is about writing and its place in the academic discourse. The matter is more complex than it meets the eye; including and interrelating different disciplines such as linguistics, philosophy, politics, sociology and pedagogy. Yet it is not my intention to investigate this complex nature of the phenomena. Rather while reviewing the literature, I develop an understanding of writing that this study bases its approach to writing.

The first section of the review deals with the theorization of writing and in its place in academic writing. Then I move on the practical approaches to writing; pedagogical approaches to writing in which I discuss ways of producing an academic text. Later, critically overview these approaches to reconceptualize writing within the scope of this study. I position my understanding of writing in this section. In this part I discuss its historic-discursive development of academic writing and its present situation. I discuss the development of essay as a form academic writing as a case through which I aim to show the dynamic and discursive character of writing. The fourth section addresses the relationship between writing and academic discourse. I discuss the particularities of this discourse in relation to knowledge production and power relations and its material effects on the academia. The fifth section is about the general tendencies in graduate writing, which I question the dominant

¹ Parts of this section had been published in the journal of COGENT Education. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1774098>

understanding of writing as a ‘write-up’ strategy. Finally, I detail my way of quantifying the quality of graduate writing.

In doing so my aim is to position this study critically in the broad historically sedimented and institutionally emergent conditions of writing within which various actors and theoretical traditions in different ways, employ (repeated) narratives and (recurred) practices to fashion certain genres of writing that make up the temporal and spatial site of writing. I delve more rigorously into and reflect on the umbilical connection between writing and academic discourse to map the topography of discursive and material landscape of a complex background that make it possible the act of writing in the first place, which is crucial in conceptualizing writing with its effects on the academia and vice versa. In this regard, mapping this topography is equally important in understanding the development of students as academic writers. Seeing writing with its complicated relationship with academic discourse bears the possibility of understanding the conditions of becoming a successful graduate students as new researchers and writers. In this regard, it is important to understand writing, especially academic writing, as an activity beyond grammar, spelling, and style skills. Becoming a successful graduate writer and a scholar require more than these skills. The claim of this review is that writing is a regularized, normalized, through endless repetition, social and cultural practice that scholar candidates are required to master in order to become a part of it. In the forthcoming pages, I discuss these arguments in detail and in relation to their epistemological argumentation.

2.1 Towards a philosophy of writing (theories of writing)

Since the dawn of writing, it has become a central concern in humanity’s organizational activities, knowledge production and sharing processes, and formation

of the social. Even though that writing has always been the prominent means of accumulating and disseminating knowledge, it is only relatively recent times that writing has become a scholarly concern.

Derrida's work (1998) is one of the leading studies that solely questions the place of writing in the western thought. The enigmatic title of the book, *Of Grammatology*, implies the problematic place of writing in western tradition of thought. Literally grammatology means the science of writing. On the other hand, *gramma* refers to the secondary or not being originary. Writing in this sense is secondary to speech or *logos*. Derrida claims that writing is not the civilization but a sign of civilization that has been characterized by ethnocentrism and logocentrism. Derrida challenges the logocentric conventions of the western thought, i.e., the favored position of speech over writing. This notion requires further discussion

The best place to start to dig is perhaps Saussure's structural linguistics. The structural linguistics examines the relationship between the signifier and the signified. Signifier denotes the sound image (the sound of pen), whereas the signified denotes the concept (the concept of pen). In this case the table is the sign. Structural linguistics argues that this relationship is not fixed and arbitrary. The sign, the pen, has meaning because of it exists within a system that is based on the difference. Pen is a pen because it is not a chair or pencil. It is this difference that makes the meaning possible in the first place. In this schema, there is no place for writing; it exists out of this system. The word, pen, is the signifier of the signifier of the signified, ergo out of the system. Since speech is the basis of the truth, and writing is out of the system, Derrida argues, there can be no science of writing. Writing in this tradition is absence whereas speech is presence; an idea that is Derrida's central concern.

Among the familiar concepts that depend on the value of presence are: the immediacy of sensation, the presence of ultimate truths to a divine

consciousness, the effective presence of an origin in a historical development, a spontaneous or unmediated intuition, the transumption of thesis and antithesis in a dialectical synthesis, the presence in speech of logical and grammatical structures, truth as what subsists behind appearances, and the effective presence of a goal in the steps that lead to it. The authority of presence, its power of valorization, structures all of our thinking. The notions of "making clear," "grasping," "demonstrating," "revealing," and "showing what is the case" all invoke presence. To claim, as in the Cartesian /*cogito*/, that the "I" resists radical doubt because it is present to itself in the act of thinking or doubting is one sort of appeal to presence. Another is the notion that the meaning of an utterance is what is present to the consciousness of the speaker.

(Culler, 1982, 93)

In other words, presence denotes a unique kind of metaphysics that always tries to locate a ground, a foundation for meaning and truth. It is such a dead-end that even ground breaking thinkers, philosophers, scholars, or theoreticians could not escape. For example, among others, Marx grounded the truth on the capital and class; Freud grounded psyche on the unconsciousness; Saussure on the language; and Descartes on the reason; all of which denoting a tradition that goes back to Plato. By attacking to the favored position of speech over writing, through various tools like difference, trace, space, supplementarity, text, and exteriority, Derrida (1998; 2005) attempts to deconstruct the metaphysics of presence. These notions of Derrida have different yet important implications for writing.

Within the Western tradition of thought, writing has been seen as a problem that philosophers, thinkers, scholars have had to deal with in one way or another. From Plato to Freud and beyond, the dominant way of dealing with the issue has been to repress and suppress writing, which also "constitutes the origin of philosophy as *episteme*, and of truth as the unity of *logos* and *phone*" (Emphasis in original, Derrida, 2005, 246). Besides, by formalizing and differentiation of writing, writing becomes an exclusive tool of producing and preserving of the margins and borders knowledge production.

The greatest force is the force of a writing which, in the most audacious transgression, continues to maintain and to acknowledge the necessity of the system of prohibitions (knowledge, science, philosophy, work, history, etc.) (Derrida, 2005, 442).

The system of prohibitions means the regularization of writing with respect to different disciplines that work as systems of exclusion.

I am doing this debate for two reasons. The first is to strengthen my claim that writing is not only a matter of grammar, style and technic, but rather it is a system of its own with complicated set of recurrent rules, conducts, and genres that elaborate the qualities of civilizations, delimit scholarly work, and select who is going to be a scholar on what terms. The second reason that I want to discuss the place of writing in relation to philosophy is related to function of writing as a system of exclusion. Writing in its academic form works as a system of exclusion. It is precisely this system of exclusion that this study addresses. Who is going to be a scholar? Who is not? Based on what rules? What kinds of tools are there for candidates to be scholars? How are these tools fashioned? Who forges these tools and with what authority? What roles do institutions and supervisors play in the whole process? These are some of the rhetorical questions that I arise with respect to the place of writing. With all of its rules and practices, the process of producing a scholarly work is extremely hard that many fail to do. On the other hand, there are ways to interfere in the system, which I name them as pedagogical approaches to writing that devise tools and strategies to fit in and become a part of research communities.

2.2 Pedagogical approaches to writing

Approaches that I am going to present are discourses of writing pertaining to the teaching and learning of writing, which has been in effect within certain times, spaces, contexts and with specific exigencies. The approaches are the products of a certain history and history themselves that contains discourses, institutions, scientific statements, philosophical arguments, power relations, and knowledge making procedures. In this review, I will elaborate these approaches while revealing their certainties and ambiguities in relation to formations of specific truth regimes. There are different classifications across the literature regarding the approaches to writing. I am going to discuss the classification developed by Roz Ivanic (2004) since it is the most comprehensive one and reflecting the developments in the field. My strategy is first to critically review them, and then position this study within the field with respect to critics that I am going to develop.

Ivanic's (2004) classification consists of six different approaches of discourses of writing; skills approach, creative self-expression, the process approach, the genre approach, social practice approach and socio-political approach. My intention is not to discuss their weaknesses or strengths per se, but rather to determine what these approaches might offer in developing a comprehensive writing approach that might have further implications for the study and teaching of writing. The discourses of writing are outlined in the Table 1 (Ivanic, 2004, 225) that commonly mean as

constellations of beliefs about writing, beliefs about learning to write, ways of talking about writing, and the sorts of approaches to teaching and assessment which are likely to be associated with these beliefs (Ivanic, 2004, 224).

These discourses are basically about what writing in general is and what the most efficient way to teach to write is. Accordingly, the first column in the table shows the discursive approaches to writing and learning to write. The second row shows the place of the discourse in the layer of the language². The next row indicates ideas and beliefs about what writing is and should be. The fourth row is about the ways of learning to write, while the next row shows approaches in relation to discourses. The last row is about the criteria to assess writing. In what follows I discuss these discourses and approaches in detail.



² Layers of the language: Ivanic (2004) utilizing the discourse approach of Fairclough, sees language as a multi-layered structure. Accordingly, there are four layers of language that make the text possible in the first place. At the center of this view lies the text, then come cognitive processes, event, and sociocultural and political context respectively. The first layer text denotes the linguistic substance of language. Layer 2 denotes the cognitive processes that produce the certain linguistic substance of language, i.e. text. “Layer 3, labeled ‘Event’, refers to the observable characteristics of the immediate social context in which language is being used, including the purposes for language use, the social interaction, the particulars of time and place” (p. 223). And finally, “the outer layer of a comprehensive, social view of language consists of the socioculturally available resources for communication: the multimodal practices, discourses and genres which are supported by the cultural context within which language use is taking place, and the patterns of privileging and relations of power among them” (p. 224). In this schema, for example, a dissertation would be the central element, i.e. the text. The cognitive processes would denote the mental processes of meaning making of the writer. The third, the event, layer would be the requirements of the discipline in which the writer studies. The outer layer then would be the guidelines and requirements of the institution, i.e. the university of which the writer pursues degree.

Table 1. Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write

Discourses	Layer in the comprehensive view of language	Beliefs about writing	Beliefs about learning to write	Approaches to the teaching of writing	Assessment criteria
1. A Skills Discourse	 The Written Text The Mental Processes of Writing The Writing Event	Writing consists of applying knowledge of sound–symbol relationships and syntactic patterns to construct a text.	Learning to write involves learning sound–symbol relationships and syntactic patterns.	Skills Approaches <i>Explicit teaching phonics</i>	Accuracy
2. A creativity discourse		Writing is the product of the author's creativity.	You learn to write by writing on topics, which interest you.	Creative Self-Expression <i>Implicit teaching whole language</i>	Interesting content and style
3. A process discourse		Writing consists of composing processes in the writer's mind, and their practical realization.	Learning to write includes learning both the mental processes and the practical processes involved in composing a text.	The Process Approach <i>Explicit teaching</i>	?
4. A genre Discourse		Writing is a set of text-types, shaped by social context.	Learning to write involves learning the characteristics of different types of writing which serve specific purposes in specific contexts.	The Genre Approach <i>Explicit teaching</i>	Appropriacy
5. A Asocial practices discourse	The Sociocultural and political context of writing	Writing is purpose-driven communication in a social context.	You learn to write by writing in real-life contexts, with real purposes for writing.	Functional Approaches	Effectiveness for purpose
6. A Socio-political discourse		Writing is a <u>sociopolitically</u> constructed practice, has consequences for identity, and is open to contestation and change.	Learning to write includes understanding why different types of writing are the way they are, and taking a position among alternatives.	Critical Literacy	Social responsibility?

2.2.1 Skills approaches

The discourse of skills put the emphasis on the patterns, rules and structure of language. If one poses the necessary knowledge of these rules and patterns, she then can write independent of any other matter about writing, like context or genre. “At its most extreme, this is a belief that writing is a unitary, context-free activity, in which the same patterns and rules apply to all writing, independent of text type” (Ivanic, 2004, 228). What make writings good are structural characteristics of the text. Correct spelling, proper grammar, sound sentencing, and logical links between the paragraphs are characteristics of a good writing. “This discourse of writing and learning to write is recognizable in references to ‘skills’, spelling, punctuation and grammar, in expressions such as ‘correct’, ‘accurate’, ‘proper’, ‘learners must/should’, in the explicit and prescriptive teaching of rules, and in an emphasis on accuracy in assessment” (Ivanic, 2004, 228). Therefore, the teaching of writing primarily concerns teaching of these characteristics. The skills approach along with the creative self-expression approach concern with the end product, the written text.

2.2.2 Creative self-expression

In the discourse of creativity, the concern is text’s content and style. It is presumed that the writer has the necessary skills of language to produce a text. Like the skills discourse, the focus is on the written text. However, “writing is treated as a valuable activity in its own right: the creative act of an author, with no social function other than that of interesting or entertaining a reader” (Ivanic, 2004, 229). The context and the genre are ignored within the discourse. It is the content and the style that account for the good writing. Hence, the teaching of writing is primarily about the teaching of

style and content. Learners are exposed different kinds of texts and are expected to write drawn from their own experiences.

Creative self-expression, in this context, refers the author's creativity. It is up to the writer's imagination and creativity to develop a good style and content, which are elements of good writing. Although one might associate this approach to the process approach, I consider it, along with the skills approach, as a product approach, due the fact that both are concerned with the writing text or the end product. Creative self-expression denotes the transition to the process approach. Yet, these two approaches still might be commonly named as the product approach.

The product approach is the most common approach used in the schools as the method of teaching of writing (Sarala, et, al., 2014). Elements of good writing are correct and consistent spelling, proper grammar and syntax, a good command of vocabulary, appropriate style and tone, relevant layout, clear focus, logical linking between paragraphs or sections, appropriate coverage and level of explicitness, and clarity (Gabrielatos, 2002). By including these elements, students are expected produce an end with product through four stages. These stages are familiarization, controlled writing, guided writing and free writing (Sarala, et al., 2014, Steele, 2004).

The first stage is where students get to know model texts and make themselves familiar with the features and the genre of the given text. Students are expected to repeat these features in their prospective product. For example, "if a student reads a story, the focus may be on the techniques used to make the story interesting, and students focus on where and how the writer employs these techniques" (Steele, 2004, par, 4). The second stage is where the student began to practice writing. Student practice specific features of the model texts and tries incorporate her writing. For example, "if students are studying a formal letter, they

may be asked to practice the language used to make formal requests, for example, practicing the ‘I would be grateful if you would...’ structure” (Steele, 2004. par. 5). The third stage is where students organize their ideas in a similar way to the modeled text. The last stage is where students actually write by using their skills and creativity. “Individually, they use the skills, structures and vocabulary they have been taught to produce the product; to show what they can do as fluent and competent users of the language” (Steele, 2004, par. 6). At the end of this stage, students produce their end results. The quality of their work heavily depends on their skills of language and their capacity to write. The whole process of product approach is a one-way linear one that centers writing on imitation, organization of ideas, grammar, vocabulary, controlled and guided writing, and the end product. In contrast to the product approach, the process approach offers a more free, reflective and dynamic approach to the writing and the teaching of writing.

2.2.3 The process approach

The cumbersome and inefficient method of the product approach was the dominant perspective of writing and teaching until 1980s. Since then, the process approach, which offers a dynamic way of writing, has been the most popular understanding of writing and teaching of writing. With the effects of cognitive psychology, researchers started to be more interested in the processes of the mind (Flower, 1979; Moffet, 1983; Murray, 1980). While not ignoring wholly the practical processes (like those in the product process), advocates of this approach consider the mental processes that play important roles in generation and organization of ideas, planning and drafting. “Syllabuses and textbooks since 1980 in many parts of the world have incorporated this approach, with chapters and activities devoted to generating ideas, planning,

drafting, various ways of providing and working with feedback on drafts, revising and editing” (Ivanic, 2004, 231). While product approaches place a special emphasis on grammar, style, and phonics, process approaches are concerned with generation of ideas, planning and drafting. Writing activities, starting from the generation of ideas to finished text are organized cyclically so that the writer can make modifications all along the process.

There are different ideas about the stages of writing in processes approaches. Tribble (1996) offers stages; prewriting, composing, revising, and editing, while Hedge (2005, 51) identifies seven different ones; being motivated to write, getting ideas together, planning and outlining, making notes, making a first draft, revising, and publishing. In a similar manner, Steele proposes eight different stages; brainstorming, planning, mind mapping, drafting, feedback, editing, finalizing, and evaluation. On the other hand, the model White and Arndt (1991, 11) is more comprehensive and explanatory with regard to the process approaches.




Figure 1. The Writing Process (White and Arndt, 1991, 11)

The first point to make is that as diagram suggests writing is cyclical process wherein the learner could move between stages and make modifications as she deems them to be necessary.

Perhaps it is best to start with the phase of generating ideas, where pre-writing tasks take place. In this phase, it is expected of student to come up potential writing ideas. The most common tool used to generate ideas is brainstorming, after which students start to focus and structure their ideas as an initial step to drafting. Students might produce outlines before drafting, which could potentially guide them while writing. After they finish initial drafting, they get feedback from their teachers as well as peers. This process is crucial because students will need to make revisions with regard to feedback, they get. It is commonly accepted among writing scholars that revision is the most important phase in the writing process (Hedge, 2005; Sheridan, 2009; Clark, 2003; Ferris, 2002; Sommers, 1982 and Zamel, 1985). In fact, Sommers (1982, 154) goes as further as to say:

Instead of finding errors or showing students how to patch up parts of their texts, we need to sabotage our students' conviction that the drafts they have written are complete and coherent. Our comments need to offer students revision tasks of a different order of complexity and sophistication from the ones that they themselves identify, by forcing students back into the chaos, back to the point where they are shaping and restructuring their meaning.

What she notes baldly implies that writing actually takes place in the stage of revision. The stage not only develops language skills but also overall writing skills. When applied effectively, revision can yield to a quality end product and a quality writer. Both product and process approaches see writing as a matter of producing texts, yet they fail to recognize different text types; a failure noticed and articulated by the genre approach to writing.

2.2.4 The genre approach

It should firstly be remarked that the genre approach reviewed in this section is not related to rhetorical genre studies (RGS), even though it has some implications for RGS. Yet the genre approach fills the gap left by the earlier revised approaches, which see writing for its own sake. Whether it is product or process, or creative approach, they fail to recognize different text types, and the purpose of texts.

The genre approach argues that texts differ with respect to their purpose and context. “The key point in this theoretical tradition is that texts vary linguistically according to their purpose and context. As a result, it is possible to specify linguistic features of particular text-types according to whether they are spoken or written, whether they are recounting, describing, informing, instructing, and according to the formality and certainty of the situation” (Ivanic, 2004, 232-33). With the genre approach, individual text type differences come into play. One cannot write a formal petition in the way she writes a story. The whole process should be fundamentally different. Accordingly, the teaching of writing should be in accordance with the specific text type. The idea of genre here is similar to the one in the field of music or filmmaking. Just as a drama differs from a musical in terms of its story,

cinematography, and acting, text types differ from each other. The teaching of writing in this context is teaching of linguistics features of different text types. “In short, genre-based approaches see writing as essentially concerned with knowledge of language, and as being tied closely to a social purpose, while the development of writing is largely viewed as the analysis and imitation of input in the form of texts provided by the teacher” (Badger and White, 2000, 156).

The genre approach primarily concerns with the linguistic and structural features of texts and teaching of them. Yet the genre approach can be seen as a bridge to social views of writing due to the fact that the context of writing came into play with the emergence of this approach. The approaches that I have reviewed so far are somehow language-oriented. They do not consider the social and cultural context of writing. Their understanding of writing basically builds on the idea that writing is an issue of the use of language, no matter how it is produced. The social and cultural context of writing is taken into consideration with the social practice approach.

2.2.5 Social practice approach

The discourse of social practices takes the social context of writing into the consideration (Barton, 1994; Street 1984, 2003; Lea & Street, 1998; Ivanic, 2004). Driven from the literacy studies, proponents of the approach argue the relevance of social contexts to literacy while positioning themselves against the technical approaches to literacy. The approach “starts from different premises than the autonomous model--it posits instead that literacy is a social practice, not simply a technical and neutral skill; that it is always embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles” (Street, 2003, 77). In this sense, the act of writing is a political action that has social purposes, like promoting ideological underpinnings.

The approach sees writing as a matter of epistemology and identity by which it distances itself with other approaches outlined so far. The following quotation from Street (2001) explains the approach brilliantly:

Literacy is a social practice, not simply a technical and neutral skill; that it is always embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles. It is about knowledge: the ways in which people address reading and writing are themselves rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, being. Literacy, in this sense, is always contested, both its meanings and its practices, hence particular versions of it are always „ideological“, they are always rooted in a particular world-view and a desire for a view of literacy to dominate and marginalize others (p. 21).

It should be noted that the word literacy could be read interchangeably with the word writing. The approach is significant in the sense that it locates the problem of writing to an institutional and social level rather than fixing it as an individual student's problem. Writing is not only a matter of development of some skills required to master the art but rather it is located in a broader socio-political complex in which various games of power at play constantly. Building on this approach, the socio-political discourse of writing builds this understanding and offers a more politically active mode.

2.2.6 Socio-political approach

Proceeding from one approach to another should not be considered linearly rather the models that I have been reviewing so far should be seen as successively encapsulating the other. The approach coming after always involves the one coming before, just as approaches in different areas and disciplines. They build on each other. In this sense, the socio-political approach encapsulates insights from the other approaches coming before it.

The socio-political approach differently builds a critical stance to writing and its surrounding discursive and institutional contexts. The approach also problematizes the position of writer who is seen “as a social agent, free to draw on discourses and genres which are not privileged in the context, and to mix resources, producing heterogeneous, nonconformist texts and practices which challenge and subvert norms and conventions” (Ivanic, 2004, 238). Hence the writer is also tasked with the carrying or at least contributing to a social transformation. “This discourse is characterized by references to politics, power, society, ideology, representation, identity, social action and social change, by the explicit pedagogy described here, and by a critical stance towards the practice of assessment” (Ivanic, 2004, 239).

The above reviewed approaches have important implications for the present study. Each contributes differently in its own way. Product, Creative, Process, and Genre approaches present important clues for the teaching of writing at a technical level. In this study, I see writing as happening as an end of a process that should be organized with respect of the genre of the text. Creative skills of individual writer also play important role in this process. The additions of social practices discourse and the socio-political discourse indeed have transformed the teaching and studying of writing. They changed the notion and way of seeing writing as a technical and linguistic matter, and has drawn attention to the social and political surroundings of writing while offering new ways of looking to position of writer and her identity. Yet, these approaches fail to recognize the rhetorical modes of writing, and to develop a critical discourse approach that investigates archeological and genealogical roots of writing, which I try to develop in the following section.

2.3 Re-contextualizing writing and rhetorical genre studies

A literary critic notes, “I soon discovered that higher education research journals were filled with articles written in a style that I, trained as a literary scholar, found almost unreadable” (Sword, 2012, p. 4). Some might find this statement overstated but it makes a factual point: Academic writing is a unique genre that has its own sets of rules and one needs master these rules in order to participate whether as a reader or writer.

This study is deeply interested in this genre and its qualities. In fact, academic writing within the framework of this study is treated as an issue of genre. Moreover, this study places its epistemology in line with rhetorical genre theory (Bazerman, et al, 2010; Pare, 2014), which sees “writing as historically evolved social and ideological practices that are regularized in genres, which are defined as recurring patterns of discursive action that arise in human collectives, such as research cultures and institutions, over time” (Starke-Meyerring et al, 2014).

These patterns govern and delineate the limits of writing. The content of writing (i.e. what of writing), ways of writing (how of writing), qualifications for authorship, qualities of author (i.e. who of writing), rules of writing, norms and values of writing, and limits of writable are all related the genre qualities of writing. These are some of the fundamental questions that rhetorical genre approach dwells upon. Since the ground-breaking work of Miller (1984), debates of genre have gone beyond textual tactics and genre turned into the unit of analysis in examining the complex relation between writing and social action.

Miller’s essay, *Genre as Social Action*, is particularly important because it denotes a breaking point in study and teaching of writing. Previous writing perspectives tend to treat genre as invariable and constant textual forms, and a

formality occurred as a consequence of endless repetitions. On the other hand, with Miller, genres are treated as social actions that refer to particular social and cultural exigencies that are “located in the social world” and “objectified social need” (Miller, 1984, 157). The notion of exigency represents a chief notion in understanding genres as rhetorical actions. It designates that genres are not exclusive, irreplaceable and unchanging at all, but are vibrant forms that regularly change in time, place with respect to needs. “Exigence is a set of particular social patterns and expectations that provides a socially objectified motive for addressing danger, ignorance, separateness” (Miller, 1984, 158). The key question that arises and needs to be investigated here is what are the exigencies of particular genres, like dissertation or story. Why are they there? To what end? In this sense, seeing genres as “typified rhetorical actions based in recurrent situations” (Miller, 1984, 159), helps us to realize the effects of disciplinary knowledge, methods, and features of writing on individual, social, and cultural life that mostly remains unnoticed. By same token, it offers us to denaturalize the rules and ways of doing things in academy.

In a similar vein, Amy Devitt sees genre as the "dynamic patterning of human experience" (1993, 573) and "the semantic resources associated with situation types, the meaning potential in given social contexts" (2004, 17-18). My aim here is not to examine the formal characteristics of genres, but rather focusing on their emergences and exigencies. How are genres created and in response to what kind of exigencies do these genres occur? What are their rhetorical positions? How do these positions surface? And what happens when these positions materialize? Bitzer's (1968) argument in relation to formation of genres in their particular situations is brilliantly elaborated and explanatory:

Due to either the nature of things or convention, or both, some situations recur.... From day to day, year to year, comparable situations occur,

prompting comparable responses; hence rhetorical forms are born and a special vocabulary, grammar, and style are established . . . The situation recurs and, because we experience situations and the rhetorical response to them, a form of discourse is not only established but comes to have a power of its own-the tradition itself tends to function as a constraint upon any new response in the form. (13)

As indicated, genres mature due to repeated exigencies. Genres are not formulas of preexisting, ordinary ways of writing. They are rather forms with an evolving nature that have been shaped and normalized in response to recurring exigencies. Consider for example the genre of essay, which we tend to think as natural form of writing that always existed.

The essay is the default genre of academic writing universally accepted form of certification of authorship. The essay is so regularized and adapted that we are inclined to overlook that it “is a culturally specific form of communication which has not always existed, and which depends for its existence now on some quite definite institutional contexts” (Womack, 1993, 42). The fact that essay was just one of various forms used to assess student learning during early 18th century should not come to us as a surprise. What is more striking is that as time went by, it turned into the fundamental tool of assessment of student learning. Womack (1993) claims that the essay is so systematized universally that it permits only somebody to participate. Essay is organized in a way that it appears everybody can achieve it because it is “to be analytic up to a point, but it is not to subject the text to the inhuman mechanical analysis of the professional scholar; rather, it is to express the cultivated response of a man of taste” (p. 43). However, this is not the case most of the time, not all can partake in the genre, only a some of people can do it. “[T]he essay is a structurally contradictory sign: it has value both because it is universally human and because only

some of us can do it” (p. 46). Exigency for essays was related to separate the poor from the middle class.

The case of essay demonstrates that genres are cultural products that built in response to certain exigencies. Genre in this regard is a form of social action (Miller, 1984) that connects the intent and the outcome. This implies that when we learn to participate in a genre, we do not learn only methods to accomplish our ends. We learn, more importantly,

what ends we may have: we learn that we may eulogize, apologize, recommend one person to another, instruct customers on behalf of a manufacturer, take on an official role, account for progress in achieving goals. We learn to understand better the situations in which we find ourselves and the potential for failure and success in acting together. As a recurrent, significant action, a genre embodies an aspect of cultural rationality...for the student genres serve as keys to understanding how to participate in actions of a community. (Miller, 1984, 165)

To emphasize, understanding genres as rhetorical tools denotes that they are not only formalities one should follow, but also, they have effects on whoever joins. They are tools used to join in a cultural entity; in the academy they are means of joining in a research community. Take for example the crystallized form of student writing, doctoral dissertation, which addresses two major recurring needs among many others. First, it addresses the need to develop new researchers, and second to contribute to the body of knowledge that grows overtime in their respective disciplinary field. In this context, academic writing should never be seen a universal skill, but rather a collection of rhetorical and generic practices and habits that are specific to research cultures.

Research cultures are significant in rhetorical genre studies because the goal of candidate scholar is to join in a research community in the end. As I have indicated frequently, the success of graduate students is not only related to correct grammar,

spelling and styling. In fact, graduate students' success is much more related to the degree they adopt the rhetorical and generic nature of writing. Research cultures are consequences of repeated rhetorical actions of research communities. Therefore, the idea is worth further discussion.

Research communities or discourse communities indicate a group of individuals who practices parallel rhetorical moves and recurrent research and chases a mutual objective (Swales, 1990; Bizzel, 1992). Swales (1990, 24-27) suggests six features for these communities:

- i. A discourse community has a broadly agreed set of common public goals.
- ii. A discourse community has mechanisms of intercommunication among its members.
- iii. A discourse community uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback.
- iv. A discourse community utilizes and hence possess on or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims.
- v. In addition to owning genres, a discourse community has acquired some specific lexis.
- vi. A discourse community has a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discursual expertise.

The Frankfurt School and the Chicago School of Economics are two of the representative models of research communities. Joining in these communities, like any other, is related to the extent one adopts the rules, ideals, anticipations, forms and generic structures that are suitable to the community. These generic features define the borders of a discipline and regulate capability of someone for entering into the particular field. Disciplines are more about how to write rather what to write as Hyland notes, "while disciplines are defined by their writing, it is how they write rather than simply what they write that makes the crucial difference between them" (Hyland, 2004, p. 3). These remind us that writing is never a politically and culturally neutral practice but rather it is located in certain socio-cultural locations of academe. The political and cultural situatedness of writing is visible in the forms of genre

developed with time by research cultures to define the limits of sayable, thinkable, knowable, understandable and disseminatable. The following items are notions that genres work to conduct:

- ✂ Whether one's work is to be presented as a matter of arguing, describing, reporting.
 - ✂ What kinds of questions can and should be asked and how they should be phrased?
 - ✂ How data can or must be generated, justified, discussed, and interpreted.
 - ✂ What kinds of knowledge claims can be made, how, based on what kind of evidence?
 - ✂ What kind of purpose is appropriate to have in a given genre?
 - ✂ What rationale is deemed compelling for making a particular kind of contribution to knowledge?
 - ✂ Who can participate in a genre—who, for example, is asked to write a particular kind of literature review, treatment, or analysis of the literature in a field to define the lay of the land in a field?
 - ✂ How—with what kinds of methodologies—questions can be answered and how those methodologies must be justified, for example, in relation to what competing methodological assumptions?
 - ✂ What is appropriate to be said and in what order, what not?
 - ✂ How much and what kind of subjectivity (e.g., "I") writers can or should project in their writing?
 - ✂ What background knowledge will be assumed?
 - ✂ What aspects require elaboration and emphasis?
 - ✂ What kinds of knowledge claims can be made, how, based on what kind of evidence?
 - ✂ What constitutes appropriate evidence and how it is to be presented?
 - ✂ The extent to which knowledge claims must be qualified, how, and under what conditions?
 - ✂ That disciplinary orthodoxies participants must reproduce and which ones can be questioned?
 - ✂ What kind of knowledge can or must be included or excluded?
 - ✂ How sentences are to be constructed to facilitate particular kinds of knowledge work, for example, whether the passive voice is to be shunned in order to allow for deeper researcher reflection about epistemological assumptions underlying the work at hand or whether the passive voice is indeed the only acceptable way of advancing particular kinds of knowledge claims?
 - ✂ How readers are to be oriented, what kinds of logical connections between ideas are to be foregrounded or assumed?
 - ✂ What constitutes appropriate evidence and how it is to be presented?
- (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, pp. 77-79)

Genres and what they conduct are cultural formations addressing exigencies of discourse communities. In this regard, genres and writing by extension, is a political and an ideological practice. As Gunnarson, Linell, and Nordberg (1997) note, "[w]e must . . . ask ourselves not only how professional genres have been constructed but also for whom, for what needs and why they have been formed the way they are" (p. 3). Dissertation is such a construct expanded into sub or micro genres with respect academic discourse.

2.4 Academic discourse and graduate writing

The process of writing in the academe is narrowly related to and elegantly elaborated within the academic discourse. The success of students is deeply related to their internalization of academic discourse as resounded by Barholomae (1986, p.4).

Every time a student sits down to write for us, he has to invent the university for the occasion-invent the university, that is, or a branch of it, like History or Anthropology or Economics or English. He has to learn to speak our language, to speak as we do, to try on the peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define the discourse of our community.

By being appropriated by the academic discourse and “the knowledge and the powers it carries with it” (Foucault, 1972, 227), candidate scholars absorb and grasp the meaning of being a member of the academy, and what constitutes as good writing in their respective fields. The details and qualities of academic writing and its relation to academic discourse are beyond the scope of the present study. Yet, it is important to emphasize the academic discourse restraints and defines the context of doctoral writing, the routines of producing a dissertation, and in the end places dissertation in the broader scholarly and disciplinary context. In this regard, it is reasonable to go

over the main qualities of the academic discourse and how it impacts academic writing.

Traditionally academic discourse is comprehended as a way of thinking and speaking within the academe (Bizzel, 1992; Hyland, 2009). It has its exclusive linguistic characteristics, which students are expected internalize in order to socialize in the academia. Furthermore, academic discourse influences views and perspectives, its rules are embedded and it is exclusionary (El-Bezre, 2014, pp. 58-60). We have known since Foucault (1972, 1981, 1994) that a discourse is not just a matter of lexis, syntax, or textual qualities, but rather it has worldly impacts. It allows us to occupy certain subject positions, restricts us, governs us and permits us to speak. It influences and forms our perspectives and informs our actions. In a similar vein, the academic discourse transforms, bends, remakes our opinions and our identities (Bawarshi, 2003; Green, 2005; Ivanic, 1998).

While working on their graduate writing, student writers are absorbed into the academic discourse. The rules that beginners are anticipated to adapt are mainly perceived as ordinary, obvious and organic (Hyland, 2009; Lillis, 2001; Starke-Meyerring, 2011; Pare, 2002). These rules and their normalization extent intensely impact the process of writing. Starke-Meyerring (2011) mentions a “cloak of normalcy” to emphasize the “sociocultural situatedness of writing” (p. 79). These rules are presumed to be obscure, unanimous and regular. Nevertheless, if the cloak is detached, we can recognize that “what is normalized and appears universal to long-time members of a research culture is deeply culturally specific to that research culture and therefore new to doctoral students” (p. 79). Thus, the doctoral education should involve the introduction of these rules to the students. Else, students might fear of asking questions about their work, feel lacking and eventually get lost. In turn,

the cloak of normalcy operates as a mechanism of elimination that delimits students “to take a more active control over their meaning making and, hence, the voices they wish to make heard” (Lillis, 1997, p. 185).

Research suggests that students know there are rules that govern the academic writing, which they are not taught. This results to what Starke-Meyerring (2011) states as the paradox of writing in doctoral writing:

On the one hand, the discursive knowledge-making practices research cultures develop over generations to accomplish their knowledge work become normalized, transparent, invisible, and indeed appear universal to long-term members of research cultures, rendering writing a non-question. On the other hand, for newcomers, these very practices constitute new territory and a vital site of inquiry into how knowledge and researcher identities are produced and negotiated in these research cultures (p. 92).

Students are just anticipated to recognize rules of game and how to perform with these rules in spite of the fact that these rules are there to eliminate them to join the game and make them to feel as strangers. On the other hand, the accomplishment of students is profoundly reliant on allowing them to learn the rules of the game by providing of opportunities of learning.

2.5 Graduate writing

Doctoral dissertations are “the ultimate student paper” (Paré et al., 2010, p. 179) and the most crystallized forms of graduate writing. Despite its importance and overabundance within the academy, dissertation and thesis writing is insufficiently researched, and undervalued (Lundell & Beach, 2002; Pare, et. al., 2010). Similarly, Kamler and Thomson (2006, p. x) detect that there is a shortage of well-theorized material about the doctoral writing. They indicate “doctoral writing was a kind of present absence in the landscape of doctoral education. It was something that everyone worried about, but about which there was too little systematic debate and

discussion” (p. x). This results in students turning to self-help books and manuals for help.

These books predominantly combine suggestions on what to do and what not to do while writing. They offer recommendations about the organization, wording, and style for the ultimate paper., Glatthorn’s *Writing the Winning Dissertation: A Step-by-step Guide* is such book and offers students to:

- ❧ Use jargon with discrimination.
- ❧ Avoid fad expressions.
- ❧ Avoid colloquial expressions.
- ❧ Avoid the use of contractions.
- ❧ Avoid adjectival nouns.
- ❧ *Avoid the vague use of we and our.* (Italics in original text)
- ❧ *Avoid the second person you.* (Italics in original text)
- ❧ Avoid the sexist use of the masculine pronouns in referring to males and females. (1998, p. 121)

It is not that these suggestions might come in handy while writing, but these kinds of ‘writing up’ manuals tend to ignore the rhetorical and epistemic nature of dissertation and thesis writing.

The graduate writing is not simply a matter of ‘writing up.’ It contains complicated strategies (not tactics), rhetorical actions, and offsetting research as writing. Kamler and Thomson (2006, p. 4) draw attention to three essential troubles with the idea of ‘writing up’:

- ❧ ‘Writing up’ obscures the fact that doctoral writing is thinking.
- ❧ Writing up’ obscures the fact that producing a dissertation text is hard work.
- ❧ Writing up’ obscures the fact that doctoral writing is not transparent.

The notion of writing up basically disregards or slips that writing is a social practice, epistemic, and a way of making connections among cultures, ideas, and knowledge.

In broad terms, what this entails is that student academic writing, like all writing, is a social act. That is, student writing takes place within a particular

institution, which has a particular history, culture, values, practices. It involves a shift away from thinking of language or writing skills as individual possession, towards the notion of an individual engaged in socially situated action; from an individual student having writing skills, to a student doing writing in specific contexts. (Lillis, 2001: 31)

Conceptualizing writing as a social act is a mode of treating writing as a vibrant and evolving process that involves and entails persistent remaking, and thus apprehending its epistemic nature. To put in another way, writing is not something that scholars do at the end of the research but it is integrated to the research process through which thoughts, opinions and knowledge are grown and shaped. In fact, writing is a method to write; a technology to produce, create, discover, review, examine, try out, and construct ideas and knowledge. Therefore, it is not about writing up of opinions, thoughts produced elsewhere. It is itself generating and forming thoughts, opinions and knowledge i.e., it is epistemic: an approach mostly unnoticed and disregarded in the processes of graduate writing.

2.6 Quantifying the quality of graduate writing

Writing is a multifaceted process and its demands vary with respect to the genre. For example, literature texts may demand creativity whereas academic writing is primarily about abiding genre and discourse rules. Because of this, it is a demanding and a consuming process. In the case of graduate writing, the rules of genre are more critical due to the fact that the premier expectancy of graduate work is to abide rules, which are unknown to newcomers and uncharted territory for the majority of graduate students. Graduate students deal with many different aspects of graduate education and graduate writing while thesis writing. One of the important aspects of this process is the quality of the work developed, which is hard to quantify and measure, because of its complex nature (Çelik, 2020).

In the context of the present study, quality is investigated in terms of two parameters: originality and plagiarism. Originality is so critical in graduate writing that according to written and unwritten rules students ought to make claim about their original contribution in their scholarly work. Originality is where the writer claims her work's legitimacy, exigency, and her contribution of meaningful knowledge to existing knowledge. As one might expect, it is hard to measure originality since the concept is inherently a qualitative one. Yet, with the help of plagiarism detection software (PDS), it is possible to get a quantitative indicator of originality. Turnitin, iThenticate, Viper, PlagAware, and CheckForPlagiarism are some of the well-known and widely-used detection software. Typically, PDS produces a ratio named similarity index used to estimate the authenticity of a written work. Ratio is basically an estimate of how the detected work is similar to the existing works. The ratio is interpreted as likely original if it is below the pre-determined threshold ratio, and doubtful if it is above the pre-determined threshold ratio. It should be noted that there is no consensus on the proper threshold ratio. Some researchers use 3% (Martin et al., 2011), some use 5% (Garden, 2009) and some use 10% (Bretag and Mahmut) as threshold. The consensus ratio for thesis and dissertations written in Turkey is 20% per Higher Education Council. The present study uses 15% threshold to make a distinction between potentially unoriginal and original work.

The other parameter of quality brought under the lenses in this study is plagiarism generally used as a "metaphor for the academic offence of the theft of another scholar's work and its representation as one's own" (Walker, 1998, 89). Especially with the rise of internet, plagiarism has become a common problem in academia across the world universities (Neville, 2010; Zhang, 2016). Conceptually speaking, plagiarism has different types with respect to the type of misconduct and its

level. Walker (1998, 103) offers seven types of plagiarism. The first is called “sham paraphrasing” indicating the verbatim copy of the text but referred as paraphrased. The second is called “illicit paraphrasing” denoting paraphrasing without crediting. Third one is called “other paraphrasing” designating duplication of material with the consent of the owner. The fourth one is called “verbatim copying” meaning exact copying without crediting. The fifth one is called “recycling” referring the use of same materials more than once for different purposes. The sixth one is called “ghost writing” indicating having a third-party person to write the material and use as his/her own. The last type is called purloining denoting copying the material without the permission of the owner.

Apart from these conceptual distinctions, plagiarism can also be classified with respect to extent of the copied material. Ison (2012) offers a distinction based on the dimension of plagiarized text. Accordingly, plagiarism can happen in three dimensions. The first one is called low-level plagiarism encompassing quantitatively low amount of copying. The medium-level plagiarism is the second dimension involving sentence-level plagiarism. And the last dimension is called high-level plagiarism denoting paragraph-level plagiarism. The present study inquires only high-level plagiarism, meaning that findings are only about this level.

The detection of plagiarism is an exhausting process requiring a thorough examination via PDS. As products of recent technological innovations, plagiarism detection software has quickly turned into a normative academic tool used to examine the originality and authenticity of written material. In its simplest sense, the tool looks for textual matches between investigated material and the material its existing repository. As an end result, the tool highlights matched sections and provide a ratio called similarity index. The index is an indicator of originality as noted, but not

precise evidence of plagiarism. Just as a ratio below the preset threshold does not mean plagiarism-free, a ratio above pre-determined threshold does not mean plagiarized material. For a true verdict, the highlighted sections must be carefully examined for misconduct.



CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study is two-phased research. The first phase addresses the quality of theses and dissertations by using quantitative methods, whereas the second phase deals with the discourse of academic writing and the experiences of graduate students and advisors/supervisors of writing process. It would be convenient to consider this study as consisting of two research projects that are related, not a mixed method study. Phases are detailed below.

3.1 Phase I

The first phase of the study investigates the quality of theses and dissertations written in the field of educational studies in Turkey with respect to two parameters; originality and plagiarism.

3.1.1 Design

This phase is descriptive and quantifies the quality of theses and dissertations by using plagiarism detection software. Plagiarism detection software are programs either running locally or online, that detects the submitted document for its similarity to millions of documents. When finishing the detection, the program returns a percentage of similarity. It is these percentages that I use to evaluate the quality of theses and dissertations. Similarity index is a percentage that hints how original research is and the likelihood of plagiarism. The higher the percentage is the less original the work is. The critical percentage is 15, which means that if a study has a

higher rate than 15, its quality is in serious concerns and it should be carefully evaluated for plagiarism. Note that, the primary purpose of this study is not to investigate whether sampled works are plagiarized but rather to determine how original the sample is. It should also be noted that 15% is not an indication of plagiarism. There could be works that have higher percentages than 15, yet are not plagiarized. And there could be works that have smaller percentages than 15, yet are plagiarized. In the course of this study, it is assumed that works that have an index higher than 15, are not original and of good quality. It should be noted that there is no clear percentage of threshold used to determine originality and plagiarism. It varies with respect to researchers and institutions. For example, as noted earlier, peer-review studies basically use 10% and lower thresholds, and some institutions, like Higher Education Council in Turkey use 20%. This study used 15%, because it was a number close to both percentages.

3.1.2 Phase I research questions

This phase deals with the quality of theses and dissertations. It answers to the question of what does the overall state of theses and dissertations tell us about the quality of academic writing in Turkey. In relation to this, the sub-problems are as follows:

1. What is the similarity index of theses and dissertations written in the field of educational studies?
2. Is there a meaningful difference between theses and dissertations written at public universities and those written at private universities in terms of similarity index?

3. Is there a meaningful difference between theses and dissertations written in Turkish and those written in English in terms of similarity index?
4. Is there a meaningful difference between theses and dissertations in terms of similarity index?
5. What are the implications of the state of theses and dissertation written in the field of educational studies with regard to the quality of academic writing in Turkey?

3.1.3 Population and sample

The population of this study is dissertations and theses written in the field of educational studies between 2007 and 2015. This study started in 2016, which is the reason for including theses and dissertations written up to 2015. Among these studies, there are 17648 theses and dissertations that are open to access at the Higher Education Council National Theses Center. For this study, 95% confidence level and -4, 4 confidence intervals have been chosen. Accordingly, the sample size needs to be 581. In the end 600 theses and dissertations are included in the study. Table 2 shows the distribution of the sample. 130 doctoral dissertations and 470 masters' theses are included in the study. 89 of the sample is written in English, whereas the rest is in Turkish.

Table 2. The Distribution of Theses and Dissertations

	Dissertations	Theses
Turkish	96	415
English	34	55
Total	130	470

3.1.4 Procedure

After the sample size determined, the individual theses and dissertations were randomly selected across each year. The selected works were downloaded to the computer and were given a unique identity number. Then individual files were uploaded to Turnitin after the removal of identity revealing pages. After the upload, each file was examined one by one. During this process, it was aimed to reach the most accurate similarity index. For this, each match within each individual file was carefully reviewed and irrelevant matches were excluded from the calculation of similarity index. Irrelevant matches are twofold. First, a writer, after finishing her theses or dissertation, could opt to publish a chapter from her work, which in turn causes the work to have a higher similarity index. The other irrelevant matching case is the matches with the works published after the original work. For example, a thesis published in 2008 could match a document published 2012 since Turnitin does not make any such differentiation. Such matches are excluded from the calculation of similarity index. This picking through process lasted for three months. Once the process completed two similarity index rates were acquired from the Turnitin. The first one was the straight similarity index that included the whole theses or dissertations. The second rate was obtained by excluding bibliography of the theses and block quotes within the body of the theses. These two similarity index numbers were used coded onto SPSS and used for the analyses.

Plagiarism detection was different than similarity. By utilizing similarity report returned by Turnitin, all of the individual matches in each of the document were carefully examined for misconduct and improper referencing. The documents that had a high-level of plagiarism was coded onto SPSS and used for analyses.

3.1.5 Data analysis

Data is analyzed by using SPSS. Means, frequencies and independent sample t-test are used for the analysis.

3.2 Phase II

The second phase of this study, which is an exploratory investigation, inquires the experiences and opinions of graduate students, and advising practices and opinions of advisors regarding thesis writing.

3.2.1 Design

The second phase of the study is the qualitative portion of the study. In this exploratory phase, data is collected through in-depth interviews and analyzed by content-analysis.

3.2.2 Phase II research questions

This phase deals with the experiences and perceptions of academic writing of graduate students and advisors. In relation to this, the question is as follows:

1. How do supervisors and graduate students of education elaborate and experience the discourse of academic writing?

3.2.3 Participants

The study's focus of inquiry is academic writing in the field of educational studies at the master of arts and the doctoral level. In this sense, the population of this study was graduate students of educational studies, and advisors/supervisors. It should be noted that advisors and students were not a pair. They were totally unrelated.

Sampling of this study was selected purposefully and conveniently. The sample of the study was selected among the graduate students who were in the process of writing their theses or dissertations. Advisors were selected if they were advising at the time of interviews conducted.

Table 3 shows the distribution of graduate participants. 24 graduate students (8 from doctoral students and 16 MA students) were included in the study.

Table 3. Graduate Participants

Graduate Level	Number
Masters	8
Doctoral	16
Total	24

Table 4 displays the distribution of advisors with respect to their titles. Accordingly, 12 advisors/supervisors (4 professors, 3 associate professors, 5 assistant professors) were included as participants.

Table 4. Advisors' Distribution per Title.

Title	Number
Assist. Prof.	5
Assoc. Prof.	3
Prof.	4
Total	12

3.2.4 Data collection

The source of data is in-depth interviews conducted with the supervisors and students inquiring their perceptions of academic writing and experiences of writing process. For the interviews, two open-ended interview forms were used, developed for students and advisors separated. The forms were developed to include related categories of writing and advising processes. These categories were the backbone of the data-analysis. Forms were developed by utilizing relevant literature. Once developed, they were sent out to two experts for their opinions. After receiving feedback, forms were tested in two interviews, which were not used in the analysis. After test interviews, forms took its final form (Appendix A). Face-to-face interviews used to collect to data. Interviews lasted between 30-45 minutes.

3.2.5 Procedure

Once ethics approval acquired from ethics committee (Appendix C), participants were recruited on the basis of voluntariness. Research aims, procedures, and participants' right to withdraw from the study at any stage were carefully explained. Participants were given consent forms and asked to sign. Interviews lasted 30-45 minutes and audio-recorded. No names were used due to confidentiality concerns, names were coded to protect the identity of participants during the analysis.

3.2.6 Data analysis

Data analysis method used in this study is constant-comparison method which is used to identify emerging themes within data through five sequential steps (Nevra-Seggie, 2007 Strauss, 1987). These steps are data organization, constant-comparison, integration of categories, delimiting and theory writing (Nevra-Seggie, 2007, 67).

Data organization includes reading and re-reading data to become familiar and to get ready data for analysis. Constant-comparison stage is coding incidents (statements, sentences or paragraphs) using different colors into possible categories. In this stage every time an incident coded, it also is compared “with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category” (Glaser, and Strauss, 1967, 106, cited in Nevra-Seggie, 2007, 67). The third stage is integration of categories to develop a ‘bigger story.’ The fourth stage is called delimiting the theory in which the researcher to determine the relation between emerged categories and research questions. Finally, the last stage is called writing theory including presenting findings with respect to themes and questions. The data is analyzed by using computer software called MAXQDA.

The analysis process started with the transcription of interviews. After three through readings of the data, it was uploaded to MAXQDA. Since the interview forms had their own categories, these categories were used for the analysis. Categories were defined to the program, and the data was coded with respect to these categories. Some categories were eliminated while some were merged.

Meanwhile, intercoders were requested to code 60% of the data. After receiving coded incidents of intercoders codes were finalized and the eventual coded segments were emerged. The coded segments were taken out of the whole data and incidents were coded in to categories. Categories were used to develop the overall story of the data. And finally, these categories were organized and classified to determine the relation between categories and research questions. Codebook (Appendix D) and coded excerpts (Appendix E) are presented in the appendix section.

3.2.7 Inter-coder reliability

Validity and reliability are important issues in qualitative research as much as quantitative studies. In qualitative studies inter-coder reliability is used establish rapport and trustworthiness of findings., which is basically checking coding consistency across different coders.

To test inter-coder reliability, two colleagues were requested to code the sample documents, which included 60% of the organized data. The coded incidents of three coders were compared to determine the stability of coding. Results revealed that coders were in consistent agreement in the coding.

CHAPTER 4

ORIGINALITY AND PLAGIARISM FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings related the quality of thesis and dissertations examined in the study. The quality examination was done with respect to two parameters: similarity index and plagiarism. The threshold used for the originality index was 15%. A thesis which had a similarity index above the indicated threshold was deemed to have originality issues, whereas a below index was considered to be original.

4.1 Demographics

This section presents findings related to overall characteristics of texts examined. Table 5 summarizes examined texts per text type. Accordingly, the percentage of thesis examined is 78.3 (n = 470) and the percentage of dissertations is 21.7 (n = 130).

Table 5. Text Types

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Thesis	470	78.3	78.3	78.3
Dissertation	130	21.7	21.7	100
Total	600	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 presents sample's distribution with respect to university type. Accordingly, 79.5% (n=477) of the analyzed documents were written at public universities, whereas 20.5% (n = 123) of documents were produced at private universities.

Table 6. University Types

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public	477	79.5	79.5	79.5
Private	123	20.5	20.5	100
Total	600	100.0	100.0	

Documents analyzed in this study were also classified with respect to language in which they were written. Table 7 summarizes related findings.

Accordingly, 85.2% (n = 511) of documents were written in Turkish and 14.8% (n = 89) of documents were in English.

Table 7. Text Language

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Turkish	511	85.2	85.2	85.2
English	89	14.8	14.8	100
Total	600	100.0	100.0	

4.2 Originality Findings

The section presents findings related to originality of documents. Findings of the study indicated that the mean similarity index for the sample was 25.58 with a standard deviation of 11.58. Table 8 outlines these findings which imply that there were originality issues with thesis and dissertations examined in the scope of this study.

Table 8. Overall Index

	n	Mean	SD	SE
Similarity Index	600	28.58	11.58	.4728

Furthermore, in order to analyze whether the found mean was different from the threshold, one-sample t-test was conducted. Table 9 shows that that similarity index of the sample was significantly higher than the threshold value, 15.

Table 9. One-sample Test of Similarity Index

	Test value= 15					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95%Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Similarity Index	28.725	599	.000	13.580	12.65	14.51

Table 10 presents similarity index of analyzed documents with respect to text type. The mean index of thesis was 29.44 with a standard deviation of 11.48 and the mean index of dissertations was found to be 25.46 with a standard deviation of 11.44.

Table 10. Similarity Index per Text Type

	Text Type	n	Mean	SD	SE
Similarity Index	Thesis	480	29.44	11.48	.53
	Dissertation	130	25.46	11.44	1.003

Table 11 presents similarity index of analyzed documents with respect to university type. The mean index of manuscripts produced at public universities was 27.88 with a standard deviation of 11.44 and the mean index of documents written at private universities was found to be 31.28 with a standard deviation of 11.76.

Table 11. Similarity Index per University Types

	Uni. Type	n	Mean	SD	SE
Similarity Index	Public	477	27.88	11.44	.52
	Private	123	31.28	11.76	1.06

Table 12 presents similarity index of analyzed documents with respect to language of the manuscripts. The mean index of documents written in Turkish was 29.31 with a standard deviation of 11.52 and the mean index of documents written in English was found to be 24.37 with a standard deviation of 10.97.

Table 12. Similarity Index per Language

	Language	n	Mean	SD	SE
Similarity Index	Turkish	511	29.31	11.54	.51
	English	89	24.37	10.97	1.16

Table 13 shows group differences with respect to similarity index of the sample. Accordingly, the similarity index of thesis ($n = 470$, $\bar{X} = 29.45$, $sd = 11.48$) was significantly higher than the similarity index of dissertations ($n = 130$, $\bar{X} = 25.46$, $sd = 11.43$, $p < .000$). The similarity index of manuscripts produced at public universities ($n = 477$, $\bar{X} = 29.89$, $sd = 11.44$) was not different from the similarity index of manuscripts produced at private universities ($n = 123$, $\bar{X} = 31.28$, $sd = 11.76$, $p = .232$). Lastly, the similarity index of documents written in Turkish ($n = 511$, $\bar{X} = 29.31$, $sd = 11.54$) was significantly higher than the similarity index of documents written in English ($n = 89$, $\bar{X} = 24.37$, $sd = 10.98$, $p < .000$).

Table 13. Group Differences

		N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Std Error Diff.	t	p	Confidence Interval	
								Low	Up
Text Type	Thesis	470	29.45	11.48	1.137	3.51	.000	1.757	6.223
	Dissertation	130	25.46	11.43					
University Type	Public	477	29.89	11.44	1.164	1.195	.232	-3.676	0.896
	Private	123	31.28	11.76					
Language	Turkish	511	29.31	11.54	1.316	3.753	.000	2.354	7.526
	English	89	24.37	10.98					

4.3 Plagiarism findings

This section summarizes findings related to plagiarized documents among the sample. It is worth noting that the findings include only high-level plagiarism. Table 14 shows the number of thesis and dissertations that have high-level plagiarism. Accordingly, 34.5% ($n = 207$) of the sample have high-level plagiarism, whereas the rest is inconclusive because no check was made.

Table 14. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Obv. Plag.	207	34.5	34.5	34.5
Inconclusive	393	65.5	65.5	100
Total	600	100.0	100.0	

Table 15 presents plagiarized material with respect to university type.

According to findings, 72.5% (n=150) of plagiarized documents had been written at public universities. This meant that 31.4% of thesis and dissertations produced at public universities had high-level plagiarism. 27.5% (n=57) of plagiarized documents were written at private universities. This meant that 46.3% of thesis and dissertations written at private universities were plagiarized at a high-level.

Table 15. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism per University Type

Uni. Type	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public	150	72.5	72.5	72.5
Private	57	27.5	27.5	100
Total	207	100.0	100.0	

Table 16 shows the distribution of plagiarized material with respect to text type. According to findings, the percentage of thesis among the plagiarized material was 83.6 (n=173), which meant 36.8% of the thesis were plagiarized at a high-level. The percentage of dissertations of among the plagiarized material was 16.4 (n=34), which meant 26.2% of the dissertations examined in this study were highly plagiarized.

Table 16. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism per Text Type

Text. Type	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Thesis	173	83.6	83.6	83.6
Dissertation	34	16.4	16.4	100
Total	207	100.0	100.0	

Table 17 shows the number of dissertations and thesis with high-level plagiarism with respect the language they were written in. Accordingly, the percentage of plagiarized sample written in Turkish was 87.9 (n=182), which meant 35.6% of the material written in Turkish were plagiarized at a high-level. The

percentage of plagiarized sample written in English was 12.1 (n=25), which meant 28.1% of the material written in English were plagiarized at a high-level.

Table 17. Number of Texts with High-level Plagiarism per Language

Language	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Turkish	182	87.9	87.9	87.9
English	25	12.1	12.1	100
Total	207	100.0	100.0	

CHAPTER 5

ADVISORS' ADVICES

This chapter deals with the opinions, beliefs and advising practices of advisors regarding graduate writing. In this regard, 12 in-depth interviews were conducted with 4 professors, 3 associate professors and 5 assistant professors. The data indicated two major themes and 11 related categories. These two themes are writing ideas, and advising practice. In what follows, I present findings related to these themes. Figure 2 demonstrates the coded segments with respect to categories. Categories related to writing ideas were writing-research connection, definitions, features, writing education, and change wanted. Categories related to advising practice were feedback, key issues in theses, ways of advice, role of juries, workload, and bureaucracy. Among the coded segments, research-writing connection, writing education, feedback and key issues in theses were stood out, meaning that participants were contemplated the most on these categories. Equally important was participants limited articulation of definition and features of academic writing.




Figure 2. Coded Segments (Advisors)

5.1 Writing ideas

In this section, I present advisors' understanding and articulation of academic writing. I firstly go over advisors' opinions of academic writing and the relationship between writing and research and the I investigate their ideas regarding writing education. The primary goal of this section is to examine advisors' understanding of academic writing by contemplating on the questions related to academic writing. What do they understand from academic writing? How do they define and articulate it? Do they see a connection between writing and research? What type of a relation do they see between writing and research? How do they relate the two? What do they think about the writing education? How their program does help students to develop writing skills, if it does at all? It seemed important to question advisors' ideas of academic writing because their understanding potentially could influence their advising. Therefore, it is only logical to start with advisors' ideas of academic writing.

5.1.1 Definition and features

I here present advisors' definitions of academic writing, features of academic writing and the connection between writing and research.

To start with the definitions, it should be noted that I was not seeking the correct definition of academic writing and whether the advisors know it but rather I am interested to understand how do they express their definition and what does seem important to them. What is the most striking in definitions is that advisors could not bring forth a clear definition and their articulation academic writing is very limited.

Academic writing is not a emotional action, and academic writing is not, as I said, written to show off. (AssistProf-1)

Academic writing should reflect the process well, if I put it in one word. It is supposed to explain what it is doing in the most economical way, and it shouldn't leave [reader] in the dark, it should not make one to say why this is so? Or a second thing: it should not make one to say what it means here. Then, It's a good academic product. (AssistProf-2)

So, it needs to be put somewhere between not using very sharp language and using very soft language, the author should not be too sharp. Because it may not be possible to find solid evidence, that is why very sharp results are not wise in this respect. Very soft results also are against the nature of research. (Assist Prof-3)

What is academic writing? The academic writing is to present the literature, findings, and conclusion to the public in an understandable language while taking into account the public interest. (AssocProf-1).

Academic writing is a matter of patience. It's a very serious job that can't be written too much. For one thing, it requires a very good reading. I mean, maybe if you read 40 or 50 articles, you'd be able to write something really qualified. That's why it's serious business. It's not an easy job, so I don't know what else to say. (AssistPro-3).

Academic writing in general is to produce flawless text that can be proved academically by using the existing academic background in any subject (Prof-1)

Apart from the limited articulations, the common theme appears in definitions is the 'rules' that one is supposed to follow while producing an academic text.

It parallel to 'what is science?' We can say that it is a writing technique based on a certain methodology. We can call it the analysis of the data that is

employed by a certain method and reporting [analysis] as a result (AssocProf-2).

(i) Basing on a certain method, (ii) necessarily basing on analysis. At least I look at it as educational science, although I do not say proofs and proofs that will increase the validity and reliability of that analysis, I speak qualitatively (AssocProf-3).

Academic writing is an issue that has been raised in Turkey in recent years. In other words, it is a whole set of rules about which rules should be followed while doing a study, writing an article and preparing a thesis in any field (Prof-2).

So, I think academic writing has a format. So, the format of a thesis and the format of an article are the same. It's the same in a proceeding. So, there is a summary, a name and a purpose. One... So, they all have the same format, but the thesis is broader, more detailed, and if you found a single result from there, it's reduced to 10 pages, but the format is the same. So as... I don't see any difference (Prof-3).

What is common among these definitions is the idea of rules. It should be noted that these are only selected excerpts. The emphasis on the rules to follow is a common understanding.

This conceptualization of writing effectively translates that making sure their advisees follow the same rules is the core of their advising practice. This notion of the rules is also echoed in their understanding of features of academic writing. These rules are sometimes structural ones which are also reiterated in many theses writing guides.

Now academic writing has a once-in-a-kind feature. What are those? The problem is once, that is, a problem sentence needs to be seen, a method must be specified, that those problems, its sub-problems need to be written. The design must be specified according to the method. Then the findings, data, assumptions, limitations, premises and consequent conclusions and recommendations need to be constructed (AssocProf-2).

Sometimes they are about the referencing systems.

So it's not like writing a professional or, I don't know, an essay. There are rituals and rules. There's a way of citation. Sometimes it can be boring. It can

be exhausting, it can be daunting, but it has something that is set in the general passing rules (Assist-Pro-2).

A similar observation is made by other participants in a more informative way.

Another issue is whether it follows the rules. You know, there are a number of rules, APA, Chicago MLA-- which is mostly dominated by sociologists -- that I used to use a Chicago MLA because my mentor was a sociologist in my student years. Then I started using a lot of APA in training. And those rules did not come to be from night to morning, but if you've got a writing from somewhere, you're going to show me the source. I think an academic text should follow these rules. (Prof-2).

Sometimes these rules are rhetorical.

I got my Master's degree at a university that has francophone tendencies, and my PhD at a university that has American tendencies. The difference between the two: long and polished sentences in the French system, are expected as accepted in our Turkish, [whereas] in the American system it is said that the best sentence is the shortest and most concise one. So, they [those who are coming from an American tradition] say, for example, do not force into three-line sentence for what we, we describe it in a three-line sentence in French, and divide it by half or three. Therefore, it recommends using short and understandable sentences, a waxed language, a clear language (AssistProf-5).

I understand the quality of the article. So, it's not going to be like it is telling a story. It must have a basis; it must be based on observation and research. The paragraph must be solid. A paragraph has the main idea and helpful ideas, it has messages. These should be written down. You have to support the end with research. In English, the rules of this are very clear. Each paragraph is a text in which an idea is expressed. There's a main idea there, and there's side ideas. You write something down, and then you show your support there. In Turkish, the rules are not so known and unclear. Sometimes there's more than one idea in a paragraph, sometimes there's no support, no evidence. That's why sometimes I get bored reading Turkish texts. It's a mess, and you're losing it. There's no integrity. It's not nice to say this either, but unfortunately, I often encounter it (Prof-2).

And sometimes they are about authorial (non)presence.

Now let me put it this way: (1) The work of the student or the work done by the teacher itself. This can be qualitative, quantitative. It could be a study done in different ways. (2) The second leg is to report this, i.e., to turning it into text. What we call academic writing is that it deals with the latter more. Using objective language, avoiding subjective expressions, necessarily citing any information you use - if you have benefited from a source - evaluating the existing literature, before you because someone has said something about it [the problem]. It includes a series of activities such as taking them wrong or right and discussing them, evaluating them, comparing your results with their results, and all this as a result... How can I say this? It involves using

objective language to make it into text not causing any different understandings. (Prof-4).

This excerpt is interesting because it makes a distinction between research and writing and it also reiterates structural qualities of the majority of theses and dissertation analyzed in the first phase of this study, where the authorial presence is very limited, distant and the author abstains from making claims. The distinction between writing and research as two separate processes is particularly important because it is a point that I specifically inquire about.

5.1.2 Writing-research connection

In this part, the aim is to capture advisors' perception with regard to the connection between writing and research, and the place of writing in the research process.

Findings indicate two major understanding of the place of writing in the research process. The first group perceives writing as an activity carried out at the end of research process which is evident from the following excerpts.

I'll put it on the last step. I'd honestly look at it as a process of making meaningful. Let me call it as the final version of a step. You write, and once it's printed, we think it's. . . That's a little bit of a cd of the sound artist. That's what happens to us (AssocProf-2).

The relationship between them is one of the last steps of the other. There are two possibilities that you do research. Either you present it as a proceeding, followed by full text or the articling process (AssocProf-3)

I don't think there's a direct link between writing and doing research, but good research, a good academic, is also a good writer. So, s/he may be a good researcher, but if s/he can't write it down, a good researcher can't be a good academic (AssistProf-5)

No one-on-one connection. You're doing research. You're going to have to write this down later. At least in our areas, if good research o isn't well written, if it's not expressed, it's going to take a lot out of its value. (AsissProf-3)

This group tends to articulate writing as an activity done in the end, which is basically about reporting the findings. The second group articulates writing as a part of the research process, not only as something done in the end but also as something done throughout the whole process.

In my opinion, writing should not be left to the end. It should be continued continuously during the thesis and research process. So, the writing has to continue by writing whatever the task is. It is not absolutely necessary to leave the writing work to the end (AssistProf-4).

Good, yes, that's a good question. So writing is an important action, when you consider the process when we are doing research, it does not make writing at the end, if it is wise, it spreads writing to every stage of its research. (AssistProf-5)

As evident, these participants see writing as an activity done throughout the research process, which sounds as a tactic rather than an epistemic move. The following and, the only, participant raises epistemic concerns regarding writing.

There is a one-to-one connection between writing in educational sciences or psychological counseling or developmental psychology. You can't really construct that research without writing, writing is a thought tool. . . Maybe that may not be the case for engineers, but it's not the area where we, especially me, work, so writing, writing and reading a lot helps.... It is necessary to read a lot, write a lot and research a lot in order to produce new knowledge. (AssistProf-2)

It's all about writing. Almost, you know, because you have to write when you're editing research. It's the most important part of collecting data, i.e. writing it. So is designing, but it's also with writing, so when you're writing it, you're writing it at the same time (AssistProf-2)

Evidently, this advisor makes robust connection between writing and research in that she sees research as writing. Moreover, she perceives writing as a thinking tool and a knowledge production mechanism.

5.1.3 Writing education

Findings of the phase I of this study make it clear that students have great difficulty in basic writing moves like paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting, taking an authorial

stance and developing a writer identity. Therefore, it seems key to understand what kind of a formation do these students get during their graduate education.

To simply put, no advisor mentions a course or program dedicated to academic writing. They tend to think that research methods course is a writing course.

No writing is not taught. he's not training. I assign homework to prepare [students] in this regard, but there are no courses (AssistProf-2).

That's what all our courses are about. Academic writing.... We have method courses. We go into the topic of how to write the thesis in method courses (AsistProf-3).

There's a seminar class in master's programs. I do not know how much the student can write as part of the seminar course (AssocProf-1).

As far as they see in the courses on research methods (AssocProf-2).

But there are assumptions that the graduate education ought to contribute their writing skills. When asked whether their graduate program contributes students' writing skills:

It's happening. I'll at least tell you from my own class (Prof-1).

Here's what's happening, we want them to write articles or write thesis proposals during the course phase. That's when they're writing something. So they're building something, and we're seeing the techniques of building it. In this sense, it contributes (AssocProf-3).

I think it's definitely happening because in our courses, our faculty members often ask students to summarize what they're reading, to write. They can ask them to write something new, make it neat, or something. In that respect, I think there are enough tasks to write, so I know a lot of our friends because. Such tasks happen in lessons. (AssistProf-5).

Even though there is no writing course, advisors are convinced that their program helps students in developing writing skills. Moreover, they simply assume that students know how to write.

We don't look at whether they know how to write when we admit students in the program. We assume they do. There may be surprises, but that's the assumption (Prof-1).

Because of this assumption, writing education seems unnecessary.

We don't have that lesson, and I don't want it to happen because the program is already deliberate and loaded. And I think the candidate should have solved that problem by the time he gets there. So, the student who comes to the master's level shouldn't have that problem. Otherwise, there are other shortcomings. Which one are you going to fix, which one are you going to complete? (Prof-1).

It is not that all advisors think similarly but this excerpt is exemplary because of the assumptions it makes. It is a general tendency in academia to assume that students know how to write if they are at the graduate level.

In this section, I presented advisors' perception with regard to academic writing, the connection between writing and research, and writing education.

Advisors generally put writing into words as an activity that has a set of rules to be followed, allows limited authorial presence, is comprised of an objective and distance stance, and is carried out at the end of research process for reporting the findings. As I claimed earlier, advisors' perceptions of academic writing can potentially affect their advising practices, which I investigate in the following section.

5.2 Advising practices

This section is about the advising practices of advisors. The aim is to capture perceptions of advisors with regard to the elements of advising and to understand their advising experiences. These elements are workload, key issues in theses, ways of advising, feedback, perceptions of bureaucratic requirements, and function of juries.

5.2.1 Workload

Findings here are about the time dedicated to graduate students by advisors. In general advisors are overwhelmed due various roles that they have to play. They have a wide work range conducting different roles. The interviews make clear that advisors

especially those who work at a private university have extreme difficulty in finding appropriate time for graduate students because of the extreme work roles and duties.

In the Turkish education system, just as students have some fatigue and attrition that come with being subjected to too much exams, we, as faculty members, can spend maybe half, maybe a quarter, of the time we can normally do and allocate, when we take on the role of advisor, especially in private universities, due to the course load and similar responsibilities (AssistProf-1).

This revelation by an advisor is exemplary in the sense that it speaks for the majority of advisors. In the most cases, advisors find very little time to conduct their advising roles despite the fact that they devote much of their time to graduate students.

I mean, I'd probably say 60% to 70%. (AssocProf-2).

More than 50% of time to undergraduate students. Mainly master's and doctorate (AssocProf-3).

Another striking issue is the number of theses and dissertation that they have advised.

I am 52 years old and have graduated between 35 and 40 graduate and doctoral students (AssosProf-2).

I think it's over 10 one way or another. 10 to 15 may have happened there (AssistProf-3)

These numbers and time dedicated to advising should have effects on their advising practices which I examine in the following sections.

5.2.2 Key issues in theses

In this section, I present findings with regard to perceived key issues in theses by advisors. The aim is to capture what do advisors consider important in theses. The issues that are central to advisors' articulations are originality authorship, and methodological-structural qualities. Ironically, the lack of these issues in theses and dissertations are among the key findings of the phase I of this study.

Originality is one of the key features that advisors think that a thesis must have.

Did he pursue a question that had never been asked before? Is it a repetition of previous thesis or a new question, so does it add something new to this field? And that's usually the question we ask the student the most. So, what do you plan to add to this field? How's this going to work out for you? An original study? Does he contribute to the field? I'm looking at that. Other than that, what are the scientific methods he follows? You know, a thesis based on application or a theoretical thesis? If he had an analysis, did the student do the analysis himself, or did he get the analysis with help from a different place? I try to pay attention to these issues (AssocProf-3)

This articulation is exemplary in the sense that this is a common concern among advisors. The original contribution of the work done is a must-have quality in graduate works. In fact, each thesis and dissertation have a specific section devoted to discuss the contribution.

The things I pay attention to in the theses; Why is this research important? How is it important to contribute to the field? Why is it important in terms of contributing to literature? What's he aiming for? And how is the method established? I'll focus on that. At the same time, after the analysis process, was he able to discuss what he cared about and intended, especially in the discussion part? He couldn't argue? I care about this (AssocProf-1).

A similar sentiment made by another advisor echoes similar concerns. Apart from the concern of originality, the common issue here is methodological and structural concerns. Right of after articulations of originality, both advisors draw attention to the methodological and structural qualities of the graduate work, which is also another central theme raised by almost all of the advisors.

Does he know the method? Is he aware of the thesis writing techniques, scientific research methods first? What method are we going to detect? Does he know what it's like to work with that method? Then how much he knows about the thesis writing techniques. If there is not enough equipment for them, they will also be able to learn them: by going to the courses by asking me or the literature or other professors. So go close the gap there. Come back later. Especially if there is still such a shortage in the PhD stage, for example, how to do a case study? We have professors who teach about it. We would like to look at the competence of the method, scientific writing techniques (AssocProf-2).

It's about everything... So, was the problem sentence written? Have there been any underlying problems? Is the method appropriate? Has the design been

properly identified? What he cited as qualitative and quantitative research method can really explain the subject... What, you know, is the tone used correctly? Is it writing according to the format requested by the institute, so whatever needs to be examined, the literature is adequately looked at, i.e. the sources are looked at, are the quotation techniques correct? Whatever comes to mind (AssocProf-3).

First of all, the purpose of the name, its compatibility, purpose, problem, sub-problems and methods of measurement tools, and the result is very important (Prof-2).

The theme of methodological and structural qualities is a recurring theme which is an expected outcome. According the advisors, the foremost requirement of a thesis is that it must show these qualities. Even though advisors are not aware, these qualities are genre-specific qualities of Turkish graduate writing which seems to be a factor in producing non-original and plagiarized works as is evident from the phase I of the present study. In this genre, the authorship does not seem to be an issue which also echoed by some participants.

Cut copy, especially in the literature section, my uncle goes takes from Mr. Ali, puts it in. Okay, he's giving me his tag [reference], and I'm not objecting. That's not.... Then From Mr. Veli, then Mr. Abbas, Mr. Hasan, Mr. Mehmet, Ms. Ayşe, ,Fatma. Cut copy, cut copy, so you... Where are you? Where are you, where are you? Whose thesis is this? Come on, look, it's partly ok in MA level, but I as mentioned earlier, the doctoral thesis, and the reason I sent this thesis back is because it's not student's enough, obviously (AssocProf-1).

One of the key findings from the previous phase of this study is lack of authorship which is also articulated by this advisor. What this advisor observes is actually a common theme in theses and dissertations examined in the Phase I. Especially introduction and literature chapters of theses and dissertations are collages where it is hard to observe any authorship moves and argumentation. Theses and dissertations do not argue and make claims.

5.2.3 Ways of advising

The aim of this theme is to capture advisors' involvement in the thesis process, their relationship with advisees, and the role they play in the process. The replies indicate that there is not a pattern here and that ways of advising change from one advisor to another as put by a participant.

Yes, that's... Let's just say every hero eats yogurt differently, right? Each advisors acts differently (Assist. Prof)

Some of the advisors are not involved too much and they maintain a distant relationship keeping it strictly 'professional.'

I'll try to take a it professionally. I'm not involved in student special life outside of student business. For example, professor, I can't find literature, so I'll tell him where to find literature, but I'll never scan literature for him. In addition, I guide him on the analysis of the methodology related to the methodology, but I never do the analysis (AssocProf-1).

This revelation raises questions about whether there are advisors who do the work for students but that is beyond the scope of this study. On the other hand, some advisors seem to be involved too much.

Considering the other thesis that I support spiritually; I can describe it as follows. I'm considering the thesis as my own. I'm embracing it a lot. I think about it all the time (AssistProf-2).

But the common theme appeared is that advisors tend to play a more guiding role, helping students along the way and providing them with feedback which sounds ideal.

Rather, the guide... I saw myself as the one to guide the student. I'm not angular [meaning, flexible]. I'm not too insistent (AssistProf-3).

For me, it's important to give feedback in the process. I mean, that's because that's how I learned it during my own training. I'm a writer. I write a chapter, then the professor reads it, and then I fix it while crying. Then I'll write it down again, and I'll fix it again... I'll fix it again. It's a relationship like this, so I'm doing the same thing, and the students aren't happy about it. Most of the time, students, especially young inexperienced and students who don't know what they're doing, don't even read feedback properly, but the real thing is

what they're doing is evolving, so that's what I'm describing. That is, to proceed with constant feedback (AssistProf-4).

What is articulated in the latter quote is the ideal way of advising. A text going back and forth between advisor and student is key in producing desired outcome.

Therefore, the issue of feedback is considered as one of the fundamental works that advisors do while advising.

5.2.4 Feedback

Feedbacks are considered to be the most important feature of advisor-advisee relationship, they are intimate and they are the actual places that the relationship between sides occurs. According to the data, feedbacks given to students are exhaustive, covering a wide range of issues and mostly they are timely mannered.

Feedbacks are mostly about the organization and structure of the work.

The organization, of course, can also be in the form of simple fixes. In terms of citation, we can say whether that citation actually says it, whether it is a proper citation or a citation, or if the flow of this sentence is difficult in the flow of the paragraph, rather than such a superficial feedback. Of course, I have feedback about the organization (AssistProf-5).

Yes, I also give feedback in shape [outlook], so the shape... Let's put this title this way. I am advising them to do this titling at the moment or something (Assist-Prof-4).

Some advisors indicate they check and give feedback about 'everything.'

It's all about... So, the problem sentence was written? Have there been any underlying problems? Is the method appropriate? Has the pattern been properly identified? The things that he mentions as qualitative and quantitative research methods can really explain the subject... What, you know, is the tone used correctly? Is it writing according to the format requested by the institute, so whatever needs to be examined, the literature is adequately looked at, i.e. the sources are looked at, are the quotation techniques correct? Whatever comes to mind (AssocProf-2).

In the introduction, I don't know, did he master all the literature? Does he have any resources to skipped? Did he follow foreign publications? In the method section, the description of the method that is suitable for the work is also looked at. I'll see if there's an argument in the conclusion section.

Whether there are only results in the discussion or a discussion is looked at. Other than that, as I just said, it is important for us to cleanse the thesis of typographical errors. Whether an academic style was used as an expression, whether attention was paid to it, whether the sentences were clear or understandable. Attention is paid to these (Prof-1).

These feedbacks generally tend to make sure that the work produced follow the guidelines and rules of the genre. What is commonly lacking in feedbacks given is to help students in developing authorship and writer identity. The key claim that can be made with respect to findings so far is that the thesis writing genre of educational studies in Turkey does not allow students to develop a writer identity but it dictates certain rules to be obeyed while doing graduate work.

5.2.5 Role of juries

The aim here is to capture perceived roles of juries by advisors. It is made clear that function of juries is different with respect to graduate level. At the MA level, the jury serves as defense community whereas at the PhD level, it serves as a tracking community.

Thesis committees perform two functions, one of which is for master's degree. The thesis committee meets once, when the thesis is over. The thesis ends. It comes to the thesis committee. The thesis passes, fails or receives an extension. In the PhD, the thesis committee makes corrections. That is, there are 2 functions; correction and finalization (AssistProf-5).

Findings indicate that MA committees are basically functionless and there is some kind of nepotism going on while forming them. When asked about the function of these committees, a participant replied;

No. There's only one group that comes together on defense. The juries in the thesis defenses are mostly determined by interrelated individuals. In fact, this is not a very healthy process because in order for the work to be defensible, those people need to be independent of each other. They are experts in the field, but they need to be independent of each other. You're supposed to not to have a relationship of interest. I don't think that committee is very functional either. In the meantime, there are theses that cannot pass, and there are theses that receive corrections. Anyway, the thesis that does not pass or receives

corrections is related to the sake of the advisor. You know, fix it, get a better thesis. It's going to include advisor's name. The author of the thesis is not evaluated in this context (AssocProf-1).

A similar observation is made by another advisor.

It's just that it is actually the advisors who do the job, and sometimes I feel that advisor hasn't read the thesis completely. So, the thesis committees are, so let's come together, graduate this child as soon as possible, let's throw him into life." (AssistProf-5).

On the other hand, committees seem to be more functional for PhD studies. The mechanism that creates this functionality is Thesis Tracking, which is raised by almost all of the participants.

Now it's not happening in a master's degree, it's happening at the PhD level, thesis monitoring committees. And that's what I want for a six-month report. What progress has been made in 6 months, where it has been written and where they have been looked at, is examined (AssocProf-3).

Oh, there's nothing to do if it is on the defense. Now I can consider it in two ways: (1) what benefits my student can get in thesis tracking: it can open a whole new dimension that I can't see, that my student doesn't realize. I mean, the other professor or the other one, we are usually three people. Other professors say things, such as one usually is from a from educational sciences. He looks at it a little more methodologically, sometimes he causes serious problems, because he's not a field educator, but there are two academic friends in educational sciences that I like very much. They already know some strict methodology. They're familiar with our thesis, they're already strict methodological, and they're a little familiar with our thesis. So, they don't go so hard. They think there are such studies in your field and they make a very important contribution. (2) If you look at it from the other angle, it covers my shortcomings from my point of view... From my student's point of view, they see different academics eating different yogurts, sometimes they see arguments. For example, my opinion and the other side's opinion don't match, and then we discuss it very politely. "But if that happens, won't it be like this? Here's whether it fits or not?" it adds wealth, not looking more versatily from a student's point of view. From the point of view of the professor who participated in the tracking, for example, we... usually our specialties are narrow. So, you become an expert in one area. You produce or grow doctors in that area. For the professors who attended the tracking, for example, my thesis would be a bit thick. I collect a lot of data. So, from there, for example, they see a different method. "Oh, for example, I don't use science. Actually, I could use that." The same goes for me, like when I walked into another professor's tracking and I said, "Oh, look, you've added a very different dimension to stem. We never thought about it." (Prof-2).

Apparently, the juries have two functions, first it helps students to realize aspects of their works that needed to be revised, corrected and developed. Secondly, it helps jury members to get to know fields that they are unfamiliar with.

5.2.6 Bureaucracy

Thesis writing process is a bureaucratic process in the sense that it has its own rules to follow, deadlines to meet, and duties to be completed. Central unit of this bureaucracy is graduate schools (institutes) who determine rules to follow, prepare schedules and define duties. In the context of Turkish Academy, the rules are exhaustive, which can be found in thesis manuals, covering a wide range of issues like the font and its size, spacing, page margins, title of sections, table formats, etc. Therefore, it seems eminent to capture advisors' perception of bureaucracy of thesis writing. The general perception thesis writing bureaucracy is positive. Overwhelming number of advisors think that these rules are necessary for the sake of standardization and serve as guide.

Bureaucratic, or bureaucratic, of course, there's an institution of social sciences, and there are rules. It is a little more shaped by the director of the Institute of Social Sciences and the perception of that director. Sometimes they're stricter, sometimes they're more dedicated to that bureaucracy, but somehow an institution has to have that bureaucracy, a sensible bureaucracy, to function. Otherwise, uh... No, of course it's going to be a social sciences institute. Of course, there's going to be a spelling rule. Yes, it can be compelling sometimes, but how it should be formatted, it has to be binding (AsistProf-3).

If the bureaucratic requirements are too detailed and overblown, I find them positive. I mean, it's unthinkable. In other words, bureaucratic requirements are designed to produce good products (AssistProf-4).

Yes, I mean, I think these, for example, the thesis writing guides, are essential. So, I think it's nice to tell the writer that he's drawing a road map and what he needs to do in terms of both shape and content. I don't think there is a process that leaves the bureaucratic processes too much, or to submit the proposal, to get approval, to obtain the necessary permissions for the thesis,

these are things that are already ethically essential to do, so it seems reasonable to me (AsistProf-5).

Not all advisors concur.

I think the subject of the rules should be left flexible in the writing of the thesis, something that I am particularly angry about. I make lyrical headlines, thesis, but the institute is very prescriptive about it. Even if you put the variables in, they don't like titles that are lyrical and question mark at work. I'll make a little more popular headline. They don't like that kind of thing, like "Piaget Against Vygotsky." So they want you to specify the dependent arguments of working there (Prof-3).

What is interesting about this quote is that it brings out an important controversy about the genre of thesis writing. Bureaucracy of thesis writing is not only about the rules or deadlines but it is more about defining the genre. Evidently, this advisor has difficulties in following the genre and its specifications. It should be noted that it is not only advisors who have difficulty in understanding genre and its role in academic writing but also the same goes for graduate students. Therefore, it is equally important, if not more, to understand graduate students' perceptions and experiences of thesis writing.

CHAPTER 6

THESIS WRITING EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

This chapter examines the experiences and perceptions of graduate students with regard to academic writing in general and thesis writing in particular. For this aim, 24 graduate students (16 MA Students, 8 PhD students) are interviewed. The analysis conducted has two basic themes; reading/writing where students' perceptions and experiences of writing are investigated; and advisor support where students' relationships with their advisor, the nature of advising, and other supporting mechanisms are brought under the lenses. Figure 2 shows coded segments with respect to categories. The categories related to reading/writing were writing experience, writing education, writing-research connection, ideas of academic writing, writing habits and obstacles, and wanted changes. The categories related to advisor support were feedback, advisor select, jury functions, advisor relations, and bureaucracy.




Figure 3. Coded Segments (Graduate Students)

6.1 Reading/Writing experiences and perceptions of graduate students

The aim of this section is to capture experiences and perceptions of graduate students with regard to their thesis writing process. In order to understand their perceptions and experiences, I have devised several categories like previous writing experience, their opinions of academic writing, the connection between writing and research, and writing education, and their writing process and habits.

6.1.1 Previous writing experiences

The goal here is to understand whether graduate students have previous writing experience. Interestingly of the interviewed 24 four graduate students only six of them refer to their previous writing experience.

When we were in the department, we had graduation assignments. We'd have response papers. In other words, we would read an article or read any book and write critical articles to them (MAS-5).

It was in the undergraduate and master's class phase. I mean, I've never sent articles to magazines or anything, but I mean, there's been almost a

dissertation in that format, there's been research. We've already taken thesis course in undergraduate and master's. I mean, let me tell you how to do research. That happened in the lessons (MAS-7).

Before doing our master's thesis, we were doing undergraduate-level assignments at the university, preparing reports, working on projects (PhD-3).

Evidently students' past writing experiences are very limited. Moreover, the common misconception, which is also observable from advisors' accounts, that research methods course is also a writing course is echoed here too.

6.1.2 Academic writing perceptions

The aim is to capture graduate students' ideas and perceptions with regard to academic writing. It seems that their perceptions are parallel to those of advisors.

Clarity, objectivity and following rules are some of the points that stand out.

I think that academic writing, that is, it is the article that follows the rules of writing in the first place, contains clear information that does not confuse the other party when it is read, and provides information that should be based on certain foundations (MAS-14).

Academic writing is an effort to give an answer to a research question. The process of writing with the work you have done after a research topic, and putting forward the information you have obtained from other sources you have read can be called academic writing (PhD-4)

As I just said, academic writing is important. A sentence shouldn't have more than one meaning, like I said, and it needs to be written properly. One mistake can change the whole meaning after all (MAS-12).

The issue of clarity seems to be a common concern among students and advisors.

Clarity evidently means conveying the meaning that is meant by the writer. Not only clarity, but also the issue of rules is another concern raised by students.

Now there are many types of academic writing, there are many types of thesis, such as experimental, semi-experimental. but I can say that the article is an academic article, which is usually a prominent type of article that takes many sections where comments are made about the findings in which these researches are summarized, abstract section. For sampling, it is necessary to

have a research described in them, and of course the research needs to be in a certain format, we can call it the type of writing that depends on this format is actually academic paper, academic studies (MAS-4).

The academic writing is supposed to be in a certain format. It needs to be written in a specific framework. This means that you need to enter first, write literature, and then write method (MAS-6)

What is evident here is rules are basically structure related. By rules, like advisors, students mean the format and structure of thesis. Moreover, the misconception of writing-research methodology duo is also present here. The conception of rules and the misconception of synonymy of writing-research are anti-authorial in the sense that they leave little room of authorial presence. The other issue that tackles down the authorial presence is the concern for objectivity.

Academic writing is the article where there are more objective sentences, that is, there are objective sentences rather than personal sentences, especially in the literature section. In the conclusion part, you can add some more subjective, personal statements, but since you even finished it with the expression 'it can be' according to the results, it is actually half subjective, semi-objective. It should be more objective; it should have a more understandable language... (MAS-13).

What is meant by objectivity is not scientific objectivity, but rather using a distant and passive language in writing for the sake of scientific objectivity which tend to result in less authorial presence within text. Another key issue is the perceived connection between writing and research.

6.1.3 The Perceived connection between writing and research

To begin with, it seems that students are not clear on the issues of writing and research. Their articulation is limited and they tend to think research as literature review while discussing the connection between writing and research.

If you're doing your research solidly and you're doing enough reading on your research question, you'll write more easily (PhD-8).

The most important part is actually the process of researching the article. Because you have to source everything, so as not to cause plagiarism. Most importantly to investigate and write them in the most accurate way (PhD-2)

When doing research, it is important to write, take notes, master and remember the subject. In this way, we blend literature knowledge with my own results more accurately (PhD-1)

The process of researching the article, i.e. research is already necessary before writing the thesis in the first place. And it's the most important part because without resources, you have to have a resource to read and paraphrase or summarize your own sentences (MAS-15).

Evidently, graduate students have tendency to equate literature review with research.

Moreover, they compartmentalize thesis sections which leads to the lack of understanding text as an organic, relational and coherent entity.

I think the writing is very, at least it's not too difficult to write the literature and the method in the thesis. I think the two are easy. At least that's how my thesis happened. But writing the results and the discussion section is the most important part of the thesis. Because that's where we're going to write the result. Everyone already knows the rest. Knows the field, the person who will read knows the field (MAS-1)

The compartmentalized understanding also yields to the urge to put writing in some places in thesis writing process rather than seeing it as a technology to generate knowledge which takes place at any moment in the process.

The process of researching the article, i.e. research is already necessary before writing the thesis in the first place. And it's the most important part because without resources, you have to have a resource to read and paraphrase or summarize your own sentences (PhD-5)

50/50 all. 50% research, 50% writing (MAS-3).

These articulations are understandable given that their writing education is very limited.

6.1.4 Writing education

Writing education is one of the key issues in the sense that it seems the primary reason of previously mentioned misconceptions is the lack of it. The goal is here to

determine whether students had any kind of writing education before writing a thesis. Of the interviewed 24 graduate students only one of them had courses that specifically deal with writing.

Yes, he did. We had creative writing lessons, we had academic writing classes, and I took advantage of all that. I believe that these have always shaped me in a very positive way until my thesis age reached the stage of writing the thesis (MAS-8)

The only graduate student that recalls writing education evidently has two courses related to writing, one of which focuses on academic writing. It should be noted that this particular student is a graduate of Turkish Language. The rest of participants indicate that they had not a particular writing course.

I did not have any writing training (MAS-9).

Unfortunately, not (MAS-10).

I took courses on research methods, but not a specific course on direct writing techniques (PhD-6).

The research methods course appears as related to writing here too. It seems that the primary source for graduate students is research methods course.

We got a lecture on thesis writing rules, in scientific research methods and statistics course. I had entered one of those courses, a teacher from Aydin, I was not very satisfied, especially in Scientific Research Methods (MAS-11).

Yes, we took one research course and produced one proposal (MAS-14).

In our Scientific Research Methods course, on how the thesis was created, abstract part, literature part, findings, conclusion, discussion, trivia section... Learns a general title... How to fill it in different courses (MAS-15).

This almost identicalness of writing and research methods was also present in the accounts of advisors. It seems as a general pattern to consider research methods courses as a way of writing education. Perhaps, research methods courses contribute to students' writing skills albeit in different ways than it is supposed to. This understanding is certainly reflected in writing habits of participants.

6.1.5 Writing obstacles and habits

This section is about writing processes of participants. How do they write? Do they have a systematic way of studying? What tools do they use? What are perceived obstacles in writing? How do they evaluate their thesis writing experience? In order to understand their actual writing experience and provide answers with these questions, this section aims to capture their writing habits and perceived obstacles in writing.

6.1.5.1 Obstacles

Writing process is not always smooth and it certainly has obstacles which deteriorate the production of meaningful product. Therefore, it is of significance to determine these obstacles and what kind of coping mechanisms do students develop to overcome these obstacles. The obstacles are so very common and immanent in thesis writing process.

There are definitely difficulties that we face, you are experiencing a moment of congestion, you have tense moments in the writing process at the time of the blockage (PhD-3).

When I was writing, I was very staked, there were times when I couldn't even think of a sentence, I sat at computer for hours, but there were sources that I could read and not write in any way (MAS-5).

The obstacles in writing happen generally as getting stuck while writing. Sometimes obstacles are advisor-related.

The challenges I've been dealing with are a little bit of a problem with this adviosr that I've been talking about, and frankly, it was a big, incredibly challenging part for me. (MAS-12)

The difficulties I faced were due to my ignorance. In the process, you have to take care of yourself. You have to learn everything by yourself. So, this process forced me (MAS-6).

The consequences of these obstacles can be sometimes dramatic; mostly appearing as psychological problems.

I can't say I'm not depressed, but frankly, I'm already taking a break because I'm depressed. I've been sleep deprived for a while or so I think it's a little bit more, I don't know, I think the counselor is actually pressuring, not in a pressured way, so I'd like to point out that it's an important process, so there's such a thing as academic mobbing against adult people, so I don't think it should be applied (MAS-12)

Writing a thesis is a very difficult process. It's a very stable process, which is very challenging to maintain for two and a half years or more. Other than that, sometimes you worry about exactly where you are. I remember the last time I had a panic attack in those thesis corrections. I mean, it's necessary to be very emotionally intimate and be able to make relationships work very well. In every respect, you work from your academic point of view depending on another person from your thesis advisor's point of view... It is a very, very difficult process in all respects (MAS-14).

It seems that these problems are more common than one would expect. At these harsh times, students mostly turn to their friends and relatives for help.

My family, friends, colleagues, other than that, my professors at the institution where I work (MAS-15).

Yes. For example, I had a lot of help from my colleagues during the thesis. My fellow research assistant is a research assistant in the English department, for example, when I was writing, we looked at grammar with her, and other than that, I was using internet programs (MAS-7).

So, this process forced me. As a solution, I tried to find solutions by studying and consulting with my friends who were already in the process of thesis writing (MAS-5).

In case of not being able to access any outside help, students tend to take a break or drop out the program. The obstacles are writing-related and problems arise when students realize that they cannot write. While interviewing advisors, some of them indicated that they assumed that students knew how to write. Interviews with students make it clear that it is not the case especially considering that majority of students do not get a chance of proper writing education. Narratives of students make it

unequivocally clear that students have difficulty in writing and hence developing proper writing habits.

6.1.5.2 Writing habits

The case of writing habits is very important in understanding the process that students go through while thesis writing. In other words, the key to their writing experiences is that habits they acquire along the way. The major finding regarding to their habits is that it seems that MA students and PhD students have different writing habits. MA students have habits that are related to mechanics and style of writing and product-oriented, whereas PhD students have habits that are related to organizing their thought and process-oriented.

Sources. I'm summarizing it in my own sentences, and then I'm going to read those summaries like this, and this time I'm sorting them, I'm sorting the paragraphs. You know, before this, before this, sometimes I do it this way, putting my own opinion in my own sentence. Then I write these on a second piece of paper, these doodles, this second paper, for example, accumulates 10-15 pages, then if the computer is with me, in the empty lesson, I write it on the computer between classes (MAS-1).

I can't write directly on the computer. I'll write it down first. I do something like, for example, I read from source A, I always summarize the points I like in my own sentences by taking note of the source. I'm reading from source B, writing in bibliography again, summarizing it. I'm reading C, I'm reading D... I draw such a summary (MAS-2).

The primary goal for MA students seems to be summarizing and organizing source that they read. Other than these beginners concern, some MA students are aiming for an organized and coherent text which they have difficulties producing especially while connecting different ideas.

I'm drawing all the titles one by one. . . After that I fill in the titles... Likewise, when I write the paragraph, what do I write in the introduction. I'm going to write it down first, which text to get at work, or what reference to get at work. Here is the introductory sentence, here are the examples of what examples will be in development now, who I will give an example or how to connect it at work and write it that way... For example, I still have serious problems with

tying, it is difficult to make the sudden transition to each other when connecting two different subjects, to ensure that flow. I have a problem there, for example. Other than that, I'm writing a plan. Or I'll write it down, I'll write it down here; this is how confusion happens (MAS-3).

The account of this participant is intriguing in the sense that she is very well-planned and organized but has difficulty in connecting ideas which is a common problem among the writers who work product-oriented. The following participant has similar problems.

There's a couple of programs on the Internet. I don't remember their full names right now, but when I'm writing, I check grammatically first to see if there's anything wrong with grammar. Then I look at the flow of the sentence, see if there's anything wrong with the flow. Because in academic writing, this is very important; not being able to keep the flow, writing broken into paragraphs. That's why I'm trying to keep the flow. If I notice, for example, that there is a shortage there, I do a reading to add something else there again, or I get support from friends and professors. Especially in providing the flow, for example, my professor was really helpful, a thesis advisor (MAS-4).

Apparently, the effort to connect ideas and paragraphs is a daunting task particularly for MA students. It might be for PhD students as well but no one addresses such an issue. Instead, their accounts centralize on organizing thoughts.

When I think about it, I write it down, I write it down when direct thoughts are in the process of forming, and then I revise it (PhD-1).

First, I try to put everything I can think of on paper without missing any of it. Then, in order not to forget, I transfer it to the paper without any order, then at the end of the transfer process to this paper, I go back and rearrange them in an organized way (PhD-2).

The students' experiences are inevitably related to their advisors' advices. In order to fully grasp what they are going through while thesis writing, it is only imperative to inquire their relationships with their advisors.

6.2 Graduate students' perceptions of advisors' advice

Thesis writing process has two major actors; student and advisor. The relationship dynamic between this duo is fundamental to the success of the process. Student in

this dynamic is the subjected part. Therefore, understanding this dynamic inevitably requires students' perceptions of their advisors' way of advice and support level.

Analysis revealed five categories related to this theme, which are advisor selection, advisor support, feedback, jury functions, and bureaucracy.

6.2.1 Advisor selection

Like any relationship, advisor-advisee relationship starts with the initial acquaintance which mostly occurs in lessons in academic settings.

My advisor was a professor I loved, whom I took lessons from (MAS-16).

Here's how I chose my advisor: I was already taking lessons from him, and I loved the study area. I made an appointment and went to the meeting (MAS-12).

I told him that I wanted to work with him with my professor, who I had previously taught and enjoyed attending his classes, and he agreed (PhD-4).

Majority of participants indicate that they select their advisors; a decision they make after having course or two with their advisors. In some marginal cases, students are appointed to advisors.

I know my advisors. My advisor is very disciplined, decent, competent, but

here's the thing: he doesn't interfere with you (MAS-13).

Hacettepe University determined itself, and my advisor ... he chose me (PhD-7).

It seems that this practice is a marginal one. Students have freedom to select their advisors as long as they convince them, which seems a positive way to start a long and daunting relationship.

6.2.2 Advisor support

The core of advisor-advisee relationship is about the support and feedback students receive from their advisors. The aim here is to capture students' perceptions of

support level and the type of support they get from their advisors. Accordingly, students seem to have two central perceptions, those who perceive a supportive relation and those who do not.

Advisor... Or, I don't know, if it's the same process for all the thesis students, but it's kind of like this. I mean, my professor is already very busy, a lot of them, I think there's are like five or six thesis students. So, it's probably due to its business, but I think I need a little more support (MAS-15).

I've had a lot of trouble with that. My friends in the thesis period had the same problem. Our advisor couldn't take much care of us because of his busy schedule (MAS-14)

Actually, it's about a lot of things, like a lot of things we didn't agree with. There was a period of professor shortage so we had to choose him anyway... I don't think he was trying to help. He had obviously interfered with my life. That was one of the factors that was effective in changing him anyway. He was pushing me on some things, to be honest. (MAS-9).

The relationship between student and advisor is so crucial that it can be very exhausting and consuming, which eventually ends in change of advisor or drop out of students from the program. On the other hand, those who narrates a supportive relationship basically address accessibility of advisor and a guiding relationship.

Yes. He was always accessible (MAS-5).

Absolutely, I got his phone number e-mail. (MAS-6)

Yes, he was a guide. But I wouldn't say they're very helpful. I usually felt more alone in this process (9).

Accessibility and guiding are not always helpful and enough for a supportive relationship.

My advisor was very interested, giving feedback when I wrote to him, so I was able to finish my thesis within the time set (PhD-3).

He would give various corrections, and he would advise on welding at points where I was blocked in research (PhD-5).

He's been very helpful. We chose the sources together. I've actually had a lot of resource pollution. So, I found hundreds of resources, we eliminated those resources together, we chose the ones that best suited the text. He kept seeing my thesis every ten pages on twenty pages, so as I made progress, he proof-read, my advisor was always available. My feedback was very constructive, I never received any devastating feedback. Always motivating (MAS-8)

Even though students do not elaborate on nature of guiding and support, it seems that a more productive and supportive relationship is basically about the degree of involvement on advisor's part. The other key component of advisor-advisee relationship is feedback and its timing.

6.2.3 Feedback

The aim here is to capture the type and timing of feedback students receive from their advisors. There are some students who are not happy about the timing and the type of feedback.

I'm not thinking about it. In fact, I wrote a study that said, "I wrote something like literature that I didn't read." He said he didn't have time, that he couldn't be, that he was in a busy period (MAS-9).

I mean, like, it might not be very fast. I mean, because he's got other things to do. For example, I'm throwing a horse, I've written a draft, I've sent it. You know how this, the draft, comes back to me in, like, two weeks. Not in a very short time. As such, the process is prolonged (MA-10).

These excerpts are typical in the sense that they convey discontent with regard to timing and the type of feedback. However, this is not always the case.

For example, I can even make a typo, and I don't see much of it, but in general he looks at it like, he says 'MAS-1, there is a typo'. I may have one, but not many because I'm a Turkish teacher. You know, there are more corrections in academic language. For example, we don't start with 'for this reason', but we start with 'in this context', or they have corrections that say, 'It would be better if it was this way', or 'this paragraph has repeated this a lot' (MAS-1).

The timing was quite short, even interfering with them when I had typos. He was giving me some resource names. He directed my work (MAS-7).

With the feedback I received from my advisor, I revised the experimental mechanisms and considered his recommendations when evaluating the results. This feedback always came on the day I received my test results or the next day at most (PhD-2)

Evidently, feedbacks are about spelling, grammar, style, methodology and locating sources, which is coherent with product-oriented writing. Product-oriented writing as

opposed to process-oriented writing is product-driven and the key in such a writing is to produce a text that is grammatically, style-wise and methodologically acceptable. In other words, the product-oriented writing focuses on error-free text production where authorial presence and rhetorical moves are limited. The other important component thesis writing is juries and their functions during the process.

6.2.4 Jury functions

Similar to advisors' accounts of jury functions, students also make distinction in MA committees and PhD juries. Formation of committees is generally being realized through personal relations.

My jurors, one of them came from outside, was a friend of the jurors, that thesis advisor. That's how it was determined, so he joined my thesis jury through my thesis advisor. Our other professor also had studies in my field, the thesis studies at the Boğaziçi. I need an internal number. My thesis professor suggested him again. We proposed and he agreed (MAS-8).

We do not select there is already a certain committee (MA-2).

The committees as stated, are formed through personal relationships of advisors and in most cases, students do not have a say on the members. MA committees are basically functional-less during the writing process; only serving as a defense mechanism.

He was supportive. I'm a little complaining about this in Turkey because there's a doctoral thesis monitoring committee now. I think it needs to be collected three times a year and they give the thesis the necessary notice. But that's not the case with a master's degree. So, he sees a proposal, and your thesis jury sees you in defense. I think if there are meetings like this, they might have more information than the thesis, but only because they've seen it in two meetings and they've given feedback to what they've seen. Their approach was supportive, but my only complaint was that they could have contributed a little more because of the system (MAS-4).

The committee members obviously did not have much of a role in the writing process, I think they had a role in my thesis defense (PhD-7).

On the other hand, doctoral committees seem to serve more functions as opposed to MA committees.

Committee members made recommendations during the writing process after the first draft (PhD-3).

One of the committee members was actively reg backward during my thesis process, while the others were very supportive (PhD-5).

Even though students are hesitant in elaborating on what roles do committee members played in their writing journey, it seems that they have contributed in some ways. This is a valid argument particularly for PhD students. The last theme that appears to be a factor in thesis writing is bureaucracy.

6.2.5 Bureaucracy

The theme of bureaucracy was a significant theme in advisors' account. Students' accounts reveal that their extent of knowledge of bureaucracy is very limited. It seems that majority of students do not have a clue about the bureaucracy of thesis writing.

It's the first thesis proposal meeting. In it, my advisor and I present the thesis subject I developed to the jurors, where feedback comes in. Then, in the light of those feedbacks, the data collection process begins or ethics committee applications. After that, the next meeting is the thesis defense with all the jurors (MAS-9).

This student outlines the steps of thesis writing in typical program in Turkey while addressing nothing about the bureaucracy of thesis writing.

Although the bureaucratic requirements are confusing, do you have the knowledge of the literatures, which is quite necessary in terms of being smooth and readable, have you designed the experimental process logically and can you explain the whole process and the result, a necessary time to see them (PhD1).

The confusion of PD-1 is obvious here.

I mean, let me tell you, we noticed that when we were writing the thesis. Thesis was not written in accordance with the rules of thesis writing. These

quotes and so on were definitely not made accordingly. You know how we're taught a rule, in which case my thesis was always in quotation marks, but when people did it in quotation marks, they did the quotes one-on-one copy paste and didn't put the quotation mark, that's what we call plagiarism. I mean, there was a lot of it. And I couldn't understand that, let's just say I read two pages, I took a sentence out of it. Anyway, if I express that sentence in my own words... I mean, what am I going to show you there in number of pages? I mean, how can I put it? I can't say that I'm fully trained in college, but... *When writing the thesis, I'm not always supposed to write down ideas in my own head because I... I have to write about the academic research I've read, don't I? I'm supposed to support them with thesis. Because one of our professors said, "You're just at the beginning of the road. You don't have the authority to read two or three pages of something and say, "This is it." Anyway, your thesis should consist of: conveying what you read. But in this case, the thesis goes into transferer of transferer mode. Then what's my contribution?* I mean, for the literature part. In the rest of the section, we were already doing: we were bumping into another thesis, like, "This was found there, this came out in mine"... In that part, we were able to reflect our own research (MAS-6, Emphasis added).

It is clear that students understand referencing from bureaucracy. The above excerpt is not only important because it shows that, but also it summarizes what is wrong with theses at the stake here. Thesis writing especially at the MA level as outlined above, is understood as parroting or simply paraphrasing what is already said and done both by students and advisors. The misplaced understanding of advisors' students' incapability and impotence is the premier reason of suppression of authorial presence and not developing a writer identity, all of which resulting in non-original and plagiarized texts.

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This dissertation was about the quality of thesis writing among graduate students of educational sciences, their experiences of the thesis writing process and their advisors' understanding of academic writing and advising practices. It comprised of two different yet related phases. The first part of the research investigated the quality of thesis and dissertations with respect to two parameters; originality and plagiarism. The second part of the study examined graduate students' experiences of thesis writing and advisors' advising practices.

7.1 Phase I Discussion

The first phase findings indicated that the analyzed documents had profound problems with respect to two parameters investigated. In terms of similarity parameter, the sample had significant originality issues. Analyses revealed that the similarity index of the sample was meaningfully higher than the threshold. This effectively meant that the graduate academic writing, at least in the field of educational sciences, was raising serious concerns in terms of originality and original contribution of graduate studies to their respective fields. I used the word concern because similarity findings were not conclusive themselves. They were simply indicating a situation where there were questions regarding the originality of the sample.

The similarity index of master theses was significantly higher than the doctoral dissertations' index. This was an expected output as graduate students at the doctoral level were assumed to have a richer writing experience. Yet still, it should be noted that the doctoral dissertations had originality issues in themselves. They were only better than the master theses with respect to the parameter. But this did not mean that they were original.

The index of materials written in the language of Turkish was significantly higher than those written in the language of English. In other words, English theses and dissertations were better than the Turkish counterpart with respect to originality. This was explained with respect to universities at which the sample was written. English theses and dissertations were basically from universities like Boğaziçi University, the Middle East Technical University and Bilkent University which happens to be known with their academic rigor. The last grouping of the sample was with respect to the university type. Accordingly, the sample selected from private universities had no difference with public universities on similarity index. Similarity index findings indicated that the sample was far from being original meaning that studies conducted at the graduate level were repeating themselves methodologically and conceptually, while adding very limitedly to the existing knowledge. The case was similar with regard to plagiarism parameter.

The major finding of the present study was turned out to be that the one in three analyzed documents had high-level plagiarism. For master theses this rate was one in less than three and for doctoral dissertations was one in four. To put in another way, given that the majority of doctoral graduate are expected to work as an academician at higher education institutions, the finding meant that one of four academicians had plagiarized in their graduate studies.

Plagiarism findings with respect to the language of the sample was also alarming. The Turkish sample with high-level plagiarism had rate of one in three and for the English sample rate was one in approximately four. As indicated, the majority of the English sample was produced at universities known for their academic rigor which explains the lower rate for the English sample. Yet, it also meant that plagiarism was happening at an alarming at ‘best’ universities of the country.

The case for university type was even more shocking. Accordingly, the sample selected from public university had a plagiarism rate of one in three, whereas in private universities, the rate was one in almost two. This meant that approximately half of the theses and dissertations written at private universities had high-level plagiarism. These finding strengths the rhetoric of commodification of knowledge. Apparently, private universities had a limited concern with respect to adding to existing knowledge, but rather they were more interested in graduating students so that the flow could continue.

Plagiarism is almost a universal concern and very common among students (Power, 2009; Walker, 2010). Although, ethical concerns provide an explanation to these widespread cases of plagiarism, which happens to be the easy one, the true reason seems to be students’ lack of knowledge. It seems that students are not familiar with the concept of plagiarism and therefore they do not know how to avoid it (Dahl, 2007; Park, 2003). The lack of knowledge is not only technical. Students are unfamiliar with the genre rules of thesis writing which are research culture specific. In most of the cases, advisors simply ignore this type of lack of knowledge. “In a very real sense, doctoral supervisors are writing teachers” (Pare, 2011, 59) The problem, as implied by the findings of the present study, supervisors’ relationship with writing is vague and more importantly, they are not aware of the idea that writing practices

are discipline-specific. They mistakenly believe that their practices are universal and stand for the ultimate text. “They advise on how and where certain things should be said, on what must and must not be mentioned, and on who should or should not be cited or criticized. Through feedback, questions, suggestions, and instruction, they help students locate their written contribution within the historical, intellectual, and rhetorical trends and traditions of their field” (Pare, 2011, 59). The misconception on advisors think that their way of writing is ‘the true one’ even though their way is just a way that has been regularized through countless repetitions. “What is normalized and appears universal to long-time members of a research culture is deeply culturally specific to that research culture and therefore new to doctoral students” (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, 79). The cloak of normalcy leaves students with a feeling of loss during the process of thesis writing; a situation echoed by participants of this study numerously.

Both similarity and plagiarism findings of this study raises serious concerns and questions with regard to the quality of graduate work at university of Turkey in the field of educational sciences. The academic writing at the graduate level is an epidemic case in Turkey; a writing experience which repeats and multiplies itself while adding very limitedly to the existing knowledge. The second phase of the present study addressed the possible explanations and reasons of this situation by interviewing graduate students and advisors.

7.2 Phase II Discussion

A graduate thesis has three core components; the text, the writer and the advisor. The present study aimed to map this topography by analyzing these three components.

The first phase of the study focused on the text, which revealed that the quality of text

was alarmingly concerning due to the issues of originality and plagiarism. The second phase of the study focused on the other components in order to generate possible explanations for the findings of the phase I. Therefore, the second phase of the study dealt with advisors' advising practices and ideas of academic writing and the experiences and opinions of students' thesis writing process.

Interviews with advisors revealed two major themes and 11 related categories. The first theme was about their ideas of academic writing including categories like definitions and features, writing-research connection, and writing education. The primary aim of this section was to understand the perceptions of advisors' elaboration of academic writing by contemplating on the questions related to definitions and features of academic writing, place of writing in the research process and writing education. Accordingly, findings revealed that the articulations of advisors with respect to academic writing were very limited as if they did not have a clear idea about academic writing and its features. Three alleged features of academic writing were appeared as common elements; rule-based, mechanic and limited authorial-presence.

Accordingly, what constitutes writing as academic was following rules that were basically rules related to referencing system, format-structure of text and using a distant-objective language. In such a case, the writing becomes mechanic and an act of repetition, that does not allow to authorial presence and developing a writer identity which are considered as key elements of meaningful and original texts. This mechanical understanding also revealed in the accounts related to writing-research connection. Findings indicated that the place of writing in the research process was considered as a matter of tactic. Some preferred the last step, some during the process. But the key thing was that writing was primarily understood as an action that

was done to report- findings and to write-up. As for writing education, the most important finding was that there was not any course designed specifically for developing and understanding writing skills. They tended believe to graduate students already knew how to write and their seminar courses were helping students to develop their skills.

The second theme was their advising practices including categories like, workload, key issues in theses, ways of advising, feedback, bureaucracy, and function of juries. To start with, workload of advisors, especially those who were at private universities, was extreme. They were working so much a number of students that they found very limited time to perform their advising duties. Advisor availability is very important to students' success in completion their program and appears to be a common problem (Donoghue, 2010; White, 2006). Amidst the heavy workload, when they found time, they tended to focus on elements like original contribution of the work, methodology and structure of the thesis.

The way of advising was understood in terms of involvement in the work of graduate students. Some involved too much, some maintained a distant relationship. This was a clear indication of the fact that advisors did not have a proper idea of how to advise. It is important for students to have a mentoring relationship with their advisors (Pride, 2005). It seems participants of this study do not build a caring relationship, mostly because advising is understood as a matter of involvement with students and their works.

The other category related to advising practices of advisors was feedback. Kumar and Stracke (2007) indicate that feedback comments are in fact a form of writing which requires a certain training. Positive and timely feedback has a positive correlation with thesis completion (Eley and Jennings, 2005). The constructive

feedback is basically helping students to navigate and find their own way in the body of knowledge. Feedbacks provided by participants of this study were mostly about the organization and structure of thesis and ensuring rules were followed.

Role of juries in thesis production was revealed out to be very limited. It seemed at the master's level, juries were only gathered during the defense, i.e., the only time they saw the student and her work. At the doctoral level, the committee would meet every semester per university regulations. Jury or committee members were selected from advisors' 'entourage' to make sure no surprises. It was clear that these committees were there to assess the work students rather than guiding them during the process. The last category was the bureaucracy of the thesis writing. Evidently, advisors tended to support bureaucracy for the sake of rules and standardization. Given the results of the phase I of this study, it seemed that standardization was working well, in fact more than well.

The other component of thesis writing topography is graduate students who are also the ultimate agents to produce the ultimate paper. Their recounts were organized around two central themes; reading/writing experiences and perceptions, and advisory support.

The first central theme of graduate students' recounts was reading/writing perception and experiences that involved categories like previous writing experiences, academic writing perceptions, connection between writing and research, writing education, writing obstacles and habits. To begin with, students' previous writing experiences were evidently very limited. Their understandings of academic writing were very similar to those of advisors. Graduate students tended to think that academic writing had rules, and it had to be clear and objective. Rules were understood structure and organization related, similar to advisors. Objectivity was

understood as using a distant and passive language for the sake scientific objectivity. The perceived connection between writing and research revealed that students were not clear on writing and research. They tended to think research as literature review and to compartmentalize thesis sections. As expected, students did not have any writing education during their undergraduate and graduate years. The last category of the first theme found out from students' recounts was writing obstacles and habits. The major obstacle for students was getting stuck while writing, not knowing what to write, which is a common problem when writing is compartmentalized and product oriented. The other significant problem was communication problems with advisors, which sometimes resulted in psychological problems on students' behalf. As for writing habits, findings indicated that PhD students and MA students had different habits. MA students tended to develop habits that were related to mechanics of and style of writing, whereas PhD students had habits related to organizing thoughts and connecting ideas. MA students generally tried to summarize the source they were reading and faced problems while connecting and organizing these summaries.

The second major theme that appeared from students' recounts was about their perceptions of advisors' advices. There were number of categories related to this theme; advisor selection, advisor support, feedback, jury functions, and bureaucracy. To start with, it was clear that students most of the time got to select their advisors, once they got know potential advisors during the lectures. The advisor and student relationship is considered to be crucial for the success of graduate studies. Interviews revealed that in case of lack of support by advisors, the process could end up in drop out of student or change of advisor. Moreover, those who perceived positive advisory support narrated the relationship in terms of accessibility and guiding. When it comes to feedback, timing and type of it are important in helping students achieve their

goals. According to findings of this study, timing of feedback was not always ideal. As for the type of feedback, it seemed that feedbacks were generally style, organization and grammatic rules oriented. Jury junctions were another key element of thesis writing. For MA students, jury members were almost functionless. They did not know the members until the defense. Therefore, one could easily infer that committee members at MA level did not contribute much to thesis writing. At PhD level, thanks to semesterly meetings, students got to know their committee members and contributions from them. Last category was thesis writing bureaucracy. It seemed that students did not know much about the bureaucracy of thesis writing. It was revealed out that majority of students did not have a clue about the bureaucracy of thesis writing.

The Turkish graduate education in the field of educational studies, in terms of writing, was evidently suffering from originality and plagiarism. Based on the findings, it seemed possible to offer three basic explanations for this situation. The first explanation was related to ethical considerations. The findings of this study indicated that there were ethical problems regarding ethics of writing. Secondly, students did not know how to write and get any kind of education that would facilitate this process and help them to develop writing skills. General assumption shared by advisors, was that students at the level graduate level knew how to write, which is an opinion that ignores the genre-specific qualities of writing. This brings us to the third explanation.

Third explanation that I offer for the results of this study is related to genre-specific characteristics of the Turkish graduate writing. Genres, defined as social and political actions, regularize limits of sayable, thinkable, knowable and writable. Accordingly, the genre used in the Turkish education system allows one's work to be

presented as a matter of describing and reporting rather than arguing; data to be generated via quantitative tools and described accordingly; limited space for subjectivity and authorial space; passive voice; and produce product-oriented outcomes. Due to its results, I called this genre as epidemic writing, which have the following qualifications;

- ⇒ Mechanical
- ⇒ Rule and format oriented
- ⇒ Lack of proper referencing
- ⇒ Objective-distant language
- ⇒ Hierarchical inferiority
- ⇒ Limited authorial presence
- ⇒ Compartmentalized writing
- ⇒ Lack of coherence and connected ideas
- ⇒ Repetition
- ⇒ Product-oriented

The mechanical qualities, rule and format oriented, and lack of proper referencing are all related to structural qualities of thesis writing which are also primary concerns of students and advisors alike. When the emphasis is on the structural qualities, the little room is left for authorial presence. The concern for objective-distant language, hierarchical inferiority, and limited authorial presence are related to limited space for authorial and writer identity development. The genre does not allow students to develop an authorial identity. And when there is little space for writer identity, the texts produced lack of coherence and connected ideas, are repetitive, and product-oriented. In such cases, the thesis and dissertations turn into collages that lack coherence, argumentation and contribution to knowledge. The genre qualities of the

sample analyzed in the present study seems to be the major factor in epidemic writing, which considers writing as a means to an end. The end for students is to graduate, and for the advisors and academicians by extension is to promote. Writing is not seen as epistemic.

Aristotle's rhetoric had five canons of rhetoric; invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery. Since then, there has been much research about what makes up invention. Invention is the process of conceptualizing, planning and generating materials for a text. Writing as epistemic considers writing as a tool of invention. Writing is not simply about conveying ideas and writing-up of thoughts generated elsewhere, but rather it includes invention, development and forming ideas and knowledge.

Writing is thinking made tangible, thinking that can be examined because it is on the page and not in the head, invisible, floating around. Writing is thinking that can be stopped and tinkered with. It is a way of holding thought still long enough to examine its structures, its possibilities, its flaws. The road to a clearer understanding is travelled on paper. It is through an attempt to find words for ourselves in which to express related ideas that we often discover what we think. (Gage, 1986, p. 24)

Writing is a complex social interaction which involves relationships with readers, listeners, and writers. When we write, we try to build these relationships which are bound to repeated and regularized discursive practices and conceptualized as genres that address exigencies and needs valued by research communities and organizations (Artemeva & Freedman, 2006; Bazerman, 1988, 1994, 2002; Bazerman & Prior, 2005; Coe et al, 2002; Devitt, 2004; Devitt et al., 2003; Giltrow, 1994; Miller, 1984; Jamieson, 1975; Paré, 2002, 2005; Schryer, 2002).

Research communities value genres because they achieve specific consequences. These outputs are related to specific types of disciplinary knowledge (e.g., what should be said, what should not be said, and in what order; what sorts of

knowledge claims can be made, how, and with what evidence, what is the limit of sayable). These outcomes and strategies that make contribution are community-specific. For example, completing a dissertation in educational philosophy will result in researchers who are knowledgeable about specific types of knowledge by identifying with and adhering to specific disciplinary paradigms. Similarly, completing dissertations in physics, social work, or any other field will result in various types of thinkers and ways of thinking. Writers eventually learn to (re)produce particular kinds of disciplinary knowledge through involvement in various genres, and the processes and practices involved in producing a dissertation.

As opposed to well-established belief, graduate students' success depends on more than correct grammar and spelling and structural qualities of text. Their success depends heavily on their understanding of writing as a regulated, normalized, and socially located practice that generates and replicates the existing work of the research community, including explicit and implicit conventions, expectations, norms, practices and assumptions. Most importantly, the view of writing as a social practice is based on the notion that writing ability is not the result of a set of individual and transferable skills that students either own or do not, but rather as an increased participation in repetitive and regulated discourse. activity. As a newcomer to the research community, she will face a new set of regulated discursive practices and the challenges that come with it. This might be the most significant challenge to newcomers. These discursive practices, norms assumptions, conventions, and expectations may seem natural to long-time inhabitants. However, newcomers cannot know these specifications of genre since that have never participated. Unfortunately, epidemic writing ignores this fact and nonevidence-based advice books and advisors who are unaware of writing as epistemic propagate these opinions.

It is very surprising that attention paid to writing development in graduate education is low, given that graduate education is basically about being writer. The “absence of a systemic pedagogy for writing” (Aitchison and Lee, 2006, 266) in graduate programs only strengthens this argument. Although individual programs could provide their own solutions to writing development like writing groups (Lee and Boud, 2003) or publishing from students’ works (Lee and Kamler), the issue of writing development remains unsolved, unless addressed systemically. “What is needed rather is a larger systemic cultural shift in research institutions)—one that recovers writing from beneath its cloak of normalcy and, creates an environment for writing that is grounded in a solid research base” (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, 92). Genre-specific nature of writing requires participants to know the rules of playing, which are generally inherited from previous generations. These rules are repeated so many times that they seem natural, unquestionable and common sense to long-time participants where in fact they are rules produced to answer pertaining exigencies and most definitely new to newcomers.

7.3 Limitations and recommendations

The present study has several limitations. First, the findings of the first phase are only about the dissertations and thesis written in the field of educational studies. Similarly, the findings of the second phase are only about the experiences and opinions of graduate students and advisors from educational studies. The third limitation is that findings of originality are not conclusive, meaning that findings do not mean that texts examined are conclusively unoriginal. But rather, they indicate that texts have originality issues. The fourth limitation is about plagiarism findings. Since the

findings here only include high-level plagiarism, the ultimate number of thesis and dissertations having been plagiarized might be substantially higher.

The present study makes several recommendations. First, a similar study could be conducted to examine the case in natural sciences and other disciplines of social sciences. A more detailed study could be repeated to reach conclusive results about the originality of and actual number plagiarism in theses and dissertations. Another recommended study would be related to qualities of genre in different disciplines. Such a study would help to draw proper policies for developing academic writing in Turkey. We do not have evidence regarding the genre of thesis writing in educational studies, or in any discipline. Such a study would hugely contribute to our understanding of academic writing in Turkey. Another key issue appeared in this study is writer-identity. A study investigating processes of development of writer-identity among graduate students seems as an urgent need.

The findings indicated that the role of juries in thesis writing was very limited. At the MA level, juries did not exist to follow the progress of students and make recommendations. They were there only at the time of defense to judge. Given that some kind of a nepotism was going on between jury members and advisors, the result was assessed with respect to these relations. As for PhD juries, they met regularly, once in every semester. It seemed PhD juries was functioning better than the MA committees. Yet there is room for development. Juries were meeting to assess the progress of student. It seems that re-tasking juries to advise and help students to develop is a more beneficial way.

Another recommendation is about the writing education. What the present study revealed among other things, is that the Turkish academe is in dire need of

epistemic writing centers and writing courses. The purpose of these centers and courses should be to help graduate students:

- œ to understand where anxieties, obstacles and challenges in writing come from and how students can address them.
- œ to analyze and position their research in research communities in which they are participating.
- œ to understand critically the role of writing in shaping and reproducing disciplinary culture, power relations, and politics and how these factors influence their writing.
- œ to develop epistemic strategies to deal with genre specifications.
- œ to develop productive relationship for feedback, peer review to revise and edit their work.
- œ to contemplate strategies for development as a writer and a systematic approach to their writing projects.

These centers and courses should go beyond correct grammar and spelling and structural qualities of academic writing. They should be based on the conceptualization of writing as a regulated, normalized and socially situated practice that involve conventions, expectations, norms, assumptions and exigencies and strive to make accessible to students this conceptualization.

My last recommendation is that there is an urgent and fundamental shift in understanding and operationalization of writing. Findings indicated that the current understanding, at least in the field of educational studies, is epidemic. What needed is a shift towards an epistemic conception of writing. Table 18 presents qualities of these conceptions. Evidence shows that there are fundamental differences between

these conceptions regarding writing conceptualization, research-writing connection, approach to literature writing, methods employed, and concluding research.

Accordingly, epidemic writing has a limited and rule-based articulation of writing regarding its functions. The focus is on the product, which basically is compartmentalized and lacks of flow and connection between ideas. On the other hand, epistemic conception sees writing as a tool of invention and knowledge generation. Writing is not writing up the ideas or knowledge, thought or invented somewhere else, but it is itself knowledge and invention. Epistemic recognizes the genre-specific nature of writing. As for the research-writing connection, epidemic writing perceives writing as some kind of action done at the end of research cycle, whereas epidemic writing is process-oriented and cyclical. Invention is an ongoing process therefore writing is research and it is embedded in the process. It is not possible to differentiate writing from the research. The two also differ on their understanding of the role of literature in thesis writing. Epidemic writing primarily repeats what has already done and said, therefore leaves very little room of authorial presence. Epistemic writing is basically positioning in the literature. The author makes arguments and claims in order to position her work against/with others. Epidemic studies tend to use repetitive and survey-based methods, whereas epistemic studies are case-specific and more genuine with regard to methods employed. And finally, these conceptualizations use conclusion/discussion for different purposes. Epistemic writing tends compare and contrast findings with previous findings of the literature. 'So what' argumentation and discussion are very limited. Epistemic writing tries to develop well-articulated arguments and claims to the question of 'so what'.

Table 18. Epidemic vs Epistemic Writing

Spaces-Genres	Epidemic Qualities	Epistemic Qualities
Writing Conception	Limited articulation, rule-based, compartmentalized, mechanical, and product oriented	Writing as invention, knowledge generation, genre-specific
Research-Writing Connection	Perceived as different and sequential phases. Writing up at the end.	Process oriented, non-sequential, embedded.
Literature	Repetition, non or limited authorial presence. Lack of proper-referencing and distant-language.	Authorial presence, discussion and argumentation, positioning.
Methodology-Methods	Repetitive, survey-based	Genuine and case-specific.
Conclusion/Discussion	Contrasting with previous findings, limited discussion, argumentation	Discussion, argumentation, falsifiable claims.

Writing is a deeply culturally specific action. Mastering technical skills, self-help books and manuals will not be enough to become a pro and participate in research communities. These communities have their own genre-specific rules and ways of articulation, which are unfamiliar to new-comers. Writing should be a curriculum movement, which encourages authorial presence, and familiarizes genres and research communities. Evidence-based pedagogies of writing should be basis of a such movement.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEWS FORMS

English Version

Student form:

Thesis Subject/Phases

- Could you tell me a little bit about your thesis?
- Why did you choose this subject?
- What processes did you go through in determining this topic?
- Did you have any subject on your mind when you started the program? Had that changed?
- How long did it take you to finish your thesis? (For finishers)
- How long have you been working on your thesis?
- What phase are you at? When do you plan to finish?
- Did you take a break?

Department/Advisor

- What department are you in?
- Can you tell us about your field of study and academic interests?
- How did you choose your advisor, how did you elect committee members?
- What areas do your committee members come from?
- What do your department/committee members expect from your work?
- Did those expectations match yours?
- If it didn't, what did you have to negotiate?
- What role did your advisor play in this process?
- What kind of contributions did your advisor make?
- Was your advisor available?
- What kind of feedback did you get from your advisor? What do you say to the timing of feedback?
- Do you think your advisor has read your entire thesis?
- How do your committee members approach you? (Flexible, supportive, solid)
- What are the roles of your committee members in the writing process?
- What do you think of bureaucratic requirements (such as thesis writing rules, monitoring meetings)?
- How was the thesis defense? What do you think the point of this is? (For finishers)

Read/Write/Research

- Previous writing experience?
- What do you think academic writing is, what kind of features do you think it has?
- When do you write, and read, do you have a program?

- How do you write? Is there a format, a format you're follow?
- Did your program teach you to write?
- Did the courses you took in the program contribute to your writing? How?
- Do you compare what you write with that of other academics in your field?
- Do you revise what you write? What kind of method do you follow?
- Is there a connection between writing and doing research? What kind of connection is there?
- Where do you put the writing in the research process/thesis process?
- How would you describe your thesis writing experience?
- Were there any difficulties you faced? How did you get over it, who was supportive?
- If you had changed anything about thesis writing and the academy, what would you want to change, why?
- Do you have any suggestions regarding the thesis writing process and your program?

Advisor Form:

- What department are you in?
- Can you tell us about your field of study and academic interests?
- How much of your workload is allocated to graduate and doctoral students?
- How many theses have you consulted?
- How do you choose students?
- What role do you play in students' subject selection processes?
- How would you describe your advising practice?
- What do you pay most attention to in theses?
- Do you read the whole thesis?
- What kind of feedback do you provide?
- How is the timing of your feedback?
- What is the function of the thesis committees?
- What do you think of bureaucratic requirements (such as thesis writing rules, monitoring meetings)?
- Does your program provide writing training?
- Do you think the courses in the program contribute to writing? How?
- What do you think academic writing is, what kind of features do you think it has?
- Is there a connection between writing and doing research? What kind of connection is there?
- Where do you put the writing in the research process/thesis process?
- If you changed anything about thesis writing and the academy, what would you want to change, why?

Turkish Version

- Tez konunuzu biraz anlatır mısınız?
- Neden bu konuyu seçtiniz?
- Bu konuyu belirlerken hangi süreçlerden geçtiniz?
- Programa başlarken aklınızda bir konu var mıydı? Bu değişti mi?
- Ne kadar sürede tezinizi bitirdiniz? (Bitirenler için)
- Ne kadar süredir teziniz üzerinde çalışıyorsunuz?
- Hangi aşamadasınız? Ne zaman bitirmeyi planlıyorsunuz?
- Ara verdiniz mi?

Bölüm/Danışman

- Hangi bölümdesiniz?
- Çalışma alanınız ve akademik ilgi alanlarınız hakkında bilgi verir misiniz?
- Danışmanınızı nasıl seçtiniz, komite üyelerini nasıl seçtiniz?
- Komite üyeleriniz hangi alanlardan gelmektedir?
- Bölümünüzün/komite üyelerinizin çalışmanızdan beklentileri nelerdir?
- Bu beklentiler sizinkiler ile uyumlu mu?
- Uyuşmadı ise neleri müzakere etmek zorunda kaldınız?
- Danışmanınız bu süreçte nasıl bir rol oynadı?
- Danışmanınız ne tür katkılar sundu?
- Danışmanınız ulaşılabilir miydi?
- Danışmanınızdan ne tür geri bildirimler aldınız? Geri bildirimlerin zamanlaması için ne söylersiniz?
- Danışmanınızın bütün tezinizi okuduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?
- Komite üyelerinizin size yaklaşımları nasıldır? (Esnek, destekleyici, katı)
- Komite üyelerinizin yazım süreçlerindeki rolleri nelerdir?
- Bürokratik gereklilikler (tez yazım kuralları, izleme toplantıları gibi) hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
- Tez savunması nasıl geçti? Sizce bunun amacı nedir? (Bitirenler için)

Okuma/Yazma/Araştırma

- Daha önce ki yazı yazma deneyimi?
- Sizce akademik yazı nedir, ne tür özellikleri vardır?
- Ne zaman yazarsınız, okursunuz, bir programınız var mı?
- Nasıl yazarsınız? İzlediğiniz bir format, biçim var mı?
- Programınız size yazı yazma eğitimi verdi mi?
- Programda aldığınız derslerin yazı yazmanıza bir katkısı oldu mu? Nasıl?
- Yazdıklarınızı alanınızdaki diğer akademisyenlerin yazdıkları ile karşılaştır mısınız?
- Yazdıklarınızda düzeltme yapar mısınız? Nasıl bir metot izlersiniz?
- Yazı ve araştırma yapma arasında bir bağlantı var mıdır? Nasıl bir bağlantı vardır?
- Yazıyı araştırma süreci/tez süreci içerisinde nereye koyarsınız?
- Tez yazma deneyiminizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?
- Karşılaştığınız güçlükler var mıdır? Nasıl aştınız bunları, kimler destek oldu?
- Tez yazma ve akademi ile ilgili bir şeyi değiştirseydiniz neyi değiştirmek isterdiniz, neden?
- Tez yazma süreci ve programınız ile ilgi bir öneriniz var mıdır?

Advisor form:

- Hangi bölümdesiniz?
- Çalışma alanınız ve akademik ilgi alanlarınız hakkında bilgi verir misiniz?
- İş yükünüzün ne kadarı yüksek lisans ve doktora öğrencilerine ayrılmaktadır?
- Ne kadar sayıda teze danışmanlık yaptınız?
- Öğrencileri nasıl seçersiniz?
- Öğrencilerin konu seçme süreçlerinde nasıl bir rol oynarsınız?
- Danışmanlık pratiğinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?
- Tezlerde en çok nelere dikkat edersiniz?
- Bütün tezi okur musunuz?
- Ne tür dönüt verirsiniz?
- Geri bildirimlerinizin zamanlaması nasıldır?
- Tez komitelerinin işlevi nedir?
- Bürokratik gereklilikler (tez yazım kuralları, izleme toplantıları gibi) hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
- Programınız yazı yazma eğitimi vermekte midir?
- Sizce programdaki derslerin yazı yazmaya bir katkısı oluyor mu? Nasıl?
- Sizce akademik yazı nedir, ne tür özellikleri vardır?
- Yazı ve araştırma yapma arasında bir bağlantı var mıdır? Nasıl bir bağlantı vardır?
- Yazıyı araştırma süreci/tez süreci içerisinde nereye koyarsınız?
- Tez yazma ve akademi ile ilgili bir şeyi değiştirseydiniz neyi değiştirmek isterdiniz, neden?

APPENDIX B: ETHICS APPROVAL

T.C.
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
İnsan Araştırmaları Kurumsal Değerlendirme Alt Kurulu

16 Mayıs 2018 - Sayı: 27

Ziya Toprak
Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Akademik Yazı ve Lisansüstü Öğrencilerinin ve Danışmanlarının Deneyimleri: Eğitim Çalışmaları Örneği" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığımız SBB-EAK 2017/51 sayılı başvuru İNAREK/SBB Etik Alt Kurulu tarafından 16 Mayıs 2018 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve uygun bulunmuştur.

Doç. Dr. Mehmet Yiğit Gürdal

Doç. Dr. Gül Sosay

Doç. Dr. Ebru Kaya

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi İnci Ayhan

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Bengü Börkan

APPENDIX C: CODEBOOK

1 Advisors	0
1.1 Writing Ideas	0
1.1.1 Academic Writing/Research	1
1.1.1.1 changewanted	16
1.1.1.2 research-writing-connect	32
1.1.1.3 features	8
1.1.1.4 definition	11
1.1.2 Writing Education	27
1.2 Advising Practice	0
1.2.1 Workload	12
1.2.2 Keyissuesintheses	19
1.2.3 WayofAdvise	13
1.2.4 Bureaucracy	11
1.2.5 Juries	16
1.2.6 Feedback	25
1.2.7 Readingthesis	6
2 Grads	0
2.1 Reading/Writing	0
2.1.1 wanted changes	14
2.1.2 WritingProcess	3
2.1.2.1 Obstacles	6
2.1.2.2 WritingHabits	19
2.1.3 WritingResearch	16
2.1.4 Support systems	1
2.1.5 WritingEducation	18
2.1.6 AcademicWriting	11
2.1.7 Prev. Writing Experience	6
2.2 Advisor Support	0
2.2.1 advisorSelect	11
2.2.2 bureaucracy	7
2.2.3 Feedback	15
2.2.4 AdvisorSupportRelations	16
2.2.5 JuryFunctionsRelations	10
2.2.6 FieldKnowledge	2

APPENDIX D: CODED EXCERPTS

Akademik yazı vıcık vıcık duygusal bir yazı değildir ve akademik yazı o dediğim gibi hava atmak için yazılan yazıda değildir. (AssistProf-1)

Akademik yazı süreci iyi yansıtması gerekir yani, tek bir kelimeyle ifade edersem. Yaptığı şeyleri en fazla ekonomik şekilde en anlaşılır şekilde anlatması gerekir ve karanlık noktada bırakmaması gerekir yani bu neden böyle dememesi lazım? Ya da ikinci bir şey: Burada ne demek istiyor da dememesi lazım. O iyi bir akademik üründür. (AssistProf-2)

Yani çok keskin bir dil kullanmamak ile çok yumuşak bir dil kullanmak arasında bir yere konulması gerekiyor yazarı çok keskin olmaması gerekir. Çünkü kati sonuçları bulduğunuza dair yeterli olmayabilir çok eski sonuçlar bu açıdan akıllıca değillerdir. Çok yumuşak sonuçlarda yani çok öyle köşeli olmayan yuvarlak olan sonuçlarda araştırma yapmanın doğasına aykırı şeyler. (Assist Prof-3)

Akademik yazı nedir? Akademik yazı, okuduğun literatürü ortaya koyduğu sonucu, bulguyu, Anlaşılır bir dille, kamu yararını gözeterek, kamuya sunmaktır. (AssocProf-1).

Akademik yazı sabır işidir. Gerçekten sabır ve çok çala kalem yazılamayacak çok ciddi bir iştir. Bir kere çok sağlam okuma gerektirir. Yani belki 40 50 tane makale okursan ancak gerçekten nitelikli bir şey yazma kıvamına gelirsin. O yüzden ciddi bir iştir. Kolay bir iş değildir öyle daha ne diyebilirim bilmiyorum. (AssistPro-3).

Akademik yazma genel olarak, herhangi bir konuda mevcut akademik birikimi de kullanarak ortaya ispat edilebilir akademik olarak da kusursuz metin ortaya çıkarmaktır (Prof-1)

Bilim nedir?" le belki aynı paralellikte bir şey. Belirli bir metodolojiye dayanan yazım tekniği diyebiliriz. Belirli bir yöntemle işe koşulmuş verinin, belirli yöntemle analizi ve sonucunda raporlaştırma aşamasına diyebiliriz bunu (AssocProf-2).

1 belirli bir yönteme dayanması 2 mutlaka analize dayanması en azından ben eğitim bilimi olarak bakıyor, o analizin geçerliliğini ve güvenilirliğini arttıracak ispat, ispatlamalar demeyeyim de, nitel üzerinden konuşuyorum (AssocProf-3).

Akademik yazma Türkiye'de son yıllarda gündeme gelen bir konu. Yani herhangi bir alanda bir çalışma yaparken, bir makale yazarken, bir tez hazırlarken hangi kurallara uyulması gerektiğine dair kuralların bütünüdür (Prof-2).

Yani akademik yazının bence bir formatı vardır. Yani bir tezin formatıyla bir makalenin formatı da aynıdır hepsi aynıdır aslında. Bir bildiride aynıdır. Yani bir adı vardır bir amacıyla bir özeti vardır. Bir... Yani hepsinin format aynıdır ama tez daha geniş daha detaylıdır Makale de eğer oradan tek bir sonuç bulduysanız onun 10 sayfaya indirgenmiş halidir ama format aynıdır. Yani şey olarak... fark görmüyorum (Prof-3).

Şimdi akademik yazının bir kere olmazsa olmaz özellikleri var. Ne onlar? Problem bir kere, yani hani bir problem cümlesini görülmesi gerek, bir yöntemin mutlaka belirtilmesi gerek, o yöntemin, o problemlerin, alt problemlerinin yazılması gerekiyor. Desen yönteme uygun mu belirtilmesi gerekiyor. Sonra işte bulgular, veriler, varsayımlar, sınırlılıklar, sayıtlar ve buna bağlı olarak sonuç ve öneriler kısmın inşa edilmesi gerekiyor (AssocProf-2).

Yani bir profesyonel veya ne bileyim bir deneme yazmaya benzemez ritüelleri vardır. Kuralları vardır. Atıf verme şekli vardır. Bazen sıkıcı olabilir. Yorucu olabilir, yıldırıcı olabilir ama öyle bir şeyi var genel geçer kurallar belirlenmiş (Assist-Pro-2).

Bir başka konu da kurallara uyup uymaması. Biliyorsun, bir takım kurallar var APA, Chicago MLA -ki daha çok sosyologların hakim olduğu bir alandır-, öğrencilik yollarımda benim danışmanım sosyolog olduğu için ben Chicago MLA kullanıyordum. Sonra eğitimde çok fazla APA kullanmaya başladım. Bu kurallar da akşamdan sabaha oluşmuş kurallar değil, bir yerden bir yazı aldıysan kaynağını göstereceksin. Akademik bir metnin de bu kurallara uyması gerektiğini düşünüyorum. (Prof-2).

Yüksek Lisansımı Fransız Ekolündeki bir üniversitede yaptım, Doktoramı Amerikan Ekolündeki bir üniversitede. İkisinin arasındaki fark: Fransız Ekolünde uzun ve ağıdalı cümleler, bizim Türkçede kabul görüldüğü gibi uzun ve ağıdalı cümleler beklenirken, Amerikan sisteminde denir ki en iyi cümle en kısa ve öz olandır. O yüzden onlar mesela Fransızcada bizim üç satırlık cümle ile anlattığımıza derler ki "Üç satırlık bir cümleye sıkışma onun yerine ikiye böl, üçe böl." denir. O yüzden kısa ve anlaşılır cümleler, ağıdalı bir dil, net bir dil kullanmayı önerir (AssistProf-5).

Yazının kalitesini anlıyorum. Yani hikaye anlatıyor gibi olmayacak. Bir dayanağı olmalı, gözleme ve araştırmaya dayanmalı. Paragraf sağlam kurulmalı. Bir paragrafın ana fikri ve yardımcı fikirleri vardır, verdiği mesajlar vardır. Bunlar yazılmalı. Sonunu araştırmalarla desteklemelisin. İngilizcede bunun kuralları çok belirgindir. Her paragraf bir fikrin ifade edildiği bir metindir. Orada bir ana fikir oluyor ve yan fikirler de oluyor. Bir şey yazar ve arkasından desteğini de orada sergilersin. Türkçe’de kurallar bu kadar bilinmiyor ve net değil. Bazen bir paragrafta birden çok fikir olur, bazen destek ve delil olmaz. Onun için bazen Türkçe metinleri okurken çok sıkılıyorum. Darmadağın yazılmış oluyor ve kendini kaybediyorsun. Bütünlük olmuyor. Bunu söylemek de hoş bir durum değil ama maalesef bununla sık sık karşılaşıyorum (Prof-2).

Şimdi şöyle söyleyeyim bir akademik çalışmanın 2 boyutu olur: (1) Öğrencinin yaptığı çalışma yada hocanın yaptığı çalışmanın kendisi. Bu nitel olabilir nicel olabilir. Değişik yöntemlerle yapılmış bir çalışma olabilir. (2) ikinci ayağında bunun raporlaştırılması, yani metin haline getirilmesidir. Akademik yazma dediğimiz şey ise bu ikincisiyle daha çok uğraşır. Nesnel bir dil kullanma, öznel ifadelerden kaçınma, kullandığınız herhangi bir bilgiyi mutlaka atıfla gösterme- bir yerden yararlandıysanız- mevcut literatürü değerlendirme, sizden önce çünkü o konularda birileri bir şeyler söylemiştir. Yanlış yada doğru onları alıp tartışma, değerlendirme, sizin sonuçlarınızla onların sonuçlarını karşılaştırma gibi bir dizi etkinlik içerir bu ve bütün bunları da sonuç itibariyle... Nasıl söyleyeyim? Nesnel bir dil kullanarak hiç bir şekilde farklı anlaşılmalara meydan vermeksizin onu metin haline getirmeyi kapsar. (Prof-4).

Son basamağa koyarım. Yani anlamlı kılma açıkçası süreci diye bakarım. Bir basamağın son hali diyeyim ben size. Yazarsınız basılır basıldıktan sonra biz onu şey sanırsınız... O birazda belki hani var ya Ses sanatçısının kaseti CD'si çıkar. Bizim de işte böyle oluyor (AssocProf-2).

Arasındaki ilişki biri ötekinin son basamağı diyebiliriz. Araştırma yaparsınız iki olasılık vardır. Ya bildiri olarak sunarsınız onun arkasından tam metin veya makaleleştirme süreci başlar (AssocProf-3)

Yazı ve araştırma yapma arasında doğrudan bir bağlantı olduğunu zannetmiyorum ama iyi bir araştırma, iyi bir akademisyen aynı zamanda iyi yazabilenlerdir. Yani iyi bir araştırmacı olabilir ama onu yazıya dökemezse iyi bir araştırmacı iyi bir akademisyen olamaz (AssistProf-5)

Bire bir bağlantı yok. Araştırma yapıyorsunuz. Daha sonra bunun yazıya dökmeniz gerekecek? En azından bizim şeyler de alanlarda Biraz önceki Cevabımla alakalı iyi bir araştırma iyi biçimde yazılmazsa ifade edilmezse bu değerinden çok fazla şey götürecektir. (AsissProf-3)

Bana göre yazma sona bırakılmamalı. Tez ve araştırma sürecinde sürekli devam edilmeli. Yani yazma işi bir şekilde görev neyse yazarak devam etmeli. Mutlaka yazma işini en sona bırakmamak gerekiyor (AssistProf-4).

Güzel, evet güzel soru. Yani yazmak mühim bir eylem, bizim araştırma yaparken süreci göz önüne aldığınızda yazmayı en sonda yapmaz akıllıca davranıyorsa eğer, yazmayı araştırmasının her aşamasına yayar. (AssistProf-5)

Eğitim bilimleri adına ya da psikolojik danışmanlık ya da gelişim psikolojisi adını yazı yazmakla araştırma yapmak arasında birebir bağlantı var. Ya yazmadan, yazma bir düşünce tool' u olduğu için yazmadan o araştırmayı tam iyi kurgulayamazsınız... Mühendisler için böyle olmayabilir belki onlar laboratuvarında dataları toplayıp, toplayıp, toplayıp datanın içerisinden bir şeyler seçip yapabilir ama bizim, özellikle benim çalıştığım alan öyle değil, o yüzden yazmanın, yazarak düşünmenin ve çok okumanın çok faydası var.... Yeni bilgi üretmek içinde çok okumak çok yazmak ve çok da araştırmak gerekiyor. (AssistProf-2)

Tamamı yazmak. Neredeyse yani hani çünkü araştırmayı kurgularkende yazmak zorundasınız. Veriyi topladıktan yani yazmak en önemli kısmı. Dizayn etmek de öyle tabi ama o da yazmayla beraber yani yazarken onu dizayn ederken yazıyorsunuz aynı zamanda (AssistProf-2)

Yok yazı yazma eğitim verilmiyor. eğitim vermiyor. Ben kendi derslerim de Bu bağlamda hazırlık yapacak ödev istiyorum ama bir herhangi bir ders yok (AssistProf-2).

Zaten bütün derslerimiz onun hakkında. Akademik yazma.... Yöntem derslerimiz var. Yöntem dersleri içinde tez nasıl yazılır konusuna giriyoruz (AsistProf-3).

Yüksek lisans programlarında seminer dersi var. Seminer dersi kapsamında öğrenci ne kadar yazı yazabilir bilmiyorum (AssocProf-1).

Araştırma metodları ile ilgili derslerde gördükleri kadarıyla (AssocProf-2).

Oluyordur. Ben en azından kendi dersimden söyleyeyim (Prof-1).

Şöyle oluyor dersler ders aşamasında makale yazmaları ya da tez önerisi kaleme almalarını istiyoruz. o sırada bir şeyler yazıyorlar. Yani bir şeyler inşa ediyorlar, bizde inşa etme tekniklerini görüyoruz. Bu anlamda katkısı oluyor (AssocProf-3).

Muhakkak olduğunu düşünüyorum çünkü derslerimizde öğretim üyelerimiz sıklıkla öğrencilerden okuduklarını özetlemelerini yani yazmalarını. Yeni bir şey yazmalarını derli toplu bir hale getirmelerini falan isteyebiliyorlar. Bu açıdan yazmaya yönelik görevlerin yeterince olduğunu düşünüyorum, yani birçok arkadaşımızı tanıyorum çünkü. Bu tür görevler oluyor derslerde (AssistProf-5).

Programa öğrenci alırken yazı yazmayı bilip bilmediğine bakmıyoruz. Bildiğini varsayıyoruz. Arada sürprizler çıkabilir ama varsayım böyle (Prof-1).

Öyle bir ders yok bizde ve olmasını istemem çünkü zaten programda süre kasıtlı ve yüklü. Bir de oraya gelene kadar o sorunu çözmüş olması gerektiğini düşünüyorum adayın. Yani master düzeyine gelen öğrencinin o sorunu olmamalı. Diğer türlü başka eksikler de çıkıyor ortaya. Hangi birini tamir edeceksiniz, hangi birini tamamlayacaksınız? (Prof-1).

Türk eğitim sisteminde, siz öğrenciler, nasıl sınava çok fazla tabii tutulmanın getirdiği bazı yorgunluklara ve yıpranma paylarına sahipseniz, biz de öğretim üyeleri olarak, Türkiye'deki hali hazırdaki eğitim sisteminde, özellikle de özel üniversitelerde, ders yükü ve buna benzer sorumluluklardan dolayı, galiba danışmanlık rolünü üstlendiğimizde, belki de normal şartlarda yapabileceğimiz ve ayırabileceğimiz sürenin, belki yarısını, belki de çeyreğini harcayabiliyoruz (AssistProf-1).

Yani oran olarak herhalde %60 70 derim. Yani görece lisans derslerinin daha az 60, 70 diyebilirim %60 70 (AssocProf-2).

Lisans öğrencilerinden daha fazla yani %50 den fazla diyeyim. Ağırlıklı yüksek lisans ve doktora (AssocProf-3).

Ben, muhtemeldir... 52 yaşındayım 35 ile 40 arası yüksek lisans ve doktora öğrencisi mezun ettim (AssosProf-2).

Herhalde, şöyle veya böyle 10'u geçti. 10'la 15 orası olmuş olabilir (AssistProf-3)

Daha önce sorulmamış bir sorunun peşinden koşmuş mu? Daha önce yapılmış olan tezlerin bir tekrarı mı yoksa yeni bir soru, yani bu alana yeni bir şey katıyor mu? Bir de öğrenciye en çok sorduğumuz soru genelde o oluyor. Yani bu alana ne katmayı planlıyorsun? Bu yaptığının çalışma sonunda bu alana nasıl bir katkısı olacak? Özgün bir çalışma mı? Alana bir katkısı var mı? Ona bakıyorum. Tabi onun dışında, izlediği bilimsel yöntemler neler? Hani uygulamalı bir tez mi, teorik bir tez mi? İşte, istatistik analizi var mı? Analizi varsa öğrenci analizi kendisi mi yapmış yoksa farklı bir yerden yardım alarak analizi yaptırmış mı? Bu konulara dikkat etmeye çalışıyorum (AssocProf-3)

Tezlerde dikkat ettiğim şeyler; Bu araştırma niye önemlidir? Alana katkı anlamında nasıl önemlidir? Literatüre katkı anlamında neden önemlidir? Neyi amaçlıyor? Ve Yöntemi nasıl kuruluyor? Bunlara odaklanırım. Aynı zamanda analiz sürecinden sonra özellikle tartışma kısmında önemseddiği ve amaçladığı şeyi tartışabilmiş midir? Tartışamamış mıdır? Bunu önemserim (AssocProf-1).

Bir kere evvela, metodu biliyor mu? Tez yazım teknikleri yani evvela bilimsel araştırma yöntemlerinin farkında mı? Hangi yöntemi tespit edeceğiz? O yöntemin, yöntemle çalışmanın ne demek olduğunu biliyor mu? Sonra tez yazım teknikleri konusunda ne kadar bilgisi var. Bunlar, bunlarla ilgili yeterli donanım yoksa, ayrıca alabilecek: benden ya da literatürden ya da başka hocalara rica ederek derslerine giderek. Yani git oradaki açığını kapa. Sonra gel. Özellikle doktora aşamasında hala böyle eksiği varsa, mesela durum araştırması nasıl yapılır? Bununla ilgili ders veren hocalarımız var. Rica ediyoruz evvela yöntem, bilimsel yazım teknikleri konusundaki yeterliliği ne bakıyoruz (AssocProf-2).

Her şeyle ilgili... Yani problem cümlesi yazılmış mı? Alt problemler oluşturulmuş mu? Yöntem o konuya uygun mu? Desen doğru dürüst tespit edilebilmiş mi? Nitel ve nicel araştırma yöntemi olarak belirttiği şeyler gerçekten konuyu açıklayabil... Ne varsa, yani hani, üslup doğru mu kullanılıyor? Enstitünün istediği formata göre mi yazım oluyor yani incelenmesi gereken ne varsa, literatür yeterli derecede yani kaynaklara bakılıyormu alıntı teknikleri doğru mu? Ne aklınıza gelirse (AssocProf-3).

İlk önce adı amacı, bunun uyumu, amaç, problem, alt problemler ve de yöntem ölçme araçları, ve sonuç çok önemli (Prof-2).

Cut copy, özellikle literatür kısmında, amcam gidiyor Ali Beyden alıyor, koyuyor. Tamam şeyini veriyor künyesini veriyor itiraz etmiyorum. O zaten şey değil. Sonra Veli Beyden, sonra Abbas Beyden, Hasan Beyden, Mehmet

Beyden, Ayşe Hanımdan, Fatma hanımdan. Cut copy, cut copy yani sen... Where are you? Neredesin? Kimin tezi bu? Hadi bak yüksek lisansta kısmen ama, ama doktora tezinde işte biraz önce bahsettim ya şu tezi geri yollamamın nedeni yani yeterince kendine ait olmadığı için açıkçası (AssocProf-1).

Evet, bu tabii... her yiğidin bir yoğurt yiyişi vardır diyelim değil mi? her danışman farklı davranabilir (AssistProf-5).

Profesyonel olarak bir iş bulmaya çalışırım. Öğrencinin işi dışında öğrenci özel durumlarına dahil olmam. Mesela, hocam ben literatür bulamadım bu konuda bana yardımcı olur musunuz noktasında nereden literatür bulabileceği söylerim ama ona asla onun için literatür taramam. Bunun yanında yöntemle ilgili metodoloji ile ilgili analizler ile ilgili kendisine rehberlik ederim ama asla analizini yapmam (AssocProf-1).

Manevi olarak desteklediğim diğer tezleri de düşünürsek, şöyle tanımlayabilirim. Tezi kendi tezim gibi benimsiyorum. Fazlaca benimsiyorum hatta. Onunla yatıp kalkıyorum sürekli (AssistProf-2).

Daha ziyade rehber... Öğrenciye rehberlik yapacak kişi olarak gördüm kendimi. Köşeli değilimdir. Çok da ısrarlı sayılmam (AssistProf-3). Benim için süreçte feedback vermek önemlidir. Yani bu böyle çünkü ben bunu kendi eğitimim esnasında böyle öğrendim. Ben yazarım. Ben bir chapter yazarım sonra hoca onu okur Sonra ben onu Ağlaya ağlaya düzeltirim. Sonra bir daha yazarım, bir daha düzeltir... bir daha düzeltirim. Bu böyle bir ilişki o yüzden bunun aynısını bende yapıyorum bundan öğrenciler hiç hoşnut değil. Çoğu zaman öğrencilerin özellikle genç tecrübesiz ve ne yaptığını bilmeyen öğrenciyse genellikle feedback' leri doğru düzgün okumuyor bile ama asıl research' te ne yaptığını anlama şeyi bu yaz boz şeyinde geliyor yani böyle tarif şey yapıyorum. Yani yazboz tahtasında sürekli geri bildirimlerle ilerlemek (AssistProf-4).

Organizasyon, tabii ki basit düzeltmeler şeklinde de olabiliyor. Atıf anlamında, gerçekten o atıf onu söylüyor mu, yerinde bir atıf mı veya bir de bir atıf gerekiyor veya bu cümlelerin akışı paragrafın akışında sıkıntı var tarzında daha böyle yüzeysel bir dönüt değil de yapısal diyebiliriz. Organizasyon anlamında da dönütlerim oluyor tabii (AssistProf-5).

Evet şekilsel olarak da dönütler veriyorum yani şekil... Bu başlık şöyle olsun. Bu başlıklandırmayı şu sırada yapalım falan gibi tavsiyelerde bulunuyormuş (AssistProf-4).

Her şeyle ilgili... Yani problem cümlesi yazılmış mı? Alt problemler oluşturulmuş mu? Yöntem o konuya uygun mu? Desen doğru dürüst tespit edilebilmiş mi? Nitel ve nicel araştırma yöntemi olarak belirttiği şeyler gerçekten konuyu açıklayabil... Ne varsa, yani hani, üslup doğru mu kullanılıyor? Enstitünün istediği formata göre mi yazım oluyor yani incelenmesi gereken ne varsa, literatür yeterli derecede yani kaynaklara bakılıyormu alıntı teknikleri doğru mu? Ne aklınıza gelirse (AssocProf-2).

Giriş bölümünde, ne bileyim işte, bütün literatüre hakim olmuş mu? Atladığı kaynaklar var mı? Yabancı yayınları takip etmiş mi? Bunlara bakarım. Yöntem bölümünde de yapılan çalışmaya uygun mu yöntemin açıklaması, ona bakılır. Sonuç bölümünde bir tartışma varmı yokmu ona dikkat ederim. Sadece bir sonuç mu var tezde yoksa bir tartışmada ilave edilmiş mi, bunlara bakılır. Onun dışında da yine az önce söylediğim gibi tezin yazım noktalama hatalarından arındırılması bizim için önemli. İfade olarak da akademik bir üslup kullanılmış mı, ona dikkat edilmiş mi, cümleler açık, anlaşılır mı. Bunlara dikkat edilir (Prof-1).

Tez komiteleri iki işlev yaparlar bir tanesi yüksek lisans. Zaten tez komitesi 1 defa toplanır oda tez bittiği zaman. Tez biter. Tez komitesine gelir. Tez geçer yada kalır veya uzatma alır. Doktorada tez komitesi düzeltmeler yapar. Yani 2 fonksiyonu var düzeltme ve sonuçlandırma şeklinde (AssistProf-5).

Yok. Bir tek savunmada bir araya gelen bir grup var. Tez savunmalarında ki jüriler daha çok birbiriyle ilişkili kişiler tarafından belirleniyor. Aslında bu çok sağlıklı bir süreç değil çünkü yapılan çalışmanın savunulabilir olması için o kişilerin birbirinden bağımsız olması gerekiyor. Alan uzmanı ama birbirine bağımsız olması gerekiyor. Bir çıkar ilişkisinin olması gerekiyor. O komitenin de çok işlevsel olduğunu düşünmüyorum. Bu arada geçemeyen tezler de vardır, düzeltme alan tezler de vardır. Zaten o tezlerde geçip geçmeyenler ya da düzeltme alan tezler danışmanın hatırına ilişkindir. Hani düzeltmesi olsun, daha iyi bir tez olsun. Danışman adı yazacak üzerinde. Tezi yazan kişi çok da bu bağlamda değerlendirilmiyor (AssocProf-1).

Sadece aslında danışman götürüyor o işi ve danışmanında bazen tamamıyla okumadığını hissettiğim tezlerde olmuş oluyor. O yüzden tez komiteleri öyle yani bir araya gelelim, bu çocuğumuzu bir an önce mezun edelim, hayata atalım." (AssistProf-5).

Şimdi bu yüksek lisansta olmuyor tabi, doktora seviyesinde oluyor, tez izleme komiteleri. Bunlar da benim aylık istediğim raporun, 6 aylık sunu şeklinde gerçekleşiyor. 6 ay içerisinde nasıl bir gelişme kaydedilmiş nereler yazılmış nerelere bakılmış bunlar inceleniyor (AssocProf-3).

Hah, savunma da yapacak bir şey yok zaten tezi görücüye çıkarıyorsunuz bitmiş oluyor ama tez izleme komitesi şöyle önemli. Şimdi ben iki açıdan değerlendirebilirim bunu: (1) benim öğrencimin tikiinde ne gibi faydalar olur: benim göremediğim, öğrencimin fark edemediği bambaşka boyutlara ortaya çıkabiliyor. yani diğer Hoca veya öbür Hoca'nın, 3 kişi oluyor genellikle. Diğer hocaların söylediği şeyler oluyor, mesela bir tane genellikle eğitim bilimlerinden genel bir eğitim bilimci çağırıyoruz. O biraz daha metodolojik açıdan bakıyor, bazen ciddi sorunlar da çıkarıyor aslında, alan eğitimcisi olmadığı için ama benim çok beğendiğim iki akademisyen arkadaş var eğitim bilimlerinde. Onlar zaten sıkı metodoloji biliyorlar biraz. Bizimde tezlerimize aşınalar eğitimini nerede onlar zaten sıkı metodolojik biliyorlar bizim de tezlerimize biraz aşınalar. Dolayısıyla hani çok böyle katı gitmiyorlar. Sizin alanda böyle çalışmalar var diye düşünüyorlar ve onların çok önemli katkıları oluyor. (2) öbür açıdan bakarsan, öğrenci adına bakarsa, bu benim açımdan

benim eksiğimi kapatıyorlar... Öğrencim açısından bakarsan farklı akademisyenlerin farklı yoğurt yiyişlerini görüyorlar, bazen tartışmaları şahit oluyorlar. Mesela benim fikrimle karşı tarafın fikri uyumlu olmuyor sonra onu çok kibar bir şekilde tartışıyoruz. “Ama öyle olursa şöyle olmaz mı? İşte şunu uyar mı uymaz mı?” bu zenginlik katıyor daha çok yönlü bakmasın sağlıyor öğrenci açısından. Tike katılan hocalar açısından bakarsak onlar da mesela kendi... genellikle çalışma alanlarınız dardır. Yani bir alanda çok spesifikleşirsiniz. O alanda doktorant üretirsiniz ya da yetiştirirsiniz. Tike katılan hocalar açısından da mesela benim tezlerim biraz kallavi olur zaten çok da kalın olurlar. Fazla data toplatırım ben. Dolayısıyla oradan mesela farklı bir yöntem görüyorlar. “Aaa mesela ben bunu fen de kullanmıyorum. Aslında ben de bunu kullanabilirim.” diyebiliyor yani. Aynı şey benim için de geçerli mesela başka bir hocanın içine girdiğimde “Aaa bak bu çok STEM’e çok farklı bir boyut katmışsınız. Biz bunu hiç düşünmemiştik mesela.” diyebiliyorum.” (Prof-2).

Bürokratik de, ya bürokratik derken tabi bir bağlı olunan sosyal bilimler enstitüsü var ve onunda koyduğu kurallar var. O da biraz sosyal bilimler enstitüsünün müdürüne göre ve o müdürünün algısına göre biraz daha şekilleniyor. Bazen daha strict oluyorlar bazen o bürokrasiye daha bağlı oluyorlar ama bir şekilde bir kurumun işleyebilmesi için o bürokrasinin, mantıklı bir bürokrasinde olması gerekiyor. Öteki türlü eee... olmaz yani tabi ki bir sosyal bilimler enstitüsü olacak. Tabi ki bir yazım kuralı olacak. Evet zorlayabilici olabiliyor bazen ama, nasıl formatlanması gerektiği, bağlayıcı birşey olması gerekiyor (AsistProf-3).

Bürokratik gereklilikler çok ayrıntılı ve abartılmamışsa olumlu buluyorum. Yani aksi düşünülemez. Yani bürokratik gereklilikler ortaya iyi ürün çıkması için tasarlandı (AssistProf-4).

Evet, yani bunların, örneğin tez yazım kılavuzlarının çok elzem lüzumlu olduğunu düşünüyorum. Yani yazan kişiye bir yol haritası çizdiğini hem şekilsel hem içerik bakımında neler yapması gerektiğini ifade etmesi bakımından güzel olduğunu düşünüyorum. Bürokratik süreçleri de çok fazla bırakıp bir süreç olduğunu düşünmüyorum ya önerisini teslim etmek, onay almak, tez için gerekli izinleri almak falan Bunlar zaten etik açıdan da yapılması elzem olan şeyler, onun için makul geliyor bana (AsistProf-5).

Yani hani kurallar konusu biraz daha bence tez yazımında esnek bırakılmalı özellikle çok sinir olduğum bir konu var. Lirik başlık atarım ben, teze, ama enstitü bu konuda çok kuralcı. Değişkenleri koysanız bile işte lirik ve soru işareti içeren başlık sevmiyorlar. Ben biraz daha popüler başlık atarım. Mesela işte “Piaget Vygotsky’ye Karşı” falan gibi bu tarz şeyleri sevmiyorlar. Yani illa orada çalışmanın bağımlı bağımsız değişkenlerini belirtmenizi istiyorlar (Prof-3).

Students:

Bölümdeyken bitirme ödevlerimiz olurdu. Response-paper'larımız olurdu. Yani bir makaleyi okuyup ya da herhangi bir kitabı okuyup onlara eleştirel yazılar yazardık (MAS-5).

Lisansta ve yüksek lisansın ders aşamasında vardı. Yani hiç dergilere falan makale göndermedim ama yani o formatta nerdeyse tez gibi yazdığımız şeyler oldu, araştırmalar oldu. Lisans döneminde ve yüksek lisansta tez dersi aldık zaten. Yani araştırma nasıl yapılır dersi diyeyim. O derslerde oldu yani (MAS-7).

Yüksek lisans tezini yapmadan önce üniversitede lisans düzeyinde ödevler yapıyorduk raporlar hazırlıyorduk projelerde görev alıyorduk (PhD-3).

Akademik yazı, yani başta tabii ki yazım kurallarına uyan, karşı tarafın okuduğunda kafasını bulandırmayacak nitelikte net bilgiler içeren ve bu bilgilerin belli temellere dayandırılmış olması gereken bilgi veren yazıdır herhalde diye düşünüyorum (MAS-14).

Akademik yazı bir araştırma sorusuna bir cevap verme çabasıdır bir araştırma konusu ortaya konduktan sonra yapmış olduğunuz çalışma ve diğer okumuş olduğunuz kaynaklardan edinmiş olduğunuz bilgilerle açık anlaşılır bir şekilde kağıda dökme süreci akademik yazı olarak adlandırılabilir (PhD-4)

Daha demin dediğim gibi, akademik yazı önemlidir. Bir cümlede fazla anlam verilmemesi lazım, dediğim gibi ve düzgün yazılması lazım. Bir yanlış bütün anlamı değiştirebiliyor sonuçta (MAS-12).

Şimdi akademik yazı, tezin de birçok türü var, tez çalışmasında işte deneysel yarı-deneysel gibi türleri var ama akademik makale olduğunu makale hani makaleyle ilgili söyleyeyim genelde öne çıkan bir yazı türü bu araştırmaların özetlendiği bulguların ile ilgili yorum yapıldığı birçok bölümleri alan işte abstract özet bölümü sonra işte başından başlayarak literatür sonra method discussion ve conclusion kısmı olan bir şey atladım mı düşünüyorum atlamadım sanırım sampling hani onların için örnekleme olan bunları açıklanan bir araştırma olması gerekiyor ve tabii araştırmanın belirli formatta olması gerekiyor, bu formata bağlı yazı türü diyebiliriz aslında akademik makale, akademik çalışmalar (MAS-4).

Akademik yazının şöyle, yani belirli bir format olması gerekiyor. Belirli bir çerçevede yazılmak gerekiyor. Yani önce introduction yapıp, literature'ü yazıp ondan sonra method' u yazmak gerekiyor (MAS-6)

Akademik yazı daha nesnel cümlelerin olduğu yazı yani orda kişisel cümlelerden ziyade nesnel cümleler olur, özellikle literatür kısmında. Sonuç kısmında biraz daha öznel, kişisel ifadelerini katabilirsin ama onu bile çıkan sonuçlara göre aslında 'olabilir' ifadesiyle bitirdiğin için o da aslında yarı öznel yarı nesnel gibidir. Daha nesnel olmalı, daha anlaşılır bir dil olmalı... (MAS-13).

Araştırmanızı sağlam yapıyorsanız ve o araştırma sorunuz konunuz üzerine yeterince okuma yapıyorsanız daha kolay yazarsınız (PhD-8).

En önemli kısmı aslında yazıyı araştırma süreci. Çünkü her şeyi kaynak göstermek gerekiyor, intihale yol açmamak için. Araştırmak ve bunları en doğru şekilde yazmak en önemlisi (PhD-2)

Araştırma yaparken, yazmak, not almak, konuya hakim olmak ve hatırlamak açısından önemlidir. Bu şekilde literatür bilgisi ile kendi sonuçlarınızı daha doğru bir şekilde harmanlarsınız (PhD-1)

Yazıyı araştırma süreci yani en başta tezi yazmadan önce araştırma zaten gereklidir. Ve en önemli kısımdır çünkü elinizde kaynak olmadan bu okuyup paraphrase edeceğiniz ya da kendi cümlelerinizi özetleyeceğiniz bir kaynak olması gerek elinizde (MAS-15).

Yazı bence çok, ya şöyle en azından alan yazını ve methodu yazmak çok zor değil tez içerisinde. Bence ikisi kolay. En azından benim tezimde o şekilde oldu. Ama sonuçları ve tartışma bölümünü yazmak tezin en önemli kısmı. Çünkü zaten sonucu orada yazarak anlatacağız. Geri kalanı zaten herkes biliyor. Alanı biliyor, okuyacak kişi alanı biliyor (MAS-1)

Yazıyı araştırma süreci yani en başta tezi yazmadan önce araştırma zaten gereklidir. Ve en önemli kısımdır çünkü elinizde kaynak olmadan bu okuyup paraphrase edeceğiniz ya da kendi cümlelerinizi özetleyeceğiniz bir kaynak olması gerek elinizde (PhD-5)

50/50 tamamen. %50 araştırma, %50 yazma (MAS-3).

Evet, verdi. Creative writing dersimiz vardı ,academic writing dersimiz vardı tüm bunlardan faydalandım. Bunlar da beni tez yaşamı pardon tez yazım aşamasına gelene kadar hep olumlu bir şekilde şekillendirdi buna inanıyorum (MAS-8)

Yazı yazma eğitimi yok almadım (MAS-9).

Maalesef vermedi (MAS-10).

Araştırma teknikleri ile ilgili ders aldım ama doğrudan yazı yazma teknikleri üzerine spesifik bir ders almadım (PhD-6).

Tez yazım kurallarıyla ilgili bir ders aldık biz, Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri dersinde ve İstatistik dersinde. Ben o derslerden, Aydın'dan bir hoca girmişti, çok memnun kalmadım, özellikle Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemlerinde (MAS-11).

Evet bir tane araştırma dersi almıştık ve onda bir proposal üretmiştik (MAS-14).

Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri dersimizde, tezin nasıl oluşturulduğuna dair, Özet kısmı, Literatür kısmı, Bulgular, Sonuç, Tartışma, ıvır zıvır bölümü... Genel bir başlıkları öğrenir... Onun içini nasıl dolduracağımız farklı farklı derslerde (MAS-15).

Kesinlikle karşılaştığımız güçlükler var bir tıkanma anı yaşıyorsunuz yazı sürecinde o tıkanma anında gerilim dolu anlarınız var (PhD-3).

Yazarken yani çok tılandım bir cümlemin bile aklıma gelmediği zamanlar oldu saatlerce başında oturdum ama hiçbir şekilde okuyup okuyup cümleye dökemediğim kaynaklar oldu (MAS-5).

Karşılaştığım güçlükler size bahsettiğim biraz hani bu danışmanımın biraz problem yaşamıştım açıkçası beni biraz gerçekten çok zorlayan büyük bir inanılmaz zorlayan kısmı oydu zaten. (MAS-12)

Karşılaştığım güçlükler bilgisizliğimden dolayı oldu. Bu süreçte kendi başınızın çaresine bakmak zorunda kalıyorsunuz. Her şeyi kendin öğrenmek zorunda kalıyorsun. Yani bu süreç beni zorladı (MAS-6).

Depresyona girmediğimi söyleyemem açıkçası zaten depresyona girdiğim için zaten ara verdim. Çok uykusuz falan kaldım baya bir süre o yüzden şey olduğunu düşünüyorum biraz daha yani bilmiyorum danışmanın en azından baskı yapıcı bir şekilde değil de gerçekten hani baskı yaptığını düşünüyorum belirli konularda o yüzden onları da belirtmek isterim, bu da önemli bir süreç sonuçta hani yetişkin insanlara karşı akademik mobbing diye bir şey de var o yüzden bunun uygulanmaması gerekir diye düşünüyorum açıkçası (MAS-12)

Tez yazmak çok zor bir süreç. Çok istikrar gerektiren bir süreç, ki bu istikrarı iki buçuk sene ya da bundan daha uzun bir süre korumak çok zorlayıcı. Onun dışında bazen hani tam olarak neredeyim kaygısına da düşebiliyorsunuz. Ben en son o tez düzeltmelerinde panik atak geçirdiğimi hatırlıyorum mesela. Yani, duygusal olarak çok samimi olmak ve ilişkileri çok iyi yürütebilmek gerekiyor. Her bakımından, akademik kendi bakış açısından tut başka bir insana bağlı olarak çalışıyorsun tez danışmanın açısından... Her açıdan oldukça çok zor bir süreç (MAS-14).

Ailem, arkadaşlarım, iş arkadaşlarım onun dışında çalıştığım kurumdaki hocalarım (MAS-15).

Evet. Mesela iş arkadaşlarımdan çok yardım almıştım tez süresince. Diğer araştırma görevlisi arkadaşım İngilizce bölümü araştırma görevlisi mesela, yazarken gramerine diline onunla baktığımız oluyordu onun dışında internet programlarından yararlanıyordum (MAS-7).

Yani bu süreç beni zorladı. Buna çözüm olarak da okuyup daha önceden tez yazan alanda olan arkadaşlarıma danışarak çözümler üretmeye çalıştım (MAS-5).

Kaynaklardan. Özet çıkarıyorum kendi cümlelerimle, sonra o özetleri şöyle bir okuyup bu sefer sıralıyorum, paragrafları sıralıyorum. Hani şunu şundan önce, bunu bundan önce, araya bazen kendi fikrimi kendi cümlemi koyarak, bu şekilde yapıyorum. Sonra bunları ikinci bir kâğıda yazıyorum, bu karalamaları, bu ikinci kâğıt mesela birikiyor 10-15 sayfa oluyor sonra bilgisayar yanımdaysa, boş derste, ders arasında bilgisayara yazıyorum (MAS-1).

Direkt bilgisayara yazamıyorum. İlk önce kâğıda yazıyorum. Şöyle bir şey yapıyorum, mesela A kaynağından okuyorum, hoşuma giden noktaları kendi cümlelerimle mutlaka özetliyorum kaynağı da not alarak. B kaynağından okuyorum, yine kaynakça yazarak, özetliyorum. C'yi okuyorum, D'yi okuyorum... böyle bir özet çıkarıyorum (MAS-2).

Bütün başlıkları tek tek önce çıkartıyorum... Ondan sonra başlıkların altını dolduruyorum... Mesela paragrafı yazarken de aynı şekilde, giriş cümlesine ne yazacağım. Onu bir yazıyorum önce işte hangi metinden alacağımı ya da işte hangi referanstan alacağımı. İşte giriş cümlesi, işte gelişmede artık hangi örnekler olacak, kimleri örnek vereceğim ya da işte nasıl bağlayacağımı planlayıp o şekilde yazıyorum... Bağlamada mesela hala ciddi problem yaşıyorum, iki farklı konuyu birbirine bağlarken ani birbirine geçişi sağlamak, o akışı sağlamak zor oluyor. Orada mesela bir problemim var. Onun dışında, planlı yazıyorum yani. Yoksa oradan yazayım, buradan yazayım; böyle kafa karışıklığı oluyor (MAS-3).

Şöyle internette birkaç tane program var. Şu an tam adlarını hatırlamıyorum ama yazarken gramer olarak önce kontrol ediyorum, gramer de bir hata var mı diye. Daha sonra cümlelerin akışına bakıyorum, akışta bir sıkıntı var mı. Çünkü akademik yazıda bu çok önemli oluyor; akışı sağlayamamak, birbirinden kopuk kopuk paragraflar yazmak. O yüzden akışı sağlamaya çalışıyorum. Eğer kendim mesela orda bir eksiklik olduğunu fark ediyorsam, tekrar oraya başka bir şey eklemek için bir okuma yapıyorum ya da arkadaşlarımdan ve hocamdan da destek alıyorum bunun için. Özellikle mesela akışı sağlama da hocam gerçekten çok yardımcı oldu, bir tez hocam (MAS-4).

Düşünürken yazarım, doğrudan düşünceler oluşma evresindeyken kâğıda dökürüm daha sonra revize ederim (PhD-1).

Önce aklıma gelen her şeyi kâğıda dökmeye çalışırım hiçbirini kaçırmadan. Daha sonra unutmamak adına herhangi bir sıra gözetmeden aktarıyorum kâğıda, daha sonra bu kâğıda aktarma sürecinin bitiminde geriye dönüp bunlara organize bir şekilde yeniden düzenlerim (PhD-2).

Danışmanım ders aldığım, çok sevdiğim bir hocaydı (MAS-16).

Danışmanımı şöyle seçtim; zaten ders alıyordum kendisinden, çalışma alanını çok seviyordum. Randevu alıp görüşmeye gittim (MAS-12). Daha önce kendisinden ders aldığım ve derslerine zevkle katıldığım hocamla onunla çalışmak istediğimi söyledim ve o da kabul etti (PhD-4).

Danışmanımı tanıyorum. Danışmanım çok disiplinli, düzgün, işinin ehli biri ama şöyle bir şey: sana müdahale etmiyor (MAS-13).

Hacettepe Üniversitesi kendi belirledi, danışmanımı da ... beni seçti (PhD-7).

Danışmanım .. ya şöyle, bilmiyorum bütün tez öğrencileri için aynı süreç mi geçerli olur ama biraz daha benim böyle zorlamamla oluyor gibi. Yani hocam zaten çok yoğun, bir sürü yani beş-altı tane falan herhalde sanırım tez öğrencisi var. Yani yoğunluğundan kaynaklanıyor büyük ihtimalle ama biraz daha desteğe ihtiyacım var bence (MAS-15).

Bu konuda çok sorun yaşadım. Tez dönemindeki arkadaşlarım da aynı sorunu yaşadı. Danışmanımız yoğunluğu yüzünden bizimle çok ilgilenemedi (MAS-14)

Aslında birçok şey hakkında yani uyuşmuyorduk birçok şey konusunda. Zaten onu seçmek zorunda kalmıştık gibi hocalar bir dönem yoktu yurt dışına gitmişlerdi... Yardımcı olmaya çalışmadığını düşünüyorum. Biraz açıkçası hayatıma müdahale etmişti. Zaten değiştirmem de etkili olan faktörlerden biri buydu. Biraz açıkçası bazı konularda zorluyordu beni. (MAS-9).

Evet. Her zaman ulaşılabilirdi (MAS-5).

Kesinlikle, telefonu var, maili var. (MAS-6)

Evet, yol göstericiydi. Fakat çokta büyük yardımları olduğunu söyleyemem. Genelde bu süreçte daha yalnız hissettim (9).

Danışmanım oldukça ilgiliydi, ben ona yazdığım da geri bildirimde bulunuyordu, bu yüzden belirlediğim zaman içerisinde tezimi bitirebildim (PhD-3).

Çeşitli düzeltmeler verirdi, araştırmada tıkanıldığım noktalarda kaynak tavsiyesinde bulunurdu (PhD-5).

Kendisi çok yardımcı oldu. Kaynakları birlikte seçtik. Ben çok fazla kaynak kirliliği yaşadım aslında. Yani yüzlerce kaynak bulmuştum, birlikte o kaynakları eledik, konuma en uygun olanları seçtik. Tezimi sürekli her on sayfada yirmi sayfada bir yani ben ilerleme kaydettikçe görmek istedi, proof-read etti, danışmanım her zaman ulaşılardı. Geri bildirimlerim çok yapıcıydı hiçbir zaman yıkıcı bir geri bildirim almadım. Hep motive ediciydi (MAS-8)

Düşünmüyorum. Aslında şöyle geçen yaptığım bir çalışmayı bir literatür gibi bir şey yazmıştım onu okumamıştı. Vakti olmadığını söylemişti olamadığını yoğun dönemde olduğunu söylemişti (MAS-9).

Yani şöyle mesela, çok hızlı olmayabiliyor. Yani çünkü yapması gereken başka işlerde var yanında. Mesela ben bir atıyorum, taslak yazdım gönderdim. Hani bunun, taslağın, geri dönüşü bana iki haftada falan oluyor hani. Çok kısa bir sürede olmuyor. Öyle olunca süreç de uzuyor bir yandan (MA-10).

Mesela yazım hatası bile yapabiliyorum, ben de çok rastlanmıyor ama genel olarak şöyle bir bakıyor ‘MAS-1 yazım hatası var’ diyor. Ben de bir tane belki çıkıyor ama ben Türkçe öğretmeni olduğum için olmuyor. Hani akademik dilde daha çok düzeltmeler oluyor. Mesela ‘bu nedenle’ diye başlamayız da ‘bu bağlamda’ diye başlarız ya daha çok, ‘Bu şekilde olsa daha çok yakışır’ diye düzeltmeleri oluyor veya ‘bu paragraf bunu çok tekrar etmiş’ gibi (MAS-1).

Zamanlama oldukça kısıydı, yazım hatalarım olduğunda onlara bile müdahale ediyordu. Birtakım kaynak isimleri veriyordu. Çalışmamı yönlendirdi (MAS-7).

Danışmanımdan aldığım geri bildirimler ile deney düzeneklerini revize ettim, sonuçları değerlendirirken kendisinin önerilerini göz önünde bulundurdum. Bu geri bildirimler her zaman deney sonuçlarım aldığım gün ve ya en fazla ertesi gün geldi (PhD-2)

Jüri üyelerim ise zaten bir tanesi dışarıdan geliyor jüri üyelerinin, o tez danışmanının arkadaşıydı. Böyle belirlendi, yani tez danışmanım aracılığıyla tez jürime katıldı. Diğer hocamızın da yine benim alanımla yani tez konumla ilgili çalışmaları vardı Boğaziçi’nde. Bir tanede internal number gerekiyor. O da yine tez hocam önermişti. Teklif ettik ve o da kabul etti (MAS-8).

Biz seçmiyoruz zaten belli bir komite var (MA-2).

Çok destekleyiciydi. Ben bundan biraz şikayetçiyim Türkiye’de çünkü doktora tez izleme komitesi var artık. Senede sanırım 3 kez toplanması gerekiyor ve teze gerekli bildirim veriyorlar. Ama yüksek lisansta böyle bir durum yok. Yani bir proposal da görüyor tez jürin seni bir de savunmada görüyor. Bence araya böyle toplantılar olursa tezden daha çok bilgileri olabilir ama sadece 2 toplantıda gördükleri ve o gördüklerine geri bildirim verdikleri için. Yaklaşımları destekleyiciydi ama benim tek şikâyetim sistemden dolayı hani biraz daha katkıda bulunabilirlerdi (MAS-4).

Komite üyelerinin açıkçası yazım sürecinde pek bir rolü olmadı, tez savunmam esnasında bir rolleri olduğunu düşünüyorum (PhD-7).

Komite üyeleri yazım sürecinde, ilk taslaktan sonra tavsiyelerde bulundular (PhD-3).

Komite üyelerinden bir tanesi aktif olarak tez sürecim süresinde geri bildirimde bulundu, diğerleri ise oldukça destekleyiciydi (PhD-5).

İlk bir tez önerisi toplantısı oluyor. Onda, geliştirdiğim tez konusunu danışmanımla beraber jüri üyelerine sunuyoruz, oradan geri bildirim geliyor. Sonrasında o geri bildirimler ışığında data toplama süreci başlıyor ya da etik kurulu başvuruları. Ondan sonra da bir dahaki toplantı yani tüm jüri üyelerinin olduğu tez savunması oluyor (MAS-9).

Bürokratik gereklilikler kafa karıştırıcı olsa da, düzgün ve okunabilir olması açısından oldukça gerekli literatür bilgisine sahip misin, deney sürecini mantıklı dizayn etmiş misin ve tüm süreci ve sonucu anlatabiliyor musun, bunları görmek için gerekli bir süre (PhD1).

Yani, ben şunu söyleyeyim: Biz tez yazarken de bunu fark ettik. Tez yazım kurallarına uyarak tezler yazılmıyordu. Bu alıntılar vesaireler kesinlikle ona göre yapılmıyordu. Hani bize bir kural öğretiliyor ya, bu durumda benim tezim hep tırnak işareti içerisinde oluyordu ama insanlar tırnak işareti içerisinde yapınca alıntıları da birebir copy paste yapıp tırnak işaretini koymadan yapıldı, bu "intihal" dediğimiz şey. Yani, çok fazla miktarda vardı. Ve ben de şunu anlayamıyordum: ben iki sayfa okudum diyelim, oradan bir cümle çıkardım. Zaten, o cümleyi komple kendi cümlelerimle ifade edersem... yani, ben orada sayfa sayısı olarak neyi göstereceğim? Yani, nasıl diyeyim? Üniversitede şeyin eğitimini tam aldığımı söyleyemeyeceğim ama... *Tezi yazarken hep kendi kafamdaki fikirleri yazmamam gerekiyor çünkü ben... okuduğum akademik araştırmaları yazmam gerekiyor, değil mi? Onlarla tez desteklemem gerekiyor. Çünkü bir hocamız şey demişti: siz daha yolun başındasınız. Sizin iki, üç sayfa bir şey okuyup da "bu böyledir" "şu şöyledir" diyecek bir yetkiniz yok. Zaten, sizin teziniz şeyden oluşmalı demişti: okuduklarınızı aktarmak. Ama bu durumda tez aktaranın aktarımı moduna giriyor bu sefer. O zaman benim katkım ne? Yani, literatür kısmı için diyorum bunu. Devamındaki kısımda da zaten şey yapıyorduk: diğer tezlerle çarpıyorduk, "Orada bu bulunmuş, benimkinde bu çıktı" gibi... O kısımda yani biz kendi araştırmamızı yansıtabiliyorduk (MAS-6).*

REFERENCES

- Aitchison, C., & Lee, A. (2006). Research writing: Problems and pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 265–278.
- Artemeva, N, & Freedman, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Rhetorical genre studies and beyond*. Winnipeg: Inkshed Publications.
- Badger, R. & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal* Volume 54/2, 153-160.
- Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the university. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 5(1), pp. 4-23.
- Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: an introduction to the ecology of written language*. London: Blackwell.
- Bawarshi, A. S. (2003). *Genre and the invention of the writer: Reconsidering the place of invention in composition*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1994). Systems of genre and the enactment of social intentions. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric*, pp. 79-101. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bazerman, C. (2002). Genre and identity: Citizenship in the age of the internet and the of global capitalism. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre*, pp. 13-37. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Bazerman, C., Bonini, A., and Figueiredo, D. (2010). *Genre in a changing world*. Indiana, W. Lafayette: Parlor Press.
- Bazerman, C., & Prior, P. (2005). Genre, disciplinarity, interdisciplinarity. In J. Green, R. Beach, M. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Literacy Research* (2nd ed.) (133-178). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Bitzer, Lloyd, E. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (Winter 1968), pp. 1-14.
- Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Bretag, T., & Mahmud, S. (2009). A model for determining student plagiarism: Electronic detection and academic judgment. *Journal of University Teaching*

& *Learning Practice*, 6(1), 49–60. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ867296.pdf>

- Celik, S. (2020). Building critical academic writing skills: The impact of instructor feedback on Turkish ELT graduate students. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, Volume 24, Number 3
- Clark, I. (2003). *Concepts in composition: Theory and practice in the teaching of writing*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Coe, R., Lingard, L., & Teslenko, T. (Eds.). (2002). *The rhetoric and ideology of genre*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Culler, Jonathan. (1982). *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Dahl, S. (2007). Turnitin®: The student perspective on using plagiarism detection software. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 8, 173-191. doi:10.1177/1469787407074110
- Derrida, J. (1998). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2005). *Writing and Difference*. London: Routledge.
- Devitt, A. (1993). Generalizing about genre: New conceptions of an old concept. *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp. 573-586.
- Devitt, A. (2004). *Writing genres*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Devitt, A., Bawarshi, A., & Reiff, M. J. (2003). Materiality and genre in the study of discourse communities. *College English*, 65, pp. 541-558.
- Donoghue, F. (2010, April 4). An open letter from a director of graduate admissions [Section: The Chronicle Review; Opinion & Ideas]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, [Sunday]. Persistent link: <http://chronicle.com/article/An-Open-Letter-From-a-Director/64882/>
- El-Bezre, N. (2014). International doctoral students learning academic writing in English: A multi-case study of five doctoral students' experiences in Canada. *Unpublished Dissertation*. Montreal: McGill University.
- Eley, A., & Jennings, R. (2005). *Effective postgraduate supervision: Improving the student/supervisor relationship*. Berkshire, GBR: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Flower, L. (1979). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. *College English*, 41, pp. 19-37.

- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Harper.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying text: A poststructuralist reader*, pp. 48-78. Boston, MA: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1994). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In James D. Faubion (Ed.), *Aesthetics, method and epistemology: The essential works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984, vol. II*, pp. 369-92. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Gabrielatos, C. (2002). EFL writing: Product and process. *ERIC*, ED476839.
- Gage, J. (1986). Why write? In D. Bartholomea & A. Petrosky (Eds.), *The teaching of writing* (pp. 8- 20). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Garden, C. (2009). *What does my turnitin report mean?* Edinburgh Napier University.
- Giltrow, J. (1994). Genre and the pragmatic concept of background knowledge. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric*, pp. 155-178. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Green, B. (2005). Unfinished business: Subjectivity and supervision. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 24(2), 151–163.
- Gunnarson, B.L., Linell, P., & Nordberg, B. (1997). Introduction. In B. L. Gunnarsson, P. Linell, & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 1-12). New York: Longman.
- Hedge, T. (2005). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan UP.
- Ison, D. C. (2012). Plagiarism among dissertations: Prevalence at online institutions. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 10(3), 227–236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-012-9165-4>
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ivanič, Roz. (2004) Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write. *Language and Education*, 18:3, 220-245, DOI: 10.1080/09500780408666877
- Jamieson, K. M. (1975). Antecedent genre as rhetorical constraint. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 61, 406-415.

- Joyner, R. L., Rouse, W. A. and Glatthorn, A. A. (1998). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step guide*. Herndon, VA: Corwin.
- Kamler, B. & Thomson, P. (2006). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision*. London: Routledge.
- Kumar, V., & Stracke, E. (2007, August). An analysis of written feedback on a PhD thesis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(4), 461-470.
doi:10.1080/13562510701415433
- Lea, M. and Street, B. (1998) Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education* 23 (2), pp. 157–72.
- Lee, A., & Boud, D. (2003). Writing groups, change, and academic identity: Research development as local practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 187–200.
- Lee, A., & Kamler, B. (2008). Bringing pedagogy to doctoral publishing. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(5), 511–523.
- Lillis, T. (1997). New voices in academia? The regulative nature of academic writing conventions. *Language and Education*, 11(3), pp.182–199.
- Lillis, T. (2001). *Student writing: Access, regulation, desire*. London: Routledge.
- Lundell, D. B. & Beach, R. (2002). Dissertation writers' negotiations with competing activity systems. In C. Bazerman & D. Russell (Eds.), *writing selves/ writing societies: research from activity perspectives* (pp. 483-514). Retrieved from Colorado State University, WAC Clearinghouse and Mind, Culture, and Activity: http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves_societies/
- Martin, D., Rao, A., & Sloan, L. (2011). Ethnicity, acculturation, and plagiarism: A criterion study of unethical academic conduct. *Human Organization*, 70(1), 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.70.1.n1775v2u633678k6>
- Miller, Carolyn R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, pp.151-167.
- Moffett, J. (1983). *Teaching the universe of discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Murray, D. (1980). Writing as process: How writing finds its own meaning. In T. R. Donovan & B.
- McClelland (Eds.), *Eight approaches to teaching composition* (pp. 3-20). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Neville, C. (2010). *The Complete guide to referencing and avoiding plagiarism*. Open University Press.

- Nevra-Seggie, F. (2007). The headscarf ban in the Turkish university: Educational and cultural experiences of part-time unveilers. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*, Michigan State University.
- Paré, A. (2002). Genre and identity: Individuals, institutions, and ideology. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre*, pp. 57-71. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Paré, A. (2005). Texts and power: Toward a critical theory of language. In L. Davies & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Social work in a corporate era: Practices of power and resistance*, pp. 76-90. Hants, UK: Ashgate.
- Paré, A. (2014). Rhetorical genre theory and academic literacy. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning* Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. A83-A84.
- Paré, A., Starke-Meyerring, D., & McAlpine, L. (2010). The dissertation as multi-genre: many readers, many readings. In Bazerman, C., Bonini, A., and Figueiredo, D. (Eds.), *Genre in a changing world*, pp: 179-193. Indiana, W. Lafayette: Parlor Press.
- Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students - literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28, 471-488. doi:10.1080/0260293032000120352
- Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 643-662.
- Pride, M. (2005). The journey through the dissertation writing process: Do relationships matter? *Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation*, Michigan State University.
- Sheridan, D. (2009). *Teaching secondary English: Readings and applications*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Schryer, C. F. (2002). Genre and power: A chronotopic analysis. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre* (pp. 73-102). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., Anthony Paré, King Yan Sun and Nazih El-Bezre. (2014). Probing normalized institutional discourses about writing: The case of the doctoral thesis. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2014, A13-A27. ISSN 1835-5196.
- Starke-Meyerring, D. (2011). The paradox of writing in doctoral education: Student experiences. In Lynda McAlpine & Cheryl Amundsen (Eds.), *Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for doctoral students, supervisors and administrators*, pp. 75-95. New York: Springer.

- Steele, V. (2004). *Product and process writing: a comparison*. Retrieved March 17, 2010, from <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/articles/product-process-writing-a-comparison>.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987) *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .
- Street, B. (2001). *Literacy and development: ethnographic perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol. 5(2), pp. 77-91.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sword, Helen. (2012). *Stylish academic writing*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, J. (1998) Student Plagiarism in Universities: What are we Doing About it?, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17:1, 89-106, DOI: 10.1080/0729436980170105
- Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(1), 41-59. doi:10.1080/03075070902912994
- White, R. and V. Arndt. 1991. *Process Writing*. Harlow: Longman.
- White, C. S. (2006). Graduate student mentor program: Exploring what a diverse student population needs. *Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation*. Ed.D. Fielding Graduate University.
- Womack, P. (1993). What are essays For? *English in Education*, 27 (2) Summer, pp. 42 –48.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*. 19/1, pp. 79-101.
- Zhang, Y. H. (2016). *Against plagiarism: A guide for editors and authors*. Springer.