

Academic Writing for Postgraduates Across Disciplines: A Lexico-syntactic Perspective

Lesia Strochenko



Department of Foreign Languages,
National University “Odesa Law Academy”, Odesa, Ukraine.
Corresponding Author: lesiastrochenko@gmail.com

Valeriia Smaglii



Philology Department, Odesa National Maritime University, Odesa, Ukraine.
E-mail: valeriya.smagliy@gmail.com

Chetaikina Viktoriia



Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine
University of Basel, Switzerland
E-mail: viktoriyachetaykina@gmail.com

Svitlana Yukhymets



Philology Department, Odesa National Maritime University, Odesa, Ukraine.
E-mail: yukhymets.svetlana@gmail.com

Received: 11/04/2024

Accepted: 02/26/2024

Published: 03/20/2025

Abstract

Postgraduate academic writing is an essential skill that students must acquire, but mastering its conventions continues to be problematic, particularly for foreign English-speaking students. This study examines postgraduate students' lexico-syntactic trends in academic writing across various disciplines. With a mixed-methods approach, data were collected from 150 postgraduate students through surveys, a corpus of 100 academic texts, and semi-structured interviews with 10 academic writing instructors. The findings reveal that building arguments, selecting appropriate academic vocabulary, and acquiring discipline-specific conventions are primary challenges students face. Furthermore, linguistic challenges such as grammatical complexity and positioning oneself within academic discourse are more prominent for non-native speakers of English. Corpus analysis detects profound disciplinary variation: natural sciences stress brevity and technical correctness, humanities opt for interpretative density, and social sciences balance factual reporting and analysis. Effective pedagogic interventions include teacher response, peer feedback, guided reading, and writing workshops, and 70% of the students reported increased writing skills after structured training sessions. The study underscores the need for discipline-based pedagogic approaches to assist postgraduate students in overcoming writing problems. The long-term impacts of academic writing interventions and the role technology has in being able to write need to be researched further.

Keywords: Academic writing, disciplinary differences, linguistic features, non-native English speakers, postgraduate students, writing challenges

How to cite: Strochenko, L., Smaglii, V., Viktoriia, C., & Ykhymets, S. (2025). Academic Writing for Postgraduates Across Disciplines: A Lexico-syntactic Perspective. *Arab World English Journal*, 16(1):285-297. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no1.17>

Introduction

Academic writing remains a cornerstone of communicating scholarship, hence a premier medium of considering and imparting research findings to the world to add knowledge. To postgraduate students, especially those studying at the doctoral level in different disciplines, mastering academic writing is quite a challenge involving not only a great understanding of one's subject but also how to present ideas with clarity and conciseness and in the manner dictated by a specific discipline (Woodward-Kron 2008; 2009).

While academic writing is a generic activity, its conventions and linguistic features often differ significantly across fields because of various expectations and methodologies involved in different disciplines (Academic Discourse Across Disciplines, 2006). In the case of non-native English-speaking postgraduates, their challenges are further exacerbated by linguistic and cultural barriers. This makes the task of learning advanced academic writing particularly challenging. It requires a nuanced pedagogical approach that considers general and discipline-specific requirements for academic writing.

The overall aim of the study is to examine the lexico-syntactic patterns of postgraduate students' writing across specializations, both in terms of what they have in common and what they do not have in common in their writing habits. By doing this, the study aims to investigate what common lexico-syntactic patterns distinguish postgraduate academic writing across fields and how they differ based on the area of study. It also seeks to explore what difficulties students encounter in following academic writing conventions and whether these difficulties vary by discipline. The study also investigates how linguistic theories can explain the variations in writing practices among postgraduate students from various specializations. Lastly, the study considers how effective writing strategies can be formulated to improve students' academic writing skills. By addressing these issues, this work bridges the gap between linguistic theory and writing practice, providing tools and frameworks that can benefit any aspiring scholar, regardless of their discipline.

Literature Review

Recent research has illuminated the complex issues of challenges and supports that relate to academic writing, feedback, and disciplinary variation (Khedri et al., 2013). Gupta et al. (2022) presented a multi-faceted difficulty for international doctoral students: linguistic, cultural, and conventions of scholarship. Maringe and Jenkins (2015) discussed the emotional challenges of academic writing, as stigma and apprehension have significantly impacted writing experience. Inouye and McAlpine (2019) expanded on this in their discussion of using feedback to inform academic identity, asserting that its effectiveness lies within both its content, and student perceptions. Tyndall and Powell (2023) supported this perspective, noting that "giving and receiving writing critique was uncomfortable for these novice peer reviewers and many described emotional disciplining associated with vulnerability" (p. 186).

Disciplinary-specific conventions lie at the core of academic writing practices (Abdulkhaleq, 2021). Dong, Wang, and Buckingham (2023) investigated syntactic complexity by

discipline and found vast variation between soft and hard sciences. This is consistent with Ahmad, Mahmood, and Siddique (2023), who illustrated distinct disciplinary patterns in dissertations written across varying disciplines and associated epistemological bases. Szczygłowska (2022) built on this trajectory of research by investigating epistemic modality. Malveira Orfanò and Wingate (2023) added to this discussion by addressing the disciplinary challenges faced by nursing students, emphasizing that "students' feedback suggests that a combination of genre-based approaches with an inclusive model of literacy instruction offers a sound rationale for the design of academic writing initiatives" (p. 120).

The linguistic complexity of academic writing has been widely examined (Campbell, 2015; Eze & Inegbedion, 2015; Tian & Zhang, 2023). Biber, Gray, and Staples (2016) contrasted conversation and academic writing grammar structures and pointed out that complex syntactic structures typical of academic texts should be explicitly taught. This was also supported by Nasser (2021), whose study implied that phrasal constructions appear more often in academic writing than clausal constructions and that they are thus among the most challenging features to master for non-native speakers of English. AlMarwani (2020) also commented on the importance of academic writing problems, affirming that the data analysis revealed that the difficulties students encounter are mainly filled into one of the following categories: language skills, academic writing skills, and source managing skills.

Different pedagogical interventions have been proposed by researchers to resolve these difficulties. For example, Kornhaber et al. (2016) and Tremblay-Wragg et al. (2021) recommended organized writing retreats, which create a supportive environment and improve productivity. Ma (2019) emphasized that one-on-one consultations for EAL doctoral students are particularly effective, as personalized feedback yields better results. Hershberger (2021) reinforced this claim by highlighting that the template served as a guide for communicating essential section components of a rigorous and reproducible literature review manuscript. Additionally, Hill and Thabet (2021) addressed broader publication challenges and obstacles to doctoral student research publication. Addressing these challenges calls for integrating linguistic and pedagogical strategies (Odena & Burgess, 2017). Ahmad et al. (2023) presented a corpus-based analysis approach to academic writing; by using this approach, academics will be able to highlight discipline-specific conventions that can be explicitly taught. Sala-Bubaré and Castelló (2018) emphasized self-regulation and metacognitive strategies that students can adopt to enhance their writing proficiency by taking better charge of their academic writing process. These strategies, combined with structured feedback mechanisms and pedagogical innovations, contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how academic writing can be effectively supported and developed.

Methodology

Participants

There were three participant groups in the study. First, postgraduate students from various academic disciplines, including natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities, were queried.

Students were recruited from three Ukrainian universities: National University "Odesa Law Academy," Odesa National Maritime University, and Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. One hundred fifty students participated, with representation across disciplines and levels of academic experience. Second, a 100-postgraduate research article corpus was compiled. These were essays, theses, and dissertations from postgraduate students. The balance of disciplines and academic levels were the criteria for selecting such texts. Third, semi-structured interviews with 10 academic writing instructors with experience teaching postgraduate students were carried out. The instructors were requested to provide feedback on students' language problems and the pedagogical practices being implemented to assist in solving them.

Research Instruments

There were three primary data collection instruments. The questionnaire, which was administered to postgraduate students, included closed- and open-ended questions to solicit their perceptions, problems, and strategies regarding academic writing. Some closed-ended questions included: *"On a scale of 1 to 5, how confident do you feel in academic writing?"* *"Which of the following aspects of academic writing do you find most challenging? (organizing arguments, using discipline-specific vocabulary, mastery of grammar and syntax, adhering to citation conventions)"* *"How often do you seek feedback on your academic writing from others or instructors? (never, infrequently, occasionally, often, always)"*. Open-ended questions such as *"What are the main problems you face when you write academic texts in English?"* were given to allow more detailed responses.

A 100-postgraduate research article corpus was analyzed for linguistic features, including lexical choice, syntactic features, and genre-specific conventions. The analysis focused on the discipline variation of these elements. Further clarification of the corpus selection criteria (e.g., inclusion/exclusion criteria, sampling frame) would make the study more transparent.

Ten academic writing tutors were involved in semi-structured interviews. The interviews investigated their perceptions of students' linguistic problems and pedagogical practices that were considered effective. Sample questions included *"What is the most frequent kind of linguistic problem in postgraduate students' academic writing?"*, *"How do you address the individual needs of students from different disciplines?"*, *"What tasks or practices have been most adequate in teaching academic writing?"*, *"How does students' mastery of Academic English affect their ability to meet disciplinary writing conventions?"*, *"Do you find a difference between native and non-native speakers in their approach to academic writing?"*.

Research Procedures

Data collection followed a systematic procedure. The questionnaire was emailed to postgraduate students in the three universities. Responses were collected over a duration to enable maximum participation. For the construction of the corpus, research papers were gathered from university repositories and faculty recommendations. Documents were anonymized to ensure

confidentiality. Interviews were conducted face-to-face or via video conferencing, depending on instructor availability. Interviews were recorded and transcribed for subsequent analysis. Ethical guidelines of informed consent and anonymity were followed during the experiment. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time.

Data Analysis

A mixed-methods design was employed to analyze the data. The survey data was analyzed statistically to identify trends in students' academic writing experiences. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were computed to highlight common trends. Text analysis software was employed to extract frequency counts of focused linguistic features to facilitate comparison across disciplines. It provided quantitative insights into lexical and syntactic variation in academic writing. Thematic analysis was carried out on open-ended survey questions, interview transcripts, and selected excerpts from the corpus. Emerging themes of linguistic challenges, disciplinary conventions, and effective writing strategies were identified.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for the study was provided, and informed consent was provided by all of the participants. Confidentiality was ensured by keeping responses and research documents anonymous. Participants were informed of their rights, including the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Results

Analysis of the data obtained through the questionnaires, corpus analysis, and interviews yielded several key findings concerning the linguistic features and academic writing practices of postgraduate students across disciplines. These findings are grouped into three main themes: common challenges in academic writing, disciplinary differences in linguistic features, and strategies to surmount writing difficulties.

Common Issues in Academic Writing

The data obtained illustrate the number of specific writing difficulties that postgraduate students reported in this study, showing a very notable difference between native and non-native-speaking students. A high proportion mentioned the main areas, like structuring arguments, using grammar at an advanced level, and following discourse-specific requirements, reflecting the complex nature of the challenges with academic writing.

The main challenges found are that a majority of 78 percent of the students struggle with argument structuring. This was especially true for fields such as the humanities and social sciences, which rely on complex reasoning and layered argumentation. One student said, "*I am often unclear about how to structure my ideas logically. Sometimes, I start with far too much detail, and my main argument gets lost in that.*" Instructors agreed, adding that many students had no clear thesis

statement and then failed to link supporting evidence to a primary argument. One instructor noted, *"Students often dilute the impact of their writing with ideas that are not well-organized."*

Similarly, using appropriate academic vocabulary proved to be another big challenge at 65%, as students find it challenging to choose words that should be used to communicate formally in academic writing. A student shared, *"I struggle with finding the right words to make my writing sound formal and academic. I tend to use simple words that don't seem professional enough."* Instructors further elaborated, highlighting that some students overuse jargon, which makes their writing inaccessible, while others fail to incorporate discipline-specific terminology, undermining their credibility as researchers.

Non-native English-speaking students were further burdened with problems such as mastering complex grammatical structures, which 73% complained about, and adjusting to conventions of the particular discipline, which 68% reported. One confessed, *"I know the basics of English grammar, but when it comes to using complex sentences, I make mistakes. I'm unsure when to use passive voice or how to vary sentence structures."* Instructors observed that these students often have difficulties with grammatical nuances such as conditional sentences or modality, which can hit the clarity and precision of their writing so hard.

A critical issue is that positioning writing within educational communities is a challenge, significantly highlighted in interviews with instructors. This involves aligning one's work with the conventions and expectations of specific disciplines while being part of existing scholarly conversations. As one instructor noted, *"Students rarely consider their audience when writing. They often fail to engage with existing research in a way that situates their work within the broader scholarly conversation."* A student echoed this difficulty, stating, *"I don't always understand how to frame my research in the context of what others have done. It's hard to find the balance between adding my voice and respecting established ideas."*

These findings highlight the complex and multi-layered nature of the challenges that postgraduate students face in academic writing. Although problems related to the structuring of arguments and academic vocabulary are shared by all, non-native speakers have further difficulties with advanced grammar and discipline-specific conventions. The difficulty of locating one's work within an academic community underlines the need for targeted instruction in scholarly communication. These findings represent the basis on which strategies to support students could be designed, including focused training in argumentation, vocabulary development, and alignment with the linguistic and rhetorical expectations of various disciplines.

Disciplinary Variation in Linguistic Features

The corpus analysis also showed significant differences in linguistic features among disciplines. In the natural sciences, sentences are short and factual, often in passive voice with technical terms. Thus, the sentence *"The reaction was conducted at 25°C, and the resulting compound was purified using column chromatography"* is typical. The passive voice used here, *"was conducted," "was purified,"* moves the emphasis from who did it (the researcher) to the

process itself, making the tone more objective. Besides, technical vocabulary such as "*reaction*," "*compound*," and "*column chromatography*" shows how the language is dependent on the use of specific, precise terms to denote scientific clarity.

On the other hand, humanities are more wordy and interpretative, with many complicated sentence structures and modal verbs used to express doubt or nuance. For instance, the sentence "*The juxtaposition of light and shadow in Caravaggio's work might suggest an intentional commentary on the dualities of human existence*" is a good example of these tendencies. The structure is more complex, with a subordinate clause ("*might suggest an intentional commentary*"), allowing for layered argumentation. The modal verb "*might*" introduces an element of uncertainty, which is characteristic of interpretative disciplines where definitive conclusions are less common. Additionally, the varied word choice, including "*juxtaposition*" and "*dualities*," highlights the humanities' emphasis on descriptive and nuanced language.

The social sciences exhibit a balanced approach, blending factual reporting with interpretative analysis. An example of this would be the following sentence "*The data from the survey point to a strong association between socio-economic status and educational attainment; however, further research must be undertaken to establish any cause and effect.*" This language maintains clarity and precision, meanwhile accounting for its complexity. The subordinate clause introduced by "*although*" recognizes the need for further research. At the same time, such terms as "*socioeconomic status*" and "*educational attainment*" are interdisciplinary, thus being understandable to readers from any professional sphere.

Lexical density varies significantly across disciplines. The natural sciences are characterized by a high level of domain-specific terminology, where words such as "*reaction*" and "*chromatography*" have particular communicative functions. The humanities show more variability in word choice, with words such as "*juxtaposition*" and "*dualities*" allowing for descriptive and interpretative depth. The social sciences fall somewhere in between, using interdisciplinary terms like "*correlation*" and "*causation*" to carry meaning across diverse academic contexts.

Syntactically, the natural sciences favor short, straightforward sentences that avoid unnecessary elaboration, focusing on clarity and precision. Humanities writing, however, frequently employs subordinate clauses, facilitating detailed and nuanced arguments. Social sciences combine these tendencies, using simple and complex sentences, and balancing factual reporting with acknowledgment of complexity. This analysis brings out the discipline-specific conventions of academic writing. While the natural sciences rely on objectivity and precision, the humanities emphasize complexity and interpretation, and the social sciences combine these approaches, reflecting their interdisciplinary nature. These distinctions underpin the necessity for tailored academic writing instruction to meet the unique demands of each field.

Practices Contributing to Overcoming Writing Obstacles

Students and instructors identified various approaches that have been especially helpful to developing academic writing. Of all the tools available, targeted feedback from instructors was the most impactful, according to 64% of the students who identified it as their most significant help in improving their skills. Many students explained that specific, detailed feedback allowed them to understand their errors and refine their writing style over time. For instance, one student reported, *"When my instructor showed me how I was using too much passive voice and then showed me how to reword the sentences it helped me to be more direct and clear."* Instructors reiterated that individualized feedback, which targets specific needs, can make the most significant difference in closing the gap between student's current abilities and the expectations of the disciplines.

Finally, 58% of the students regarded peer review and collaborative writing exercises as crucial resources. Such activities give them different viewpoints on their work and the opportunity to learn from others' strengths. One student remarked, *"Reading my classmates' drafts gave me ideas about how to make improvements to my own writing, especially in structuring arguments and using transitions."* These collaborative activities also facilitated discussions of writing strategies and promoted the students' sense of working together and supporting one another.

Corpus analysis also supported such findings: students who read academic texts from their fields extensively demonstrated much better genre conventions. For example, the students who read journal articles regularly knew better how to use field-specific terms, structure their arguments according to the field tradition, and sustain an appropriate tone. According to one instructor, *"Students who steep themselves in academic literature internalize the conventions of their field, which helps them with their writing."*

Interviews with instructors emphasized the integration of writing workshops and discipline-specific tasks in the students' postgraduate curriculum. Such interventions were believed to raise awareness not only about linguistic conventions but also about the possibilities for applying them. According to one instructor, for instance, a practical workshop started with students analyzing some assertive abstracts and then went into their writing with on-the-spot feedback. This process helped the students grasp the subtlety of academic style, along with the hands-on experience in crafting abstracts in lucid and succinct ways.

Students who attended this kind of workshop generally declared manifold improvements in their writing. A remarkable 70% of students surveyed, after attending these workshops, stated that their effective writing had increased. One participant said, *"The workshop on writing introductions was a game-changer for me. I learned how to hook the reader, state the problem, and outline my objectives in a way that feels natural and persuasive."* Instructors concurred, adding that workshops allow a structural setting in which students can try out new techniques and obtain constructive feedback.

These findings underscore the worth of a multilayered approach toward developing academic writing skills: targeted feedback, peer interactions, and extended reading contribute to a deeper understanding of writing conventions, while workshops and tailored tasks provide the

practical experience required for skill mastery. Combined, these strategies create a nurturing yet effective environment where postgraduate students can improve their academic writing.

Discussion

This research clarifies knowledge of novelties in lexico-syntactic patterns in postgraduate academic discourse, emphasizing common and discipline-specific problems. The synergy between survey results, corpus data, and interviews with students' instructors presents a rich picture of the difficulties faced by the students and possible solutions to overcome them.

The most pronounced of these are structuring arguments, in which 78% of students are struggling in this area, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, where subtlety in reasoning is vital (Hill & Thabet, 2021). Unclear thesis statements and poor logical connections between arguments are barriers to coherence. Choice of vocabulary is also an issue, as the students cannot maintain a balance between accessibility and professional vocabulary, one that has been noted by AlMarwani (2020) as well. The natural sciences opt for technical precision, with humanities employing interpretive terminology that justifies vocabulary instruction based on discipline.

Other syntactic challenges faced by non-native English speakers include intricate grammar constructions such as modality and passive voice, affecting clarity and coherence. These challenges align with Eze and Inegbedion (2015), who noted linguistic accuracy as a key predictor of academic success. Most students also struggle to position their work within ongoing scholarly debate, reflecting linguistic competence and knowledge of literary conventions.

Corpus analysis illustrates the diverse writing habits of various disciplines. Natural sciences emphasize conciseness with concise sentences and technical vocabulary, while humanities use compound syntax and interpretive aspects. Social sciences strive to find a middle ground by proportioning fact reporting with analysis. These differences warrant discipline-based instruction in writing to address the scholarly needs of students.

Effective writing habits include instructor feedback, peer review, and guided reading. Students engaged in collaborative writing and extensive reading have more control over academic conventions. Teacher interviews confirm that workshops combining text analysis with experiential writing activities greatly enhance skills, supporting research by Hershberger (2021). In the study, 70% of students reported improved writing skills after participating in workshops, confirming the value of structured, practice-based learning.

Overcoming academic writing challenges requires an integrated approach. Expert teaching, one-to-one feedback, peer teaching, and structured workshops can bridge the gap between students' current capability and discipline needs. By providing tailored support for both generic and field-specific writing needs, educators can better equip postgraduate students to meet academic needs, eventually improving the quality of scholarly output and professional development.

Conclusion

The present study has examined the lexico-syntactic tendencies in postgraduate discipline-specific academic writing, noting common issues across fields and field-specific variations. The study reported persistent challenges in structuring arguments, learning special terms of scholarship, and observing discursive conventions, with some extra-linguistic challenges posed by students with non-native English proficiency. The natural sciences require exactness, the humanities encourage interpretive richness, and the social sciences blend reporting facts with analysis. These variations necessitate pedagogies unique to each discipline that balance clarity with adherence to field conventions. The study also underlines the effectiveness of systematic measures such as peer review, specific feedback, and writing workshops in improving students' writing skills. Encouraging exposure to scholarly reading and supplying discipline-specific exercises proved most useful in enhancing writing skills.

Lastly, these findings necessitate an integrated and adaptive approach to teaching academic writing, equipping postgraduate students with skills needed for professional and academic success. Future research must investigate the long-term impact of writing interventions and find the application of computer-based tools in facilitating the acquisition of academic writing.

Funding: This research is not funded.

Acknowledgments: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authenticity: This manuscript is an original work

Artificial Intelligence Statement: During the preparation of this work, the author used Grammarly to check the grammar. After using this tool, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and took full responsibility for the publication's content.

About the authors

Lesia Strochenko, Doctor of Philological Sciences, associate professor, professor of the Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Civil and Economic Justice, National University "Odesa Law Academy", Odesa, Ukraine. Her research interests are Language Teaching and Learning, English for Specific Purposes, and Communicative Linguistics.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3619-3484>

Valeriia Smaglii, doctor of philological sciences, professor, head of the Philology Department, Odesa National Maritime University, Odesa, Ukraine. Her research interests are Language Teaching and Learning, English for Specific Purposes, and Cognitive Linguistics.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6222-7652>

Chetaikina Viktoriia, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine; Guest Scholar, University of Basel, Switzerland. Her research interests cover a range of

linguistic problems, many of which fall within the scope of foreign language teaching methods and communicative linguistics.

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0332-7925>

Svitlana Yukhymets, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at Philology Department, Odessa National Maritime University, Odessa, Ukraine. Her research interests are Methodology of Teaching English, English for Specific Purposes, Linguistics, Theory and Practice of Translation. ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3350-7310>

References

- Abdulkhaleq, M. M. A. (2021). Postgraduate ESL student's perceptions of supervisor's written and oral feedback. *Journal of Language and Communication*, 8, 45–60.
- Academic Discourse Across Disciplines (2006). K. Hyland & M. Bondi (Eds.), *Linguistic Insights* (pp. 68-70). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ahmad, M., Mahmood, M. A., & Siddique, A. R. (2023). Features characterizing academic writing: A corpus-based research on dissertations from hard and soft science disciplines. *City University Research Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, 6(1), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2024.21618>
- Ahmad, S. F. et al. (2023). Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Human Loss in Decision Making, Laziness and Safety in Education. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01787-8>
- AlMarwani, M. (2020). Academic writing: Challenges and potential solutions. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* (Special Issue on CALL), 6, 114-121. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call6.8>
- Biber, D., Gray, B., & Staples, S. (2016). Contrasting the grammatical complexities of conversation and academic writing: Implications for EAP writing development and teaching. *Language in Focus*, 2(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lifjsal-2016-0001>.
- Campbell, T. A. (2015). A phenomenological study on international doctoral students' acculturation experiences at a U.S. university. *Journal of International Students*, 5, 285–299.
- Dong, J., Wang, H., & Buckingham, L. (2023). Mapping out the disciplinary variation of syntactic complexity in student academic writing. *System*, 113, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102974>.
- Eze, S. C., & Inegbedion, H. (2015). Key factors influencing academic performance of international students' in UK universities: a preliminary investigation. *British Journal of Education*, 3, 55–68. doi: 10.37745/bje.vol3.no5.p55-68.2013
- Hershberger, P. E. (2021). Using a Manuscript Template to Foster Dissemination of Doctoral Students' Literature Reviews. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 60(2), 111-115. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20210120-11>

- Hill, C., & Thabet, R. (2021). Publication challenges facing doctoral students: Perspective and analysis from the UAE. *Quality in Higher Education*, 27(3,) 324-337.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2020.1867036>
- Gupta, S., Jaiswal, A., Paramasivam, A., & Kotecha, J. (2022). Academic Writing Challenges and Supports: Perspectives of International Doctoral Students and Their Supervisors. *Frontiers in Education*, 7:891534. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2022.891534
- Inouye, K., & McAlpine, L. (2019). Developing academic identity: a review of the literature on doctoral writing and feedback. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 14, 001–031. doi: 10.28945/4168
- Khedri, M., Chan, S., & Tan, B. H.. (2013). Cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic perspectives on metadiscourse in academic writing. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 31, 129-138. 10.2989/16073614.2013.793957.
- Kornhaber, R., Cross, M., Betihavas, V., & Bridgman, H. (2016). The benefits and challenges of academic writing retreats: an integrative review. *Higher Education Research Development*, 35, 1210–1227. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2016.1144572
- Malveira Orfanò, B., & Wingate, U. (2023). Teaching academic writing to Nursing students: Developing criticality through a genre-based approach. *ESP Today*, 12(1), 118-135.
<https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2024.12.1.6>
- Maringe, F., & Jenkins, J. (2015). Stigma, tensions, and apprehension: the academic writing experience of international students. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29, 609–626. doi: 10.1108/IJEM-04-2014-0049
- Nasseri, M. (2021). Is postgraduate English academic writing more clausal or phrasal? Syntactic complexification at the crossroads of genre, proficiency, and statistical modelling. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 49, 100940.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100940>
- Odena, O., & Burgess, H. (2017). How doctoral students and graduates describe facilitating experiences and strategies for their thesis writing learning process: a qualitative approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42, 572–590. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2015.1063598
- Sala-Bubaré, A., & Castelló, M. (2018). Writing regulation processes in higher education: a review of two decades of empirical research. *Reading and Writing*, 31, 757–777. doi: 10.1007/s11145-017-9808-3
- Szczygłowska, T. (2022). Lexical verbs of epistemic modality in academic written English: Disciplinary variation. *Linguistica Silesiana*, 43, 91–111. <https://doi.org/10.24425/linsi.2022.141219>
- Tian, M., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Exploring nominalization in academic writing: A comparative study of shipbuilding and oceanography engineering and linguistics. *Athens Journal of Philology*, 10(2), 101–122. <https://doi.org/10.30958/ajp.10-2-2>.

- Tremblay-Wragg, E., Mathieu Chartier, S., Labonté-Lemoyne, E., Déri, C., & Gadbois, M. E. (2021). Writing more, better, together: how writing retreats support graduate students through their journey. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45, 95–106. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2020.1736272
- Tyndall, D., & Powell, S. B. (2023). Good critical friends are hard to find: Promoting peer review among doctoral students. *Studies in Graduate and Postdoctoral Education*, 14(2), 186-200. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SGPE-11-2021-0081>
- Woodward-Kron, R. (2008). More than just jargon – the nature and role of specialist language in learning disciplinary knowledge. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 234-249. 10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.004.
- Woodward-Kron, R. (2009). “This means that...”: a linguistic perspective of writing and learning in a discipline. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8, 165-179. 10.1016/j.jeap.2009.07.002.