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Abstract

Given the high status of English academic publishing in academia, there has been an increasing demand on doctoral students to enter into the arena of publishing in international English-medium journals. However, to date, the academic publishing efforts of non-native English speaking (NNES) doctoral students in Anglophone contexts have been under-researched. Addressing this gap, this multiple case study explored how NNES doctoral students enrolled in a U.S. university negotiated the demands of English-medium academic publishing from a sociopolitical perspective. The participants in this study included four NNES doctoral students from East Asian countries. Triangulated data sources included interviews with the focal students and their faculty advisors, questionnaires, email communication, publication-related documents, university policy documents, and analytic field notes. Drawing on the notions of discourse community, (Swales, 1990), legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and social capital (Boudieu, 1986, 1990), the study focused on (1) the difficulties and successes that the students experienced, (2) the strategies that they used to overcome the difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication, and (3) the micro and macro sociopolitical forces that influenced the students’ writing-for-publication process.
The findings of the study revealed that the students had to negotiate the complex sociopolitical realities of meeting the publication demands by U.S. and home academic cultures, while studying in a U.S. university. They experienced a range of difficulties not only at the language and genre levels, but also in negotiating unequal power relations with their faculty advisors in the coauthoring process to be recognized as legitimate and competent scholarly writers. To overcome their difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication, the students developed and used academic research networks and linguistic/textual strategies. Some of the students also attempted to take the ownership of their learning by negotiating their positionalities and agency in the power-infused context of novice-expert interaction.

Based on the findings of the study, I argue that English-medium academic publishing by NNES doctoral students needs to be seen as a complex phenomenon in which NNES students negotiate multidimensional issues of language, culture, and power to participate as legitimate and competent scholarly writers. To empower these students, I suggest that both language and disciplinary professionals should foster a learning environment which will help NNES students identify power-infused relationships among agents of different power statuses and effectively deal with these relationships to create a more facilitative learning space for the development of disciplinary knowledge and linguistic growth.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

With the globalization of research, English has become the lingua franca of the international research communities (Flowerdew, 1999a, 2007; Giroux & Myrsiades, 2001). For the past four decades, the main languages of the research literature of the past, such as German and French, have been replaced by English (Flowerdew, 1999a; St. John, 1987). This dominance of English in academic communication has led to inequality in the sharing of academic resources and knowledge. ThomsonReuters.com (2008) reported that 67% of the 66,166 academic periodicals included in the standard journal database, *Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory*, were published partially or fully in English (Lillis, Magyar, & Robinson-Pant, 2010). More specifically, it is estimated that English is the primary language of 95% of science journals and 90% of social science journals (Lillis et al., 2010). One consequence of this dominance of English in global scholarship is that it has resulted in increasing pressure for academics to publish in English-medium international journals\(^1\). Publishing in such journals is the sole way that an academic can disseminate his or her research work to the international academic communities (Uzuner, 2008). It is also the most highly rewarded in many academic institutions worldwide since it serves as an important criterion for measuring scholars’ academic performance and for

---

\(^1\) In this dissertation the term, English-medium international journals are interchangeably used with the term, Anglophone Center journals.
achieving academic promotion and competitive research funding (Canagarajah, 1996; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000; Kamler, 2008).

Given the high stakes involved in publishing in English-medium international journals, there is an increasing demand for doctoral students to enter into the arena of academic publishing in English. Doctoral research is a key source of new knowledge production in global scholarship (Kamler, 2008), and writing for publication is an important part of students’ disciplinary enculturation. Many universities worldwide now require their doctoral students to publish in English-medium international journals as a pre-requisite for graduation (Huang, 2010). Moreover, publications in such journals are recognized as a critical factor that influences not only employment upon graduation, but also further professional involvement in international academic communities (Cho, 2004; Saraswathi, 2008). However, publishing internationally presents numerous challenges to doctoral students, particularly NNES doctoral students whose first language (L1) is not English. It requires doctoral students to develop a high level of discipline-specific expertise and to learn acceptable and legitimate discourses in their disciplinary communities. It also entails learning sophisticated writing practices with sets of conventions and textual characteristics imposed by their disciplinary academic communities (Kamler & Thomson, 2004). Considering that research article (RA) writing according to discipline-specific conventions is a complex process to many authors,
challenges of academic publishing are even greater to NNES doctoral students, who often have difficulty meeting the language requirements of the mainstream Center academic communities (Cheung, 2010). Previous studies (e.g., Cho, 2004; Kwan, 2010; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007) have suggested that NNES doctoral students face the burdens of producing linguistically and rhetorically adequate texts for publication in a language that is not their first language (L1) and making their research work relevant to the international academic communities. In particular, unfamiliarity with the language requirements can decrease these students’ chances of getting their research work published in Anglophone Center journals, as it may lead to rejections by journal editors and reviewers (Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Li, 2005).

Considering the high stakes and difficulties involved in English-medium academic publishing during the doctorate, how NNES doctoral students negotiate the demand of publishing in Anglophone Center journals deserves research attention. To date, relatively little research has been done to investigate the academic publishing experiences of NNES doctoral students in non-Periphery settings, such as the U.S. Hence, this study explored how NNES doctoral students enrolled in a U.S. university negotiated English-medium academic publishing, focusing on the difficulties and successes that they experienced, the strategies that they used to overcome the difficulties and secure English-medium
academic publication, and the micro and macro sociopolitical forces that influenced their writing-for-publication process and publishing strategies.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

It has been widely accepted that NNES scholars are important contributors to global scholarship in that they “help reform, expand, and enrich the knowledge base of core disciplinary communities” (Liu, 2004, p. 2). Considering significant contributions that NNES scholars can make to the international academic communities, there has been a concern that the dominance of English unfairly advantages native English speakers (NESs) while diminishing NNES academics’ efforts to secure publications in mainstream Center journals (Ferguson, Perez-Liantada, & Plo, 2011). To assist NNES scholars’ successful achievement in publications in mainstream Center journals, L2 advanced academic literacy (AAL) researchers have conducted studies on NNES experienced and novice scholars’ difficulties and strategies in English-medium academic publishing (e.g., Canagarajah, 1996; Cheung, 2010; Cho, 2004; Curry & Lillis, 2004; ElMalik & Nesi, 2008; Englander, 2009; Flowerdew, 1999a, b, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Gosden, 1996; Jerudd & Baldauf, 1987; Li, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2006; Liu, 2004; Pupipat, 1998; Shi, 2003; St. John, 1987). While the literature on NNES scholars’ academic publishing in English has been growing, the bulk of the
literature on L2 academic publishing has been primarily concerned with NNES scholars in Periphery contexts, such as China (Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Li, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Shi, 2002, 2003), Japan (Gosden, 1992, 1996), Hong Kong (Cheung, 2010; Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000), Mexico (England, 2006, 2009), Spain (Burgess, 1997; St. John, 1987), Sri Lanka (Canagarajah, 1996), Southern and Central Europe (Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010), the Scandinavian countries (Jerudd & Baldauf, 1987), Taiwan (Huang, 2010), and Thailand (Pupipat, 1998). As a result, relatively less attention has been paid to the academic publishing experiences of NNES scholars in Anglophone contexts, although a few researchers (Cho, 2004; Hasrati, 2005; Tardy, 2005) have attempted to address this gap in L2 AAL scholarship.

In particular, the academic publishing efforts of NNES novice scholars (i.e., NNES doctoral students) in Anglophone contexts, such as the United States (the U.S.), have been under-researched. Although doctoral research is considered as an important source of building new knowledge in global scholarship, “little attention, if any, has been given to novices as contributors of new knowledge in disciplines” (Li, 2006a, p. 160). Gosden (1995) also addresses the importance of investigating NNES novice scholars’ socialization into the complex process of writing for publication, stating that “[t]he many unwritten ‘rules of the game’ of academic discourse manifest themselves textually in a multitude of subtle ways – how do these come to be appreciated and appropriately
imitated by novices?” (p. 39). The lack of focus on NNES doctoral students’ L2 academic publishing, particularly in the U.S. contexts, is surprising given the ever-increasing number of NNES graduate students enrolled in U.S. universities. The *Open Doors* (2011) reports that in 2010-2011 year the number of international graduate students enrolled in U.S. higher education institutions increased to 296,574, with total international enrollment, 723,277. The top sending nationalities are non-English-speaking countries, including China, India, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia, comprised 56 percent of all international students enrolled in U.S. tertiary institutions. As NNES doctoral students enter into U.S. universities, they are expected to acquire the linguistic and rhetorical norms of the Anglophone discourse community and participate in the Center academic communities through various activities, such as presenting at conferences and publishing their research. In particular, given that scholarly publication is an important way to be socialized into their chosen disciplinary academic community as well as to gain better employment opportunities upon graduation, NNES doctoral students are often encouraged to publish their research by their faculty advisors or academic departments/programs. In fact, NNES doctoral students in some disciplines, such as the sciences, are required to publish for doctoral graduation (Huang, 2010; Li, 2006a). For these students, therefore, scholarly publication is significant for their survival in a U.S. academic setting and for their future professional career. However, writing for
publication in English poses a number of challenges to these students, due to the possible lack of linguistic, cultural, social, and discursive knowledge of the discipline.

Considering NNES doctoral students’ potential contribution to knowledge construction in global scholarship, it is important to explore how they acquire disciplinary academic discourse, knowledge, and skills as well as achieve success in English-medium academic publishing. It appears that to these students, getting their first journal paper published in an Anglophone peer-review journal is a formidable undertaking. This suggests a need to identify NNES doctoral students’ difficulties and strategies in their first attempt to publish a RA in English. In particular, it is imperative to examine strategies employed by successful NNES novice scholarly writers of RAs because it can facilitate NNES novice scholars’ publication productivity and scholarly visibility in global scholarship by raising their awareness of effective strategies and demystifying the publication process.

Although much attention has been given to the strategies used by both experienced and novice NNES scholars in Periphery contexts (e.g., Cheung, 2010; Gosden, 1996; Okamura, 2006; St. John, 1987), relatively little is known about strategies adopted by NNES scholars, particularly NNES novice scholars residing in Anglophone settings (cf., Cho, 2004). Therefore, this study investigated the strategies that NNES doctoral students in the U.S. utilize to cope with their difficulties and achieve success in English-medium academic publishing.
One important consideration in L2 AAL research is that, to date, few research studies have examined NNES doctoral students’ L2 academic publishing experiences from a sociopolitical standpoint, with the exception of Blakslee’s (1997) and Li’s (2006a) studies. According to Casanave (2003a), written products and processes are sociopolitically-oriented. In other words, written texts are socially constructed in that they are “material objects fashioned by people” (Casanave, 2003a, p. 83). They are also politically situated, since they are “produced in power-infused setting such as classrooms and discourse communities, and are used to further political as well as intellectual and instruction agendas” (Casanave, 2003a, p. 83). Overall, Casanave (2003a) claims that writing products and processes are “embedded in local, institutional, and disciplinary contexts, and where people, their goals and institutional policies, and their relationships matter as much as do grammar and syntax, drafting and revising” (p. 98). Previous research adopting a sociopolitical perspective on L2 writing has primarily investigated NNES undergraduate and graduate students fulfilling group writing projects with NES peers or taking program-based English proficiency exams (Cheng, 2013; Johns, 1991; Leki, 2001; Spack, 1997). This lack of research on L2 academic publishing from a sociopolitical lens calls for a need to examine how NNES doctoral students fulfill the high-stakes task of publishing in Anglophone journals through interaction with powerful
authorities of the target academic community (i.e., faculty advisors and journal gatekeepers).

Bearing in mind the social and political dimensions of L2 academic publishing, this study particularly focuses on coauthoring between NNES doctoral students and their faculty advisors. It is assumed that faculty advisors are key players influencing students’ fulfilling their sociopolitical purposes of academic publishing. The sociocultural views of learning assume that coauthoring with faculty advisors (experts) facilitates a NNES student’s (novices’) transition from peripheral participation toward fuller and more central participation in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). With authority and expertise, the oldtimer advisor aids the novice student’s learning of the practices of the academic community. For example, Cho (2004) highlighted the importance of mentoring by faculty advisors when NNES graduate students attempted to enter the arena of English-medium academic publishing. However, although some researchers (e.g., Li, 2006a; de Oliveira & Lan, 2012) refer to the particular benefits of coauthoring with faculty advisors in English-medium academic publishing, it may also be problematic due to unbalanced power in authority and expertise between NNES doctoral students and faculty advisors. For instance, in Casanave’s (1998) study, a Western-trained Japanese scholar had to negotiate power relations with her former NES faculty advisor in the coauthoring process. This situation created tensions in which the Japanese scholar had to
decide “who would be listed as first author, who would draft and revise, and generally how to balance the work of preparing an article for publication” (p. 191). Such tensions can only be examined through an analysis of micro sociopolitical forces that NNES students face in the context of expert-novice interaction. Given that scholarly text production is shaped by the genres and power relations of the academic community (Kamler & Thomson, 2004), it is important to explore how NNES doctoral students’ cognitive and linguistic processes of English-medium academic publishing are embedded in the social and political context of interaction with expert members of the disciplinary academic community (i.e., coauthoring with faculty advisors).

To sum up, given the complexity of academic publishing in English and the dearth of research on the academic publishing efforts of NNES novice scholars in Anglophone settings, there is a need for more research on NNES doctoral students’ L2 academic publishing experiences. The examination of how NNES doctoral students undertake the high-stakes task of L2 academic publishing can empower these novice scholars in their transition from peripheral participation to fuller and more central participation in communities of practice. Therefore, this dissertation project was conducted to fill the gap in knowledge by looking at how NNES doctoral students in the U.S. negotiated the demands of publishing in Anglophone journals from a sociopolitical perspective.
1.2. Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the knowledge base about NNES doctoral students’ negotiation of academic publishing in English, responding to Casanave’s (2003a) and Flowerdew’s (2000) call for more case studies to enable the TESOL profession to better understand English-medium academic publication by NNES novice scholars. This study makes several contributions to expanding the current state of knowledge about L2 AAL.

First, this qualitative multiple case study yields insights that contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of English-medium academic publication by NNES novice scholars, such as NNES doctoral students in Anglophone settings. Relatively little attention has been given to NNES novice scholars (i.e., NNES doctoral students) as contributors of new knowledge in the international research communities. Most L2 AAL research has primarily focused on the student status of NNES novice scholars and portrayed how they socialize into academic discourses and fulfill the requirements of academic assignments (e.g., writing research papers and theses/dissertations) within graduate programs (e.g., Belcher & Hirvela, 2005; Dong, 1996a, 1996b, 1998; Prior, 1998). Given the lack of focus on NNES novice scholars in Anglophone settings, there is a particular need to conduct empirical studies exploring how NNES doctoral students enrolled in U.S. universities become knowledge contributors to global scholarship through publishing in mainstream Center journals. Therefore, this study sheds light on
difficulties and successes that these students experience in publishing discipline-appropriate research papers and strategies that they employ to overcome their difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication.

Second, this study is significant in that it attempts to expand the current knowledge of L2 AAL by examining NNES doctoral students’ negotiation of the demands of publishing in Anglophone Center journals from a sociopolitical lens. Despite Casanave’s (2003a) call for more sociopolitically-oriented case studies in L2 AAL scholarship, after 10 years now, there is still a paucity of research examining NNES novice scholars’ writing-for-publication process and strategies from a sociopolitical perspective (c.f., Cheng, 2013; Li, 2006a). Most L2 AAL studies have typically looked at NNES scholars’ perceptions of publishing in Anglophone Center journals (e.g., Li, 2002; Tardy, 2004), the challenges that NNES Periphery scholars face in English-medium academic publishing (e.g., Flowerdew, 2000), and the types of coping strategies they employ to produce academic texts in English (e.g., Gosden, 1996; Flowerdew, 1999a; Okamura, 2006; St. John, 1998). Few studies have documented a variety of conflicts and tensions that NNES novice scholars may experience when fulfilling the demands of academic publishing with agents of different power statuses, such as faculty advisors and journal gatekeepers (cf., Li, 2006a). Adding to the findings of earlier studies on L2 AAL, therefore, this study offers much-needed insights into how NNES novice scholars’
writing-for-publication process and strategies are embedded in the macro and micro sociopolitical contexts of research writing (i.e., institutional publication requirements and coauthoring with faculty advisors). Such insights are essential for enabling TESOL educators to better understand and respond to NNES scholars’ realities in academic publishing (Curry & Lillis, 2004) and for helping NNES scholars gain and exercise a sense of agency and become more central and fuller participants of the communities of practice.

Last but not least, the study aims to make important pedagogical contributions. Examining NNES doctoral students’ academic publishing experiences can suggest important implications for consolidating the commitment of TESOL and English for Academic Purposes (EAP)/English for Specific Purposes (ESP) professionals to the instruction of L2 AAL. TESOL professionals, EAP/ESP instructors, writing center personnel, and instructors across the disciplines can benefit from the analysis of the issues related to NNES doctoral students’ challenges, coping strategies, and the social and political power-infused contexts influencing the students’ writing-for-publication process. Knowledge of these issues may help tailor instructional practices to the needs of NNES doctoral students in writing for scholarly publication.
1.3. Research Questions

The central research question of this study was: How do NNES doctoral students enrolled in a U.S. university negotiate the demands of publishing in Anglophone peer-review journals? More specifically, this study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. What difficulties and successes do NNES doctoral students in a U.S. university experience in their attempts to publish in Anglophone peer-review journals?
2. What strategies do NNES doctoral students use to overcome their difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication?
3. What are the social and political power-infused relationships that influence NNES doctoral students’ writing-for-publication process? How do NNES doctoral students negotiate those power-infused relationships to learn to write for publication in English?

1.4. Definitions of Key Terms

This section defines a set of key terms that are used throughout this study.

1. **Discourse**: In this study, discourse is not simply viewed as a set of technical linguistic skills. Instead, Gee’s (1996) sociocultural view of discourse with a
capital $D$ (Discourse) is adopted. Gee (1996) defines *Discourse* as “ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles (or ‘types of people’) by specific groups of people” (Gee, 1996, p. viii).

2. **Discourse Community**: The concept of *discourse community* traces its roots in the notion of *speech community*. Hymes (1974) defines *speech community* as a distinct group of people who use particular speech practices (e.g., American English or British English). Swales (1990) further developed this notion of speech community to the field of academic writing, using the term *discourse community*. According to Swales (1990), *discourse community* refers to “sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals” (p. 9).

3. **Community of Practice and Legitimate Peripheral Participation**: A community of practice (CoP) refers to “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger, 2006, from http://www.ewenger.com/theory/communities_of_practice_intro.htm). In relation to the notion of community of practice, learning is viewed as a socially situated practice in which newcomers gradually move toward fuller participation in a given community by interacting with more experienced members. This process of
learning is called “legitimate peripheral participation” (LPP). In this study, it is assumed that multiple communities of practice are experienced and negotiated among NNES doctoral students due to their interaction with members of different communities.

4. **Disciplinary Enculturation**: The term, *disciplinary enculturation* is often synonymously used with other terms, such *socialization* and *academic enculturation*. Casanave (2002) defines disciplinary enculturation as “a process in which novice community members learn to engage in a community’s practices and hence to participate in ways that redefine their identities. Texts and people’s relationships with texts and with other people who are producers and users of texts lie at the heart of the process” (p. 27).

5. **Center and Periphery**: The dichotomy of *Center* and *Periphery* was originally developed to address the politico-economic power imbalance between the Western industrialized countries and the underdeveloped countries (Li, 2006c). These binary terms have also been adopted in the field of L2 AAL. *Center* often refers to English-speaking Inner Circle countries (Kachru, 1985, 1992), while *Periphery* refers to countries that belong to the Expanding and Outer Circle countries (Kachru, 1985, 1992). With regard to the concept of Center, the term, mainstream Center academic communities, refers to Anglophone academic
communities. In addition, the term, mainstream Center journals, mean Anglophone journals.

6. **Academic publishing**: Academic publishing refers to “a system that is necessary in order for academic scholars to peer review the work and make it available for a wider audience” (Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Research).

7. **Refereed (peer-review) Journal**: Many journals use a process of peer review prior to publishing an article, whereby other recognized scholars in the writer’s field or specialty critically assess a draft of the article. A refereed journal usually refers to a journal that only publishes peer-reviewed articles that have passed through the review process. For example, some refereed journals include:

- *TESOL Quarterly*,
- *English for Specific Academic Purposes*
- *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*
- *Information Sciences*
- *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*

8. **Research Article (RA)**: A RA reports the results of original research and assesses its contribution to the body of knowledge in a given field. It usually contains a summary or abstract, a description of the research, the results of the research, and the discussion of the results.

9. **NNES or L2 or Multilingual Students**: I use terms such as NNES, L2, and multilingual students, to refer to individuals who study in a language other than
their first language in an academic setting. While I am aware of the risk of stigmatizing these individuals by using such labels, I use them to highlight the fact that they are simultaneously learning a L2 and academic content. I also use the terms because they are commonly used labels in the literature. These two terms are used interchangeably in this study when referring to students whose native language is not English and who are literate and fluent in more than one language.

10. **L1**: L1 is an acronym for an individual’s first or native language.

11. **L2**: This acronym is used to refer to any additional language (second, third, fourth, or higher) learned beyond the L1.

1.5. Theoretical and Methodological Assumptions

Below is a list of the theoretical and methodological assumptions that will guide this study.

1. Doctoral education refers to “structured programs of advanced study and supervised research” (International Affairs Office, U.S. Department of Education, 2008). According to Golde (2006), the purpose of doctoral education is to help students become stewards of the discipline, “who will creatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly
transform those understandings through writing, teaching and application” (p. 5). Effective advisor-advisee relationships play a crucial role in the successful completion of a doctoral program (Neumann, 2003). The advisor-advisee relationship can be considered as mentoring process in the master/apprentice tradition (Neumann, 2003).

2. Learning is situated and takes places in social contexts.

3. Writing is a process of self-construction.

4. Academic publishing is a complex and multi-layered process.

5. Academic publishing is embedded in social and political contexts of writing.

6. Participants experience and negotiate multiple communities of practice as they interact with experts or more experienced members within and across different communities.

7. Participants can identify and discuss their publishing activities that take place.

8. Participants are able to communicate in English.

1.6. Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation presents a multiple case study examining the L2 academic publishing experiences of four NNES doctoral students in the U.S. from a sociopolitical lens. It comprises eight chapters. In Chapter 1, I present the statement of the problem in
relation to the dominance of English in global scholarship, and NNES novice scholars’ challenges in publishing in Anglophone journals; research questions; the significance of the study; its assumptions; and definitions of terms that are relevant to the study. Chapter 2 discusses the theoretical frameworks of the study, focusing on discourse community (Swales, 1990) legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wengre, 1991), and social capital (Bourdieu, 1985, 1990). It also reviews selected literature on two broad issues: (1) NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation in Anglophone settings and (2) NNES scholars’ participation in English-medium academic publication. Chapter 3 describes the methodological framework which shaped the design for this multiple case study. It delineates participant selection, the role of researcher, data collection instruments and procedures, the data analysis, and a brief discussion of confidentiality and ethical considerations. Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 present the findings of the case study participants’ (Sungju, Jun, Ken, and Mei) English-medium academic publishing experiences consecutively. In the final chapter, Chapter 8, I present a cross-case analysis of themes that emerged from the findings as well as answers to the study’s research questions. The chapter also addresses implications for language and disciplinary professionals who deal with NNES graduate students as well as recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2:
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS AND REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical frameworks that shaped and guided this study and offers a review of the relevant literature. The present study is situated within the broad context of sociocultural theory that posits that “higher forms of human mental activity are always, and everywhere, mediated by symbolic means” (Lantolf, 1994, p.418). In this framework, learning is viewed as the process of social interaction and participation in a given social context. Specifically, the three notions of discourse community (Swales, 1990), legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990) serve as theoretical underpinnings for this study.

The chapter consists of two major sections. The first section gives an overview of the theoretical bases: discourse community (Swales, 1990), LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990). The second section offers a review of the relevant literature on two broad issues: (1) NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation in Anglophone settings and (2) NNES scholars’ participation in English-medium academic publication. The term, disciplinary enculturation has been drawn to capture students’ acclimation into an academic discipline (e.g., Berkenkotter & Huckin,
Given that writing for publication is an important part of students’ disciplinary enculturation (see more details later in this chapter), the chapter provides a relevant review on the disciplinary enculturation of NNES graduate students in English-speaking contexts. Particular attention is paid to studies that have explored issues concerning discursive and non-discursive aspects of NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation experiences. With regard to L2 AAL research on NNES scholars’ publishing experiences, the findings of the previous studies have raised an awareness of the needs, challenges, and coping strategies that NNES scholars bring with them to their publishing contexts, and have yielded an understanding of the norms and expectations involved in producing academic texts in English. The second section of this chapter offers a review on the following two categories that are relevant to this study: (1) the difficulties that NNES scholars face in academic publishing in English and (2) the strategies that these scholars utilize for English-medium academic publishing. Overall, this review of relevant literature serves as an important framework of reference for study findings and discussions in Chapters 4 to 8.
2.1. Theoretical Frameworks

2.1.1. Discourse Community

In the field of L2 AAL the concept of discourse community is often used to describe the language and discourse specific to an academic discipline (e.g., Barzerman, 1988; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Woodward-Kron, 2004). The concept of discourse community traces its roots in the notion of speech community. Hymes (1974) defines speech community as a distinct group of people who use particular speech practices (e.g., American English or British English). Swales (1990) further developed the notion of speech community to the field of academic writing, using the term discourse community. According to Swales (1990), discourse community refers to “sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals” (p. 9). Swales (1990) delineates the following six features of discourse community: 1) a broadly agreed upon set of goals; 2) mechanisms for intercommunication among community members; 3) established procedures for providing feedback to individuals; 4) one or more accepted communicative genres; 5) a specified lexis; and 6) a threshold level of members each with a suitable degree of expertise.

An academic discipline is often described as academic discourse community. One characteristic of academic discourse community is that it is heterogeneous. Members of academic discourse community “share certain language using practices, canonical
knowledge and approaches to interpreting experience” (Woodward-Kron, 2004, p. 141). Yet, academic discourse community is heteroglossic and multivoiced since there is a space open for debates over theories and research findings among members of academic discourse community (Bazerman, 1992). Another characteristic of academic discourse community that is useful to this study is that it is multidimensional. Several researchers (Bizzell, 1992; Burgess, 2002; Freedman & Medway, 1994) have focused on multiple layers of academic discourse community. Each writer belongs to a number of discourse communities. Each affiliation carries its own rhetorical rules. Consequently, academic or professional writers make rhetorical decisions in accordance with the norms of the multiple discourse communities that they belong to. For instance, Curry and Lillis (2004) examined how a group of European NNES scholars in the discipline of psychology wrote for multiple discourse communities, which are three distinct dimensions: the linguistic medium of communication (i.e., L1 and English), geopolitical location (i.e., domestic and international), and theory- versus application-oriented research. In a more recent study, Li (2006b) examined how a Chinese doctoral student in artificial intelligence (AI) negotiated three layers of discourse communities: her disciplinary community of AI, the domestic discourse community as represented by her target domestic journals, and the international discourse community as represented by her target international conference. These studies suggest that an academic or professional writer is a member of multiple
discourse communities and that a writer’s geographic, linguistic, and disciplinary backgrounds may influence the types of discourse communities that he or she belongs to. With regard to the multidimensional nature of academic discourse community, this study is concerned with how NNES doctoral students’ membership in multiple discourse communities (i.e., academic communities in the U.S. and home countries) shaped their publication efforts and participation in English-medium academic publishing.

2.1.2. Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Writing for publication is a vital part of students’ disciplinary enculturation. Disciplinary enculturation through the writing-for-publication process is aligned with the notion of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This notion of LPP originated from the idea of cognitive apprenticeship, which is a theory of “situated learning” in which a novice acquires new skills under the guidance of a master. Lave and Wenger (1991) expanded this idea and developed the notion of LPP, which defines learning as a socially situated practice in which newcomers gradually move toward fuller participation in a given community by interacting with more experienced members. This process of “situated learning” is called “apprenticeship.” A central idea of apprenticeship is “centripetal participation in the ambient community” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 100).
LPP emphasizes the importance of learners’ participating in a community of practice (CoP), which refers to “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger, n.d., retrieved from http://wenger-trayner.com/theory/). Wenger (1998) notes that a community of practice has three dimensions: (1) mutual engagement, (2) shared repertoire, and (3) joint enterprise. Mutual engagement means that participants in the community engage in actions and practices and make sense of them with others. This interaction may be homogeneous or heterogeneous. Shared repertoire includes ways of doing things, such as routines, words, tools, genres, actions or concepts that participants in the community have adopted and practiced. Joint enterprise refers to “the result of a collective process of negotiation that reflects the full complexity of mutual engagement” (Wenger, 1998, p. 77). Therefore, it generates mutual accountability among participants.

Within a community of practice, newcomers are on or outside the periphery of the community of practice. They are legitimate and peripheral participants seeking fuller participation in a CoP (Lave & Wenger, 1991). They are considered as legitimate members of the community in a sense that they have legitimate access to resources, information, and members of the community. Newcomers’ participation in the community of practice is also seen as peripheral in that they begin as outsiders and move toward full participation. On the contrary, old timers are considered full participants.
They serve as gatekeepers and make decisions about who to let in to their gated community. Lave and Wenger (1991) also describes learning as the production of identity. Identify can be understood as “the way a person understands and views himself, and is viewed by others, a perception of self which is fairly constant” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 51). Therefore, newcomers’ status changes from novices to full members as they gain competence and enhance their involvement.

Lave and Wenger’s (1991) notion of LPP is particularly informative to this study in two aspects. First, the concept of LPP provides a theoretical lens for understanding the multidimensional nature of the experience these students undergo to learn to write for publication. From the perspective of LPP, NNES doctoral students are seen as newcomers situated in one or more particular communities (e.g., graduate programs in a U.S. university and academic communities in home countries) and engaging in the practices of those communities. These students are regarded as peripheral participants in two respects: their NNES status and novice researcher status (Cho, 2004). They are also viewed as legitimate participants in that they participate in their ongoing activities and practices, often by interacting through a form of apprenticeship with more experienced peers and faculty advisors. The careful examination of the specific local disciplinary communities as well as the larger sociocultural context in which NNES students are situated helps understand not only how NNES students learn to become fuller members
of the disciplinary academic communities, but also how larger and local sociocultural contexts influence (facilitate or impede) these students’ trajectories of learning.

Second, a critical view of LPP provides an important framework for this study in that it helps to understand how NNES doctoral students negotiate the sociopolitical purposes of publishing in Anglophone journals in order to become more legitimate and fuller participants in the Center academic communities. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), LPP is not a smooth and peaceful process, but a conflictual process of negotiation and transformation since legitimate peripherality is situated in “social structures involving power relations” (p. 36). They note that “hegemony over resources for learning and alienation from full participation are inherent in the shaping of the legitimacy and peripherality of participation in its historical realization” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 42). In other words, even though newcomers’ access to the community of practice (e.g., access to a variety of information, resources, and members of the community) is crucial to legitimate peripherality, old timers exercise power and control over newcomers by manipulating access to resources, information, and opportunities for participation, which may hinder newcomers’ LPP. Toohey’s (1998) study of L2 learners’ participation in school settings found that L2 learners were denied access to resources and opportunities necessary for their learning and that their knowledge and experience in L1 were devalued.
Without access to desirable resources, L2 learners continue to be on the margin and never become legitimate participants in communities of practice (Kanno, 1999).

However, newcomers are not simply passive agents receiving community knowledge or accepting power from old timers. Peripherality entails “a rich notion of agency” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 53), which allows newcomers to “take actions and carry out new roles and identities as reactions to their social and political connections and interactions with other people in the CoP” (Cheng, 2013, p. 13). While agency can be affected by social and political dimensions of newcomers’ participation in a CoP, it may also have an impact on the social and political dynamics of a CoP (Cheng, 2013).

Previous L2 AAL studies concerning newcomers’ agency have explored NNES graduate students’ engagement with expert members of their CoP (i.e., faculty advisors and journal gatekeepers) (e.g., Belcher, 1994; Dong, 1996a; Flowerdew, 2000; Li, 2005, 2006a) and bilingual academics’ balancing act between differing norms and expectations posed by the Center and Periphery academic communities (Casanave, 1998). While some of these studies have highlighted NNES novice scholars’ agency that accommodates the norms and conventions of the Center academic communities, others have demonstrated that NNES writers’ agency may be resistant to the accepted norms and conventions. In negotiating the challenges of producing English-medium academic text and participating in the Center academic communities, NNES writers may employ both accommodation
and resistance to the expected norms and conventions (e.g., Canagarajah, 1993, 2003; Kramsch & Lam, 1999; Morita, 2004). This study drew on this critical perspective of LPP to examine how NNES doctoral students responded to old timers’ (i.e., faculty advisors and journal gatekeepers) exercising power and control over them and what coping strategies (i.e., accommodation and/or resistance) they used to gain agency and negotiate their ways to move toward fuller membership.

2.1.3. Social Capital

The notion of LPP is linked to the idea of social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990). Bourdieu was the first sociologist to systematically develop the concept of social capital. His theory of three forms of capital (economic, cultural, and social) provides a conceptual framework for this study. Bourdieu (1986) defines social capital as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition - or in other words, to membership in a group” (p. 248-249). Cultural capital and social capital have sometimes been interpreted as overlapping. However, cultural capital tends to focus on the resources that are helpful to navigate educational and other status systems (Bourdieu, 1986), while social capital emphasizes the actual social relationships and networks that help an individual access these resources (Stanton-Salazar, 1997, 2001). In other words,
social capital serves as a vehicle to enhance an individual’s access to human, information, and other forms of capital (Coleman, 1988; Lin, 2001; Stanton-Salazar & Dornbusch, 1995). In educational settings it includes relationships with peers, teachers, counselors, or community members. These relationships may exist as forms of material or symbolic exchanges.

A number of educational researchers have adopted the notion of social capital to investigate school-aged minority students’ socialization and academic achievement, such as minority students’ socialization in school settings (Stanton-Salazar, 1997), the role of parental involvement and minority students’ college enrollment (Perna & Titus, 2005), and the influence of relationships with family and school personnel on minority students’ access to college (Gonzalez, Stoner, & Jovel, 2003). A few recent L2 studies have drawn on the social capital framework to conceptualize how different forms of social capital influence experienced and novice NNES scholars’ academic achievement and development. Drawing on the notion of social capital, Cho (2009) examined five NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation. The author found that NNES students’ disciplinary enculturation was enhanced by the kinds of social ties and networks that they developed. The study concluded that it is crucial for NNES graduate students to establish positive and supportive personal interactions with members in their disciplinary community for successful disciplinary enculturation. In their nine-year longitudinal study
exploring the academic publishing experiences of 50 psychology and education scholars in southern and central Europe, Curry and Lillis (2010) also adopted the concept of social capital in order to explore experienced NNES scholars’ participation in local and transnational research networks. The study suggests that strong and durable local networks play a significant role in NNES Periphery scholars’ participation in transnational research networks, which facilitate their publications in both English and local languages. Based on the referenced studies above, the notion of social capital offers a useful conceptual framework for the present study to examine how NNES doctoral students access and utilize “socioacademic relationships” (Leki, 2006) as social capital in their disciplinary community to overcome their difficulties and achieve success in English-medium academic publication.

2.2. Review of Selected Literature

2.2.1. NNES Graduate Students’ Disciplinary Enculturation in Anglophone Settings

The term, *disciplinary enculturation* has been used to explore how students become apprenticed into an academic discipline (e.g., Casanave, 2002; Casanave & Li, 2008; Chang, 2011; Cho, 2013; Hirvela & Yi, 2008; Prior, 1998). This term is often synonymously used with other terms, such as *socialization* and *academic enculturation*. Casanave (2002) defines disciplinary enculturation as “a process in which novice
community members learn to engage in a community’s practices and hence to participate in ways that redefine their identities. Texts and people’s relationships with texts and with other people who are producers and users of texts lie at the heart of the process” (p. 27).

The process of disciplinary enculturation entails uncertainty and challenges as students constantly negotiate “discourse, competence, identities, and power relations” (Morita, 2004, p. 583). Thus, disciplinary enculturation is viewed as “a potentially complex and conflictual process of negotiation rather than as a predictable, unidirectional process” (Morita, 2000, p. 279).

While enculturation into graduate school may not be a smooth and easy journey to native-English-speaking (NES) mainstream students, previous studies on NNES graduate students’ experiences in English-speaking graduate schools have demonstrated that disciplinary enculturation poses greater challenges to NNES students “who often lack the cultural and linguistic capital of their native speaker peers” (Kuwahara, 2008, p. 187). In their discussions of multiple voices and identities of NNES graduate students, Hirvela and Belcher (2001) note that “having achieved some measures of success and recognition as first language (L1) writers” (p. 84), many NNES students enter into graduate schools in English-speaking universities. Nonetheless, Casanave and Li (2008) maintain that if any new graduate student has to go through “double socialization” (Golde, 1998) (that is, being simultaneously socialized into the role of graduate student and into a profession),
NNES graduate students in English-speaking graduate programs will need to deal with “triple socialization” (Casanave & Li, 2008, p. 3). In other words, these students have additional burden of learning a language and culture that their NES peers have acquired since they were born.

Since disciplinary enculturation involves acquiring written discourse and genres of the relevant disciplines, a number of researchers have focused on NNES students’ fulfilling course writing assignments and dissertation writing. Given that English is the dominant language in accessing, communicating and producing knowledge in English-speaking graduate programs (Chang & Kanno, 2010), some studies have focused on language barriers that NNES graduate students encounter in their disciplinary enculturation. For example, in a survey study of NES and NNES doctoral students’ dissertation writing, Dong (1998) found that NNES doctoral students identified vocabulary as a problematic area in their writing. In a case study of four NNES graduate students, in addition, Angelova and Riazantseva (1999) examined students’ difficulties in the process of adapting to the requirements of discipline-specific written discourses during their first year of studies in the U.S. The study revealed that the challenges students faced in writing were attributed to their unfamiliarity with the academic register as well as the disciplinary rhetorical style and organization.
Other researchers have addressed non-discursive aspects of NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation (e.g., Casanave, 2002; Casanave & Li, 2008; Hirvela & Yi, 2008; Kim, 2007; Krase, 2003; Prior, 1998). It has been documented that NNES graduate students are less likely to have access to resources to establish positive relationships with peers and/or faculty advisors for success in learning (Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999; Ballard, 1996; Burk & Wyatt-Smith, 1996; Deem & Brehony, 2000; Dong, 1998; Y. Kim, 2007; Krase, 2003; Morita, 2000, 2004). For instance, Schneider and Fujishima’s (1995) study of a NNES student’s disciplinary enculturation experiences demonstrated that the student’s academic failure was attributed to his lack of ability to build a social network for his learning as well as his limited sociolinguistic competence to acquire academic genres. In a similar vein, several studies have explored how advisor-advisee relationships influenced NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation experiences. Belcher (1994) conducted a case study of three NNES doctoral students in the U.S. and their faculty advisors. Belcher found that the NNES students who turned out to be less successful did not build enough trust in their relationships with the advisors and there was a “mismatch between the advisors’ and the students’ conceptualization of their community, apparent in their very different notions of research writing goals and research reader expectations” (p. 23). Her study suggests that compared to a more hierarchical advisor-advisee relationship, a more collaborative one can better support in negotiating
academic demands in the context of dissertation writing. Krase’s (2007) and Kim’s (2007) studies of Korean graduate students enrolled in U.S. universities confirmed that relationships between doctoral advisors and their students can be dysfunctional and ineffective when the two parties have differing expectations of graduate supervision. Krase (2007) examined the interaction between a Korean graduate student and her NES advisor. The NNES student expected a more directive supervision, while the advisor pursued an egalitarian advisor-advisee relationship. The study suggests that effective advisor-advisee relationships are crucial to NNES students’ successful disciplinary enculturation in graduate schools. The findings of Krase’s (2007) study are supported by Kim’s (2007) study. Kim (2007) explored the challenges that nearly 100 Korean graduate students in the U.S. encountered in building effective advisor-advisee relationships. She found that inconsistency in the expectations of the role of advisors between NNES students and their advisors led to Korean students’ confusion or resentment toward their advisors. The study also revealed that Korean students’ passivity in interaction and communication as well as some advisors’ unavailability and indifferent attitude hindered building supportive relationships between Korean graduate students and their advisors.

In contrast, some studies have illustrated a more positive picture of the advisor-advisee interaction in the process of NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation. For instance, in their autobiographical study on dissertation writing, Hirvela and Yi (2008)
investigated how a dissertation advisor engaged a NNES advisee in the successful negotiation of the intricate expectations of writing a qualitative results chapter. Having their own writing agendas, the dissertation advisor and the NNES advisee initially developed different expectations of what constitutes a good qualitative results chapter. Due to the lack of communication between them, these different expectations resulted in frustration and even resentment on the part of the NNES advisee. However, through the advisor’s deliberate guidance and meaningful feedback on the results chapter, the NNES advisee’s attempt to negotiate these differing expectations turned out to be a successful one. A new set of expectations that were mutually established through “frank, open, and ongoing discussions” (p. 131) between the two parties helped the NNES advisee gain a deeper level of control over her dissertation writing and a sense of empowerment as a qualitative writer. In another autobiographical study on disciplinary enculturation in the U.S., de Oliveira and Lan (2012) examined how a NNES faculty advisor provided apprenticeship for a NNES graduate student to achieve success in the development of academic literacy and teaching ability. In addition to providing psychological support and sharing her personal experiences as a NNES graduate student, the NNES advisor engaged the student in classroom-based research and publication as well as graduate-level teaching. The advisor’s scaffolded support particularly led to the attainment of successful apprenticeship for the NNES student. For instance, by getting exposed to the email
correspondence between the editors and the advisor, the student gained an awareness of the editors’ expectations and learned how to initiate and carry on academic discussions with journal gatekeepers. The study suggests that the advisor-advisee relationships that involve collaboration in research and writing and the establishment of trusting relationships play a pivotal role in NNES graduate students’ successful disciplinary enculturation. In their longitudinal qualitative study, Samimy, Kim, Lee, and Kasai (2011) demonstrated how an NNES TESOL faculty advisor’s long-term and supportive mentoring empowered three NNES advisees to become more confident and contributing members of the TESOL community. Providing mentoring on teaching, research, and professional career, the NNES TESOL faculty advisor served as “a trusted counselor, a cheerleader, and a troubleshooter” (p. 568) for the NNES advisees. With the advisor’s multidimensional mentoring, the NNES advisees were able to successfully participate in various discipline-specific activities, such as presenting at international conferences and publishing in international peer-review journals.

Only a few studies have explored issues concerning the academic publishing experiences of NNES graduate students in Anglophone contexts. Using a questionnaire and a focus-group interview, Tardy (2004) examined NNES graduate science students’ perceptions of the role of English in scientific publication. NNES science students in Tardy’s study reported that they felt disadvantaged vis-à-vis their NES peers due to
language difficulties and a great deal of time spent on learning English when it came to writing for publication. Using in-depth interviews, Cho (2004) focused on NNES graduate students’ strategies to overcome their challenges in publishing in international journals. The study found four main strategies used by the NNES students. The strategies included (1) coauthoring with faculty advisors, (2) choosing certain types of research, (3) getting help from NESs, and (4) using local-based knowledge. Perhaps Blakeslee (1997) is the most relevant to the present study, in that it examined how the advisor-advisee relationship influenced NNES graduate students’ situated learning of writing for publication in English. The study revealed that NNES graduate students’ situated learning was hampered by three factors: (1) NNES students’ existing composing approach that impeded the acquisition of new genre skills, (2) the faculty advisor’s implicit mentoring that was not sufficient enough to scaffold students’ learning, and (3) unbalanced power relations between NNES graduate students and their faculty advisor. These studies are noteworthy in that they are the first studies of this line of inquiry to document the perceptions, difficulties, strategies, and mentoring experiences of NNES graduate students in the U.S. in relation to English-medium academic publishing. Although these studies provide useful insights into the academic publishing experiences of NNES graduate students in Anglophone contexts, many questions still remain unanswered.
Although much attention has been paid to NNES graduate students’ acquisition of discipline-specific written genres and discourse, only a small number of studies have explored NNES graduate students’ oral academic discourse development (e.g., Kobayashi, 2003; Morita, 2000, 2004; Robinson, Strong, Whittle, & Nobe, 2001). Building on this emerging body of research, Morita conducted two studies of NNES graduate students enrolled in Canadian universities. Morita (2000) explored the oral academic discourse development of NES and NNES students through academic presentations in a TESOL graduate program at a Canadian university. The study revealed that NNES students gradually developed discipline-specific oral academic discourse by negotiating with instructors and peers in terms of expectations and expertise as “they prepared for, observed, performed, and reviewed OAPs [oral academic presentations]” (p. 302). This study suggests that oral academic presentations provide NNES students with an effective opportunity to become apprenticed into the expected norms and values of the given classroom communities. Several years later, Morita (2004) examined the academic discourse socialization of six Japanese women at a Canadian university. She focused on the women’s various forms of oral participation in open-ended class discussions, such as turn-taking, raising questions, and critical thinking. Their multiple identities were constructed by various contributing factors in different course contexts. These factors included their status as English teachers, NNESs, non-Canadians, women, and particular
positionality imposed by teachers and NES classmates (i.e., outsiders versus insiders). They negotiated different types of positionality and their sense of agency within each classroom context. This study is significant in that it captured complex issues of culture, gender, and power to see how Japanese female students participated in open-ended oral discussions and negotiated their legitimacy and identities in academic discourse communities.

To sum up, the review of the above referenced literature suggests that disciplinary enculturation is a complex and discursive process in which NNES graduate students not only attempt to acquire specified genres and conventions in a given discipline, but also negotiate multiple identities, agency, and social relations of power within their unfamiliar academic communities. Writing for publication is an important part of NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation, in that it helps students learn expected discipline-specific norms and practices and gain membership to the target disciplinary community. Given the multidimensional nature of disciplinary enculturation which foregrounds the situated learning of English-medium academic publishing, this study focuses on both discursive (i.e., linguistic and rhetorical difficulties) and non-discursive (i.e., mentoring relationships and academic networks) aspects of NNES doctoral students’ writing for publication in English.
2.2.2. NNES scholars’ Participation in English-medium Academic Publication

This section presents the review of relevant literature, focusing on the following two categories: (1) the difficulties that NNES scholars face in writing for publication in English and (2) the strategies that these scholars utilize to publish in Anglophone Center journals.

2.2.2.1. The Difficulties NNES Scholars Face in Writing for Publication in English

Considerable work has been done to identify NNES scholars’ difficulties and constraints with regard to gaining entry to the Center academic communities through English-medium academic publication (Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2001; Li, 2005; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Liu, 2004; Man, Weinkauf, Tsang, & Sin, 2004; Shaw, 1991). The major difficulties identified include (1) language problems, (2) divergence from the rhetorical norms of the Center academic communities, (3) non-discursive difficulties, and (4) editors’ and reviewers’ potential bias against NNES scholars’ submissions.

Language Problems

NNES scholars’ underrepresentation in global scholarship has been a concern among L2 AAL researchers (e.g., Canagarajah, 1996, 2001; Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b,
2000, 2007). In an effort to facilitate NNES scholars’ participation in the interactional academic communities, special attention has been paid to difficulties and obstacles that hinder NNES scholars’ publishing in Anglophone journals. Previous studies have indicated that one primary source of difficulty that NNES scholars encounter in writing for publication in English is language problems. For instance, Flowerdew (1999a) found that 68 percent of the 585 Hong Kong academics surveyed believed that due to language problems, they were disadvantaged in comparison to their NES counterparts in publishing in Anglophone Center journals. The same perspective was revealed in Tardy’s (2004) survey study. The study indicated that NNES science graduate students enrolled in a U.S. university felt disadvantaged vis-à-vis their NES peers due to language difficulties and a great deal of time spent on learning English when it came to writing for publication in English. Specific language-related areas that appear to be problematic to NNES scholars include lack of linguistic repertoire in terms of English expressions and vocabulary (Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b; Shaw, 1991; St. John, 1987), difficulty with syntax and grammar (Flowerdew, 2001), and inappropriate use of idiomatic expressions (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005; Liu, 2004). The findings of the above referenced studies suggest that language barriers impose an additional burden on NNES academics.
Divergence from the Rhetorical Norms of the Center Academic Communities

From the perspective of contrastive rhetoric, each culture has its own writing styles and rhetorical conventions (Connor, 1996). Previous studies (Flowerdew, 2001; Li, 2002; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Melander et al., 1997; Swales, 1990) have suggested that rhetorical differences across cultures may be attributed to NNES scholars’ difficulty in publishing in Anglophone journals. These studies have indicated that the stylistic divergence between the rhetorical conventions and cultural values of NNES scholars and those of the Anglophone academic communities often result in NNES scholars’ texts that are rhetorically flawed or weak. For instance, Flowerdew (1999a) and Liu (2004) point out that NNES scholars seem to make claims without adequate evidence or illustrations in their texts due to the differences between their L1 rhetorical conventions and those of the Center academic communities. These studies corroborate Flowerdew’s (2001) study that examined applied linguistics journal editors’ perspectives of scholarly writing by NNES scholars. Journal editors participating in Flowerdew’s study reported that “lack of an authorial voice” (p. 134) was one of the major problems for NNES authors. A similar point was made by Cho (2004) and ElMalik and Nesi (2008). These researchers observed that Korean and Sudanese scholarly writers failed to make explicit and bold claims about the significance of their research work. NNES scholars in these studies consciously or unconsciously failed to make the kind of rhetorical claims or appeals expected by the
Center academic communities due to their reliance on L1 rhetorical conventions or cultural values. In their study of Hungarian scholars’ publishing experiences, Curry and Lillis (2004) suggest that the adoption of L1 discursive conventions and regional styles often make NNES scholars’ academic texts problematic for Center audiences. Divergences from the expected norms of the mainstream Center academic communities are likely to prevent these scholars from effectively persuading Center audiences for the significance and credibility of their research work.

Concerning mismatches between L1 rhetorical norms and conventions and those of the Center academic communities, NNES academics’ difficulty in writing certain sections of a research paper has also been the focus of research. Previous studies have indicated that the Introduction and Discussion sections are often found to be the most challenging parts to write (e.g., Buckingham, 2008; Flowerdew, 1999b; Misak, Marusic, & Marusic, 2005). For instance, Chinese scholars in Hong Kong interviewed by Flowerdew (1999b) reported they found the Introduction and Discussion sections particularly difficult to write. These two areas are the places in which writers are expected to create “a research niche” (Swales, 1990). In other word, in these areas writers should raise questions, claim counterarguments, and bridge gaps in the existing literature “to insert themselves into the scholarly tradition, create a research space for their work, and promote its significance and value” (Uzuner, 2008, p. 255). However, these Center-
based expected norms may conflict with NNES scholars’ L1 rhetorical conventions and cultural values. It appears that this conflict leads to NNES scholars’ difficulty in writing the Introduction and Discussion sections.

In summary, the findings of the referenced studies above suggest that NNES scholars’ divergences resulting from the adoption of L1 discursive tradition and regional writing styles is often seen as flaws or ineffectiveness, rather than unique and valuable contribution (Uzuner, 2008), consequently leading to rejection by journal editors and reviewers.

*Non-discursive Difficulties*

NNES scholars in Periphery contexts may have limited opportunity to develop the practices necessary to compete for publication space within the international academic communities (Canagarajah, 1996, 2001, 2003). There are many constraints deriving from NNES scholars’ geographical isolation from the mainstream Center academic communities. Lack of contact with members of the Center academic communities may hinder NNES scholars’ success in international academic publishing, although being isolated or off-networked does not automatically lead NNES scholars’ submissions to editorial rejection (Belcher, 2007). Studies by Belcher (2007), Casanave (1998), and Curry and Lillis (2004) indicated that maintaining a network of connections with the
Center academic communities was essential for novice and emergent NNES scholars to enter into the arena of international publication. These studies suggest that maintaining a distant position from the Center academic communities puts NNES scholars at a distinct disadvantage in terms of making scholarly contributions to the global knowledge base (Flowerdew, 2000).

Getting alienated from the publishing practices of the Center academic communities may create the problem of parochialism, which refers to scholars’ being too localized in research. NNES scholars’ local-based research may be considered less relevant and less convincing to the mainstream Center academic communities (Flowerdew, 2001). Curry and Lillis (2004) and Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008) illustrated how NNES scholars’ commitment to local-based research resulted in Center-based audiences’ disinterest. In addition to parochialism, it has been suggested that the lack of materials coupled with limited research funds limit NNES scholars’ research work in Periphery contexts. Canagarajah (1996) observed that non-discursive obstacles, such as the lack of material resources (e.g., limited access to up-to-date scholarly journals, lack of computerized resources and Internet connections), were attributed to the marginalization or underrepresentation of NNES scholars in Periphery countries. Findings of Hiep’s (2006) study confirm Canagarajah’s (1996) observation. Hiep (2006) found that Vietnamese
researchers felt constrained by the lack of access to materials in getting their research work published in English-medium international journals.

Previous studies have demonstrated that insufficient research funds are another major discursive obstacle for increasing NNES scholars’ participation in international scholarly publishing. Adopting multiple regression techniques, Man et al. (2004) examined the impact of national research funding on publication output in the field of medicine. The study revealed that English-speaking Center countries (e.g., the US, the UK, Canada, and Australia) allocated more funds to research. On the other hand, the nations that spent less funds on research were the ones in Periphery contexts (e.g., Japan, Turkey, Korea, Mexico), with the exception of Denmark, Finland, Switzerland, The Netherlands, and Sweden. The results of the multiple regression indicated that total research funding was significantly correlated with standardized publication rate. The study concluded that the nations that invested more on research had higher publication output than those that spent less on research. The findings of Man et al.’s (2004) study are consistent with Aydinli and Mathews (2000). Aydinli and Mathews (2000) reviewed the RAs published in Anglophone Center journals in the area of international relation to examine what percentage of the RAs was contributed by NNES scholars in Periphery countries. The results of the study indicated Periphery scholars’ low contribution to
global scholarship. The authors concluded that Periphery scholars’ marginalization in Anglophone Center journals might be attributed to restrictions in research funds.

Editors’ and Reviewers’ Potential Bias against NNES Scholars’ Submissions

In relation to NNES scholars’ underrepresentation in Anglophone Center journals, the issue of editors’ and reviewers’ potential biases against NNES scholars’ submissions has received attention from a number of researchers (Canagarajah, 1996; Coates et al., 2002; Flowerdew, 2000; Aydinli & Mathews, 2000; Belcher, 2007; Cho, 2004; Gosden, 1992; Li, 2002, 2006a; Liu, 2004). Several studies have indicated journal editors’ fair and equal treatment for submissions by NNES authors. For instance, Flowerdew’s (2001) study of journal editors’ perceptions of NNES scholars’ problems and contribution found that there was no evidence of discrimination against submissions by NNES scholars. This finding is consistent with Li’s (2002) and Liu’s (2004) studies. NNES novice and experienced scholars in these studies reported that they did not experience discrimination due to their NNES status. In contrast, other studies (Aydinli & Mathews, 2000; Belcher, 2007; Cho, 2004; Li, 2006a) have provided counter evidence. For instance, some of journal editors participating in Gosden’s (1992) survey study reported that submissions by NNES scholars from certain regions were not reviewed due to journal editors’ bias. Li’s (2006) sociopolitically-oriented case study also indicated journal reviewers’
potential bias against Chinese scholars’ submissions. Moreover, a Hungarian psychologist participating in Curry and Lillis’s study (2004) reported that “if the style or the form of the paper is not native or not current, reviewers think that ‘this is a stupid man, this is not acceptable material’. They’re [sic] [The papers are] not accepted for regional accent, for regional style, absolutely [sic] refusal, this is their [reviewers’] attitude” (p.678). The findings of these studies suggest that there may be potential reviewer bias against NNES scholars’ submissions, which may diminish NNES scholars’ publication efforts and scholarly visibility in the mainstream Center academic communities.

2.2.2.2. The Strategies NNES Scholars Utilize to Publish in Anglophone Center Journals

To understand strategies employed by successful NNES authors of research articles, studies have been conducted with both experienced and novice NNES scholars (e.g., Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Cheung, 2010; Gosden, 1996; Li, 2007; Okamura, 2006; St. John, 1987). Empirical evidence shows that one strategy commonly used by NNES scholars in non-Anglophone contexts is L1 to L2 translation despite its time-consuming nature. For example, L1 to L2 translation was a preferred writing strategy among NNES scholars participating in studies by Gosden (1996), Li (2007), and St. John (1987).

Experienced scholars in St. John’s (1987) study in Spain mixed their L1 and L2 English
during the writing process. A similar observation was made in Gosden’s (1996) study. About half of NNES novice scholars in Gosden’s study in Japan reported that they first wrote their entire paper in Japanese and then translate it into English. Another preferred strategy identified is getting textual mentorship from published texts. Okamura (2006) found that both experienced and novice Japanese scholars relied on reading published texts to learn discipline-specific writing patterns. Bitchener and Basturkmen (2006) also revealed that one NNES student dealt with her linguistic difficulty by borrowing “expressions and chunks of language” (p. 11) from published books. Similarly, in Li’s (2007) case study of a Chinese doctoral student’s English-medium publishing experience, the Chinese student relied on the strategy of using published texts, which offered linguistic and rhetorical assistance for him. In the context of Hong Kong, Cheung (2010) found that in dealing with difficulties in their publication efforts, NNES doctoral students adopted specific strategies, such as reading articles in past issues of targeted journals.

In addition to the aforementioned text-based cognitive strategies, a social strategy identified by Liu (2004), Cho (2004), and Lillis and Curry (2010) was building academic/social networks. NNES novice and experienced scholars in these studies reported using their academic academic/social networks to help alleviate writing difficulties. In their recent study of Eastern and Central European scholars’ publishing experiences, Lillis and Curry (2010) found that scholars’ networking with a variety of
scholars in both national and transnational contexts was crucial to securing English-medium academic publications. Similarly, Cho’s (2004) and Cheung (2010)’s studies highlighted the positive impact of NNES doctoral students’ collaboration with faculty advisors. NNES students in these studies found coauthoring with faculty advisors valuable for their success in the arena of scholarly publication. However, academic/social networks and collaboration are not without cautions. Some studies (Casanave, 1998; Li & Flowerdew, 2007) have cautioned against power issues between NNES scholars and their NES collaborators. In his case study of a NNES scholar’s English-medium publishing experiences in Hong Kong, for instance, Flowerdew (2000) also found a drawback of collaboration with a language professional. His study revealed that a NES language professional, who lacked disciplinary knowledge, adversely affected the quality of editing.

Other strategies identified in the literature include choosing topics associated with one’s linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Cheung, 2010; Liu, 2004) and using local-based knowledge (Cho, 2004).

Overall, previous studies have presented a variety of strategies that NNES scholars employ during their research writing process in English. The examination of strategies used by successful NNES authors of research articles deserves attention in that it can facilitate NNES scholars’ publication productivity and scholarly visibility in global scholarship by raising NNES scholars’ awareness of effective strategies and demystifying
the publication process. However, to date, a majority of research has primarily focused on strategies employed by NNES scholars in Periphery countries. Scholars’ geographical and cultural contexts may influence the way they utilize a range of strategies. Therefore, this study aims to contribute to this line of inquiry by investigating the strategies that NNES doctoral students in the U.S. utilized to cope with their difficulties and achieve success in English-medium academic publishing.

2.3. Chapter Summary and Overview

This chapter presented the three theoretical frameworks that guided the present study: *discourse community* (Swales, 1990), *LPP* (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and *social capital* (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990). The chapter also offered the review of relevant literature in which the study findings and discussions are situated. The review focused on two issues: (1) NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation in Anglophone settings and (2) NNES scholars’ participation in English-medium academic publication. Thus, this chapter serves as an important theoretical and conceptual framework in which data collection, analysis, and interpretation in this study are grounded. In the following chapter, the methodological framework which shaped this multiple case study, including participation selection, the role of researcher, the methods of data collection, and data analysis will be discussed in detail.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodological framework that guided this dissertation’s data collection and analysis. The study was broadly grounded in the premise of interpretivism, which posits that reality is socially constructed and the researcher serves as a vehicle by which reality is discovered (Cavana, Delahaye, & Sekaran, 2001). Interpretive research focuses on (re) construction of meaning in a given social and cultural setting and assumes that the phenomenon being investigated is influenced by research participants’ own social and cultural contexts (Erickson, 1986). In addition, the process of interpretive research is never linear or static. Therefore, the research process in this study was recursive, involving constant moving back and forth between data sets. It was also constructed by the research participants’ own voices and perceptions as to English-medium academic publishing in relation to their social and political contexts.

The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section of the chapter provides the rationale for the qualitative multiple case study approach that I adopted for this dissertation study. In the second section, I explain the context of the study, including the research site and participants. The third section describes my roles as a researcher to explain my relationships with participants. In the fourth section I provide a detailed
description of the data collection and analysis processes. Finally, the fifth section discusses the issues of trustworthiness in the data and ethical considerations in this study.

3.1. The Rationale for a Multiple Case Study Approach

The aim of the study was to gain a holistic picture of the English-medium academic publishing experiences of NNES doctoral students in the U.S. from a sociopolitical perspective. The overarching research question that guided this study was: How do NNES doctoral students enrolled in a U.S. university negotiate the demands of publishing in Anglophone peer-review journals? The following specific questions were used to frame this study:

1. What difficulties and successes do NNES doctoral students in a U.S. university experience in their attempts to publish in Anglophone peer-review journals?
2. What strategies do NNES doctoral students use to overcome their difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication?
3. What are the social and political power-infused relationships that influence NNES doctoral students’ writing-for-publication process? How do NNES doctoral students negotiate those power-infused relationships to learn to write for publication in English?
Given the exploratory nature of my study, I adopted the qualitative research methodology that is aligned with the interpretive paradigm. This qualitative methodology enabled me to “make connections among lived experiences, larger social and cultural structures, and the here and now” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 367). My primary concern was to obtain a holistic picture of the L2 academic publishing experiences of NNES doctoral students in the U.S. According to Merriam (1998), “[i]n contrast to quantitative research, which takes apart a phenomenon to examine component parts (which become the variables of the study), qualitative research can reveal how all the parts work together to form a whole” (p. 6). Therefore, the adoption of the qualitative research methodology was a suitable choice.

The specific methodological design for this study adopted the qualitative case study approach, which is defined as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2003, p.13). The case study approach was chosen for the present study due to its three distinct strengths: (1) particularistic (i.e., a focus on a specific event, process, or phenomenon), (3) descriptive (i.e., a “thick description” as the end product of the investigation), and (3) heuristic (i.e., drawn from the researcher’s experiences, which allows readers to be able to interpret the findings of the study based on their own judgments and experiences) (Merriam, 1998).
These characteristics of the case study approach can enable the researcher to gain “a full and thorough knowledge of the particular” (Stake, 2000, p. 22) through rich, detailed, and contextualized qualitative data. Another reason for the use of the case study approach was that it offers a valuable means to conduct studies that are guided by “how” and “why” questions, rather than by more quantitative “how many” and “how much” questions. Given that this study aimed to answer the research questions that take the form of “how” and “why,” the case study approach was a suitable choice. The most important rationale for the use of the case study approach was that this study responded to Casanave’s (2003a) call for more sociopolitically-oriented case studies in L2 AAL scholarship. Casanave (2003a) argues that “in order to address the many questions in L2 writing scholarship that concern the power-infused relationships and interactions among people, documents, and institutions, cases studies are particularly well-suited.” (p. 97). Therefore, the case study approach served as an appropriate methodological framework for this study that aimed to present detailed descriptions of how NNES doctoral students negotiated the social and political realities of L2 academic publishing in relation to academic agents with power inequalities, such as faculty advisors and journal gatekeepers.

This study also employed a multiple case study design where the focus of inquiry is placed on more than one case (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2008). In this study, each focal participant was considered as an individual case, and a cross-case analysis was performed.
to highlight salient features of the participants’ L2 academic publishing experiences. Evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling than evidence from a single case study because it presents a better understanding and theorizing of cases applicable to a larger collection of cases (Yin, 2008). It is believed that the inclusion of multiple cases enhances the trustworthiness (reliability) and the potential generalizability of the study (Merriam, 1998). Merriam (1998) states that “the more cases included in a study, and the greater the variation across the cases, the more compelling an interpretation is likely to be” (p. 40). Thus, the present study used the multiple case study approach to strengthen research findings by providing detailed accounts of multiple cases with cross-case comparison. In sum, adopting the qualitative multiple case study approach, this study focused on teasing out the complexities of NNES doctoral students’ negotiation of L2 academic publishing in order to broaden the current understanding of L2 AAL.

3.2. Research Site and Participants

Research Site

The institutional context for this study was a large state university in the U.S. with a student body of about 61,400 students, including 5,600 international students. The university was a Research One institution, which was committed to quality teaching and
research. In the graduate school, international students occupied about 25 percent of the total enrollment (2533 out of 10,384). The top five sending countries with the largest number of international students enrolled were China, India, South Korea, Taiwan, and Malaysia.

Primary Participants

Participants were recruited from March 2011 to July 2011 through various channels. For example, with the help of my colleagues and ESL program coordinators, I sent out my email recruitment letter (Appendix A) to international graduate student listserves. In addition, I purposely took two courses on Academic Publishing as well as Dissertation Writing designed for NNES doctoral students in Spring 2011 and Summer 2011, respectively, to advertise my study to the students enrolled in those courses. Moreover, I contacted program coordinators and administrative staff in the social science, humanities, engineering, and sciences departments and asked them to distribute my recruitment letter to their graduate students. Although many of them did not respond, some program coordinators sent out my recruitment letter to their graduate student listserves. Furthermore, I attended a conference called “Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs Symposium,” which was held at the research site university, in order to recruit participants in the sciences.
Purposeful sampling method was used to select participants for the study. Pattern (1990) states that “the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling” (p. 169). In order to select information-rich cases, the selection criteria adapted from Cho’s (2004, p. 52) study were used. I particularly recruited participants from East Asian countries to lessen the complexity of interplaying variables in cross-case comparison. In addition, considering a large number of East Asian students enrolled in U.S. universities, the study aimed to provide insights about these students for educators in U.S. higher education institutions. Moreover, as I myself come from one of East Asian countries, South Korea, I found it personally meaningful to focus on NNES doctoral students from East Asian countries. Furthermore, I recruited participants who were the first author of their manuscript. The justification for this selection criterion is that, in general, being the first author means that regardless of the discipline, the author partly or fully participated in the writing process. In some disciplines (i.e., sciences and engineering), being the second or third author does not necessarily mean that the author participated in the writing process. Below are the participant selection criteria used in this study:
• Participants must be NNES doctoral students in the U.S.;
• They must have come from East Asian countries using English as a foreign language, such as China, Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan;
• They must have finished their undergraduate studies in their home countries;
• They must have submitted at least one paper to an English-medium refereed journal, and received reviewer feedback; and
• They must be the first author of the manuscript.

Initially, nine East Asian NNES doctoral students from diverse disciplines responded positively to my recruitment email. I exchanged several emails with them. In my emails I addressed issues about the interview procedure and explained the purposes of particular themes that I intended to cover during the interview. However, three male participants dropped out in the early stage of data collection. One of them from the engineering department was very impatient with the lengthy qualitative interview process. The other two male participants, from South Korea, which is generally a male-dominant society, created some gender-related tensions with me. They seemed to put themselves in a higher position than me as a female. They also seemed to have a desire to go beyond the role of participant and take some control over the research process (e.g., how to conduct interviews) with their own understanding of how qualitative research could be conducted, which caused some unpleasant experiences to all of us. These three male participants eventually dropped the study. Therefore, six participants completed their participation in the study. All the students agreed to participate, allowed me to audiotape
interviews, and signed the consent form when we first met. All interviews were conducted at the places of participants’ choice within the university campus.

Given the limited space for this dissertation, I finally selected four participants who were the most information-rich cases. They represented two broad disciplines: two participants in social sciences and two participants in sciences. All the participants defined themselves as NNES students, who ultimately planned to return to their home country after graduation. They also identified themselves as quantitative researchers. Even though they were from different disciplines, they all had conducted science-related research. All participants were identified by pseudonyms that represented their cultural and linguistic identity. Table 3 provides brief background information about the four selected research participants: Sungju, Jun, Ken, and Mei (pseudonyms).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sungju</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Ken</th>
<th>Mei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay in the U.S.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic field</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in the doctoral program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rated English proficiency</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing experiences in L1</td>
<td>7 first-author RAs and 8 co-authored RAs</td>
<td>1 second-author RA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing experiences in L2</td>
<td>1 first-author RA accepted by an Anglophone peer-review journal</td>
<td>2 first-author RAs accepted by Anglophone peer-review journals</td>
<td>1 first-author RA</td>
<td>1 first-author RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career goal</td>
<td>Professorship in Korea</td>
<td>professorship in China</td>
<td>Professorship in Japan</td>
<td>Professional researcher in Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Background Information about Research Participants

Other Participants

Originally, I intended to recruit student-faculty advisor pairs. However, two participants, Jun and Mei did not give me permission to contact their faculty advisors for fear of damaging their working relationships with their advisors. Therefore, it resulted in relatively low participation of faculty advisors. Nevertheless, three faculty advisors (Sungju’s advisor as well as Ken’s primary advisor and co-advisor), who were U.S.-born
speakers of English, participated in the study. In addition, a program coordinator in the department of biochemistry joined the study.

3.3. Role of the Researcher

    This section addresses my roles as a researcher in the present study, thereby describing the potential causes of assumptions or biases which might have influenced the study. In this study I played multiple roles as I undertook various research activities. These roles included being a researcher, fellow/senior doctoral student, and counselor.

    First, as a researcher, I shared a bilingual and bicultural background with the participants. We were all from East Asian countries and were studying in the U.S. This helped me better understand their needs and perspectives, develop rapport, and create opportunities for reciprocity. For instance, my knowledge about East Asian languages and cultures was useful to engage the participants in conversations. In addition, to the participants, I was a fellow doctoral student or someone senior to them with more academic experiences. This seemed to help them talk candidly about their concerns and difficulties with me.

    Second, my NNS status and my position as a novice researcher guided the study to draw issues on the English-medium publishing experiences of NNES doctoral students from an emic perspective, rather than an etic perspective. Since I had experienced both
success and failure in publishing in international journals, I started with a good understanding of how hard it was to publish in Anglophone journals and to deal with comments from journal gatekeepers for successful publication. Thus, my situated voice as a novice NNS researcher was a powerful one, in that it offered valid insider perspectives. However, the fact that a certain part of my experiences was different from that of my student participants and I had limited access to the students’ faculty advisors made me conscious of the importance of reflecting on my own biases, subjectivity, and value system as a researcher. This research was grounded in interpretive research that focuses on the reflective nature of the research process and subjective nature of mutual constructions of meaning by the researched and the researcher (Mottier, 2005). Denzin (1989) notes that “Interpretive research begins and ends with the biography and self of the researcher” (p. 12). In other words, researcher is an important part of the interpretive research process, and his or her historical and cultural backgrounds influence and limit how data are understood and interpreted. Therefore, in the study it was essential for me to be aware of my own reflexivity, including my subjectivity, assumptions, beliefs and values and to systematically reflect on it. Reflexivity refers to “assessment of the influence of the investigator’s own background, perceptions, and interests on the qualitative research process” (Krefting, 1991, p. 218). Citing Agar (1986), Krefting (1991) notes that the researcher’s personal history or background (e.g., multiple roles as a
researcher) dictates the framework from which he or she will collect data and analyze the findings. Hence, I focused on reflexivity by keeping research reflective journals and consulting my fellow doctoral students. I also consulted my colleagues, sought feedback from my dissertation committee, and read relevant literature with regard to the issue of multiple and subjective interpretations from the same set of data. Moreover, to answer an important question, “If there is more than one truth or reality, how much weight should be given to the findings of my study that may reflect only one side of truth or reality?”, I clearly documented my entry, acceptance, and my participation role in this dissertation in order to allow for an evaluation “of possible disruptive effects of the research process on the normal flow of cultural routines and practices” (Eder & Corsaro, 1999, p. 523).

Finally, one unique role that I played was to serve like a counselor for some of my participants. As an active listener, I shared my participants’ concerns and difficulties in English-medium academic publishing and encouraged them to come up with solutions for their problems. For instance, one of the participants, Jun, considered his interviews with me as “counseling” sessions (Interview 8: September 7, 2011). He mentioned that his participation in the interviews made him feel cared for and motivated to develop himself as a L2 scholarly writer. Sungju also described me as a counselor who helped him reflect on his publishing process and provided individual attention to his writing-for-publication
process. This unique role enabled me to create a more safe and comfortable environment for the participants to share their thoughts and experiences freely.

3.4. Data Collection and Analysis

3.4.1. Overview

This dissertation project was approved by the institutional research review (IRB) board in February 2011. The study was carried out from March 2011 to September 2012 (a period of approximately 18 months). The research participants were recruited from March 2011 to July 2011. Each participant joined the study at a different time. While Ken and Mei had already published their papers in Anglophone peer-review journals, Sungju and Jun’s papers were accepted by Anglophone journals at the time of the study. Thus, I employed both retrospective and prospective approaches to data collection and analysis. The data collection period for Ken and Mei was 5 to 7 months. However, the data collection period for Sungju and Jun was longer (8 to 15 months), since I traced their writing and revision processes until their papers were finally published. Data were collected from multiple sources: questionnaires, interviews, email communication with the participants, publication-related documents, and institutional documents. Data collection from multiple sources was intended to facilitate triangulation of the data and generate “thick description” (Merriam, 1998) of the participants’ L2 academic publishing
experiences in their respective disciplinary setting. Table 3.2 presents the data collection period as well as the overview of the methods and sources of data collection for each participant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sungju</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Ken</th>
<th>Mei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection period</strong></td>
<td>July 2011 to September 2012</td>
<td>April 2011 to November 2011</td>
<td>March 2011 to September 2011</td>
<td>May 2011 to October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>-2 questionnaires</td>
<td>-2 questionnaires</td>
<td>-2 questionnaires</td>
<td>-2 questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>-7 interviews with Sungju</td>
<td>-8 interviews with Jun</td>
<td>-6 interviews with Ken</td>
<td>-5 interviews with Mei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 interview with the advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1 interview the co-advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td>-with Sungju (15 times)</td>
<td>-with Jun (12 times)</td>
<td>-with Ken (10 times)</td>
<td>-with Mei (12 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication-related documents</strong></td>
<td>-5 major drafts</td>
<td>-3 major drafts</td>
<td>-2 major drafts</td>
<td>-1 final draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Feedback from the advisor</td>
<td>-Feedback from the advisor and the professional editor</td>
<td>-Feedback from the co-advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Comments from reviewers</td>
<td>-Comments from reviewers</td>
<td>-Comments from reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Email correspondence with journal editors</td>
<td>-Email correspondence with journal editors</td>
<td>-Email correspondence with journal editors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional documents</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-Program website</td>
<td>-Program website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Graduate program Handbook</td>
<td>-Graduate program Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic field notes</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Overview of the Data Collection
Data analysis occurred simultaneously with data collection. For data analysis, I adopted inductive analysis, using Nvivo 9 software. Specific data collection methods and analysis will be discussed in more detail below.

3.4.2. Sources of Data Collection

The data collection tools of the study included questionnaires, interviews, publication-related documents, institutional documents, and analytic field notes. Since the four participants were at different stages of academic publishing, I collected data taking both retrospective and prospective approaches. While a retrospective approach focuses on participants’ memories of and reflections on events that occurred prior to the research, a prospective approach keeps track of the developmental process or change under study (Baltes, Reese, & Nesselroade, 1988). Although retrospective analysis can be restricted by participants’ recall difficulties and memory failures, combining retrospective and prospective analysis can result in an enhanced understanding of the research phenomenon because such an approach allows the researcher to gain access to the ways past events influence participants’ present activities and perspectives (Menard, 1991).
Two questionnaires were created. The first questionnaire was designed to collect general demographic information about the participants, including English language learning experiences, self-assessment of their own English proficiency in academic situations, and academic publishing experiences in L1s and L2 English (see Appendix B). The second questionnaire was intended to collect data about various levels of difficulties that the participants faced in writing for publication in English (see Appendix C). This questionnaire was used as a stimulus to facilitate interviews with the participants. The questionnaire was adopted from Gurel (2010) and was modified according to the purpose of this study. The questionnaire consisted of 24 statements that addressed three categories: (1) linguistic and rhetorical difficulties (13 items), (2) difficulties with the genre of research writing (8 items), and (3) sociopolitical difficulties (3 items). The participants were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed with each of the statements where 1 meant strongly disagree and 7 meant strongly agree. Then it was created using an online survey tool (SurveyMonkey.com) and was sent to the participants. However, data collection was not limited to these three categories of difficulties, since the online questionnaire was used as a starting point to collect data on the participants’ difficulties. Figure 3.1 presents a snapshot of the online questionnaire.
Interviews

Another primary data source for this study was qualitative in-depth interviews. All interviews were semi-structured. Thus, although I had general themes and purposes for each interview, the participants’ responses largely guided the procedure of the interviews. The interviews lasted between 60 and 120 minutes and were audio-taped with the participants’ permission. During the first interview, the participants were asked about their educational and literacy backgrounds. Interview questions were designed to develop a better understanding of (1) the difficulties and successes the participants experienced in preparing an English-medium RA for publication, (2) the sources they drew upon and the strategies they used to overcome their difficulties, and (3) how they negotiated their situated social and political contexts in order to learn to write for publication (see
Appendix D and E). The participant interviews were also supplemented with interviews with their advisors as well as their textual data, such as the major drafts of the published papers, feedback from the advisors, and comments from journal editors and reviewers. Although the focus was on the student participants, information from advisors was obtained for verification and data triangulation. The supplementary data contributed to a “thick” description of the student participants’ L2 academic publishing experiences in the study context.

The interviews were conducted in a variety of settings according to the participants’ preferences. For example, Sungju and Jun preferred to meet in my/their office or reserved library study rooms. Ken and Mei chose to meet in my office. This provided the participants with a comfortable space and privacy needed for the interviews. For Jun, Ken, and Mei, the interviews were carried out in English, while for Sungju, the interviews were conducted in Korean. I was also able to interview Sungju’s and Ken’s advisors. The advisor interviews were intended to obtain information about the advisors’ experiences with NNES doctoral students and their mentoring to support NNES doctoral students in research and academic publishing. The advisors were interviewed individually in their office. However, Jun and Mei did not give me permission to contact their advisor for interviews for fear of offending their advisors or ruining their working relationships with the advisors.
Email Communication

In addition to the qualitative in-depth interviews described above, I maintained regular contact with the participants through email communication. The email communication was primarily used to clarify follow-up issues or responses that needed elaboration. All email communication was saved and organized in such a way that it could be easily retrieved for analysis.

Publication-related Documents

I compiled the participants’ publication-related documents, such as major drafts of their published papers, copies of their published papers, feedback from the advisors, and comments from journal gatekeepers. The participants consented to provide their publication-related documents to me. However, it was difficult to gather textual documents from Mei. Since her advisor believed that all her textual documents belonged to him, Mei was reluctant to share her documents with me. The participants were asked to bring their publication-related documents to interviews or email them to me. All of their documents were photocopied. To better understand the process of the text production and interaction with agents with power inequalities, such as the advisors and journal reviewers, the participants were asked to explain and comment on the documents.
Institutional Documents

In order to situate the participants’ L2 academic publishing experiences in a larger institutional context, I collected institutional documents from the program website (e.g., the mission statement of the program) and graduate program handbook (e.g., course requirements and the publication requirement for doctoral graduation).

Analytic Field Notes

In addition to audio taping, analytic field notes were taken during and/or after each interview. The primary purpose of taking these field notes was to document my reflections and feelings as well as issues that were highlighted and questions that were raised during the interview. These field notes helped generate questions for the interviews and identify salient features of the participants’ L2 academic publishing experiences.

3.4.3. Data Analysis

Data analysis was ongoing and occurred simultaneously with data collection. For data analysis, I adopted inductive analysis, which refers to “analyzing multiple forms of data (e.g. texts, observations, interviews) to discover recurrent themes and thematic relations” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 19). With a bottom-up coding approach, I started with open coding, which refers to “to identify and formulate any and all ideas,
themes, or issues [data] suggest, no matter how varied and disparate” (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995, p. 143). Data were coded line-by-line to ensure that every possible aspect of the data was included. After numerous rereadings of the data, a number of individual codes (i.e., recurring themes or categories) were created. Then I identified connections among the individual codes and organized these codes in hierarchies - moving from individual codes to supercodes (e.g., individual codes: (1) “departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation” and (2) “the publication requirement by the advisor” and a supercode: “institutional publication pressure.” As supercodes were created, I alternated between bottom-up and top-down analysis approaches (Erickson, 2004) to look for emerging categories and themes and their possible relationships. Table 3.3 presents selected examples of individual codes, supercodes, and families of codes emerged from the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code families</th>
<th>Examples of supercodes</th>
<th>Examples of individual codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>Linguistic difficulties, rhetorical difficulties, non-discursive difficulties</td>
<td>Lack of vocabulary, difficulty with English grammar, rhetorical differences in L1 and L2, perceptions of English-medium academic publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Written resources, research networks, the use of L1</td>
<td>Online dictionaries, published articles, literacy brokers, network brokers, faculty advisors, academic peers, language professionals, L1 to L2 translation, direct writing in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro sociopolitical contexts</td>
<td>Institutional publication demands, non-institutional publication pressure</td>
<td>Departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation, institutional evaluation criteria for employment and promotion, the publication requirement by the advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coauthoring with the advisors</td>
<td>accommodation, resistance, agency</td>
<td>Division-of-labor type of collaboration, the advisor’s revisions, the advisor’s participation in the revise-and-resubmit process, denied access to the journal gatekeepers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. Selected Examples of Individual Codes, Supercodes, and Families of Codes Emerged from the Data

To systematically sort and analyze the data gathered from the multiple sources, I used Nvivo9, which is a computer-aided qualitative data analysis (CAQDAS) software program. According to Sprenkle and Piercy (2005), CAQDAS has several benefits: (1) it automates, speeds up, and livens up the data coding process; (2) it provides various ways of examining the relationships in the data; (3) it provides formal structure for recording and storing data; and (4) it helps to develop more conceptual and theoretical frameworks.
for data analysis. Therefore, in the present study the data were imported to Nvivo9 for systematic coding and analysis for emergent themes and patterns with respect to the participants’ L2 academic publishing experiences. Figure 3.2 presents a snapshot of creating and linking nodes (i.e., creating and linking individual codes and supercodes) in Nvivo9.

Figure 3.2. Creating and Linking Nodes in Nvivo9

In addition, I wrote memos and attempted to find evidence to confirm or disprove tentative claims that arose in the memos (Charmaz, 2006). Based on the integrative memos, some assertions about relationships were captured and formed. After these assertions were established, the literature on L2 AAL was revisited and the data was
reconsidered. Moreover, I analyzed the data in two phases: (1) within-case analysis and (2) cross-case analysis (Merriam, 1998). In within-case analysis, tentative assertions and claims were developed about each individual participant after the data were coded according to salient themes and categories. They were then tested against the data about the particular participant obtained from different data sources and were confirmed, revised, or rejected (Merriam, 1998). This within-case analysis was followed by cross-case analysis. I examined similarities and differences across the cases to highlight salient themes and patterns (e.g., building academic research networks, institutional and/or non-institutional publication pressure, and co-authoring with the faculty advisors) regarding the participants’ English-medium academic publishing experiences. Comparing and contrasting the students’ publishing experiences in three broad issues ((1) difficulties and successes, (2) strategies, and (3) macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing the writing-for-publication process) was particularly informative.

To establish credibility (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) and ensure participant verification of my analysis (referred to as “member checking” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the transcribed interviews were read, corrected slightly where suggested, and validated by the four participants. The participants were also provided with summaries of the findings via e-mail and were requested to review them for accuracy, make changes when necessary, and return them via e-mail.
3.5. Ensuring Trustworthiness and Ethical Considerations

In quantitative research, validity and reliability are viewed as a main means of establishing research rigor. However, these two measures are not applicable for qualitative research (Lietz, Langer, & Furman, 2006). As mentioned earlier, this study was broadly situated in the premise of interpretivism, which purports to understand and interpret the phenomenon in question. Interpretivism assumes that the phenomenon being investigated is influenced by research participants’ own social and cultural contexts (Erickson, 1986). It is, therefore, difficult for the present study to be assessed by validity and reliability that are derived from quantitative positivist theory and methods. According to Guba and Lincoln (1989), the positivist criteria of validity and reliability are replaced by trustworthiness as a major criterion for qualitative research. Guba and Lincoln (1989) assert that trustworthiness involves three components: credibility (parallel to internal validity), transferability (parallel to external validity or generalizability), and dependability (parallel to reliability). This study follows a set of procedures for ensuring trustworthiness.

Firstly, in order to enhance credibility, which refers to confidence in the truth of the findings, the following three procedures suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1989) were used for the study.
(1) Prolonged engagement: Prolonged engagement refers to spending a sufficient amount of time in the field to understand various aspects of the phenomenon being investigated. In the study, I had substantial involvement with the participants over the course of the study. Since I shared similar cultural/ethnic backgrounds with them, I easily established good rapport and trust with them so that they felt comfortable with disclosing information.

(2) Persistent observation: Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim that “if prolonged engagement provides scope, persistent observation provides depth” (p. 304). Although I was not able to directly observe the writing-for-publication process of the participants (e.g., observing writing conferences with the advisors) due to low participation of faculty advisors, I carefully kept track of their writing process over a long period of time through interviews and email communication with the participants. This persistent observation helped identify details of the issues closely associated with the participants’ social and political interaction with agents of different power statuses.

(3) Triangulation: Triangulation refers to using multiple methods and data sources to double (or triple) check research findings. It increases the credibility of the findings since it offers chances to confirm emerging themes and categories. In
this study this technique facilitated a deeper understanding of the complexity of L2 academic publishing by the participants.

Secondly, to increase the degree of transferability, which is concerned with the question of whether the findings of the study can be applied to other situations, I followed the technique of having thick descriptions. Although the focus of qualitative research is not placed on the generalization of the research findings, results in one setting might be useful to others. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), a thick description is a way of achieving a type of external validity in qualitative research. By describing a phenomenon in sufficient detail, one can begin to evaluate the extent to which the conclusions drawn are transferable to other times, settings, situations, and people. Finally, for the dependability of the study, which is concerned with consistency of the results obtained from the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), I had my colleagues and fellow doctoral students (those who were not involved in the research process) examine both the process and product of the study. This technique helped evaluate the accuracy and assess whether or not the findings, interpretations, and conclusions were supported by the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Some ethical issues were considered for the study. The first issue was informed consent. Before collecting data, the participants were informed of the purpose and goals of the study. However, their knowledge of the research purposes may lead them to
intentionally provide positive and desirable answers concerning the issues regarding L2 academic publishing, which may be linked to the credibility of findings. In order to prevent such potential problems, I used techniques of prolonged engagement and triangulation. The second ethical consideration was confidentiality. In ensuring confidentiality, I did not report private data that identified participants. The third ethical issue was reflexivity. In qualitative research it is essential for the researcher to be aware of his or her reflexivity (Krefting, 1991). Hence, as a researcher, I reflected on any potential influences of my multiple roles as a researcher and my bilingual and bicultural background on the study by taking reflective notes and consulting my fellow doctoral students and colleagues. When interviews conducted in Korean were translated into English, I translated transcripts twice and used triangulation through multiple data sources in order to minimize potential biases or subjectivity that impeded the interpretation of the data.

3.6. Chapter Summary and Overview

This chapter presented the methodological framework which shaped this multiple case study, including the rationale for adopting a multiple case study approach, participation selection, the role of researcher, the methods of data collection, data analysis, and ensuring trustworthiness and ethical considerations. The following four
chapters (Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7) present the stories of four research participants (Sungju, Jun, Ken, and Mei) enrolled in a large public research university in the U.S. and how they negotiated the sociopolitical demands of publishing in Anglophone Center journals to participate in the international academic communities. Each participant’s story is presented in a separate chapter. In the story of each case, I will begin with providing the participant’s portrait to familiarize the reader with the participants and their first English-medium publication as well as to contextualize the findings. The participant’s portrait includes his or her self-reported English language learning experiences, professional and academic goals, and academic publishing experiences in both L1 and L2 English. The individual portrait is followed by brief background information about his or her first RA published in an Anglophone Center journal. After this, I will discuss detailed accounts of the findings, drawing on multiple sources of data (questionnaires, semi-structured interviews with the case study participants and their faculty advisors, email correspondence with the participants, publication-related documents, university policy documents, and analytic field notes). The findings are presented within three broad issues regarding the case study participants’ English-medium academic publishing experiences: (1) difficulties encountered when preparing a paper for publication in writing for publication in English, (2) strategies used to secure English-medium academic
publication, and (3) macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing the writing-for-publication process.
CHAPTER 4: SUNGJU’S CASE

From the Published L1 Writer to the Novice L2 Writer

4.1. Portrait of Sungju

Sungju was a second year doctoral student in science education and was in his early 30’s. He originally came from South Korea and had been in the U.S. for 2 years. Upon completion of his master’s degree in biology education in South Korea, he came to the U.S. to pursue his Ph.D degree in science education. His research interests were wide-ranging, but his primary research interest lay in students’ conceptual changes in evolution. I first met him in a Dissertation Writing course designed for NNES doctoral students. He attracted my attention since he was someone eager to publish his work in an international journal. We soon built a good relationship as classmates and discussed our research projects with each other. Sungju considered his participation in my study as a “reflective practice” in which he reflected on his publishing experiences to better plan his future research and publications. He was very happy to have me as a fellow doctoral student who listened to and shared his concerns and struggles as a NNES novice scholarly writer.

When we met, he often expressed his difficulty with using English for academic purposes. He felt frustrated about his perceived lack of progress in improving academic English language skills. He self-rated his English writing skills as “very poor” (Interview
1, July 15, 2011), although he had learned English since he was in the 7th grade. He recalled that English was always a difficult subject to him. His experience with learning English in South Korea was primarily focused on obtaining high scores on English proficiency tests, including the college entrance examination. As a result, he primarily learned English through the drilling and cramming of grammar rules and vocabulary; he did not have much opportunity to effectively use English as a medium of academic communication.

Due to his limited English proficiency, Sungju had to spend two years to meet the English requirement (e.g., 580 or 237 on the TOEFL) to start his Ph.D studies in the U.S. Upon completion of his master’s degree in biology education in South Korea, he personally contacted Dr. Goodman (pseudonym), who was a professor in science education at a state university in the U.S. Intrigued by Sungju’s strong publication record in Korea Citation Index (KCI) peer-review journals and future research plans, Dr. Goodman decided to accept him as his doctoral advisee. However, Sungju was not able to start his doctoral studies immediately, since he did not pass the minimum GRE and TOEFL test scores for doctoral admission. Thus, he had to spend one additional year studying for the GRE and TOEFL tests and finally achieved the minimum test scores for doctoral admission. He also attended a private language institute in the Philippines and studied English there for several months. Yet, his overall English proficiency did not
improve much. Concerned about Sungju’s lack of English proficiency, Dr. Goodman first invited him as a visiting scholar and allowed him to enroll full-time in an intensive English program. Sungju took three ESL courses (listening/speaking, reading/writing, and grammar). One quarter later, he was officially admitted to the doctoral program in science education and joined Dr. Goodman’s laboratory. He completed a required ESL composition course in the first year of his doctoral program. However, he still exhibited a sense of inadequacy in regard to writing in English and an apparent lack of confidence in using English for academic purposes. When taking graduate-level courses in his first year, he sometimes received comments from professors regarding his poor writing skills and was asked to have a native English speaker (NES) edit or proofread his written assignments. He also felt that his oral English proficiency was quite limited. He often had a hard time understanding the oral English of Dr. Goodman and expressing his opinions verbally. Despite his lack of English language proficiency, his hard work and good learning strategies had helped him become a very competitive doctoral student.

Since he ultimately sought a professorship in South Korea as his professional goal, he was planning to return to South Korea after graduation. This gave him additional pressures that his NES peers did not have; to meet Korean academic expectations, he felt a strong need to publish in both KCI domestic journals and English-medium Anglophone journals. He had a firm commitment to the local academic communities in South Korea.
He described himself as a “bridge” between the Center and Periphery academic communities. He had a strong desire to introduce local knowledge to the mainstream Center community and bring advanced research to the local academic community in South Korea. For this reason, he was pursuing several lines of research with his former colleagues and friends in South Korea (e.g., professors, graduate students, and K-12 science teachers) at the same time when he was conducting research studies from Dr. Goodman’s laboratory projects. When it came to academic publishing in KCI journals, he had a strong publication record. He had published seven first author RAs and eight co-authored RAs in KCI peer-review journals. He also had several years of experience as a reviewer for KCI peer-review journals. His strong L1 publication record gave him a sense of professional pride and confidence. He identified himself as a quantitative researcher and was proud that he had sophisticated technical skills necessary to publish quantitative papers. With regard to academic publishing in English, however, he considered himself as a novice scholarly writer. In the beginning of the present study, he had one paper accepted at a top-tier English-medium peer-review journal. This paper was published at the end of the present study.
4.2. Background Information about *Sungju et al. (2012)*

*Sungju et al. (2012)* was Sungju’s first English-medium paper published in an international peer-review journal. The work reported in his paper was the research study that he conducted when he was in his master’s program in biology education in Korea. Aside from his master’s research, he began this study out of “academic curiosity.” As he claimed, the significance of the study was to challenge the traditional models of the factors influencing students’ acceptance of evolutionary theory and propose a novel model informed by a reinterpretation of the findings of previous studies. Interestingly, he did not want to publish this work in a KCI journal. One reason was that since open criticism and direct critique are not often encouraged in Korean academic culture, he felt that his attempt to challenge the traditional models might not be highly regarded by Korean journal editors and reviewers. Another reason was that the topic of students’ acceptance of evolutionary theory did not seem to be one of those “hot topics” among Korean academics (Li, 2006). Thus, he elected to try to publish it in an English-medium journal outside South Korea instead.

In order to gain a deeper insight into Sungju’s writing-for-publication process, it is important to look at the “text history” (Lillis & Curry, 2006a, 2010) of his paper. Figure 4.1 presents the text history of Sungju’s first English-medium publication. Three key stages were identified in the text history:
Stage 1: pre-submission - drafted an English-medium manuscript with two NES co-authors

Stage 2: post-submission (after the first review - “revise and resubmit”) - revised and resubmitted the manuscript

Stage 3: post-submission (after the second review – “accepted with minor revision”) – revised and resubmitted the manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-submission</td>
<td>Post-submission (after the 1st</td>
<td>Post-submission (after the 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review)</td>
<td>review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy brokers</td>
<td>Sungju Dr. Goodman Dr. Braine</td>
<td>Sungju Dr. Goodman Dr. Braine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in text</td>
<td>Reviewer A Reviewer B Reviewer C</td>
<td>Reviewer A Reviewer B Reviewer C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td>Journal editors</td>
<td>Journal editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft 1 → submitted</td>
<td>Draft 2 → resubmitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written texts</td>
<td>Draft 3 → resubmitted</td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. The Text History of Sungju’s First English-medium Publication

As Figure 4.1 shows, the text history provides an overview of the drafts produced and the different people involved (including the authors and journal gatekeepers) in the three key stages of Sungju’s learning trajectory. In Stage 1, Sungju coauthored with two
NES professors, Dr. Goodman and Dr. Braine (pseudonym), who was an associate professor in science education and an expert in neuroscience. When the paper was completed, it was submitted to the journal, JSE. In Stage 2, after the paper was reviewed by three reviewers, A, B, and C, Sungju and his co-authors received a “revise and resubmit” recommendation. The three authors revised the paper based on comments from the reviewers and editors and resubmitted it to JSE. In Stage 3, after the second round of review by the same reviewers, the JSE editors recommended “accept with minor revision.” After minor revision, the paper was finally published in JSE (July, 2012). In the published version of Sungju et al. (2012), Sungju was listed as the first and corresponding author, while Dr. Goodman was the third author.

4.3. Difficulties Encountered When Preparing a Paper for Publication

This section illustrates a range of difficulties that Sungju encountered when preparing a paper for publication. Sungju’s collaboration with his co-authors, Dr. Goodman and Dr. Braine, was similar to the “division-of-labor” style of collaboration (Hemphill, 1996). The three authors used the following structure: Introduction, Methods, Findings, Discussions, and Conclusion. Each of the authors was responsible for writing certain sections of the paper. Dr. Goodman assigned Sungju to write the Methods and Findings sections. Sungju’s transition from a proficient L1 scholarly writer to a novice L2
scholarly writer was filled with difficulties. Despite his extensive publishing experiences as a Korean scholarly writer, Sungju faced various linguistic and rhetorical difficulties in writing early drafts. When it came to linguistic difficulties, he mentioned a range of specific points, including his inability to use specific grammatical features (e.g., modals, verb tenses) and his syntactic and lexical weaknesses. However, Sungju reported lack of vocabulary as the most problematic area. He particularly had difficulty with using general vocabulary or semi-technical terms appropriately. This often caused imperfect transmission of the message to be conveyed. Specifically, it resulted in difficulty in accurately describing study results and effectively making claims. His limited intuitive knowledge about English and insights into contextual meanings of words was reflected in the following interview excerpt:

Because of my limited vocabulary and expressions, I still have difficulty with describing details. You know it is an important skill to use adverbs appropriately when you are describing details. I think adverbs help express delicate nuances of thought. My advisor often uses adverbs, such as nearly and poorly. For example, … I wrote, multiple choice questions cannot predict open responses. Then my advisor changed cannot predict to poorly predict. The use of an adverb, poorly
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helped express my intention more accurately. It is a sophisticated language skill to use appropriate adverbs. (English translation)

The second problem area that he reported was rhetorical difficulties, in particular, organizing texts. This problem seemed to come from differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions. Since he tended to rely on his previous L1 writing experiences to write the first draft, his English writing was influenced by Korean rhetorical conventions, which value a deliberate delay of the main argument towards the conclusion to satisfy the curiosity of the reader (Cho, 1999). However, in English academic writing, a linear rhetorical structure in which a writer’s thesis should be presented directly is considered conventional. Sungju’s difficulty that stemmed from such differences in English and Korean rhetorical conventions was clearly evidenced in his comments:

제 writing 선생님이 지도교수에게 이메일을 보내서 민수가 뭐가 문제냐고 물어봤대요. 지도교수가 첫문제점은 민수가 grammar가 안되고 두번째는 organization이 안된다구. topic sentence가 없다고 했대요. 한국논문을 쓰때 topic sentence 잘 안써요. 밑에 항상 가 있죠. 각 paragraph도 처음에 general 하게 시작하고 마지막에 얘기해야. Topic sentence를 쓰고 기술하는건 본적도 없구요. (Interview 2: July 26, 2011)

My writing teacher emailed my advisor and asked him what writing problems he thought I had. My advisor said I had problems with grammar and organization. Particularly, he said I tended to write without topic sentences. In fact, Korean writing does not require topic sentences like English writing since the thesis is usually placed at the end of a paper. In Korean writing, the introduction is written in a general way, and the most important points are addressed at the end of a paper. (English translation)
He was told by Dr. Goodman that his indirect and inductive writing approach (e.g., the delay of the thesis statement, the absence of topic sentences) made his English writing incoherent, unfocused, disorganized, or ineffective; thus, it made it difficult for Center audiences to understand his text. This shows that Sungju’s use of L1 rhetorical knowledge in L2 English writing resulted in divergences from the norms of English writing. This carries important ramifications regarding his prospects for publishing in English-medium international journals. In other words, it suggests that differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions may serve as potential barriers for NNES novice scholars, like Sungju, who juggle between two different sets of rhetorical conventions (e.g., English and Korean) in their transition to English-medium academic publishing.

4.4. Strategies used to Secure English-medium Academic Publication

This section illuminates the strategies that Sungju used to overcome his difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication. It focuses on two major strategies: (1) linguistic and textual strategies and (2) building an academic research network.
4.4.1. Linguistic and Textual Strategies Used When Writing the Early Drafts

When writing the early drafts, Sungju employed two salient writing strategies. One strategy adopted for his transition to English-medium RA writing was the use of L1 to L2 translation, although he noticed the negative influence of using L1 on his L2 English writing. He mainly used L1 to L2 translation to compensate for his linguistic deficiencies. Since his attempt to write directly in English caused distractions in his thinking, he did think and wrote first in Korean and then translated it into English. For instance, he first wrote an outline of a paragraph in Korean, focusing on the main flow of ideas. He subsequently translated it into English. In the translation process, he added details in English. Finally, he deleted the outline written in Korean. This process was repeated until he finished his entire draft. Table 4.1 provides an example of how he used L1 to L2 translation in the early draft.
Moreover, (1) the advantage of ORF is related to current science education reform that emphasizes the importance of authentic science practices such as constructing scientific explanation and argumentation (NRC, 2012) (added phrase). (2) Scientists typically generate research hypotheses and find evidence to support their hypotheses; however they eventually need to communicate their scientific activities with others via journal articles consisting of scientific explanation and argumentation. (direct translation) Therefore, science education programs need to offer the opportunities of not only doing science such as inquiry program but also communicating their findings of inquiry. (added sentence) (3) To construct scientific explanation and argumentation clearly and logically, students need to recall their previous knowledge (e.g., theory), connect their previous knowledge to current finding (e.g., evidence), and select appropriate languages to express their ideas. (direct translation) In addition, students need to possess critical thinking ability to examine their hypothesis and evidence. (added sentence) (4) Thus many different types of abilities are required for students to do authentic scientific practice. (direct translation) However, multiple choice assessments are capable of capturing only simple knowledge not such complex and comprehensive abilities for doing authentic scientific practice (added sentence).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sungju’s Outline Written in Korean</th>
<th>L1-L2 Translation by Sungju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moreover, (1) 주관식이 가지는 장점은 최근의 교육과정 리폼에서 강조하는 오센틱 사이언스 프랙티스와 관련이 있다. (2) 과학자는 실험을 하고 증거를 찾아 자신의 가설을 주장하는 일을 하지만 최종적으로는 글이라는 것을 통하여 다른 사람들과 의사소통한다. 이와 같은 글의 종류에는 설명과 논증이 될 것이고 과학자는 적절히 두 종류의 글을 활용하여 하나의 아티클을 완성한다. (3) 글을 논리적으로 구성하기 위해서는 다양한 지식의 리콜, 구조화, 그리고 올바른 단어의 선택과 같은 다양한 외부요소들이 반영이 될 것이고 (4) 이런 것을 종합적으로 판단하는 것이 오센틱 사이언스 프랙티스의 발달을 평가하는 올바른 것이라고 하겠다.</td>
<td>Moreover, (1) the advantage of ORF is related to current science education reform that emphasizes the importance of authentic science practices such as constructing scientific explanation and argumentation (NRC, 2012) (added phrase). (2) Scientists typically generate research hypotheses and find evidence to support their hypotheses; however they eventually need to communicate their scientific activities with others via journal articles consisting of scientific explanation and argumentation. (direct translation) Therefore, science education programs need to offer the opportunities of not only doing science such as inquiry program but also communicating their findings of inquiry. (added sentence) (3) To construct scientific explanation and argumentation clearly and logically, students need to recall their previous knowledge (e.g., theory), connect their previous knowledge to current finding (e.g., evidence), and select appropriate languages to express their ideas. (direct translation) In addition, students need to possess critical thinking ability to examine their hypothesis and evidence. (added sentence) (4) Thus many different types of abilities are required for students to do authentic scientific practice. (direct translation) However, multiple choice assessments are capable of capturing only simple knowledge not such complex and comprehensive abilities for doing authentic scientific practice (added sentence).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Sungju’s Use of L1 to L2 Translation in the Early Draft
(Note: The underlined parts indicate Sungju’s direct translation from English to Korean, and the italicized parts indicate the phrases or sentences that he added during the translation process.)
Another strategy was the extensive reading of published RAs. He was particularly very active about reading these textual sources because, as a Periphery scholar, he did not have easy and convenient access to published RAs when he was in South Korea. Because he was on the Periphery, it was quite time- and cost-consuming for him to get articles published in prestigious international journals, which reflects what Canagarajah (1996, 2001) refers to as “non-discursive difficulties.” Thus, using published RAs was an important strategy to him since he could keep himself up-to-date with what was going on in his field. He searched for published RAs and read the abstract section of the articles to see if they matched his needs for writing. He mostly read these reading sources to acquire disciplinary knowledge. However, he approached it very carefully due to plagiarism issues. He was fearful that his language barriers would lead to textual plagiarism, which would jeopardize his scholarly reputation. Thus, he never took notes or copied sentences as he read. He also avoided borrowing expressions from published RAs.

Some strategies used by Sungju seemed to be sociopolitically-driven and very goal-oriented. While they helped him complete his writing tasks, they did not appear to be conducive to his own learning. For example, a writing strategy that he adopted was the use of “codified language,” which is “a system in which the writer employs only a limited number of linguistic forms to realize his/her intention” (Okamura, 2006, p.74). Due to the tight timeline for the manuscript writing and submission set by Dr. Goodman, he felt that
time constraints weighed more heavily on him than the necessity to improve his English writing skills. This made him adopt this “lowering the standard” strategy (Uzawa & Cumming, 1989) to complete the writing task within the given timeframe and with less mental effort. He focused on getting his main ideas across by using short sentences and simple grammatical structures. Instead of learning English vocabulary and expressions, he relied on Dr. Goodman to polish his English. In short, this strategy equipped him with the minimal, yet necessary linguistic forms to write for publication in English (Okamura, 2006). However, it apparently restricted the development of his English writing ability, which would eventually hinder building his career as a L2 scholarly writer.

4.4.2. Building an Academic Research Network

It has been documented that for securing English-medium publications, academics need not only linguistic competence (e.g., Flowerdew, 2001; Swales, 2004; Uzuner, 2008), but also “non-discursive” resources (e.g., material, financial, and social resources) (Canagarajah, 1996, 2001). In particular, the availability of social resources (e.g., colleagues, supervisors, journal and book editors), which is a form of “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990), is a useful means for multilingual academics to secure English-medium academic publication (Curry & Lillis, 2010). According to Curry and Lillis (2010), these social resources include network brokers as well as literacy brokers. While
network brokers refer to network members who “may or may not intervene directly in text production but are important in providing access to resources and opportunities for publishing” (p. 283), literacy brokers directly “mediate text production” (Lillis & Curry, 2006, p. 4). There are three types of literacy brokers: academic professionals (e.g., discipline experts), language professionals (e.g. translators, copy editors, and proofreaders), and non-professionals (e.g., friends, family members) (Lillis & Curry, 2006).

Building a research network through social resources was a major strategy for Sungju to secure English-medium academic publication. Figure 4.2 illustrates the network that he established for his first English-medium publication.
Figure 4.2. Sungju’s Academic Research Network

Notes:
- Square: academic professional outside of the U.S.
- Octagon: academic professional in the U.S.
- Orange: network broker
- Yellow: literacy broker
Sungju’s network included three NNES academic professionals in South Korea (two Korean university professors and a graduate student in science education) and three NES scholars in the U.S. (Dr. Goodman, Dr. Braine, and a NES labmate), which indicates the cross-national/language nature of his network. Sungju worked with one Korean university professor and one graduate student in South Korea to collect data from Korean college students enrolled in science education to examine their conceptual changes in evolutionary theory. Then, to analyze data, he got help from a Korean university professor, who was an expert in structural equation modeling. These three Korean academic professionals served as network brokers, who provided material resources and access to Korean college students as research participants.

Sungju also worked with three NES academic professionals in the U.S. (Dr. Goodman, Dr. Braine, and a NES labmate). The two NES professionals mainly served as literacy brokers. They directly mediated and shaped Sungju’s text production for not only content, but also language. Dr. Goodman played the role of an editor and corrector and revised Sungju’s drafts. In addition, Dr. Braine’s main contribution was to write the Introduction section of the paper. He also helped Sungju develop and visualize a novel model of factors influencing students’ acceptance of evolution theory and incorporate the perspectives of neuroscience into the paper. Sungju believed that due to his NNES and novice status, it was essential to work with these two experienced NES academic
professionals in order to enter into the Center academic community. The sociopolitical implication of co-authoring with these two NES academic professionals is revealed in

Sungju’s comments below:

Although this study came from my own ideas, publishing it in a mainstream journal would have been almost impossible without Dr. Braine’s help. As a matter of fact, my English proficiency is not high enough. Based on my data from Korea, [Dr. Braine] developed an overall framework of the new model and created a visual representation of it. He also used his expertise in neuroscience and wrote the Introduction/Literature Review section. Then we wrote the rest of the paper based on the theoretical framework set by [Dr. Braine]. In fact, I am still not familiar with some of the studies in neuroscience that [Dr. Braine] cited in our paper. In order for me to publish research work in a top-tier mainstream journal like JSE, working with NES scholars, such as [Dr. Braine] is essential. (Interview 7: September 13, 2011, English translation)

As shown in the comments above, Sungju indicated his strategic consciousness about using experienced Center scholars’ expertise and experiences in publishing to boost his chances of getting published. In addition to the two NES professors, Sungju sometimes asked his NES labmate for feedback on his drafts before he submitted them to
Dr. Goodman. Sungju was able to have face-to-face interaction with this labmate, who served as a literacy broker (peer reader and corrector) and offered feedback.

In sum, the value of the portrait of Sungju’s network is that it depicts the kind of networking that NNES novice scholars, like Sungju, may need in order to publish in English-medium journals. Each of the academic professionals made different contributions to his success in publishing his paper in an English-medium peer review journal. The resources that they provided included assistance for research (data collection and analysis), collaboration on writing, and brokering (e.g., support with writing and help in interpreting reviewers’ comments). What is notable is that Sungju’s network consisted of “academic professionals” only. This can be explained by the fact that he had easy and convenient access to the NES academic professionals, who directly mediated and shaped his text. The high cost of recruiting a local editor or a proofreader also prevented him from working with language professionals.

4.5. Macro and Micro Sociopolitical Forces Influencing the Writing-for-Publication Process

In order to gain a more holistic understanding of the sociopolitical realities of Sungju’s academic publishing experiences, this section addresses macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing his writing-for-publication process. The macro and
micro sociopolitical forces include (1) the institutional and non-institutional publication pressure and (2) coauthoring with the advisor, respectively.

4.5.1. The Macro Sociopolitical Force: The Institutional and Non-institutional Publication Pressure Influencing the Writing Process

In order to better understand Sungju’s first English-medium academic publishing experience from a sociopolitical perspective, it is useful to examine the power-infused settings in which he had to negotiate the demands of English-medium academic publishing. The primary power-infused sociopolitical context was that he had to fulfill the publication requirement set by his advisor, Dr. Goodman (that is, publishing at least two papers before graduation). Dr. Goodman was an associate professor in science education and was a NES well-established scholar. He had more than 15 years of experience as a reviewer for several international peer-review journals. Since he had a strong background in the natural sciences, he considered himself as a scientist and science educator. Coming from the natural sciences discipline, Dr. Goodman strongly believed that his doctoral advisees should publish at least two papers before graduation in order to become competitive in the job market. During the interview, he showed me the website of his research group and pointed to his former and current doctoral advisees’ publications listed on the website. He commented:
Some of our students in science education graduate without publications. I think it’s bad because the job market, you really need a couple of publications. So whether my students like or not, I force them to do publications because I know that that’s something that you have to learn the ropes before you graduate. So anyone who works with me, publishing, no choice! Because I think you have to have that experience to be successful. (In-depth interview: September 20, 2011)

The publication requirement described above was intensified by the fact that students’ publication records would build the credit of Dr. Goodman’s research group. Thus, for Sungju, the sociopolitical aspect of publishing in an Anglophone journal was that it was not only a personal goal, but also was an individual contribution to improving the reputation of the research group and gaining further research grants. Although Sungju perceived this publication requirement as positive reinforcement for his growth as a scholarly writer, he felt pressure to meet this requirement, mainly because of his limited English writing ability. He also felt that he was disadvantaged in comparison to his NES peers when writing a paper for publication in English. He stated:

I think I’m disadvantaged. Of course, native English speaking students are at an advantage. If this is a running race, they are running 10 meters ahead of non-native English speakers. The starting point for native English speakers is different although being a native English speaker does not guarantee success in academic publishing. (Interview 5: September 1, 2011)

Another power-infused sociopolitical context was that unlike his NES peers, Sungju was under pressure to meet publication-related evaluation criteria for employment and
promotion in South Korean academia since he aimed to return to his home country after graduation to start his professional career. He clearly identified himself as a Periphery Korean scholar. Although he continuously attempted to publish papers in KCI journals while working on his doctoral studies in the U.S., he was more concerned about publishing in Anglophone peer-review journals, since English-medium publications weigh much more than Korean-medium publications in South Korean universities. In the name of globalization and international competitiveness, publications in SCI journals are indispensable for obtaining employment opportunities and promotion (e.g., being awarded tenure) in South Korean academia (Park & Leydesdorff, 2008). Sungju was well-aware of this “SCI publication pressure” that Korean academics faced. He explained as follows:

In the case of XXX University in Korea, faculty is required to publish in SCI journals for promotion. For instance, assistant professors are required to publish at least three papers in English-medium SCI journals in order to get promoted to associate professors. So some people publish in Indian local journals classified as SCI since it is easy to publish in those journals. In fact, professors in Korea would like to publish in English-medium international journals. If they cannot, they receive low evaluation. …Usually professors who received their doctoral degree in Korea are behind western-trained Korean professors unless they have a lot of

XXX 대 같은 경우에는 교수 임용 후에 승진 규정에 SCI 가 있다고 하네요. 예를 들어 전북대 부교수가 정교수 되려면 영어논문 3편 내야한데요. SCI 급으로. 그래서 사람들이 인도저널이 SCI 급이 있는데 내기 쉬운 저널. 사람들이 영어논문 많이 내고 싶어요. 그리고 못 내면 평가절하되구요. …국내박사 하신 교수들은 외국박사한사람들에 비해 밑려요. 주변의 전폭적인 지지가 있지 않은이상. 모든 논문이 평가에 다 들어가니가요. (Interview 3: August 9, 2011)
support from others. All publications are considered for evaluation. (English translation)

This “SCI publication pressure” influenced Sungju’s choice of the journal for his first English-medium paper. He purposely chose the journal “JSE”, which was one of the prestigious SCI journals in science education. According to Sungju, JSE was viewed as “unreachable” by Korean academics, in that since the start of JSE roughly 50 years ago, only a small number of papers by Korean authors had been published in this journal. Thus, Sungju’s sociopolitical motivation to publish in JSE was very clear. He believed that publishing his work in JSE would help him gain a scholarly reputation and get better employment opportunities in South Korea. He knew that papers by only 10 Korean scholars had been published in JSE. He said with excitement, “I want to be the 11th Korean author who publishes in JSE!” Indeed, this came true later on.

In short, the discussion above suggests that NNES graduate students studying in U.S. universities, like Sungju, may have additional pressures to meet the publication demands by academic cultures in the U.S. and their home countries. In the present study, Sungju was under pressure to meet both the institutional and non-institutional publication demands, which would directly affect his doctoral graduation in the U.S. and ultimately his scholarly success in South Korea. To meet these publication demands, Sungju
adopted some sociopolitically-driven strategies, such as aiming to publish in a SCI Anglophone journal that would increase his “market value” in his native country.

4.5.2. The Micro Sociopolitical Force: Coauthoring with the Advisor

This section discusses three micro-level sociopolitical aspects of Sungju’s publishing experiences, focusing on his coauthoring with his faculty advisor in the power-infused setting: (1) the “division-of-labor” type of collaboration, (2) Dr. Goodman’s revision of Sungju’s drafts, and (3) denied direct access to the journal gatekeepers.

4.5.2.1. The “division-of-labor” Type of Collaboration

Sungju described his relationship with Dr. Goodman as close and friendly. He had close contacts with Dr. Goodman on a daily basis. He could stop by Dr. Goodman’s office any time without making an appointment to discuss his research or to ask for help. Yet, he still felt social hierarchy as well as power inequality in the relationship with Dr. Goodman. During the coauthoring process, the asymmetrical power relationship between them shifted the control of the work from Sungju to Dr. Goodman. Although Sungju was the one who initiated and conducted the study, he was not allowed the control of the writing process. Dr. Goodman became the primary decision-maker and was in charge of
directing the co-authoring process. Before the coauthoring started, Dr. Goodman determined the authorship order of the paper: Sungju as the first author, Dr. Braine as the second author, and himself as the third author. Although Sungju remained the first and corresponding author, a subservient role was imposed on him. Dr. Goodman also held the political privilege to set the timeline of the manuscript writing and submission.

Interestingly, Sungju’s novice and NNES status seemed to play a significant role in how he was treated as a co-author by the NES expert, Dr. Goodman. Dr. Goodman determined who would write which sections of the paper. Due to Sungju’s novice status as well as his lack of English writing skills, Dr. Goodman assigned him to write the Methods and Findings sections, which involved more technical details and less language skills. In addition, due to the perceived disadvantages associated with Sungju’s NNES status (e.g., more time needed for writing and potential editorial rejection due to language problems), he was excluded from writing the Introduction section. Instead, this section of the paper was written by Dr. Braine. According to Sungju, Dr. Goodman believed that, based on his own experiences as a writer and reviewer, language errors, particularly in the Introduction section, would lead to immediate editorial rejection. For this reason, Dr. Goodman did not let Sungju write the Introduction section. Sungju stated:

지도교수가 얘기하는건...첫단락에 문법이 틀리면 바로 리젝이래요. ...nonnative 한테 generous 한 저널이 몇개 있다고 해요. ...유럽쪽 저널들이 nonnative 한테 generous 하대요. 지도교수가 얘기하는건 성의문제죠.
완성도의 문제고 한문장한문장 다 체크를 했느냐.. 근데 제눈에 그 차이가 안보이지만요. (Interview 7: September 13, 2011)

My advisor said that if there are grammar errors in the introductory paragraph, the paper gets rejected immediately. There are some journals that are very generous to nonnative writers, such as some journals in Europe. But U.S. journals do not seem to be. What my advisor said is the matter of “completeness.” Whether every single sentence has been checked for language so there are no language problems. But I can’t tell the differences in the matter of completeness. (English translation)

In addition, although Dr. Goodman was concerned with Sungju’s learning, he seemed more interested in facilitating the efficient publication of the paper. He knew that Sungju would need more time to write than a NES would need. In fact, a large amount of time needed for writing was a heavy disadvantage for Sungju. He described himself as a fast writer in his L1 Korean. However, English writing required him to spend a large amount of time because he had to spend extra time on polishing up his English. Therefore, Dr. Goodman intended to make the co-authoring process more time-efficient by having the NES expert, Dr. Braine, write the Introduction section and limiting Sungju’s role as an author. Sungju felt disappointed about being excluded from writing the Introduction section. Moreover, given his professional pride as a L1 published writer, he was not comfortable with the marginal role that Dr. Goodman ascribed to him. Nevertheless, he ended up taking up that role and acted accordingly, rather than resisting it, since he thought that it would increase the likelihood of getting published. He explained:
Since this study originally came from my ideas and we discussed a lot about how to organize the paper, I could have written the Introduction section. But if I wrote it, my advisor would have had to take extra time to revise or rewrite it. He set the tight timeline for the manuscript writing and submission and wanted to send the paper out as quickly as possible since he thought it would enable us to do a follow-up study soon. … It was because my English is not good. Even though it made me disappointed, I had to accept it since I thought it would help us publish the paper. (English translation)

As mentioned above, he felt frustrated about being treated as a less competent author. However, he placed being published above any feelings of frustration or disappointment he might have felt over being marginalized as an author. This suggests a certain willingness to accept marginalization within the scholarly framework due to the NNES status. It was his self-debilitating which attributed to his marginal participatory practice in English-medium academic publishing.

4.5.2.2. Dr. Goodman’s Revision of Sungju’s Drafts

Dr. Goodman provided Sungju with doctoral supervision through the co-authoring process. He believed that his role as an advisor was to help Sungju see the “big picture” of writing (e.g., how to organize an entire paper, what data to present). He called this
approach “the apprenticeship model” (Lave & Wenger, 1991) in which he expected Sungju to learn through “observing and copying a more experienced person” (Dysthe, 2002, p. 523). However, he viewed his role in teaching research writing as secondary to teaching content and technical skills. During the interview, he mentioned that since he had never been trained to teach research writing to NNES students, he often found himself unable to explain what made Sungju’s writing problematic. Thus, he generally used a minimalist approach to the teaching of research writing and expected Sungju to improve his writing skills by looking closely at his revisions and corrections. He also encouraged Sungju to get linguistic help from language professionals, such as writing center tutors. He described his supervisory approach to guiding Sungju in RA writing in the following excerpt:

> When it comes to writing, I give less guidance. Mostly him putting down general ideas and me modifying and talking about… Well, let’s focus this way and that way. Nitty gritty writing, I haven’t provided guidance at all. Basically rewriting it and saying you should continuously look at the changes and get help from the writing center. So try to push off some of the nitty gritty to support because I’m just overwhelmed with stuff. But the bigger picture stuff I’m trying to do, we have a lot of discussions about what are more important questions and what are less important questions and what are good ways for framing a paper and organizing a paper, sequencing we do, kind of big picture so we spend most of our time, I think. This is my perspective. (In-depth interview: September 20, 2011)

> With the supervisory approach described above, Dr. Goodman extensively revised Sungju’s drafts, while Sungju wrote multiple drafts of the Methods and Findings sections.
His revisions included not only surface minor changes (e.g., the correction of the improper use of words and modifying wording), but also “the addition/alteration/deletion of technical details and of interpretative statements” (Li, 2006a, p. 467). Table 4.2 exemplifies Dr. Goodman’s revisions of Sungju’s draft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Revisions</th>
<th>Excerpts from Sungju’s initial draft</th>
<th>Revisions by Dr. Goodman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The correction of the improper use of words</td>
<td>Specifically, the ANOVA revealed that (a) third year teachers harbored greater MATE scores than did fourth year teachers, (b) first, second, and fourth year teachers did not demonstrate significant differences in MATE scores, and (c) the first, second, and third year teachers did not display significant differences in MATE scores (F= 2.86, p. &lt; 0.05; First year: M=73.52, SD=10.56, Second year: M=72.09, SD=10.12, Third year: M=78.48, SD=11.65, Fourth year: M=71.26, SD=11.10).</td>
<td>Specifically, the ANOVA revealed that: (a) third-year teachers exhibited greater MATE scores than did fourth-year teachers, (b) first, second, and fourth-year teachers did not exhibit significant differences in MATE scores, and (c) the first, second, and third-year teachers did not exhibit significant differences in MATE scores (F= 2.86, p. &lt; 0.05).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alteration of technical details</td>
<td>The participants were affiliated to department of biology education. The enrolled students in both universities are top ranked (5%) students. One of the universities is specialized in education for purpose to train teachers; another university is Research University.</td>
<td>Participants were affiliated with the department of biology education at both institutions in which top 5%-10% ranked students in the national college enrollment examination can enroll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deletion and alternation of technical details</td>
<td>The ORI responses were scored by two human raters; one is PhD student in biology education and another is in-service biology teacher in Korea. Human raters initially scored 60 subsampled data in order to figure out the inter-rater reliabilities of all key concepts and misconceptions. The kappa values were over 0.8 in all key concepts and misconceptions. Finally human raters made final consensus scorings which were used for this study. This scoring rubric consists of seven key conceptions and six misconceptions. Key Concept (KC) scores for each item ranged from 0 to 7, and misconception scores for each item ranged from 0 to 6; therefore, the maximum score for KCs across the three items was 21 and the maximum score for misconceptions was 18. ORI responses were independently scored by two raters: a Ph.D. student in biology education and an in-service biology teacher. In an initial comparison of score agreement, Kappa values were &gt; 0.8 for all KCs and misconceptions (n = 60). Consensus scores were subsequently established for all responses. ORI reliabilities (measured using Chronbach’s alpha) were 0.73 for KCs and 0.48 for misconceptions.</td>
<td>This scoring rubric consists of seven key conceptions and six misconceptions. Key Concept (KC) scores for each item ranged from 0 to 7, and misconception scores for each item ranged from 0 to 6; therefore, the maximum score for KCs across the three items was 21 and the maximum score for misconceptions was 18. ORI responses were independently scored by two raters: a Ph.D. student in biology education and an in-service biology teacher. In an initial comparison of score agreement, Kappa values were &gt; 0.8 for all KCs and misconceptions (n = 60). Consensus scores were subsequently established for all responses. ORI reliabilities (measured using Chronbach’s alpha) were 0.73 for KCs and 0.48 for misconceptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Dr. Goodman’s Revisions of Sungju’s Initial draft
Unlike Dr. Goodman’s good intentions, however, such extensive revision did not seem to provide the opportunity of apprenticeship for Sungju, since Dr. Goodman directly revised or changed Sungju’s text without providing feedback or comments. During the interview, Sungju described his frustration and the ineffectiveness of Dr. Goodman’s revisions and rewriting on improving his writing skills:

Sungju: 지도교수가 comment 를 주지 않고 그냥 바꾸어버리니까 잘 모르겠어요.
Sun Yung: 그럼 어드바이저가 많이 수정해서 주면 고마우세요?
Sungju: 고맙죠 … 아이디어를 바꾸지 않는 이상, 수정한게 다시 안 보게 됩니다. ... 그런데 제 어드바이저는 자기가 제 글을 많이 고쳐주는데 제 영어글쓰기가 왜 안느나고 해요. 코멘트 없이 글을 바꾸는데 어떻게 능겠어요? (Interview 6: September 7, 2011)

Sungju: My advisor revises or rewrites my text without giving any comments.
Sun Yung: How do you feel when your text is extensively revised or rewritten by your advisor?
Sungju: I am really appreciative of that. … Unless he changes my ideas, usually I don’t pay much attention to the text revised or rewritten by him. … But he asked me why my English writing didn’t improve much despite the fact that he revised or rewrote my texts a lot. But he revised my writing without giving any comments. How can my writing improve? (English translation)

Sungju felt that he could have learned more effectively through his advisor’s specific verbal or written feedback on his writing. Dr. Goodman’s revisions without feedback made him lose his motivation to make additional efforts to enhance his English writing skills, since he knew that his text would be revised or altered by Dr. Goodman
anyway. This suggests that Dr. Goodman and Sungju had different views of the supervisory practice of extensive revisions. Dr. Goodman considered it as linguistic input and modeling for the opportunity of apprenticeship, while Sungju viewed it as counter-productive to improving his academic writing skills. However, it should be noted that there was no attempt made to bridge the gap between these two different views. Although Sungju was frustrated about not being able to receive the type of support that he wanted from Dr. Goodman, he never brought this up to Dr. Goodman. He rather showed his deference toward Dr. Goodman and his unwillingness to express his frustration. He stated, “I am [Dr. Goodman’s] hands and feet” (Interview 2: July 26, 2011), which indicates Sungju’s perception of his advisor as absolute authority. His silence and compliance to Dr. Goodman appeared to come from his previous experience of the advisor-advisee relationship in South Korea. He was familiar with “the traditional teacher-student relationship” (Kim, 2007, p. 184) in which the teacher offers students detailed directions about what to do, and students are expected to show respect and conform to the teacher’s guidance without question. In short, in the context of the novice-expert relationship, due to the perceived power of the advisor, Sungju showed deference to Dr. Goodman’s practice of extensive revisions. His passive and compliant attitude kept himself from negotiating the conflicts with Dr. Goodman’s supervisory approach, which generated negative effects on Sungju’s learning of writing for publication.
4.5.2.3. Denied Direct Access to the Journal Gatekeepers

The completed manuscript was submitted to the target journal, JSE. After the first round of review, Sungju and his co-authors received the “revise and resubmit” recommendation. The journal reviewers provided a number of suggestions for revisions in six areas: Introduction/Study framing, Methods, Findings, and Discussions, Implications, and Conclusion. In writing responses to the reviewers’ reports, Dr. Goodman was still in charge. He assigned Sungju to respond to some of the reviewers’ comments. In the hope of getting the paper published in JSE, Sungju tried to incorporate almost all of the suggestions from the reviewers. However, he disagreed with Reviewer C’s criticism that the paper was less relevant to science education. Reviewer C commented:

I did not see much, if any, connection to the science education literature. While this study is in the realm of science education, I would have liked to see more connections to this literature and the ideas that readers of JSE will be interested in. For example, this study was carried out with pre-service teachers. What are implications of these ideas for pre-service teachers (and why did you choose this sample)? (Excerpt from the comments by Reviewer C: May 5, 2011)

Based on Reviewer C’s criticism, the journal editors suggested as follows:

Currently, the discussion includes more of a focus on providing a summary of the results rather than making a case for how this work helps to move the field forward. This section should be honed and expanded to delve into the issues in more depth. The revision of the introduction in terms of framing the study should help clarify what aspects should be revisited (e.g. pre-service teachers, religion,
etc.) in terms of how this work build on previous science education literature.
(Excerpt from the comments by the editors: May 5, 2011)

Sungju felt that Reviewer C and the editors did not fully understand the focus of his study, which was the assessment of students’ knowledge about evolutionary theory. Despite his L1 publishing experiences, however, his confidence in interacting with the journal gatekeepers was not high because he was put in the position of a L2 novice writer. As the corresponding author, he did not feel that he had sophisticated language skills to defend his points and negotiate with these journal gatekeepers. In particular, he was concerned about his lack of ability to use pragmatically appropriate language not to offend the journal gatekeepers, and yet still address his disagreement in an assertive way. To overcome this feeling of inadequacy in confronting the journal gatekeepers and push himself to voice his opinions, he consulted Dr. Goodman and expressed the central claim of his disagreement in an oral form. Surprisingly, instead of helping him write his responses to the comments of the editors and reviewer, Dr. Goodman wrote rebuttals himself without discussion. The following are Dr. Goodman’s responses to the comments of Reviewer C and the editors, respectively:

Reviewer [C’] criticisms were quite anomalous, but we have nevertheless put considerable effort into trying to understand and address them; many were quite helpful. His/her uncertainty about the focus of the study, and his/her rather harsh view that the paper is of little importance to science teaching and learning may have stemmed from his/her framing of our manuscript as a study about teaching and learning, whereas it was focused on the assessment of
knowledge. We have rewritten the introduction to make this point much more explicit and make the introduction easier to read.

When [the editors] requested “make this paper relevant to science teaching and learning” we were not sure if this meant that you did not view assessment as part of teaching and learning. Further, when you stated that the discussion and conclusion section does “not clearly state how this study builds upon existing knowledge”, and yet we reviewed and critiqued 30 years of research on evolution assessment, we were again not sure if you did not view this assessment work as part of teaching and learning. Nevertheless, we added a series of specific recommendations in a new discussion section (Implications for biology assessment, curriculum, and instruction). We hope this is what you were referring to. (Excerpt from the resubmission cover letter written by Dr. Goodman: July 1, 2011)

Later, Dr. Goodman incorporated these rebuttals to the re-submission cover letter and sent the letter to the editors. In sum, from a sociopolitical perspective, Sungju’s experience of interacting with the journal gatekeepers was disempowering due to his advisor’s excessive mediation. It appeared that he was able to challenge the authority of more powerful players (Reviewer C and the editors) in the publishing game and make his voice heard through Dr. Goodman’s rebuttals. In fact, this helped settle the disagreement with Reviewer C and the editors during the second round of review, which led to a positive consideration for publication. However, it was a marginalizing experience to Sungju since, due to his NNES status and limited English writing skills, he was perceived as incapable of effectively interacting with the journal gatekeepers by his advisor. Consequently, Dr. Goodman played a dominant role in communicating with the journal
gatekeepers. His powerful role undermined Sungju’s role as the corresponding author and hindered his development in becoming a full-fledged participant in interaction with the expert members of the academic community. Although Sungju officially remained the corresponding author, it was surely a loss of ownership to him. He, who produced successful a co-authored publication in English, did not appear to emerge with a strong sense of achievement or professional authority.

4.6. Chapter Summary

Sungju was a published L1 writer. He came to the U.S. with a strong desire to contribute to both Periphery and Center academic communities. What made his case interesting is that his first attempt to publish in an Anglophone journal was motivated by both the institutional and non-institutional publication pressure. He was required to fulfill the publication requirement set by his doctoral advisor. His self-identification as a Periphery Korean scholar also put himself under ongoing pressure to meet the publication demands of the academic culture in South Korea.

He encountered many linguistic and rhetorical difficulties in his transition to L2 RA writing. However, he was an “experienced newcomer” who was equipped with strategies to cope with his difficulties. The main strategies that he utilized included (1) resorting to published RAs to get linguistic and rhetorical mentorship, (2) getting assistance from a
number of network and literacy brokers, (3) relying on L1 to L2 translation, and (4) using the codified language. However, some of the sociopolitically-driven strategies he adopted (i.e., using the codified language and self-marginalization) seemed too goal-oriented and therefore restricted his development of L2 AAL.

What was salient about Sungju’s case is that his writing-for-publication process was largely influenced by the power-infused relationship with his doctoral advisor, Dr. Goodman. His novice and NNES status seemed to play a significant role in how he was treated as a co-author by Dr. Goodman. Dr. Goodman took charge and determined the extent to which Sungju could contribute to the construction of the paper. Although Sungju felt frustrated about the dominance exerted by Dr. Goodman, his overall coping strategy to deal with the power relations was “accommodation” (Leki, 1995, p. 250). That is, he generally accepted the marginal role imposed on him. The struggles on the part of Sungju were both political and cultural. Because of his perceived power of Dr. Goodman, Sungju made realistic decisions to accept the marginal role imposed by Dr. Goodman. In addition, his willingness to take the subordinating role came from the fact that he gave higher priority to being published than to his ownership of learning. Moreover, his Korean cultural values of showing respect to teachers also led to his compliance to Dr. Goodman. Overall, Sungju’s story shows that his marginalization as an author in the context of the expert-novice coauthoring was masked by his success in
English-medium academic publication. The unequally distributed power between him and Dr. Goodman restricted his development of autonomy and decreased his motivation for improving writing skills in English. In addition, Dr. Goodman’s control of the interaction with the journal gatekeepers impeded his learning of the professional practices of negotiating knowledge construction with the expert members of the target discourse community.
CHAPTER 5: JUN’S CASE

Moving from the Periphery to the Center

5.1. Portrait of Jun

The Department of Geography was one of the social sciences departments at the research site university. Jun was a second year doctoral student in geography, in the specialized area of Geographic Information System (GIS). He had been in the U.S. for two years at the time of the study. He was the youngest participant in my study; he was in his mid 20’s. Upon completing his master’s degree in Geography in China, he came to the U.S. to pursue his doctoral degree in Geography. My recruitment email was sent to the Chinese international student listserv. He quickly responded to my recruitment email and expressed his interest in participating in my study. His primary reason for participation was that he wanted to help other NNES doctoral students who attempted to publish in international journals by sharing his L2 academic publishing experiences. He was an energetic, warm, and caring person. His warm and lively personality helped me build good rapport with him. He enjoyed meeting with me for interviews and appreciated my interest in his research and publications. Since I was a senior NNES doctoral student with some academic publishing experience to him, he often called me a “counselor” and
shared with me his concerns and asked for suggestions regarding his English-medium academic publishing.

With regard to his English learning experiences, he started to learn English when he was in the 7th grade. Due to the Grammar-Translation method as the dominant approach to introducing English in China, he mostly memorized grammar rules and vocabulary words and focused on reading comprehension in middle and high school. At college, he took two English writing courses. However, he recalled these writing courses as not useful for him. The classes were very big (about 50 students in class), and his writing instructors’ teaching approaches focused on memorizing English words and grammar rules. Rather, the venue for learning English for him was the interaction with his American friends who were studying Chinese in a university exchange program in China. Interacting with these American friends helped him develop his English oral and writing skills.

Jun self-rated his overall English proficiency as “good” (Interview 1: April 25, 2011). However, he believed that he still had many problems with English writing and that his English did not sound as natural as that of a NES. Since he came to the U.S., he had sought opportunities to teach courses in his department as a way to improve his overall academic English skills. However, he pointed out the restrictions he faced in accessing graduate teaching assistant (GTA) opportunities, due to his less-than-native
like English proficiency. He was often excluded from GTA opportunities. He felt that his limited English put him at a disadvantage in comparison to his NES peers in terms of getting GTA opportunities. He said with frustration:

My spoken and written English is not as good as that of a native English speaker. My advisor allows a native English-speaking student to teach four classes, but I don’t have that chance because my English is not as good as his. … You have less opportunity than native English speakers. If you’re good at speaking, then maybe you’re offered an instructor position for one class. Usually positions go to Americans. More opportunities to teach can help me improve my speaking and writing. (Interview 2: May 3, 2011).

While he aimed to get a postdoctoral position in the U.S. for a short-term goal, his ultimate professional goal was to obtain a professorship in China. With regard to academic publishing experiences in Chinese, he had a second-author paper published in a prestigious Chinese peer-reviewed journal. Although he was the primary person who conducted research and wrote the paper, his co-author, who was his former advisor in China, was listed as the first author of the paper. His former advisor asked for the first authorship of the paper for her tenure, and he let her take the first authorship so as not to damage his working relationship with her. The Chinese journal required him to write his paper in two languages: Chinese and English. He felt that the English version of his paper was not well-written, since he relied heavily on direct translation using dictionaries and Google Translate. Nevertheless, he was proud that he was a L1 published author. When it came to academic publishing experiences in English, he was writing two papers for
publication. The first paper was coauthored by him and his doctoral advisor, Dr. Chan (pseudonym), while the second paper was coauthored by him and his former advisor in China. The present study focused on the first paper, which was published as Jun and Chan (2012).

5.2. Background Information about Jun and Chan (2012)

Jun and Chan (2012) was Jun’s first English-medium paper published in an international peer-reviewed journal. When he began to draft the paper, he was beginning his second year of the doctoral program. For this paper, he coauthored with his doctoral advisor, Dr. Chan, who was originally from Hong Kong and was a prestigious scholar in geography. She had been a faculty member in the Department of Geography for more than 20 years. At the time of the study, she was the graduate studies chair in her department and had three doctoral advisees, including Jun. She was also the chief editor of an international peer-reviewed journal. Although her research interests were diverse, she particularly had a strong research background in time geography. The work reported in Jun and Chan (2012) was the first research study that Jun conducted in the U.S. using computer simulations. The major contribution of his study was to develop four novel models for identifying the choice set with multiple flexible activities under space-time constraints. He chose the research topic of developing new models since he believed that
this application-focused topic would elicit interest from both U.S. audiences and home audiences.

Figure 5.1 presents the text history of Jun’s first English-medium paper. Three key stages were identified in the text history:

Stage 1: pre-submission - drafted an English-medium manuscript

Stage 2: post-submission (after the first round of review - “revise and resubmit”) - revised and resubmitted the manuscript

Stage 3: post-submission (after the second round of review – “revise and resubmit”) – revised and resubmitted the manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-submission</td>
<td>Post-submission (after the 1st review)</td>
<td>Post-submission (after the 2nd review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network brokers involved in text production</td>
<td>Jun Kathy</td>
<td>Jun Dr. Chan Kathy, Reviewer A, Reviewer B, Journal editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun Kathy, Dr. Chan, Kathy</td>
<td>Jun Dr. Chan Kathy, Reviewer B, Journal editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written texts</td>
<td>Draft 1 → submit-ed</td>
<td>Draft 2 → resubmitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1 → resubmitted</td>
<td>Draft 3 → resubmitted</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1. The Text History of Jun’s English-medium Publication
As shown in Figure 5.1, the text history provides an overview of the drafts produced and the different people involved in the three key stages of Jun’s learning trajectory. In Stage 1, Jun drafted the paper by himself. Then he had a NES local editor, Kathy, edit and proofread it. His coauthor, Dr. Chan, briefly reviewed the paper before it was submitted to the target journal, IJG. In Stage 2, after the paper was reviewed by two reviewers, A and B, Jun received the “revise and resubmit” recommendation. He revised the paper based on comments from the reviewers. He also had Kathy edit and proofread the paper before it was resubmitted to the journal. In Stage 3, for the second round of review, the editor added two new reviewers, C and D, since she lost contact with Reviewer A. After the second round of review by the three reviewers, B, C, and D, the editor intensified her encouragement to “revise and resubmit.” Dr. Chan participated in the revision process and helped Jun accommodate the reviewers’ comments. After the major revision by Jun and Dr. Chan, the paper was finally accepted and published. In the published version of Jun and Chan (2012), Jun was listed as the first and corresponding author, while Dr. Chan was the second author.

5.3. Difficulties Encountered When Preparing a Paper for Publication

This section illustrates a range of difficulties that Jun encountered when preparing a paper for publication. Due to Dr. Chan’s unavailability, Jun had to write initial drafts by
himself. Before writing the first draft, Jun’s L2 English writing experience was limited to technical reports as class assignments. Therefore, he was a bit confused and overwhelmed by the initial task of formulating what to write and how to organize different parts of the paper in a coherent way.

Even though he self-rated his English writing ability as “good” (Interview 1: April 25, 2011), Jun still faced various linguistic difficulties. He felt that his linguistic difficulties described above often led to lack of clarity. The degree of difficulty that he suffered from was greater, since he felt that his field, geography required more language skills than other fields, such as engineering or sciences in which mathematical formulae or equations may be predominantly used to present study findings. His difficulty in conveying ideas clearly and accurately was evidenced in the comments below:

My field is more related to social science. You should write technical, but also you should relate to people, people’s behavior, which demands a lot of writing skills. … In quantitative research a good researcher is not always a good writer. I have non-native background. I can be a good researcher, but I can’t express my ideas more clearly than native scholars. That makes me less confident than native scholars. (Interview 4: June 2, 2011)

Like Sungju, Jun reported his lack of lexis as the most problematic area when it came to linguistic difficulties. In particular, knowledge of field-related terminology turned out to be a major problem for him, mainly because he had little field-specific academic training in English. Throughout the writing process, he continued to be concerned about...
his insufficient knowledge of field-related terminology. He felt that his limited field-related vocabulary constrained the flow of his thinking, since he often had to look up unknown words in a dictionary. It also resulted in difficulty in accurately describing relevant field-specific concepts. For example, he used some newly learned field-related terms (e.g., hazard and disaster) in his paper. Later, one reviewer commented on his lack of clarity in using field-related terminology and concepts. The reviewer stated:

The paper confuses basic disaster and emergency management aspects and using them interchangeably. The paper also confusing using natural disasters (earthquakes, Tornadoes) with industrial disasters (toxic spills) with Human Induced Disasters (terrorism). The authors should make clear distinctions of each, no matter how the impact might be similar. The paper also confuses the concepts of risk and hazard. (Excerpt from the reviewer reports)

The above reviewer comments suggested that Jun clarify some of the key field-related terms and concepts used in his paper. The following interview segment highlights his particular difficulty with two field-related vocabulary terms, hazard and disaster:

There is the difficulty with the terms, hazard and disaster. The reviewer said I should differentiate these two. But I have hard time identifying the definitions of these terms. I was confused about the terms. I read many books and didn’t find appropriate explanation. … The most confusing thing is that under each term there are different types of hazard and disaster. So I’m struggling with that. (Interview 8: September 7, 2011)

Another problematic area reported by Jun was related to the difficulty with rhetorical structure due to differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions.
Although his publishing experience in Chinese was advantageous, his perceived differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions presented challenges to him in two areas: (1) reader-responsible versus writer-responsible languages and (2) writing the Introduction section.

Differences between reader-responsible language (Chinese) and writer-responsible language (English) caused him difficulty when he was writing in English. According to Hinds (1983, 1987, 1990), in a writer-responsible language (e.g., English), a writer is primarily responsible for effective communication. He or she has to make relationships, purposes, and main ideas as clear as possible for readers. In contrast, in a reader-responsible language (e.g., Chinese), a reader takes the main responsibility for effective communication. He or she is expected to work to fill in information and transitions and to infer conclusions and implications. Jun emphasized that Chinese written discourse requires readers’ background knowledge for understanding texts. He explained the differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions that he learned through his readings:

I think in Chinese writing we use a lot of difficult terminology, formulas, and calculations. Everything is very dense in a paper. That’s why I think the purpose of Chinese writing is to confuse readers. But in English writing we describe the background of this method in detail and we cannot throw out a concept to readers without explanation. That’s the big difference. I read a lot of other people’s papers and feel this way. For example, in my Chinese thesis I used a model called “a cluster model.” This is a reference here without any explanation. So you as a
reader should search for the idea of that model to understand. (Interview 6: June 9, 2011)

Due to the differences explained above, he tended to deliver information at random or organize the discourse diffusely. He later received feedback from a journal reviewer that in the Results/Discussion sections, he had problems with presenting the analysis and interpretation of the study results in a coherent way.

Writing the Introduction section was another major difficulty with the rhetorical structure of the RA for him. He felt that this difficulty stemmed from his perceived differences in Chinese and English RA writing. He observed that Introduction and Literature Review are often mixed in both Chinese and English RA writing. However, a major difference between Chinese and English RA writing that he noticed was that in Chinese RA writing, little attempt is made to discuss relevant previous studies in the Introduction section (Mu & Carrington, 2007), while in English RA writing authors are expected to provide thorough literature review incorporated into the Introduction section. In RA writing in English, literature review is an important step to “establish a territory and niche” (Swale, 1990): providing the reader with sufficient information on the territory in which particular research is situated and to elaborate on the gap in research (Samraj, 2002). He explained that the low presence of literature review in the Introduction section in Chinese RA writing might come from the fact that Chinese
reader-responsible language relies heavily on readers’ background knowledge. He described the difference between Chinese and English RA writing in the following way:

In English paper you do good literature review and comprehensive understanding of the literature. But in Chinese paper you don’t need to spend too much time on that. That’s the most challenging part. … In Chinese journals they don’t require you to write a long introduction part. For English journals you present all the previous research related to your research. (Interview 2: May 3, 2011)

Due to the differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions described above, he had great difficulty with summarizing relevant previous studies and incorporating them into the Introduction section effectively. It took a great deal of time and effort for him to learn about making a clear link between what had been previously studied and found and what his study had established and was presenting.

To sum up, Jun encountered both linguistic and rhetorical difficulties when writing for publication in English. Similar to Sungju’s case, limited vocabulary skills (particularly, lack of field-related vocabulary) were a major concern for him because it made it difficult to describe field-related concepts clearly and accurately. In addition to the lack of vocabulary, L1 interference resulting from differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions served as an obstacle for him in adapting to L2 English academic writing conventions. This suggests that negative L1 transfer may compound the linguistic problems encountered by NNES novice scholars like Jun.
5.4. Strategies used to Secure English-medium Academic Publication

This section discusses the strategies that Jun used to overcome his difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication. It focuses on two major strategies: (1) linguistic and textual strategies and (2) building an academic research network.

5.4.1. Linguistic and Textual Strategies Used When Writing the Early Drafts

In the relationship with his advisor, who was often unavailable for mentoring, Jun had to develop his independence and autonomy in RA writing through “learning from doing.” To write the initial draft, he made an outline and used the following format required by the target journal: the Introduction/Literature Review – Material/Methods – Results/Discussion – Conclusion. He also read writing manuals written in Chinese to learn about the organizational structure of the RA. When writing early drafts, he relied on two salient strategies: seeking “rhetorical and linguistic mentorship” from published RAs (Li, 2005, p. 159) and mixing L1 Chinese and L2 English. He particularly found the first strategy beneficial. Reading published RAs was an important strategy for him to not only learn disciplinary knowledge and find a niche in the field, but also learn research writing skills (e.g., basic structures and patterns and formulaic expressions). What was salient about his learning from published RAs was that he kept a special notebook and took notes as he read. His notes consisted of summaries of his readings as well as a compiled
list of “ready-to-use” phrases and expressions suitable for insertion into his draft. Figure 5.2 illustrates his compilation of ready-to-use phrases extracted from published RAs.

He used the words or expressions from his notes when he experienced writer’s block or he felt difficult to find an appropriate word or expression. He described the benefits of using summary notes and words and expressions borrowed from published RAs:
I read others’ papers and write their words and take some notes about their expressions. … I think writing and reading more improve my own English skills. It’s helpful to read papers, like other people’s papers to get an idea of what expressions to use. I take some notes in my hand as I read. I use this as a reference for my paper. This is excerpts from the papers I read. I also have some summaries. I feel very distracted when I take notes on computer, so I write in my special notebook. After I read the papers, I take notes about what the study is about and what category it falls into. Like U for utility and M for method. I categorize studies. (Interview 4: May 25, 2011)

In particular, he used copied sentences for what Kamler and Thomson (2006) refer to as “syntactic borrowing.” Once sentences from already published RAs were selected, he deleted the content. Then the sentence skeleton was left. He inserted the details of his own research into the skeleton structure. In essence, he learned productively from the published RAs of his field, which offered him rhetorical and linguistic mentorship.

The second strategy reported by Jun was that he mixed both Chinese and English in the writing process. He used Chinese for higher-order thinking, such as writing outlines and generating ideas. Moreover, when struggling to find the right word in English, he would use a Chinese word and look up the word in a Chinese-English dictionary. Unlike Sungju, however, he tried to avoid L1 to L2 translation in the actual writing process. Rather, he tended to write directly in English. His primary reason for direct writing in English was the time-consuming nature of L1 to L2 translation and difficulty with conveying subtle nuances of meaning. He stated:
I take notes in my first language. When I have difficulty finding the right English words, I use Chinese words. And then I look up Chinese-English online dictionaries. But writing in Chinese is so different from writing in English. So it confuses me if I try to translate back and forth. It doesn’t work. Chinese language is so complicated. It’s difficult to translate subtleties and different nuances of Chinese into English. It’s so time-consuming to organize ideas in Chinese and translate into English. (Interview 2: June May 5, 2011)

In sum, the two strategies described above helped Jun cope with some of his language barriers and complete the high-stakes task of writing a paper for publication. In particular, published RAs were an important source of cognitive mentorship to him, given his advisor’s unavailability.

5.4.2. Building an Academic Research Network

With previous collaboration-based graduate training from Dr. Guo in China, working with others was a preferred strategy for Jun when it came to research and publication. However, for his first attempt to publish in an international journal, his research network was limited to two people, including his co-author, Dr. Chan, because Dr. Chan had very strict confidentiality rules about research and publication (i.e., maintaining the confidentiality of one’s research idea). Thus, Dr. Chan’s powerful position restricted his use of social resources. He conducted his research by himself. In the writing process he sought advice from one disciplinary professional (Dr. Chan) and
one language professional (a NES local editor\(^2\), Kathy). Figure 5.3 illustrates the network that he built for his first English-medium publication.

Notes: Diamond: language professional in the U.S.
Octagon: academic professional in the U.S.
Yellow: literacy broker

Figure 5.3. Jun’s Academic Research Network

Dr. Chan and Kathy mainly served as literacy brokers and made different contributions to Jun’s success in English-medium academic publishing. Due to her

\(^2\) There are numerous terms used in the literature to refer to people who “specialize in correct NNES texts” (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003, p. 2008). The terms include authors’ editors, language correctors, revisers, and local editors (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003). In my study I adopted the term, “local editor” from Flowerdew’s (2000) study, partly because “editor” was the term that Kathy used to call herself.
unavailability and indifferent attitude, Dr. Chan did not participate in the writing process until Jun received a “revise-and-resubmit” recommendation from the journal editor after the second round of review. Nevertheless, she made some important contribution, such as revising the Discussion/Conclusion section of the paper at the post-submission stage.

Kathy, a NES local editor, was recruited after Jun finished his rough draft. Unlike the other participants, Jun valued help from language professionals. His positive attitude toward language professionals came from his experiences with two NES ESL writing teachers that he previously met. He recalled that the ESL writing teachers spent extra time and provided helpful feedback on constructing the Introduction section of his paper when he was taking ESL writing courses with them. This positive experience made him want to work with a language professional, like Kathy. His recruitment of Kathy was motivated by his belief that NES help was necessary to overcome his linguistic disadvantage as a NNES writer. More importantly, working with Kathy was a mild form of resistance to Dr. Chan’s confidentiality rule. It was a way to get assistance from someone outside the field while he was still complying with Dr. Chan’s confidentiality rule. The advantage of working with Kathy was clear to him. He explained Kathy’s contribution as follows:

I am a nonnative speaker, so my writing sounds awkward. [Kathy] reorganized the paragraphs and improved my sentences and paragraphs. She makes it sound like a native speaker writing it. I can give you a short example. I wrote, “people are using their time more efficiently.” But she changed it to “people are more
efficient users of time.” It sounds more authentic and more native. (Interview 2: May 3, 2011)

Kathy used the “track change” feature in Word and corrected errors in his drafts and marked all the changes in red color. Her editing mainly included minor surface-level changes (e.g., correction of the improper use of words and modifying wording). Table 5.1 illustrates Kathy’s editing of his early draft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of revisions</th>
<th>Excerpts from Jun’s early draft</th>
<th>Editing by Kathy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correction of the improper use of words</td>
<td>That the case of two flexible activities is presented is in light of a comprehension of the algorithm with ease.</td>
<td>The case of two flexible activities is presented for the sake of simplicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying wording</td>
<td>From the perspective of time geographers, a similarity with traffic study is a trend of measuring individual accessibility in terms of the maximal utility or benefits resulting from alternative travel programs.</td>
<td>There are previous studies that, similar to studies conducted by transportation scientists, measured individual accessibility in terms of the maximal utility or benefits resulting from alternative travel programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1. Kathy’s Editing of Jun’s Early Draft

However, it is worth noting that Jun encountered several constraints as to working with Kathy. One constraint was the high cost for her editing services. It was clearly a concern for Jun as a graduate student without research funding. He found the advertisement of Kathy’s editing services posted on a bulletin board in his department
building. He hired her, mainly because the rate for her editing services was lower than other local editors. However, he still felt that it was high cost for him. He said:

This is Kathy’s advertisement. It says she has 10 years of experience with editing. She doesn’t say which area she got a master’s degree in. Her charge is low compared to other editors. I contacted many editors and some charged $20 per hour. So it was expensive. But with Kathy, I paid $5 per page. So one round of editing for the whole paper was $120 or something. . . . But it was still expensive for me. The low rate is one of my preferences. (Interview 5: June 2, 2011)

Another constraint was related to a lack of opportunity for face-to-face consultation. Although their relationship was similar to that of the employer and the employee, Jun seemed to face NES-NNES power relations with Kathy. Kathy positioned herself as a language expert and considered Jun as a linguistic novice. In this relationship, Jun felt inferiority about his position as a NNES writer. While she determined how their communication was to be done, he conformed to her decisions. Since she preferred to communicate via email and was not willing to offer face-to-face consultation, Jun never had an opportunity to discuss his writing with her through face-to-face interaction. While he thought that face-to-face consultation would be more beneficial to discuss what was required for effective editing, he chose not to ask her for it since he was concerned that she would charge him extra for it.

The third constraint was what Burrough-Boenisch (2003) calls “cognitive constraint,” which pertains to the amount and types of corrections by Kathy. The text
analysis of Jun’s major drafts as well of his final product showed little evidence of elaborate content revisions by Kathy. As an outsider of Jun’s discipline, she did not make any changes to higher-order problems (e.g., text organization, appropriateness for the genre and writing style). It appeared that her knowledge of the discipline was not adequate enough to make such changes. One consequence of this cognitive constraint was that despite Kathy’s editing a few times, Jun received a couple of reviewer comments on the writing style of his paper after the first round of review at IJG. Although the reviewer comments were not specific enough, they seemed to indicate that Jun’s paper did not follow the discipline-specific writing style. For example, one reviewer stated: “The writing style is a little awkward in some places.”

To sum up, Jun’s research network was relatively limited, and its formation was influenced by Dr. Chan’s powerful position as an advisor. His network consisted of the two professionals who played a pivotal brokering role in text production. Jun gained assistance from them to make sure that his ideas were communicated appropriately and accurately in English. However, as discussed above, working with these two professionals presented both benefits and constraints.
5.5. Macro and Micro Sociopolitical Forces Influencing the Writing-for-Publication Process

In order to gain a more holistic understanding of the sociopolitical realities of Jun’s academic publishing experiences, this section addresses macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing his writing-for-publication process. The macro and micro sociopolitical forces include (1) the non-institutional publication pressure and (2) coauthoring with the advisor, respectively.

5.5.1. The Macro Sociopolitical Force: The Non-institutional Publication Pressure Influencing the Writing Process

Unlike the other participants, Jun did not face the institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation. However, his first attempt to publish in an English-medium journal was motivated by non-institutional publication demands in relation to his professional goals. He aimed to get a postdoctoral position in the U.S. after graduation and ultimately planned to return to China for his professional career. Based on his ultimate goal, he identified himself as a Periphery Chinese scholar. He was proud of being a Chinese scholar and believed that his local knowledge from China would give him great potential for future publications in Anglophone Center journals. His professional plans and goals made him feel a strong need to meet the publication
demands by both U.S. and Chinese academic cultures. In particular, his motivation to publish in Anglophone journals was strengthened by his former advisor (Dr. Guo, pseudonym) in China with whom he had close and ongoing contact.

Dr. Guo strongly encouraged him to attempt to publish in Anglophone journals. Due to their long-term and reciprocal advisor-advisee relationship, she still had a strong influence on his academic studies, and he felt compelled to live up to her expectations. Since he ultimately pursued professorship in China, the connection with Dr. Guo was important to him. He viewed his efforts to keep in contact with her as an investment for potential opportunities for employment and scholarly visibility in China. He was first exposed to the demand of academic publishing when he was working on his master’s degree in geography in China. Academic publication (either in Chinese or English) was a requirement for his master’s graduation, albeit this departmental requirement was flexible depending on students’ research and writing abilities. To fulfill this publication requirement, he conducted his master’s research with Dr. Guo and published a part of his research in a prestigious Chinese peer-review journal. After he started his Ph.D studies in the U.S., Dr. Guo forced him to publish a different part of his master’s research in an international peer-review journal. They coauthored an English-medium paper, which became his second publication in an Anglophone journal later. Dr. Guo also created
academic networks in China for him by connecting him to her current graduate students in China and facilitating collaboration between them for international publication.

Dr. Guo constantly reminded him that publishing in Anglophone Center journals was an important criterion for faculty evaluation and scholarly recognition in Chinese academia. In fact, the higher value attached to English-medium academic publications in Chinese academia has been addressed in the literature. Kratoska (2007) notes that an English-medium publication is given three or four times the weight of a Chinese-medium publication in some universities in China. Jun discussed his sociopolitical motivation for his first attempt to publish in an international journal:

In academia people judge you based on how many publications you have. So that’s the criteria to judge a researcher. ... It is important to publish in top Chinese journals, but it is more important to publish in English-medium journals because you get more scholarly recognition and get better employment opportunity through publishing in English and the school considers it to be a greater achievement. It’s hard to make your contribution recognized internationally if you publish in a Chinese journal. English publications get more attentions and credits in China. Only top students and prestigious researchers in China publish papers in English. This is why I want to publish my English paper in the U.S. (Interview 1: April 25, 2011)

However, moving between universities in China and the U.S. added challenges to his attempt to publish in an Anglophone Center journal. The aforementioned non-institutional publication pressure he felt as a Periphery scholar did not seem to be recognized by his U.S. university or department. He did not have any institutional
publication requirement. In addition, there was a lack of departmental support (e.g., offering research writing courses) for graduate students who attempted to publish in English-medium international journals. Thus, as he was moving from a university in China to a university in the U.S., he faced a conflicting academic atmosphere in which graduate students were often left to their own devices and resources to learn to write and sort out what and how to publish from their research. Dinham and Scott (2001) point out that without appropriate institutional support, doctoral students are likely to avoid the challenge of academic publishing. It was the case in Jun’s doctoral program. He noticed that many students in his doctoral program graduated without any publication. This made him turn to the strategy of coauthoring with his doctoral advisor to publish in an Anglophone Center journal. Unfortunately, however, the advisor turned out to be often unavailable for supporting his specific professional goals and needs for English-medium academic publishing. This lack of support at the institutional level became a source of constraints to him in undertaking the high-stakes task of academic publishing in English.

5.5.2. The Micro Sociopolitical Force: Coauthoring with the Advisor

This section discusses two micro-level sociopolitical aspects of Jun’s publishing experiences, focusing on his co-authoring with his faculty advisor in the power-infused
5.5.2.1. Writing under the Rule of “Confidentiality”

Since Dr. Chan had a high international reputation as a scholar, Jun admired her scholarship. However, he described his relationship with Dr. Chan as formal, impersonal, and hierarchical. According to Jun, Dr. Chan was quite authoritative and had a strong personality. Her advising sessions always focused on impersonal topics, such as research, and she rarely made mention of personal matters with her students. Thus, he never had an opportunity to discuss with her his personal and professional goals and plans. Since she was busy with her own professional activities (e.g., hosting a local conference and attending professional meetings), she was often unavailable and looked indifferent toward Jun’s needs. This unfriendly relationship made Jun feel anxious and distant from her. When Jun invited her to coauthor the paper, she did not appear to be excited and gave her answer immediately. It made Jun feel that she doubted his ability to write at an appropriate level for international publication. However, she finally agreed to coauthor with him. Notwithstanding Dr. Chan’s lukewarm attitude toward coauthoring, Jun’s sociopolitical motivation to work with her was his belief that coauthoring with her would increase his chances of getting published. In fact, she gave him a “roadmap” (Interview 2:
May 3, 2011) to “[bid] for Center journals” (Li, 2006a, p. 472) by choosing an appropriate journal for him and potential reviewers to recommend to the journal editor.

He articulated the benefits of working with Dr. Chan:

[Dr. Chan] didn’t give me step-by-step instruction. But she points out the most important things for research and how to get a paper published. You have to identify all the possibilities when you submit a paper to a journal. When you are selecting a certain journal and the reviewers, she identifies each reviewer and she chooses the most appropriate reviewers for me, which is very important. If you give the paper to random reviewers, your paper can’t be either rejected or severely criticized. Reviewers can reject the paper. But she knows which reviewers are more critical and which reviewers are more generous. She gives me guidance on the choice of the reviewers. (Interview 3: May 11, 2011)

Nevertheless, coauthoring with Dr. Chan was not always beneficial to Jun. Dr. Chan’s powerful position restricted his interaction with members of the institutional academic community. Dr. Chan was very strict about protecting students’ research and publication. In other words, Jun could only work with Dr. Chan and was not allowed to share information about his research and writing with other students in the doctoral program until it was published in a journal. As a result, he had to work on his research by himself and ended up being an isolated writer. This explains why he did not let Dr. Chan know about his participation in my study and refused to give me permission to contact Dr. Chan for interviews. While he wanted to share his publishing experiences with me, he did not want to give her any potential sign of the violation of the confidentiality rule (i.e., maintaining the confidentiality of one’s research idea). According to Jun, Dr. Chan’s
strict confidentiality rule seemed to reflect her personal approach to surviving and succeeding in U.S. academia as a NNES scholar. In order to succeed in the competitive research world, it was her strategy to protect her own research ideas and data from being stolen and build strong publication records. Since she perceived it as a beneficial strategy, particularly for NNES scholars, she forced Jun to adopt it. However, Jun had an opposing view, partly because he was forced to write in isolation. In addition, he felt very uncomfortable with adopting this strategy because it contradicted with the collaboration-based graduate training he received from his former advisor in China. Jun stated:

When I was in China, my advisor always encouraged me to work with other students for my research and writing. For example, in her seminar class she had me present my research every other week and get feedback from other students. It was very helpful. … My current advisor is too serious about confidentiality. So I am not supposed to talk to anyone about my research and writing. I can’t get feedback on my research findings from other doctoral students. This is frustrating. My advisor is a nonnative speaker. She grew up in Hong Kong and she graduated from a Hong Kong university and did her graduate studies in California. It was difficult for her to come here and become a professor. She should have strong personality and protect her research in order to succeed here. Her strong personality is also related to her experience here. … She never mentioned about whether she is married. Nobody knows. She is a mysterious person. We only talk about research. (Interview 1: April 25, 2011)

Later, Jun received criticism on some aspects of his research from journal reviewers. He felt that this could have been prevented by communicating with his fellow doctoral students and getting feedback on his study results from them. However, he did not
confront Dr. Chan in this regard. Coming from the culture where the absolute authority of the teacher is emphasized, he found it challenging to communicate openly with Dr. Chan and articulate his expectations and negotiate tensions with her. His deferential silence seemed to contribute to his continued lack of access to social resources (e.g., fellow doctoral students).

5.5.2.2. The Advisor’s Participation in the “Revise-and-Resubmit” Process

Jun wrestled with how to position himself relative to the ascribed authority of Dr. Chan. He was frustrated about Dr. Chan’s non-participation as a coauthor. However, he felt uncomfortable about taking time away from her, since she seemed quite busy. This discouraged him to seek help or participation from her. When the manuscript was completed, Jun handed it into Dr. Chan for her feedback. However, she only provided some quick comments on language problems, such as the incorrect use of articles and prepositions. When the final revision was done, Jun submitted the manuscript to the target journal, IJG.

He underwent the “revise and resubmit” process twice. During the first revise-and-resubmit process, Jun still had to work on his paper by himself by following Dr. Chan’s confidentiality rule. Besides, he received no guidance from Dr. Chan for addressing reviewers’ comments since she was unavailable for hosting a local conference. His
particular difficulty in the first revise- and-resubmit process was to interpret the point behind Reviewer B’s comments and figuring out what was required to make effective revisions. Reviewer B provided criticism that Jun’s paper did not seem to fit into the target journal since it presented little discussion on its contribution to the field of GIS, which was the theme of the journal. Reviewer B commented:

I am not sure whether [IJG] is a good venue to publish this paper. How is this study related to GIS and how can the results contribute to the research field of GIScience? These questions are not clearly addressed in the paper. This paper does provide a brief discussion on recent advancements of accommodating the time geography concepts in GIS. (Excerpt from the reviewer reports)

When responding to Reviewer B’s comments, Jun was quite confused. Jun’s revisions eventually involved the addition of two main points to the Discussion/Conclusion section: (1) some GIS scientists’ major contribution to the development of time geography and (2) several strengths of his study. However, in the second round of review, Reviewer B expressed his dissatisfaction with the revised version of the manuscript. Based on Reviewer B’s comments, the editor intensified her encouragement to “revise and resubmit.” However, she clearly noted that further revision would not guarantee acceptance for publication.

The failure to meet the demands of Reviewer B gave Jun a great deal of frustration. However, his strong desire to enter into the Center academic community kept him from giving up. Instead, his frustration turned into his efforts to actively approach Dr. Chan
and elicit more attention and participation from her. For example, he emailed Dr. Chan and explicitly explained his needs for English-medium academic publishing and asked for help. He also strengthened his communication with Dr. Chan by visiting her during her office hours to discuss revisions whenever she was available. He also reported his revision progress either via email or in person on a regular basis. Fortunately, his efforts did pay off. Dr. Chan eventually participated in two areas and played a brokering role, even though her overall supervisory approach did not change. The first area of Dr. Chan’s participation was that she revised the Discussion/Conclusion section of the manuscript based on Reviewer B’s comments. Through her revisions, this section was rewritten to connect the reported work to the wider context of the research in the field and to the theme of the target journal. Table 5.2 exemplifies Dr. Chan’s revisions of the Discussion/Conclusion section.
GIS scientists have made many significant contributions to the development of new theoretical frameworks and computational algorithms for operationalizing time-geographic constructs. Miller (1991), for instance, offered the first computational algorithm for implementing the concept of potential path area (PPA) on a fictitious transportation network. Kwan and Hong (1998) developed another computational algorithm for generating more restrictive choice sets that takes both space-time constraints and people’s cognitive constraints into account. They called this new operational formulation of PPA the cognitive feasible opportunity set (CFOS). This algorithm was later adapted for representing realistic PPA and evaluating space-time accessibility for a sample of activity-diary survey participants based on a real transportation network in Columbus, Ohio (Kwan 1998, 1999) … These studies represent important efforts by GIS scientists in extending the conceptual framework of classical time geography and developing operational methods for implementing its constructs, both have been crucial for enhancing our understanding of human activity-travel patterns and multipurpose trips. …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jun’s revised Discussion/Conclusion section after the first round of review</th>
<th>Dr. Chan’s revision of the Discussion/Conclusion section after the second round of review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIS scientists have made many significant contributions to the development of new theoretical frameworks and computational algorithms for operationalizing time-geographic constructs. Miller (1991), for instance, offered the first computational algorithm for implementing the concept of potential path area (PPA) on a fictitious transportation network. Kwan and Hong (1998) developed another computational algorithm for generating more restrictive choice sets that takes both space-time constraints and people’s cognitive constraints into account. They called this new operational formulation of PPA the cognitive feasible opportunity set (CFOS). This algorithm was later adapted for representing realistic PPA and evaluating space-time accessibility for a sample of activity-diary survey participants based on a real transportation network in Columbus, Ohio (Kwan 1998, 1999) … These studies represent important efforts by GIS scientists in extending the conceptual framework of classical time geography and developing operational methods for implementing its constructs, both have been crucial for enhancing our understanding of human activity-travel patterns and multipurpose trips. …</td>
<td>The paper not only presents the conceptualization of the trip-chaining models. It also elucidates how the models can be operationalized based on a real case study that used a transportation network to substantiate and validate them. Results from the case study indicate that spatial proximity of certain activity locations to an individual’s home or workplace does not necessarily lead to a higher likelihood of being feasible when activities are interdependent. This not only corroborates an important observation of past studies by GIS scientists: locational proximity does not necessarily mean space-time feasibility (e.g., Kwan 1998). It is also particularly significant when identifying explanatory factors in many discrete choice models in traffic studies (Train 2002). When there are multiple flexible activities in a trip chain, representing space-time constraints simply in terms of spatial separation has considerable limitations - since space-time constraints are also determined by the sequencing and scheduling of associated activities. A more realistic and accurate evaluation of space-time constraints can be achieved by taking into consideration the FCA proposed in this paper. For measuring individual utilities in discrete choice models, FCA can be used as an effective explanatory variable for gauging the role or importance of distance rather than distance itself in decision-making concerning destination choice. This evaluative variable is a better alternative for quantifying the effect of space-time constraints in many applied fields that examine multipurpose trips. …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2. Dr. Chan’s revisions of the Discussion/Conclusion section
Given Dr. Chan’s authority and expertise, Jun complied with all the revisions by her and incorporated the revised Discussion/Conclusion section straight into the manuscript. From a perspective of LPP, this “professor-authored revision” (Prior, 1995, as cited in Li, 2006a, p.466) played a critical role in guiding the NNES novice Jun in terms of addressing journal reviewers’ comments and adapt to the requirement of the target discourse community. When he visited her during her office hours, Dr. Chan explicitly explained her revisions and helped him understand the importance of making connections to the “bigger picture” of the existing literature and achieving a good fit between his paper and the target journal. She pointed out that he tended to base his writing too much on his own interpretations and that he did not sufficiently discuss the links between his results and the existing literature. She also stressed the relevance of the study to the theme of the journal. He described what he learned from Dr. Chan’s revisions and her explicit guidance:

[Dr. Chan] told me if you want to publish this in a top journal, you need to see something related to the wider context of the research field and the theme of the journal. Especially you should mention a lot about the journal. I remember I wrote my study was very significant to time geography, which is a subfield of GIS. My advisor said I wrote too much about time geography. I should say more about GIS, so contribute to GIS. I should also relate to the journal. Show them it fits their journal. I think that’s very helpful. I checked the format of the journal, also the length of the paper. But I didn’t realize the theme of the journal until she told me. (Interview 4: May 25, 2011)
The second area of Dr. Chan’s participation was that she played a mediating role in resolving author-reviewer conflicts. Although Jun felt that most of the comments were helpful, he found Reviewer C’s comments quite critical. The following excerpt is from Reviewer C’s comments:

Unfortunately I did not find quite as much new material here as expected. Researchers have investigated the topic of space-time paths for over ten years and a substantial literature now exists. This paper does not cite the paper by Thompson et al [pseudonym] that also considered paths with multiple stops and route choice. Also work by Smith et al [pseudonym] on modeling paths over multiple granularities is relevant for this work. … Discussions here on dividing long trip chains into shorter segments relate to granularity although discussions of level of detail are not explicit in this paper. For this reason, I found the material up to page 15 repeating much of what already has been published on space-time paths. The newer contribution starts on page 16 (too late in the paper) where the authors begin to discuss preference for one location over another. (Excerpt from the reviewer reports)

As shown in the comments above, Jun’s work was criticized, particularly his failure to acknowledge significant previous research and to discuss the contribution of his study to the larger context of the research field. In fact, Reviewer C seemed to question whether Jun’s study was new or innovative enough to be published. In response to Reviewer C’s criticism, Jun acknowledged his failure to situate his work in relation to an already established body of literature. However, he expressed strong disagreement with Reviewer C’s comment on the study’s lack of originality. However, he found it very challenging to use pragmatically appropriate language not to offend the reviewer, and yet still address
his disagreement in an effective way. He drafted his responses to Reviewer C’s criticism by himself and then asked Dr. Chan for feedback. Table 5.3 presents the responses to Reviewer C’s criticism drafted by Jun and Dr. Chan’s revisions.
The table below shows the responses drafted by Jun and revised by Dr. Chan to the reviewer's criticism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses drafted by Jun</th>
<th>Responses revised by Dr. Chan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Move 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, we would like to apologize for neglecting the two papers suggested by the reviewer. After scrutinizing these two papers, we have found their work is less relevant to our research, for two reasons.</td>
<td>Thank you for bringing these two interesting papers to our attention. After reading these two papers carefully, we found that their work is relevant but does not overlap with our research for two reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Thompson et al (2002) used the notion of granularity (the level of detail for travel information) to structure different forms of lifeline bead (an equivalent to the space-time prism). …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Smith et al (2003) structured a conceptual projection of a traveler’s activity space in space-time environment with compulsions (conditions that must be met) and barriers (conditions that must be avoided), where compulsions are specified as not contingent upon another (the 7th page of the paper, “this approach assumes independence of compulsions; a compulsion cannot be contingent upon another.”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Move 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have included both papers as references in our paper (p.4 and p.5). Although the comment seems critical, it is still very helpful for us to realize our distinction as well as relevance to other studies.</td>
<td>As our response above indicates, the choice problem becomes vastly complex and challenging once the space-time flexibility of activities is introduced, and no previous studies have actually addressed the problem. Our paper thus represents an important initial attempt to conceptualize and tackle the problem. We, however, have included both papers as references in our revised paper (p.4 and p.5). We thank the reviewer for bringing this work to our attention. It is relevant and helpful to our study, and pushes us to think about what is truly new and distinctive in our work when compared to previous studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Responses to Reviewer C’s criticism drafted by Jun and Dr. Chan’s revision
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In the initial responses above, Jun made three moves. In the first move, he acknowledged the reviewer’s concern by apologizing (First, we would like to apologize for neglecting the two papers suggested by the reviewer.) before expressing his disagreement, which may sound pragmatically a bit odd to Center-based audiences. The second move was to offer two reasons for the disagreement. In the third move, he expressed his positive accommodation of the reviewer comments due to their usefulness, which did not seem to help defend the originality of his study. Dr. Chan revised the first and third moves and reframed the presentation of the responses. In the first move, she acknowledged the reviewer’s concern by thanking him to mitigate the disagreement (“Thank you for bringing these two interesting papers to our attention.”). More importantly, in the third move, she strongly defended the significance of the study and refuted the reviewer commentary, but still showed respect to his concern. The first and third moves revised by Dr. Chan were a vital opportunity for Jun to learn about how to accept, understand, and address reviewer comments in a polite, yet assertive way. Later, these rebuttals were well-taken by the editor, which led to the acceptance of the paper for publication.

To sum up, for fear of offending Dr. Chan or ruining his working relationship with her, Jun initially underwent the writing-for-publication process by himself and simply endured the fact that Dr. Chan was unavailable to participate as a coauthor. His sense of
isolation, combined with the failure to meet the demands of Reviewer B, gave a great deal of frustration to him. However, his strong desire to gain entry to the Center academic community made him alter his somewhat passive and reserved attitude toward the power structure of the advisor-advisee relationship and become an active agent. This not only helped him mitigate the asymmetrical power relations with Dr. Chan, but also empowered him to manage and use Dr. Chan’s expert mediation to learn ways to interact with the journal reviewers effectively.

5.5.3. Chapter Summary

Jun was a young and vibrant doctoral student from China. He was enthusiastic about writing in both English and Chinese. Like Sungju, he was a published L1 author. Although Jun studied in a U.S university, his identification as a Periphery Chinese scholar put himself under ongoing pressure to meet the publication demands by the Chinese academic culture. This publication pressure from the Periphery served as the primary sociopolitical context for his first attempt to publish in an English-medium international journal. Though he was a published L1 writer, he faced a number of linguistic and rhetorical difficulties when writing for publication in English. To overcome the difficulties, he mixed Chinese and English as well as relied on published academic texts to gain disciplinary knowledge and learn how to write a RA paper.
Jun’s L2 publishing experiences consisted of both struggles and successes through the negotiation with the power-infused relationship with his advisor, Dr. Chan. Because of her perceived power as the advisor, he initially complied with Dr. Chan’s directions. However, when he realized that his compliant attitude seemed to have a negative impact on his own learning of writing for publication, his agency was activated and applied. He tried to consciously mitigate the unequal power relations with Dr. Chan to elicit her attention and participation by using a set of strategies. He became more autonomous and less inclined to accept subordination or marginalization in an effort to move himself toward fuller participation in the disciplinary academic community. For example, after a lot of frustration about his failure to accommodate the reviewer’s suggestions, he repositioned himself and became an active agent in the advisor-advisee relationship. He actively used Dr. Chan’s office hours to meet her regularly and report on his writing progress and elicited Dr. Chan’s attention to his writing. His attempts resulted in Dr. Chan’s participation in the “revise-and-resubmit” process. Her mediation helped him learn the professional practice of negotiating with the journal reviewers to contribute to knowledge building in the disciplinary academic community. Overall, Jun’s self-transformation from the submissive agent to the active agent in the novice-expert relationship represents a successful case of working toward fuller participation in the community of practice through English-medium academic publishing.
CHAPTER 6: KEN’S CASE

“Publish or No Degree”

6.1. Portrait of Ken

Ken was a doctoral candidate in biochemistry. He was in his late 30’s and originally came from Japan. He had been in the U.S. for about seven years. After obtaining a master’s degree in pharmaceutical sciences in Japan, he came to the U.S. to pursue a doctoral degree in biochemistry. At the time of the study, he had already completed his coursework and passed a qualifying exam. He had already spent seven years working on his doctoral degree at the time of the study. He believed that the delay in his doctoral study was due, in part, to his lack of English language skills.

I first met him through my Japanese colleague in my doctoral program. He became not only a focal research participant, but also a great supporter for my study. As a person outside the science field, I had difficulty getting in touch with professors and staff in his program. However, he helped me contact his program coordinator to get information about the publication requirement for doctoral graduation. He also helped me arrange face-to-face interviews with his primary advisor and co-advisor who were involved in his research and academic publishing. He was an easy-going, warm-hearted, and optimistic person. He was also soft-spoken and reticent about expressing his opinions in English,
though he felt comfortable being interviewed by me. Although he was not a chatty person, he shared his thoughts and answers my questions sincerely and openly.

Although he did not consider himself as a proficient L1 writer, he liked to write in Japanese. He was concerned that his Japanese writing skills were getting rusty due to his lengthy stay in the U.S. He mentioned, “When I was in Japan, I wrote in Japanese a lot. But not much here. When I was in undergraduate in Japan, I joined a book review group. I read Japanese novels and wrote reflections. But I don’t have time to read Japanese novels here” (Interview 1: March 31, 2011). For this reason, he described himself as a “dual nonnative writer” (Interview 1: March 31, 2011), indicating that his writing ability was limited in both Japanese and English. With regard to his English learning experiences, he started learning English at the age of 13 during his first year of junior high school. He then continued to learn English as a high school student, undergraduate student, and graduate student in Japan. Similar to the other participants’ prior English language learning experiences, his English training in Japan was primarily based on the drilling and cramming of grammar rules and vocabulary. Although he had learned English for about 15 years, he had great difficulty with using English for academic purposes. He self-rated his overall English proficiency as “poor” (Interview 1: March 31, 2011). Though he liked to write in English, he was not a confident academic writer in English. In an effort to improve his English writing skills, he actively used a social
network site, Facebook. Interestingly, although he was usually a quiet and reserved person, he had a very different online identity as an energetic social person. In the online environment he became a confident writer. He posted messages and photos on his Facebook daily, which invited his online friends to comment on his postings and photos. He was an active poster of information and built up intricate social networks of friends. Although his daily Facebook activities were non-academic in nature, they offered him a space to practice writing in English and helped him learn from his peers by observing their online postings. Figure 6.1 illustrates Ken’s daily Facebook writing activity.

![Image]

I saw the flower of Titan Arum (native of Indonesia) in biological sciences greenhouse (next to Aronoff bldg)! The flower lasts 24-48 hours (the flower bloomed 11pm this Saturday). The greenhouse opens until 9 pm today. The floral structure is big. Flowers can be seen at the bottom through rectangular cutting.

Natalie
I went to see it too! It didn’t smell very strongly like I expected it to.
April 25, 2011 at 12:15pm · Like

Ken
That is good! I read that the smell of flower is strongest at night. I went to see the flower in the morning, so it didn’t smell much either.
April 25, 2011 at 12:24pm · Like

Figure 6.1. Ken’s Facebook Writing Activity
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Despite his efforts to improve his English ability, he still suffered from his limited English skills. In fact, he had trouble in making progress in his doctoral studies. In the second year of his studies, his GPA dropped to 3.1 (The GPA scale ranged 0 to 4.). Since he was always considered as a brilliant student and had a smooth journey in his educational paths in Japan, it put him in panic. In order to keep his GPA from further decreasing, he stopped taking graduate-level courses and instead took non-credit bearing ESL courses or undergraduate courses (e.g., Yoga, Ice Staking, Golf). He described the negative impact of his limited English proficiency on his GPA:

Taking courses was not ok since my GPA dropped because of my limited English. At that time I didn’t study well. My GPA was 3.1 or so. In my second year there were also a lot of oral presentations I had to do. I had difficulty with that. I didn’t like that. That might be part of the reason my GPA dropped. After my GPA dropped to 3.1, I got scared. So I just took ESL courses and undergraduate courses like Yoga class and it helped me keep my GPA from dropping more. (Interview 2: April 5, 2011)

What made his academic situation worse was that he did not pass the SPEAK test to be certified as a GTA until he finished the third year of his doctoral studies. Since he had to take six ESL spoken language classes to pass the SPEAK test and take two required ESL composition courses, it took a longer time to finish his graduate course work. Failing the SPEAK test situated him in a vulnerable position because his chances of obtaining a GTA position were jeopardized. This also made it difficult for him to get financial support from his department. Since his original advisor could not offer him any financial
support, he had to find a new advisor, Dr. Fund (pseudonym), who later hired him as a graduate research assistant (GRA). He was able to join Dr. Fund’s laboratory in the second year of his doctoral studies. Due to his changing advisors and laboratory groups, he started his laboratory work much later than his fellow doctoral students.

He identified himself as a quantitative researcher who was researching mosquitoes. He said, “I want to do research to help sick people. I’m interested in pesticides to kill mosquitoes” (Interview 4: June 5, 2011). Since his ultimate professional goal was a professorship in Japan, he was planning to return to Japan after completing his doctoral program. It was partly because he wanted to stay close to his parents in Japan. To keep himself up-to-date on what was going on in Japanese academia, he was in ongoing contact with his Japanese friends who were in academic positions in Japan. He had no academic publishing experience in Japanese, although he was aware of the importance of publishing in domestic Japanese journals for his future professional career in Japan.

During his doctoral years, he had paid more attention to his immediate goal of meeting the departmental publication requirement for his survival in his U.S. university. (Details of this departmental publication requirement will be discussed later in this chapter.) When he was in the fifth year of his doctoral studies, he published his first paper in an English-medium international refereed journal indexed by the SCI. He stated with
excitement, “I have done my homework! I felt relieved after the paper was published” (Interview 1: March 31, 2011).


Ken and Writer (2008) was Ken’s first English-medium paper published in an international peer-review journal indexed by SCI. The purpose of Ken’s study was to discover the improved synthesis of a particular molecule, photo-leucine, which could be applicable to the synthesis of other alpha-amino acids. His study also focused on how the synthesis of photo-leucine could help find a mechanism to kill mosquitoes. Ken argued that the significance of his research was the first experimental realization of the synthesis of photo-leucine, since only outlines of this synthesis had been published.

When Ken began to draft the paper, he was in his fourth year of the doctoral program. He worked in a research group under the leadership of Dr. Fund, who was a well-established NES scientist. Dr. Fund’s primary research interests included protein engineering and biophysical analysis of insecticidal toxins. The work reported in Ken and Writer (2008) was the initial work of Dr. Fund’s research project on the biophysical analysis of insecticidal crystal proteins. Dr. Writer, who was Ken’s co-advisor, was invited to join Dr. Fund’s long-term funded research project and directed the initial laboratory research. He was an emeritus professor and was an expert in organic chemistry.
He had more than 25 years of experience as a reviewer for a number of international journals. He was also the editor of an international peer-review journal at the time of the study. Overall, Ken’s research work was financially supported by Dr. Fund and directed by Dr. Writer. However, it was carried out primarily by Ken. Thus, his research work was regarded as collaborative efforts with his two advisors.

To contextualize Ken’s learning trajectory, Figure 6.2 presents the text history of Ken’s first English-medium publication. Two key stages were identified in the text history:

Stage 1: pre-submission - drafted an English-medium manuscript with Dr. Writer

Stage 2: post-submission (after the review – “accepted with minor revision”) - revised and resubmitted the manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-submission</td>
<td>Post-submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(after the review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network brokers involved in text production</td>
<td>Ken Dr. Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Dr. Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written texts</td>
<td>Draft 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ resubmitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2. The Text History of Ken’s First English-medium Publication
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As presented in Figure 6.2, the text history provides an overview of the drafts produced and the different people involved in the two key stages of Ken’s learning trajectory. In Stage 1, Ken coauthored with Dr. Writer. When the paper was completed, it was submitted to the target journal, JSC. In Stage 2, Ken and Dr. Writer received a “accept with minor revision” recommendation after the paper was reviewed by two reviewers. The two authors revised the paper based on three minor comments from the reviewers and resubmitted it to the journal. The paper was finally published in JSC (July, 2008) as Ken and Writer (2008). In the published version of Ken and Writer (2008), Ken was listed as the first author, while Dr. Writer was listed as the corresponding author. Dr. Fund’s financial support was acknowledged in the acknowledgement section of the paper.

6.3. Difficulties Encountered When Preparing a Paper for Publication

This section illustrates a range of difficulties that Ken encountered when preparing a paper for publication. Since his disciplinary writing experience was limited to class term papers and writing laboratory reports (e.g., writing down details of laboratory operations), Ken faced the task of writing a scientific RA for the first time. Similar to Sungju’s case, in his co-authoring process with Dr. Writer, Ken was involved in the “labor-of-division” type of collaboration (Hemphill, 1996). Dr. Writer controlled all aspects of writing and assigned Ken to specific writing tasks. For instance, Dr. Writer
controlled the preparation of the paper. First, he made a specific outline and set timelines for writing. Next, he chose a target journal, JSC, and told Ken to use the following format: Introduction – Experimental/Methods – Results, which was the journal’s formatting requirement. Then, he determined the order of writing different sections of the paper for Ken: writing the Methods and Results sections first and composing the Introduction section last. Given the nature of his research and the journal’s formatting requirement, he did not have to write the Discussions/Conclusion section.

With Dr. Writer’s specific guidelines, Ken was able to start his writing without much challenge in terms of organizing the paper. For example, he followed the specific outline of the paper that Dr. Writer made for him. He also used several published RAs that Dr. Writer gave him as model papers and borrowed the organizational and rhetorical structures of those RAs. Another reason why he felt less challenged about organizing the paper was that the structure of scientific writing was quite formulaic. However, with regard to the genre of research writing, he found the Introduction section difficult to write. He expressed his difficulty as follows:

Writing the Introduction was difficult. I needed to search many references to summarize previous studies. Although it’s short, it’s more difficult to write than the Methods and Results. I didn’t feel any cultural differences when I was writing the Introduction. Maybe it was because I don’t have much experience with writing except for writing lab reports. I didn’t really have a clear idea about writing a good introduction. I don’t even know how to write a good introduction in Japanese. So how can I write a good introduction in English? (Interview 3: April 12, 2011)
As shown in the comments above, his difficulty with the Introduction section mainly seemed to come from his limited knowledge about the general characteristics of the Introduction section in both L1 Japanese and L2 English. Given that L1 literacy skills can be positively transferred to L2 literacy learning, his lack of familiarity with this specific RA section in both languages surely became problematic to him. Dr. Writer, who was his coauthor as well as his co-advisor, particularly pointed out that his lack of awareness of the expectations of Center-based readers made his writing deviate from the expected norms of the Center academic community.

Not surprisingly, he faced linguistic difficulties when writing early drafts. He reported that the incorrect use of grammar features was the most problematic to him. Grammatical problems were an ongoing concern to him. For example, he had problems with subject-verb agreement and verb tenses, where errors can obscure meaning. He believed that his difficulty was partly derived from interference from his L1, Japanese. He stated, “I have many problems with grammar. For example, I have a problem with singular and plural and subject-verb agreement. In Japanese we don’t have a clear distinction between singular and plural. So sometimes I don’t know whether I should add an ‘s’ [third person singular] to a noun or verb I want to use.” (Interview 3: April 12, 2011). Lack of vocabulary was another linguistic difficulty to Ken. Non-field-related vocabulary was mostly a concern. This made him frequently use online dictionaries and
thesauruses to correct his own linguistic errors. However, it should be noted that, unlike Sungju and Jun, who had stayed in the U.S. for only 2 years, Ken did not find field-related vocabulary as a problematic area, since a large amount of his scientific knowledge had been acquired in the U.S. This suggests that vocabulary knowledge gains may be associated with the length of stay in the target language community.

6.4. Strategies used to Secure English-medium Academic Publication

This section illuminates the strategies that Ken used to overcome his difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication. It focuses on two major strategies: (1) linguistic and textual strategies and (2) building an academic research network.

6.4.1. Linguistic and Textual Strategies Used When Writing the Early Drafts

Like the NNES doctoral students in Cheung’s (2010) study in Taiwan, one main strategy used by Ken during the writing process was reading past issues of the target journal. He gained information about the readership and the theme and writing style of the journal. He also borrowed frequently used expressions and phrases from published articles to overcome his language barriers. He described the use of these textual resources as follows:

I checked some articles published in the target journal. Especially the recent ones. I followed their approach and format. It was pretty standardized. I used them as a
model. … I also borrowed some frequently used expressions and phrases from papers published in that journal, like “the procedure was expanded and modified bla bla bla” or “the findings of the study suggest …” I think using these expressions helped me deal with my language problems. (Interview 4: June 9, 2011)

Another main strategy used by Ken was the mix of L1 Japanese and L2 English. However, he seemed to use his L1 less than Sungju and Jun who had extensive writing experiences in his L1. Due to his seven years of the stay in the U.S., he had lost his scientific writing skills in Japanese to some extent. He confessed that he had forgotten many scientific terms and expressions in Japanese. The loss of scientific writing skills in Japanese made him directly write in English, despite his limited English writing skills. He used Japanese for higher-order thinking, such as organizing paragraphs and generating ideas. He also used Japanese words and looked up the words in a Japanese-English dictionary when struggling to find the right words in English. He described his mixed use of L1 Japanese and L2 English, stating “I try to write directly in English, but if I can’t find words, I look up dictionaries. Both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. Also, electronic translators” (Interview 5: August 31, 2011).

The third strategy reported by Ken was specific to scientific writing. He drew on his existing skills of writing technical details to write the Experimental/Methods and Results sections. Ken was required to write informal laboratory progress reports as a daily scientific practice while he was conducting his laboratory experiment. It has been
indicated that the laboratory report is the most common genre of writing in the sciences (Jackson, Meyer, & Parkinson, 2006). The laboratory report shares many commonalities with the RA in general organization and discourse patterns, although there are also important differences between these two genres, such as target audiences (Jackson et al., 2006). During his research process, Ken wrote informal, but detailed laboratory progress reports to describe experiment procedures and research findings. When he was writing early drafts, he relied on his existing skills of writing technical details to write the Experimental/Methods and Results sections and help himself with accuracy in writing, which is a main principle of scientific writing. Figure 6.3 exemplifies Ken’s informal laboratory progress report.

Figure 6.3. Ken’s Informal Laboratory Report
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Although Blakslee (1997) observed that sticking with existing skills of writing technical details served as an obstacle for a NNES graduate student to acquire a new genre of scientific RA, in Ken’s case the informal laboratory report above modeled the genre of research writing for him. Because the nature of the particular RA that he wrote required specific technical details about the synthesis of a molecule, photo-leucine, Ken used this familiar genre to help himself move forward in RA writing.

It appears that not all strategies that he used were conducive to his learning, particularly when they were sociopolitically-driven and very goal-oriented. Similar to Sungju’s case, his writing approach relied on the “lowering the standard” strategy (Uzawa & Cumming, 1989). In order to complete his writing tasks within the timeframe set by Dr. Writer, he relied on the “codified language” (Okamura, 2006) in which he adopted minimal, but necessary linguistic forms to put his main ideas in his paper. Thus, his writing was characterized by short sentences and simple grammatical structures. In fact, he described his writing as “simple and boring,” stating, “My English is not beautiful” (Interview 1: March 31, 2011). It should be noted that this use of the codified language seemed to be enhanced by Dr. Writer’s comprehensive feedback approach. Dr. Writer seemed very kind and corrected every single language error that Ken committed. As shown among NNES science doctoral students in Taiwan (Huang, 2010), Ken did not feel the necessity to improve in English since he knew that Dr. Writer would correct all
his language errors and rewrite his drafts. (Details of Dr. Writer’s feedback approach will be discussed later in this chapter.) Instead of making efforts to learn more complex English expressions and vocabulary necessary for scientific writing, he would fall into getting immediate and convenient help from Dr. Writer. Overall, the adoption of the “lowering the standard” strategy increased his dependence on Dr. Writer and restricted the development of his scientific writing skills in English.

6.4.2. Building an Academic Research Network

According to Curry and Lillis (2010), participation in academic research networks enables scholars to access resources that are essential for English-medium academic publication, particularly in Center Anglophone journals. Like the other participants, Ken used the strategy of establishing an academic research network in which he sought assistance and advice from five academic professionals: Dr. Writer (Ken’s co-advisor), Dr. Fund (Ken’s advisor), Dr. Schmitz (pseudonym, a scientist in Germany), and two NNES labmates. Figure 6.4 illustrates Ken’s network for his first English-medium publication.
Notes: Square: academic professional outside of the U.S.
Octagon: academic professional in the U.S.
Orange: network broker
Yellow: literacy broker

Figure 6.4. Ken’s Academic Research Network
As mentioned earlier, Ken’s research work was financially supported by Dr. Fund and directed by Dr. Writer. It is important to note that the formation of Ken’s network was directly influenced by Dr. Writer’s beliefs about who to work with and who not to work with. Apparently, to Ken, Dr. Writer was a gatekeeper to academic networks. He advised Ken to consult “a NES in the field” for scientific publication. He seemed to believe that NESs are ideal language teachers and that NES disciplinary professionals are more capable of supporting students in English-medium academic publishing in comparison to NNES disciplinary professionals. In fact, he criticized some NNES professors in his department for their being less capable of mentoring graduate students for international publication due to their own language deficiencies. He described his mentoring approach for NNES graduate students as follows:

You need to consult a native speaker in the field. And if you consult a native speaker out of the field, you’ll miss things. Let me tell you why. We have a device in the lab called “condenser.” It’s used if you want to boil water, or make some steam, or turn steam back into water. I read an article and there was a phrase, “a glass refrigerator.” I wrote the author, “Clearly, you mean “condenser,” but where did you get this, “glass refrigerator”?” The author was Italian and the word means literal translation. It turned out the author had a native speaker look at the paper, but unfortunately, the native speaker was not a physicist. He didn’t know what a condenser was. So it’s very important to get a native speaker within the field. (Interview: May 4, 2011)

Dr. Writer added that his NNES doctoral students who were coauthoring with him usually did not need to work with other NESs in the field, since, he said, “My English is
very good” (Interview: May 4, 2011). His excessive control made Ken work only with Dr. Writer as a literacy broker, who directly mediated his English-medium text. As a result, Ken did not show as much interaction with other members in his laboratory, as typically occurs among science graduate students.

It was apparent that Dr. Writer’s advice to consult “NES disciplinary professionals only” affected Ken’s attitude toward language professionals. Ken stated that “language people would not understand my paper” (Interview 3: April 12, 2011). His somewhat negative and doubtful attitude toward language professionals also seemed to come from his experiences with the ESL composition courses that he was required to take. He recalled that these courses were not helpful for him to develop discipline-specific writing skills, since the focus of the courses was on general academic writing and grammar. For this reason, he resisted visiting the writing center or seeking help from language professionals (e.g., writing tutors, local editors), although the program coordinator, Mr. Simpson, asserted that the writing center could be a valuable resource for NNES doctoral students in the program. His resistance to language professionals was evident in the following interview excerpt:

To improve general writing skills, I want to take ESL classes. But I think publishing is different genre from general academic writing, although there is overlap between them. It involves more technical vocabulary and different writing style. For my publications, I don’t think I’d go to language professionals like professional editors or writing tutors. (Interview 4: June 9, 2011)
When it came to guiding Ken in research, Dr. Writer was more open and inclusive toward NNES disciplinary professionals. In particular, he helped Ken build a cross-national network tie to a NNES scientist in Germany to seek advice on research. Ken’s research started with replicating the experiment by Schmitz (pseudonym) (2005), who was a German scientist and professor. However, Ken faced difficulty with replicating it, since Schmitz’s (2005) article did not provide specific details of the procedures of the experiment. In fact, his attempt to replicate it failed multiple times. Then, Dr. Writer suggested that Ken email Professor Schmitz and ask for advice on the experiment. Ken followed Dr. Writer’s suggestion. Although they had never met each other, Dr. Schmitz kindly suggested helpful articles to read and provided specific advice for Ken via email. Thanks to the help of Professor Schmitz, Ken was able to complete the experiment. In fact, Dr. Writer recommended Professor Schmitz to be a potential reviewer when he submitted the manuscript to the journal editors. To Ken, networking with a NNES scientist outside of the U.S. was a new, but meaningful experience that he learned from Dr. Writer. Dr. Writer also encouraged Ken to seek assistance from his NNES labmates who had more research experiences than Ken. Essentially, two NNES labmates served as network brokers for Ken and offered research-related assistance. Since his experiment failed multiple times, they helped him assess what might lead to failure and provided useful tips, such as how to handle particular chemicals.
To summarize, the analysis of Ken’s network shows that his research network was discipline-oriented due to the influence of his co-advisor’s “disciplinary professionals only” advice and his somewhat negative attitudes toward language professionals. The academic professionals in his network provided not only financial and material resources, but also linguistic resources in order to publish in an Anglophone journal. Given that Ken was able to publish in an Anglophone journal despite his limited English writing ability, mastery over linguistic skills may not be a prerequisite for L2 academic publishing. This supports Lillis and Curry’s (2010) argument that networked activity serves as social capital that enables NNES scholars, like Ken, to access multiple scholars and material resources necessary to produce English-medium academic texts.

6.5. Macro and Micro Sociopolitical Forces Influencing the Writing-for-Publication Process

In order to gain a more holistic understanding of the sociopolitical realities of Ken’s academic publishing experiences, this section addresses macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing his writing-for-publication process. The macro and micro sociopolitical forces include (1) the institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation and (2) coauthoring with the co-advisor, respectively.
6.5.1. The Macro Sociopolitical Force: The Institutional Publication Requirement for Doctoral Graduation

Given the high status of academic publishing in academia, English-medium academic publishing has become a prerequisite for doctoral graduation in many universities worldwide (Cheung, 2010). This was true of Ken. He was required to publish at least one first-author paper for doctoral graduation. Thus, his primary motivation to publish in an English-medium journal was to fulfill the institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation. Below are the specific accounts of the publication requirement described in the Program Handbook for Graduate Students.

Students of [Biochemistry program] must have 1 or more publications before applying for graduation with a PhD. At least one of the student’s publications must list the student as first author. By “publication” we mean the paper must be published, in press, or accepted. Submitted manuscripts and manuscripts “in preparation” and theses or abstracts may not be counted towards the publication requirement. Students may not apply to defend their Doctoral Dissertation and the Director of the Program may not sign the application to graduate unless the Requirement for Publication is met, meaning that a 1st author primary literature manuscript is published, in press, or unconditionally accepted. It is the Faculty Research Advisor’s responsibility to assure that this policy is followed. (Excerpts from the Graduate Handbook)

For the purpose of helping doctoral students become more competitive in the academic job market, the Department of Biochemistry started to implement this publication requirement. A program coordinator, Mr. Simpson (pseudonym), described
the rationale behind the implementation of this departmental publication requirement as follows:

This requirement was adopted sometime between 2001-2003 to ensure that students are competitive in applying for post-graduation jobs in academia and beyond. The publication requirement also provides in-depth training in scientific writing and is a summation of some of the important research students accomplish during their time in [biochemistry program]. Our publication requirement also adheres to a trend among strong graduate programs in our discipline that also have similar publication requirements. (Email communication: May 4, 2011).

According to Dr. Fund, who was the former graduate studies chair as well as Ken’s primary advisor, the publication rate of the doctoral students in the program had dramatically increased since the start of the publication requirement. He explained that before this publication requirement was adopted, only 50% of doctoral students in the program graduated with at least one publication. Mr. Simpson asserted that the implementation of this requirement had been very successful since “All graduating students now have at least one publication” (Email communication: May 5, 2011).

Moreover, Ken’s co-advisor, Dr. Writer said, “The definition of Ph.D degree is the production of original work. If they [students] don’t publish, they shouldn’t get a Ph.D degree” (Interview: May 4, 2011). The implementation of this publication requirement was also enhanced by the fact that students’ publication records would build the credit of their advisors’ research groups. Therefore, for Ken, the sociopolitical aspect of publishing in an Anglophone journal was that it was not only a requirement for doctoral graduation,
but also was an individual contribution to improving the reputation of his research group and gaining further research grants. Ken stated, “[Publication] will increase the reputation of my research team and my advisors. It’ll also help us get more funding. For my advisor, getting more funding is very important because without funding we can’t do research.” (Interview 1: March 31, 2011).

Despite its positive influences, the departmental publication requirement seemed to pose additional layers of difficulty to NNES doctoral students, like Ken. Ken perceived this requirement as a necessary catalyst to advance his professional career and become a knowledge contributor to the scientific field. However, due to his limited English writing skills, it was great pressure for him to undertake the high-stakes task of English-medium academic publishing that determined his graduation. He felt that he was disadvantaged in comparison to his NES peers when fulfilling this publication requirement. His explanations for the perceived disadvantage included (1) difficulty with clarity for language and (2) longer time spent to write for publication. In particular, he mentioned that in a highly competitive science field, completing his RA writing within a limited timescale was particularly challenging. He said:

I think I am disadvantaged in time spent on writing as I sometimes need to check words in a dictionary or think the way how to write. When I write the paper, there are a lot of grammatical errors. I need time to get these errors corrected. (Email communication: September 15, 2011)
He was worried that this publication requirement would be a big hurdle for his graduation, considering that it took three years for him to pass the SPEAK test. He used the expression, “publish or no degree” (Interview 3; April 12, 2011), to describe his sense of pressure to meet this publication requirement. What made him more concerned was that there was a lack of departmental writing-based support available (e.g., offering discipline-focused writing courses) to help him learn disciplinary writing conventions and improve his English writing skills. Thus, he was expected to learn to write on his own. Dr. Fund confirmed Ken’s concern. He admitted that there was relatively little practice on writing in the sciences because of the quantitative nature of the discipline. He also explained that although graduate seminar courses in his program introduced graduate students to the genre of research writing, training in academic publishing mainly came from informal support, such as help from faculty advisors or peers. To meet the publication requirement, therefore, Ken relied heavily on his co-advisor, Dr. Writer, who adopted authoritative and directive supervisory practice. Unfortunately, this resulted in Ken’s lack of autonomy in writing and low motivation to improve his English writing skills.
6.5.2. The Micro Sociopolitical Force: Coauthoring with the Co-advisor

Co-authoring with the co-advisor was a micro sociopolitical force in which Ken was writing for publication in power-infused settings. This section illustrates three sociopolitical dimensions of Ken’s coauthoring experiences with his co-advisor: (1) work division in collaboration. (2) Dr. Writer’s comprehensive error correction and text appropriation, and (3) denied direct access to the journal gatekeepers.

6.5.2.1. Work Division in Collaboration

The NES expert, Dr. Writer, provided an “apprenticeship” for the NNES novice, Ken. Unlike many students in his graduate program who called their advisor “boss,” Ken used the term “advisor” for Dr. Writer. This indicates his close and friendly interaction with Dr. Writer, despite the hierarchical structure of their advisor-advisee relationship. Ken mentioned that the close interaction with Dr. Writer in carrying out the research, analyzing the research results, and writing the RA was a big benefit for his academic training.

Dr. Writer’s supervisory practice seemed directive and somewhat authoritative. During the interview, he explained a sociopolitical context in which he had to adopt this directive advising approach. According to him, he had two conflicting demands as a faculty advisor and professional scientist. He had to not only provide an apprenticeship
for Ken, but also get the paper published in a timely manner, which would contribute to improving the reputation of the research group and gaining further research grants. In fact, when Dr. Writer and Ken were coauthoring the paper, Ken’s research group was competing with other rival research groups in terms of developing the synthesis of the molecule, photo-leucine. The conflict between the two different demands suggests that although Dr. Writer was concerned about Ken’s learning, he was still reluctant to share the authority and responsibility of the work with Ken. He intervened in Ken’s writing, not only to help him, but also to ensure the successful completion and quality of the paper. Considering that disciplinary knowledge and writing skills can be best acquired through active engagement in the practices of the target discourse community (Blakeslee, 1997), Dr. Writer’s taking full control of the work seemed to constrain Ken’s development of authorial control and autonomy.

6.5.2.2. Dr. Writer’s Comprehensive Error Correction and Text Appropriation

Dr. Writer’s supervisory approach toward NNES doctoral students, including Ken, was characterized by his great involvement in the writing process. Though he acknowledged that some NES doctoral students had difficulty with scientific writing, such as writing succinctly and using formal academic register, he believed that NNES doctoral students had more problems, including inaccuracy in English. He was quite
empathetic toward NNES doctoral students’ language barriers and therefore used more lenient standards toward their writing and did not complain about slow improvement in their English writing ability. While he used similar advising approaches to NES doctoral students, he described his approach to guiding NNES doctoral students in scientific publication as follows:

What I do is to have a student write the paper all by himself. It doesn’t matter how good or how awful it is. He has to try. Sometimes 10 times I revise it. Before a student gets this stage, he should read a lot. So I give them literature to read. Generally if student’ English is not so good, let me show you. This paper is written by a Brazilian. This is a good paper, but there were errors and mistakes in English. So I corrected them all. Beginning students have a paper like this, then full of corrections, tell the students to rewrite it. That’s how they learn. (Interview: May 4, 2011)

As he was actively involved in Ken’s writing, Dr. Writer frequently provided feedback. It is worth noting that his feedback approach for Ken appeared to be influenced by the “model minority” image of Asian students. He offered comprehensive feedback in which he corrected all errors in Ken’s writing. This seemed to be in line with the idea that noticing and understanding linguistic features are essential for language acquisition (Schmidt, 1994; Ellis, 2005). Based on his successful mentoring experiences with his former NNES doctoral students (particularly, Asian students), he believed that Ken, who

---

3 Model minority refers to a minority group from certain countries, which is often perceived to achieve a higher degree of success than other racial minority groups. In the U.S. this term is typically associated with Asian Americans. However, the image of Asian Americans as a model minority has led researchers to address the discrepancy between this stereotypical perception and the reality of the academic achievements of Asian American students (Wong, Lai, Nagasawa, & Lin, 1998).
came from Japan, was “smart” enough to notice and learn language features through his corrections and revisions, although it might take some time. Figure 6.5 presents an example of Dr. Writer’s comprehensive feedback on Ken’s draft.

The reaction mixture was heated to 80 °C until the reaction mixture became light yellow (around 1.5 hours). To pull out the reaction mixture from a water bath before the color of the reaction mixture changes to dark brown is important to achieve a good yield (2). When the color of the reaction mixture became dark brown, di-bromination products increased, while mono-bromination products decreased. The color of the reaction mixture changed from red orange to light orange, yellow orange, yellow, to light yellow. After that the color of the reaction mixture became darker yellow. The reaction mixture was pulled out from the water bath.

The reaction mixture was transferred to 100 mL flask with CCl₄, Br₂, SOCl₂, and CCl₃ were evaporated by rotary evaporation. Yellow white solid and orange liquid. The mixture was filtered on a Büchner filter and then a folded filter paper. The mixture was washed with CCl₄. The filtrate was evaporated. 5.40 g crude mixture.

Figure 6.5. Dr. Writer’s Revisions of Ken’s Rough Draft

The example above indicates Dr. Writer’s “special treatment” of correcting all language errors in Ken’s draft. Apart from the surface-level corrections, he occasionally reorganized Ken’s sentences and paragraphs as well as added or altered technical details and interpretative statements. However, unlike Dr. Writer’s intention, there seemed to be little connection between this feedback practice and Ken’s learning, since multiple drafts passed between Ken and Dr. Writer without meeting to discuss why certain changes or
revisions were made. Dr. Writer’s comprehensive feedback targeted a broad range of linguistic forms, which increased the cognitive load for Ken and made him feel overwhelmed. In fact, there is a concern that in the long run, this type of editing approach may not have a positive impact on L2 students’ improvement in writing (Casanave, 2004). As a result, Ken did not understand some of the corrections or misunderstood them, which resulted in the repetition of the same errors, even after being corrected many times, which contradicted the model minority image of Asian students.

In addition to the comprehensive feedback approach, Dr. Writer provided implicit and indirect guidance, with the belief that Ken would learn how to meet Center-based readers’ expectations through his text appropriation. For example, during the interview Dr. Writer mentioned that he noticed that Ken tended to default to “knowledge telling” (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987) that focused on simply describing existing knowledge without adjusting that knowledge to the needs of readers. He commented on the Introduction section written by Ken: “[Ken] just presented a summary of literature review. What he missed was to convince readers of the contribution of the work” (Interview: May 4, 2011). He pointed out that this was a typical problem that many graduate students had. Like a supervisor of a NNES graduate student in Blakeslee’s (1997) study, however, he seemed to be unwilling to explicitly address these issues with Ken. His implicit guidance was evident in Ken’s comments, “[Dr. Writer] said my Introduction was very long. So he
rewrote the entire section. But I’m not sure exactly what the problem was. He just rewrote it and didn’t give me comments” (Interview 6: August 31, 2011). This shows that Ken still struggled to grapple with the needs and expectations of Center-based readers. Instead of offering explicit guidance, Dr. Writer appropriated Ken’s text as an attempt to draw Ken’s attention from “knowledge telling” to “knowledge transforming” (i.e., convincing readers of the contribution of the work) (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). Dr. Writer was proud to say that the completed manuscript was of high quality through his textual intervention. In fact, the manuscript was accepted with minor revision after one round of review. However, Dr. Writer’s implicit guidance through text appropriation was not sufficient enough to engage Ken in learning.

It is interesting that Dr. Writer and Ken did not seem to have overt power struggles while coauthoring together. However, this does not mean that Ken did not have frustration about or conflicts with his marginal position and Dr. Writer’s supervisory approach. Although he was frustrated about Dr. Writer’s corrections and revisions without any explanation added, he kept silent as a way to show respect to Dr. Writer. His silence came from multidimensional issues, such as his cultural values, previous educational experiences in Japan, and the expectation of being a model minority student. Being accustomed to the practice of his former Japanese advisor who gave him directive guidance and specific directions of how and what to do, Ken viewed Dr. Writer as being
in a higher position as a teacher, researcher, and writer and therefore, he should not be questioned. Therefore, he slavishly responded to Dr. Writer’s corrections and comments, relinquishing his authority over his text. In addition, although he wanted to have more explicit and overt guidance, he seemed unable to ask for it. He mentioned on several occasions that his reluctance to ask for help was related to his desire to meet Dr. Writer’s “model minority” expectation as well as his cultural value of saving face. He did not want to show that he had difficulty with understanding some of the changes and revisions by Dr. Writer, since he feared that he might be viewed as a less capable writer.

In sum, Ken’s NNES status influenced how Dr. Writer provided his feedback on Ken’s writing (i.e., the comprehensive feedback approach that focused on form). Although he reported some frustration about how Dr. Writer offered feedback, Ken was very much dependent on Dr. Writer as “a mediator of the academic text culture” (Dysthe, 2002) as he wrote his main drafts. Dr. Writer’s powerful position combined with Ken’s passive and compliant attitude contributed to Ken’s marginalized position in the coauthoring process and hindered his development of autonomy and ownership of the work.
6.5.2.1. Denied Direct Access to the Journal Gatekeepers

When the manuscript was completed, Dr. Writer wrote a submission cover letter without Ken’s input. After one round of review, the paper was accepted with minor revision. Dr. Writer shared reviewers’ written reports with Ken and told him to revise the paper based on those reports. Ken was very excited to see actual feedback from the reviewers for the first time. The reviewers’ comments were all related to the scientific content of the paper, which was not surprising to Ken. Due to Dr. Writer’s heavy involvement in the writing process, he did not receive any comments on the English of the paper from the journal editors and reviewers. Below are the editorial suggestions by the journal editors based on reviewers’ comments.

This carefully described preparation of “photo-leucine” would appear to be usefully published after minor changes.

1. On p. 9, it might be useful to add a note emphasizing the thermal stability of the diazirine function to the conditions employed (55 °C for 5 days).
2. Given the very low overall yield of the procedure (2%), it is necessary to add a brief discussion of the comparative yield of the procedures described in references 2 and 5. Does the current procedure improve on the previous reports? If not, why is it to be preferred?
3. Can the authors suggest any areas where their preparation can be improved to boost the yield?

(Excerpt from the comments from the journal editors)
He found the editors’ suggestions useful to improve the paper. Since it was minor revision, he did not experience difficulty with accommodating the editors’ suggestions. The revision of the paper based on the editors’ suggestions was a valuable learning experience to him. It gave him a sense of ownership and made him feel part of the target discourse community.

Although the review reports enabled Ken to indirectly interact with the journal gatekeepers, Dr. Writer’s excessive control denied him direct access to the journal gatekeepers. The initial revision of the paper was done by Ken. When the revised paper was submitted to him, Dr. Writer revised and proofread it and wrote the resubmission cover letter by himself. Ken was curious to know how Dr. Writer wrote responses to the review reports. When he heard that Dr. Writer already submitted it along with the revised paper to the journal, he felt neglected as a coauthor. However, he soon accepted the marginal role imposed on him. He said with a passive voice:

My co-advisor paid the publication fee. I don’t know how much it cost. … Before it was to be published, [the editors] asked us to revise the paper. … My co-advisor and I both worked on revision and he sent it to the editors. I wanted to know how he wrote the response letter, but he wrote it by himself and sent it to the editors. And I just couldn’t ask him if he could show it to me. I just followed my co-advisor’s directions. (Interview 3: April 12, 2011)

The paper was finally accepted for publication, with his name being listed as the first author. However, it was a disempowering experience for him when it came to the
interaction with the journal gatekeepers. Dr. Writer’s political privilege to control interaction with the journal gatekeepers, which was compounded by Ken’s compliant attitude, deprived Ken of an opportunity to learn how to directly communicate and negotiate with the expert members of the disciplinary academic community to contribute to knowledge building. Denied access to the journal gatekeepers led to Ken’s peripheral, but not legitimate participation.

6.6. Chapter Summary

Ken was a struggling L2 writer from Japan. His limited English language ability delayed his doctoral studies at a U.S. university. His first attempt to publish in an international journal was motivated by the departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation. Although he perceived this requirement as a positive influence on his professional career, he felt pressure to fulfill this requirement due to his limited L2 writing ability. He also felt disadvantaged in comparison to his NES peers, since he had to meet the requirement without departmental formal writing-based support.

He encountered a range of linguistic difficulties when preparing a paper for publication. The main strategies that he utilized included (1) reading past issues of the target journal to get cognitive mentorship, (2) getting assistance from a number of network and literacy brokers, (3) mixing L1 Japanese and L2 English, and (4) using the
codified language. Similar to Sungju’s case, however, some of the socipolitically-driven strategies he adopted (i.e., using the codified language) seemed too goal-oriented and therefore was detrimental to his development of L2 AAL.

One of his coping strategies to overcome his difficulties was to coauthor with his co-advisor, Dr. Writer. His writing-for-publication process was affected by the power-infused relationship with Dr. Writer. Due to the conflicting dual role of an advisor and professional scientist, Dr. Writer was reluctant to relinquish the authority and ownership of the work. He eventually took the control of the writing process and determined the extent to which Ken could contribute to the construction of the paper. His powerful position undermined Ken’s role as a coauthor and hindered his development of L2 AAL.

What was interesting about Ken’s case is that power struggles on the part of Ken appeared to be hidden because he used a strategy of “accommodation” (Leki, 1995, p. 250) to respond to the marginal position given by his advisor. He normally had a passive and compliant attitude toward Dr. Writer’s supervisory approach. Although he was frustrated about Dr. Writer’s corrections and revisions without any explanation added, he kept silent as a way to show respect to Dr. Writer. His adoption of silence was encouraged by his cultural values and previous educational experiences in Japan. To sum up, despite his accomplishment as a L2 published author, his sociopolitical realities of
coauthoring with the co-advisor impeded his development of autonomy and ownership, which hindered his LPP in the target discourse community.
CHAPTER 7: MEI’S CASE

Academic Publishing in the “Laissez-Faire” System

7.1. Portrait of Mei

Mei was a female doctoral candidate in biochemistry. She and Ken were in the same doctoral program, but worked in different laboratory groups. She was in her late 30’s and originally came from Taiwan. She had stayed in the U.S. for about 10 years at the time of the study. Upon completing her master’s degree in chemistry in Taiwan, she moved to the U.S. After she obtained her second master’s degree in biochemistry at a university in California, she moved to her current university to pursue a doctoral degree in biochemistry. At the time of the study, she had already completed her coursework and passed a qualifying exam. Her primary research interest was proteins purification. Her professional goal was to become a professional researcher in Taiwan. Thus, she was planning to return to Taiwan after completing her doctoral degree.

She was a down-to-earth, energetic, and outspoken person. She also had a great sense of humor and was easy to work with. I first met her at a conference called “Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs Symposium,” which was held at the research site university. Her poster presentation came to my attention. She was a confident and enthusiastic presenter explaining her research and publication, which made me eager to
have her join my study. After the Symposium, I sent her a letter of invitation. She responded to my invitation positively. However, it was not easy to recruit her in the beginning. Since her time in and outside the laboratory seemed to be controlled by her advisor, she needed to get permission from her advisor first in order to participate in my study. It took me about a week to follow up with her. After she got permission from her advisor, she finally agreed to join my study with a certain condition. That is, she could participate in interviews, but refused to share the main drafts of her published paper and advisor comments on her drafts for fear of offending her advisor.

She was the only female participant in my study. Thus, our conversation was occasionally on some gender-related issues that we faced in U.S. academia. She was particularly unhappy about the fact that she was often expected to be obedient and play a submissive role because of her ethnicity and gender. For example, she was one of the few female doctoral students in the laboratory. She explained that she was viewed as an “Asian female” by her NES advisor and some male labmates, even though she perceived herself as someone far different from a stereotypical Asian woman who was obedient and compliant. She mentioned that she was expected to perform certain gender roles associated with stereotypes of Asian women, such as ordering pizza for her advisor and labmates. She complained, “Basically lab work wouldn’t be interfered by gender issues. But it’s about professors’ attitude. That part, for example, my advisor thinks that I need to
order pizza because I’m a female. It’s big humiliating because males can order pizza, too” (Interview 1: May 6, 2011). Nevertheless, she seemed confident about herself and the progress she had made during her doctoral years, even though she sometimes talked about her frustration of being a NNES student in a U.S. university.

Although she was in the scientific field, she had high interest in learning different languages. She spoke Mandarin Chinese as her mother tongue. Since she came from a multilingual family, she had learned multiple languages. Her family members (her parents, siblings, and relatives) spoke different dialects of Chinese. Thus, the linguistic medium of communication in her family was Mandarin Chinese. Besides her native language (Mandarin Chinese), she spoke English, German, French, and Hakka (an indigenous language in China). Although she was a fluent speaker in her L1, she described herself as a poor writer in L1. In contrast, she self-rated her English writing skills as “very good” (Interview 1: May 6, 2011). She attributed her poor Mandarin Chinese writing skills and good English writing skills to the high school and college education that she received in Taiwan. For her high schooling, she attended a boarding school that offered a special curriculum in Math and Science. English was her dominant academic language at this school. She also attended a technical college that adopted the German educational system. In this technical college, English-medium disciplinary texts were used as textbooks in many classes. She explained that she was a quite rebellious
person at that time. Thus, she skipped many courses and did independent studies with some faculty. She primarily exposed herself to written texts in English while doing independent studies. For this reason, Mei said, “I cannot write in Chinese for science. Writing in my native language would be even more challenging” (Interview 1: May 6, 2011).

With regard to her academic publishing experiences in English, she had published a first authored RA in an English-medium refereed journal indexed by SCI. With this first publication, she was able to fulfill the departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation. At the time of the study she was also writing an invited book chapter, which would be published in English. However, she did not have academic publishing experience in Chinese. Given her ultimate goal of becoming a professional researcher in Taiwan, she felt a need to publish in domestic Chinese journals to contribute to the local academic communities in Taiwan. Nonetheless, she was not quite worried that she did not have publishing experience in Chinese. During her doctoral pursuit, her immediate attention had been paid to English-medium publications in Anglophone Center journals, since she knew that they would be highly regarded in the competitive academic job market in Taiwan and give her an advantage in her job seeking.
7.2. Background Information of Mei’s paper, Mei et al. (2010)

Mei et al. (2020) was Mei’s first English-medium paper published in an international peer review journal indexed by SCI. The purpose of Mei’s study was to report the successful purification and characterization of recombinant human mortalin. As Mei argued, the significance of her research was to contribute to the growing body of biochemical research on human mortalin.

When she began to draft the paper, she was in her third year of the doctoral program in biochemistry. Mei worked in a research group under the leadership of Dr. Power (pseudonym). Dr. Power originally came from Scotland, UK and was a very successful chemist. Since Mei’s graduate program (the biochemistry program) had an interdisciplinary nature, Dr. Power had students from diverse subdisciplines, including biochemistry, organic chemistry, and chemistry. For this reason, he ran a large laboratory in which a variety of research projects in diverse subdisciplines were being conducted. In the laboratory the range and focus of graduate students’ laboratory research was often constrained by ongoing research projects directed by Dr. Power. In the second year of her doctoral study, Mei joined Dr. Power’s laboratory and was assigned to conduct experiments on molecular cloning. When she worked on the experiments, she encountered an interesting phenomenon. Although this phenomenon was beyond the
scope of Dr. Power’s research project on molecular cloning, it made her develop and conduct her own experiments that led to *Mei et al. (2010)*.

Figure 7.1 presents the text history of Mei’s first English-medium publication. This text history provides an overview of the drafts produced and the different people involved in the key stages of Mei’s learning trajectory. Four key stages were identified in the text history:

Stage 1: pre-submission - drafted an English-medium manuscript

Stage 2: post-submission (after one round of review - “rejection”) - rejected

Stage 3: pre-submission – revised the manuscript according to the theme of the journal

Stage 4: post-submission (after one round of review – “accepted with minor revision”) – revised and resubmitted the manuscript.
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Figure 7.1. The Text History of Mei’s First English-medium Publication
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As shown in Figure 7.1, in Stage 1, after she drafted the paper by herself, Mei had her NES labmate, Peter, edit and proofread it. Then, Dr. Power briefly reviewed the paper before it was submitted to the target journal, JBP. In Stage 2, after the paper was reviewed by two reviewers, it was rejected. In Stage 3, Mei chose a different journal and revised the paper according to the theme of the new target journal, JPEP. After the paper was proofread by a NES labmate, Mei sent it to Dr. Power for his approval. Then, Dr. Power briefly reviewed the paper and submitted it to the journal. In stage 4, after the paper was reviewed by two reviewers, the editor suggested “accept with minor revision.” After the minor revision, the paper was finally published in JPEP (February, 2010). In the published version of Mei et al. (2010), Mei was listed as the first author, while Dr. Power was listed as the last and corresponding author, indicating his status as the leader of the research group.

7.3. Difficulties Encountered When Preparing a Paper for Publication

This section illustrates a range of difficulties that Mei encountered when preparing a paper for publication. When her experiment was completed, Mei initiated a conversation with Dr. Power regarding publishing her work in an English-medium international journal. Dr. Power chose a target journal and told her to write an initial draft by herself. Although she had experience with laboratory progress report writing, she had
had little exposure to RA writing. Therefore, when writing the first draft, she faced the
task of writing a scientific RA for the first time.

When asked about her difficulties in writing a RA in English, her first response was
related to the time-consuming nature of writing in English. She said, “Non-native
speakers like me have to learn to use English before the delivery of their ideas. More or
less, this is time-consuming” (Email communication: October 29, 2011). With regard to
linguistic difficulty at the sentence level, she had less difficulty than the other participants
due to her relatively good English proficiency. Although she occasionally made errors in
articles, prepositions, and word order, they usually did not obscure meaning. Similar to
Ken’s case, in addition, she felt relatively confident about the use of field-related
vocabulary, since a large amount of her scientific knowledge had been acquired in the
U.S. However, her lack of non-field-related vocabulary was clearly a concern to her. Her
limited intuitive knowledge about contextual meanings of non-technical words (e.g.,
hedge words –presumably, supposedly, arguably) was problematic because, like Sungju’s
case, it resulted in the lack of ability to accurately describe study findings and strengthen
the meaning of her ideas.

A bigger concern to her was that, due to her lack of familiarity with the genre of
research writing, she felt challenged by the task of organizing different sections of the
paper in a coherent way. Thus, she checked the formatting requirements of the target
journal and used the following format: Introduction – Material/Methods –
Results/Discussion – Conclusion. She reported that writing the Introduction and
Results/Discussion sections was difficult. When it came to writing the Introduction
section, she had difficulty with what Swales calls “establishing a territory” (Swales, 1990), although she seemed to understand the rhetorical organization of this section. She
learned from published RAs and writing manuals that she needed to make “centrality
claims”⁴ (Swales, 1990) and provide the reader with sufficient background information.
Making centrality claims is important in asserting “the importance of the topic being
discussed” and “active research activity in the area concerned” (Samraj, 2002, p. 4). In
other words, she had a problem with establishing the importance of the general topic in
which her research was situated by summarizing relevant literature in a succinct and brief
manner. She believed that this problem primarily stemmed from her lack of writing
experience with RAs. In addition to the Introduction section, she found writing the
Results/Discussion section very challenging, since this section required her to “establish
and occupy a niche” (Swales, 1990) by showing her grasp of the field in relation to her
study and convincing readers that her research was “sound, significant, and worthy of
publication” (Flowerdew, 1999b, p. 259). The following interview excerpt illustrates her
difficulty with establishing and occupying this research niche:

⁴ Swales (1990) defines “centrality claims” as “appeals to the discourse community whereby members are asked to accept that the research about to be reported is part of a lively, significant or well-established research areas” (p. 144).
Discussion was the most difficult for me since I did not know if I knew the field extensively enough. … I was not sure how to interpret my findings compared to previous studies because I’m a novice and I don’t know enough. I still needed to read a lot so that I could compare my findings with previous studies. … Very unfortunately, no one in my lab was working on the same project and my advisor is not the one I will consult with. (Interview 3: May 27, 2011).

This suggests that since she felt insecure about her knowledge of the chosen topic, she had particular difficulty with positioning her claims in relation to those of the wider literature by using evidence to support her claims and critically evaluating theories, models, and methodologies in the published literature. This resulted in her tendency to overstate the significance of her findings in relation to the existing literature, as her NNES lab mentor pointed out.

In Mei’s view, the biggest difficulty that she faced had to do with Dr. Power’s not providing adequate mentoring for her (that is, his “laissez-faire” supervisory approach), rather than her English writing ability. She described her relationship with Dr. Power as similar to that of “employer and employee.” This explained why she always called him “boss” or “PI (primary investigator),” rather than “advisor.” Thus, her relationship with him was highly hierarchical and business-like. Dr. Power was always very busy with his research projects. Thus, he was often unavailable, unsupportive, and indifferent to students’ needs. Mei stated, “I think my boss doesn’t know what I am working on. … He is a good scientist, but mentoring is not his strength” (Interview 2: May 13, 2011). She
particularly showed frustration about his indifferent attitude toward her needs and ambiguous communication style. She mentioned:

I don’t think [Dr. Power] particularly wants to mentor anyone. The [ambiguous] communication style problem is not “my” opinions only; many think the same, including my lab mates and his former postdocs. … For example, my boss gave me a sample all out of blue and asked me to test the sample. However, he just didn’t tell me the reason why I had to test the sample. Of course, I asked him the reason, but he replied my question with two sentences without detailed explanation or background information. It just quite hard for me to be convinced. … That kind of communication is quite normal between us; he never replied my questions in a “yes or no” way. (Email communication: October 29, 2011)

Nonetheless, Mei considered that Dr. Power’s laissez-faire supervisory approach had both an advantage and disadvantage. The advantage that she described was that she gradually developed her independence and autonomy in terms of research and writing through “learning from doing” by herself. She stated, “[Dr. Power] doesn’t do micromanagement for me. Some PIs [principle investigators] have that kind of protocol for you. Then you look like a robot” (Interview 3: May 27, 2011). However, she felt that the disadvantage outweighed the advantage because she did not receive adequate help and mentoring from Dr. Power and, therefore, the completion of her paper was delayed. Dr. Power never set any guidelines or timeline for her writing, nor did he check the progress of her research and writing. In short, Dr. Power’s laissez-faire approach resulted in Mei taking control over her research and writing processes, but struggling to figure out how to effectively construct a RA paper in English.
7.4. Strategies used to Secure English-medium Academic Publication

This section illuminates the strategies that Mei used to overcome her difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication. It focuses on two major strategies: (1) linguistic and textual strategies and (2) building an academic research network.

7.4.1. Linguistic and Textual Strategies Used When Writing the Early Drafts

As she was writing the initial drafts, her writing approach was characterized by the use of three strategies: (1) thinking and writing directly in English, (2) drawing on existing skills of writing technical details, and (3) seeking rhetorical and linguistic assistance from published RAs. With regard to the first strategy, she reported that she did think in English and wrote directly in English. Unlike Sungju and Jun, who were published L1 authors, the use of L1 was not beneficial to her because she had never been trained to write RA papers in her L1. In fact, since much of her scientific knowledge and writing skills had been learned in the U.S., she was able to think and write in English more easily than in her L1. The second strategy was that she drew on her existing skills of writing technical details (i.e., writing laboratory progress reports). This strategy was shared by Ken, who was also in biochemistry. Like Ken, Mei was required to write informal laboratory reports as a daily scientific practice while she was conducting her laboratory experiments. The laboratory report is the most common genre of writing in the
sciences (Jackson et al., 2006). The laboratory report parallels with the RA in general organization and discourse patterns, although there are also important differences between these two genres, such as target audiences (Jackson et al., 2006). During her research process, Mei wrote informal, but detailed laboratory progress reports to describe experiment procedures and research findings. When she was writing early drafts, she drew on her familiar writing approach to start to construct the Material/Methods and Results/Discussion sections. This strategy also helped herself with accuracy in writing, which is a main principle of scientific writing. She said, “I looked back at my reports, and it helped me start to write” (Interview 3: May 27, 2011). Figure 7.2 illustrates Mei’s informal laboratory progress report.
This finding is contrary to Blakslee’s (1997) observation that relying on existing skills of writing technical details served as an obstacle for a NNES graduate student to acquire a new genre of scientific RA. However, in Mei’s case the use of her existing writing skills was combined with the third strategy described below (i.e., the extensive reading of published RAs), which functioned as a useful means for her to attain skills and knowledge about a genre of RA writing.

Perhaps the most important strategy that she used was resorting to published RAs in order to get linguistic and rhetorical assistance. Unlike the NNES science doctoral
students in Huang’s study (2010) in Taiwan, she believed that that English plays an important role in scientific publication:

I think English is important in publishing in my field. For publication writing, you have to communicate with your advisor, editors, reviewers. We don’t just publish. We go to conferences and make networking. Otherwise, we can’t survive. (Interview 4: June 3, 2011)

She stressed that even though science students did not seem to use language very often, language competence was no less critical to her than to students in other disciplines. To be proficient in scientific English in order to read extensive amounts of literature and present research findings effectively in written language, she had made it a habit to read published RAs in her field, which helped her build a sense of the appropriate patterns of logic and rhetoric for RA writing. She searched for texts with which she could model the style, content, or layout of her own writing. She selected some published RAs for ideas about how to construct an effective framework for her study. She also borrowed sentence patterns and expressions from them and fit her words into textual formulas, which was similar to what Kamler and Thomson (2006) refer to as “syntactic borrowing.” She emphasized the usefulness of the extensive reading of published RAs during the interview:

Before I go to sleep or when I am waiting in the hallway before my advisor’s appointment, constantly I keep reading journal articles, but not necessarily very hard core articles. Some science-related articles like news, some reports, very short, but I constantly keep reading. For example, Science, Nature. Every week whenever I have time. Because for my understanding if I want to improve my
writing, reading is the only way I can. I keep reading, so I can improve my writing. That’s the way I can learn. (Interview 1: May 6, 2011)

As shown in the interview excerpt above, she strongly believed that the best way to gain scientific literacy was by reading published articles of the field. It was apparent that published RAs served as a linguistic and rhetorical mentor in her initiation into the new task of writing a RA paper in English. It is worth noting that although the strategy of constant and cumulative reading may seem obvious to people engaged in academic publishing, it was particularly a crucial strategy for Mei, considering the lack of academic mentoring from her advisor. Reading published RAs helped her gain a deeper understanding of how scientific information is conveyed and to develop her knowledge of how to construct an English-medium RA.

7.4.2. Building an Academic Research Network

According to Mei, collaboration and joint work are highly valued in the scientific field. To write and publish her first English-medium paper, Mei made good use of social resources available to her. She built a network in which she received various types of assistance from four academic professionals (disciplinary experts): Dr. Power, Dr. Helper (pseudonym, a NNES lab mentor), Jinsoo (pseudonym, a NNES labmate), and Peter (pseudonym, a NES labmate). Figure 7.3 illustrates Mei’s network for her first English-medium paper.
Each of these academic professionals made a distinctive contribution to Mei’s success in publishing in an English-medium journal. For her laboratory research, Dr. Power provided financial support. However, she received little scientific guidance from him. It was mainly due to his “laissez-faire” approach (Dong, 1996a, p. 14) in which he
was often unavailable and indifferent to her needs. Instead, she got scientific advice and help from her NNES lab senior, Dr. Dubois, and her NNES labmate, Jinsoo. These two people functioned as network brokers and helped her conduct her experiments. Particularly, Dr. Dubois was Mei’s lab mentor and provided feedback on scientific content of her early drafts. In fact, they were listed as the second and third authors in Mei’s published paper.

In addition to the two network brokers above, Mei believed that it was necessary to get NES help for her writing. She sought textual suggestions from her NES labmate, Peter, who served as a literacy broker. She had convenient access to him, since they had daily interaction in the laboratory. Peter edited and proofread Mei’s drafts and explained his corrections or revisions through face-to-face interaction. When asked about her opinions regarding using editing services or working with local editors, she was negative. She pointed out two problems with using editing services: (1) high cost and (2) cognitive constraint on the part of writing editors (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003). She stated, “Actually, nowadays, we can find online writing service (even the publisher recommends international scholars to do so). Of course, quite expensive. Also, we have to write to the point that the writing service agency people can understand” (Email communication: October 29, 2011). When the manuscript was finished, Dr. Power provided feedback on the English of the manuscript (e.g., corrections of linguistic errors).
To sum up, Mei’s text production took place in the context of “academic social network” (Ferenz, 2005, p. 345), which supports the sociocultural theory of viewing writing as a social act, emphasizing the importance of the social context in which writing is done for a particular audience (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Mei relied on her social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990), which was convenient access to her senior lab member and peers, in order to get assistance and resources necessary to secure English-medium academic publication. Her network was comprised of academic professionals only, who helped her gain disciplinary academic knowledge and literacy.

7.5. Macro and Micro Sociopolitical Forces Influencing the Writing-for-Publication Process

In order to gain a more holistic understanding of the sociopolitical realities of Mei’s academic publishing experiences, this section addresses macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing her writing-for-publication process. The macro and micro sociopolitical forces include (1) the institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation and (2) coauthoring with the advisor, respectively.
7.5.1. The Macro Sociopolitical Force: The Institutional Publication Requirement for Doctoral Graduation

Like Ken, Mei’s primary motivation to publish her work was to fulfill the departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation. According to the Graduate Handbook, “Students of [Biochemistry program] must have 1 or more publications before applying for graduation with a PhD. At least one of the student’s publications must list the student as first author.” Mei first heard of this publication requirement at the departmental orientation for incoming doctoral students when she started her doctoral studies. She perceived this publication requirement as a positive influence on her professional career. To her, it was not merely the publication requirement, but her initiation into the scientific discourse community. However, she felt hampered by the lack of formal departmental support (e.g., offering field-specific writing courses) to fulfill this publication requirement. What made her even more frustrated was a lack of mentoring and support from her advisor, Dr. Power. Her work and time in and outside the laboratory were controlled by him. She felt that she had a “dysfunction” advisor-advisee relationship with him, since he was normally unsupportive or indifferent to her needs. She described her frustration about the lack of advisor support available to meet the publication requirement:

When I look think back, the publication process was painful. But I still think the publication requirement is positive. Doctoral students should publish before
graduation. That’s important for our program since we don’t have to take any exams like students in other programs. It’s hard to judge if doctoral students are qualified without a publication record. It’s a reasonable requirement. I’m not against that. But I became nervous because I didn’t realize I didn’t have much support to meet that requirement. My boss didn’t give me much help. He is not interested in mentoring students. (Interview 3: May 27, 2011)

She particularly felt constrained by Dr. Power’s approach of not allowing her to take research writing courses (e.g., grant writing courses), which she believed would help her improve her writing skills and meet the departmental publication requirement. According to Mei, Dr. Power believed that sound research was the most important resource for scientific publication. Therefore, he wanted her to spend most of her time on her laboratory work and believed that it was not worth taking writing courses, since writing courses would take her away from her laboratory work. Mei’s frustration was evident in the following interview excerpt:

One day students need to be independent. If they don’t get enough training, how can they be independent? My boss doesn’t want us to spend a lot of time developing writing. Of course, he wants us to write since he will revise it. He thinks taking wiring courses is a waste of time and money. But would it be better to take a course than struggling? He wants us to spend more time in the lab. … Other departments such as Pharmacy department offer writing courses and you can take them. But I have to get permission from our boss. Normally some advisors support internationals students to take writing courses. But my boss would say “you don’t need it.” (Interview 4: June 3, 2011)
As shown above, the advisor’s “anti-writing” attitude served as a sociopolitical constraint that limited Mei’s interaction with members of the institutional academic community (e.g., writing instructors and writing tutors).

7.5.2. The Micro Sociopolitical Force: Coauthoring with the Advisor

Co-authoring with the advisor was a micro sociopolitical force in which Mei was writing for publication in power-infused settings. This section illustrates two sociopolitical dimensions of Mei’s coauthoring experiences with her advisor: (1) publication efforts and rejection for publication and (2) gained agency and denied access to the journal gatekeepers.

7.5.2.1. Publication Efforts and Rejection for Publication

When the manuscript was completed, Mei sent it to Dr. Power for his feedback. However, he only provided feedback on language, not on scientific content. She felt very uncomfortable about his not providing mentoring and not making significant contribution as a coauthor. She stated:

In the end, I just take it for granted that I will not get any assistance from him. No, he did have any comments about the revision or anything. Basically, writing is “my thing” --- which I am not very comfortable since he is supposed to provide his opinions as a mentor. (Email Communication: October 29, 2011)
Nevertheless, Mei put Dr. Power’s name on the completed paper as the last author (that is, the corresponding author), although she never discussed the authorship of the paper with him. Surprisingly, when Dr. Power accepted the corresponding authorship, the control of the work shifted from Mei to him, despite his limited involvement in the writing process. Mei explained two reasons why she included Dr. Power as the corresponding author. First, it is the norm in the scientific field to list the name of the leader of the research group as the corresponding author of any article to be published (Dong, 1996a). Even though her laboratory research was separate from Dr. Power’s research projects, in her view Dr. Power still deserved the corresponding authorship, since he provided financial support for her research. Second, her cultural view of faculty advisors compelled her to show respect to Dr. Power by including him as the corresponding author. In Chinese culture the teacher is viewed as the absolute authority (Dong, 1996a). According to Mei, Dr. Power seemed to understand this Chinese cultural view of advisors very well. Although Mei let Dr. Power take the corresponding authorship, she initially assumed full ownership of her paper as the first author. However, it turned out that Mei and Dr. Power had different assumptions and expectations about authorship and authorial roles. Unfortunately, these differing assumptions and expectations were never discussed openly, which eventually resulted in unhealthy tensions between them.
Though Mei was the first author, Dr. Power seemed to put her in a marginal position. He wrote a submission cover letter without her input and submitted it along with the completed manuscript to the target journal, JBP. After one round of review, the journal editor notified him that the paper was rejected. However, he did not let Mei know about the rejection until she asked him about the status of the review. Therefore, Mei found out about the results of the review 6 months after the paper was rejected. This made her feel that she was simply treated as a student assistant, rather than a contributing coauthor. This also left her with a feeling of the loss of the ownership. She stated:

[Dr. Power] didn’t let me know the rejection. He didn’t even ask me “Do you want to submit it to a different journal?” My paper was just sitting on his desk for 6 months. I don’t understand why he was holding my paper for 6 months for nothing. It was my first-author paper. I was not familiar with the publishing process. He didn’t say anything about the review process. I didn’t know what was going on. (Interview 1: May 6, 2011) (Italics in Mei’s emphasis)

As shown in the comments above, she was frustrated and resentful about Dr. Power’s positioning her as a peripheral member and his unwillingness to keep her in the loop. Dr. Power also did not share reviewers’ written reports with Mei. She stated, “[the editors] emailed my boss, not me. I never understand that part. My boss kind of kept me out of loop. I never saw the reviewers’ comments” (Interview 1: May 6, 2011). Being excluded at the post-submission stage intensified her feelings of isolation and marginalization as a coauthor.
Mei asked Dr. Power about the main reason for the rejection and considered other possible reasons so that she could avoid rejections in her future publication attempts. According to Dr. Power, the major reason for the rejection explained by the journal editors was that journal reviewers thought that her paper did not fit the theme of the journal. Mei felt that it was not a fair reason for the rejection because she observed that the journal had published a number of papers on the purification of proteins, which was the topic of her paper. She suspected that the reviewers might come from competing research groups and said, “I got a feeling that there was a bias there. … I felt I was accused of something I hadn’t done” (Interview 4: June 3, 2011). In fact, Mei’s suspicion was confirmed by Dr. Fund, who had extensive experiences as a scholarly writer and journal reviewer. He stated that the blind review in the scientific field could cause prejudice on the part of the reviewers. He explained:

It is a blind review. I don’t know who they are, but they know who I am. So names of the authors of the papers reveal. It can lead to prejudice on the part of the reviewers. [A reviewer] is in competition or doesn’t like [the author]. Then it can be negative. But it’ll be very hard to hide that. … [Reviewers] don’t like what the authors are saying even though data is good. They’ll find a reason to reject the paper. In a way science is no different from any other human activity. There’s prejudice, mean behavior, ego, and jealousy. (Interview: May 27, 2011)

Mei felt that Dr. Power’s unequal and unjust distribution of power and authority was partly responsible for this potential reviewer bias. She learned that Dr. Power wrote the submission cover letter to the editor without her input and did not mention a very
important thing in the cover letter: that is, to indicate the names of people from competing research groups and ask the journal editors not to select them as reviewers. According to Mei, this practice is customary in the field of biochemistry, which Dr. Power might have mistakenly forgotten.

It was clear that the mismatches of the expectations of supervision between Mei and Dr. Power made her even more frustrated about the writing-for-publication process. Based on her previous educational experiences in Taiwan, Mei had “the parental image of teachers” (Kim, 2007, 183). Being accustomed to the practice of her former Chinese advisor, who was “a strict and demanding individual who was also capable of being generous, attentive, supportive, protecting, and caring” (Kim, 2007, p.183), Mei expected Dr. Power to closely supervise her and help her develop an understanding of the review process and maintain the ownership of the work. She stated with frustration:

My former boss in Taiwan was very caring. He shared cover letters and reviewer comments with his students in the lab. He said our paper was reviewed by whom and he let us knew everything. But I can’t expect that from my current boss. But if he could do that, that would be helpful. If he could share information about how to write a cover letter to the editors… But that doesn’t happen. Frustrating! (Interview 5: September 6, 2011)

In spite of her frustration shown in the quotes above, she found it very difficult to openly communicate with Dr. Power and negotiate conflicts with his supervisory approach. According to Mei, Dr. Power seemed to perceive her as an “Asian” and expect
obedience and compliance from her. She stated, “If there is any cultural issue between us, one thing I noticed is that he expects me to be very Asian (in terms of being obedient) and you might notice that I am actually a bit Western” (Email communication: September 29, 2011). The feeling of obligation to meet such expectations resulted in a lack of openness on her side.

In short, Dr. Power’s unequal and unjust distribution of power and authority and his indifferent supervisory style restricted Mei’s development of the ownership of the work and diminish her publication efforts.

7.5.2.2. Gained Agency and Denied Access to the Journal Gatekeepers

As discussed in the previous section, Mei was very frustrated about Dr. Power’s taking control over the publishing process. This problem was a profound one for her, since she had a strong desire to contribute to the publishing process as a competent author. In this section I will discuss how she attempted to negotiate the power relations with Dr. Power and how such attempts eventually led to the activation and exercise of her agency.

After a lot of frustration about the rejection of the paper, Mei tried to reposition herself as a more active agent toward the power relations with Dr. Power. She learned her lesson from her previous unpleasant experience working with Dr. Power and tried to mitigate the power relations with him. She resisted the assigned marginal role and
became more proactive. For instance, she approached Dr. Power and expressed her interest in sending the paper to a different journal. With Dr. Power’s approval, she carefully chose a different journal, JPEP, and revised her manuscript based on the theme of the journal. After the manuscript was sent to the target journal, she made deliberate efforts to keep the ownership of the paper as a coauthor. For example, she regularly asked Dr. Power if he heard from the journal regarding the status of review. She said:

Soon or later, I need to publish myself. I need training and I’m supposed to learn all this. I tried to push [Dr. Power] to give me reviewer comments. I had to keep asking him of what was going on, what was the status of the paper because that was my paper! (Interview 5: September 6, 2011)

When seeking information or assistance from Dr. Power, she was very cautious not to give him an impression that she was pushing him. When asking or requesting help from Dr. Power, she also increased her politeness by using more direct polite devices (e.g., Dear Sir, please, thank you, I would appreciate), which would lead to a likelihood of acceptance of request. These direct politeness devices helped her manage social distance and power in her relationship with Dr. Power. Mei’s efforts were successful to a certain extent. After one round of review, the paper was accepted with minor revision. Dr. Power finally shared with her reviewers’ written reports and told her to revise the paper based on those reports. She was very excited to see actual feedback from the reviewers for the first time. According to Mei, the reviewers’ comments were all related to the
scientific content of the paper (e.g., adding more data, modifying data graphs). Since she was not permitted to share the reviewer comments with me, she summarized them for me as follows:

1. To add more data and enhance the resolution of the figure
2. To add a couple of references (Those references are the editor’s published articles.)

In contrast to previous studies that provide evidence on NNES authors’ unfair treatment by journal reviewers (e.g., Aydinli & Mathews, 2000; Belcher, 2007; Cho, 2004; Li, 2006a), Mei felt that the reviewers were not biased against her manuscript due to her NNES status, since they primarily focused on content, rather than language. In fact, she was proud to say that there were no reviewer comments on the English of the paper. Based on her experience with the journal editors and reviewers, Mei expressed her belief about journal gatekeepers’ fair treatment for submissions by NNES authors in the scientific field:

I believe that editors and reviewers are generally fair in this aspect [language aspect] as long as the key issue (the science, in my field) is explained well and the contribution to the question is significant. The reputation of one journal or one publisher is not built in one day. I cannot comment on personal behaviors if there are a few people in the field who are biased. However, we, as writers, have the right to choose a decent publisher as well. (Email communication: September 17, 2011)
In responding to the reviewer comments, her response was positive. She agreed with all the reviewer comments and found them very helpful to improve her paper. The revision of the paper based on the reviewer comments gave her a sense of ownership and connection to the target discourse community. She stated:

It was good that I could actually see the reviewer comments because it was my work. … The reviewers said I needed to add more details. Scientifically more details. I agreed with that since it was important to my study. After the review, I put a new figure because the reviewers said the original figure was not clear. They also said concentration was not strong enough. So it was all scientific comments and they were helpful to improve my paper. … The reviewers read my paper and I revised the paper based on their comments. It made me feel like I’m part of the community. (Interview 3: May, 27, 2011)

Notwithstanding Mei’s small triumph described above, Dr. Power’s excessive control still denied her access to the journal gatekeepers. The revision of the paper was done by Mei with some discussion with Dr. Power. When the revised paper was turned in to him, Dr. Power only checked it for English. Then, he wrote the resubmission cover letter by himself and submitted it along with the revised paper to the journal. Mei was very anxious to know about how he wrote responses to the reviewer comments, but he did not show it to her. She remained silent for fear of damaging her working relationship with him, although this made her feel excluded and neglected as a coauthor. The paper was finally accepted for publication. However, it did not give her a great sense of accomplishment. She felt that she was deprived of an opportunity to learn how to
communicate with the journal editors and reviewers, which restricted her learning of the professional practices of the target discourse community. She mentioned:

I want to know how to contact and communicate with editors and reviewers. My boss wrote responses to the reviewer comments and he wrote the cover letter to the editor. He paid for the paper. But I don’t know how to do it. I don’t have a big picture of the publishing process. I only know parts. I don’t know whether I can publish on my own in the future. (Interview 4: June 3, 2011)

The interview excerpt above suggests that despite Mei’s resistance to the subordinating role imposed on her, Dr. Power’s political privilege to control interaction with the journal gatekeepers deprived Mei of an opportunity to socialize into the community of practice. It left her with only a partial understanding of the practices involved in the academic publishing process and disempowered her to gain confidence as a L2 writer.

7.6. Chapter Summary

Mei was a doctoral candidate in biochemistry from Taiwan. She was the only female participant in my study. Although she was not a proficient writer in her L1 Mandarin Chinese due to her special educational training in Taiwan, she was an enthusiastic and competent L2 writer. In the fifth year of her doctoral studies, she published her first paper in an English-medium international peer-review journal. The institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation was the primary
sociopolitical context for Mei’s first attempt to publish in an English-medium international journal. Notwithstanding her relative good writing ability in English, she still felt constrained by the time-consuming nature of RA writing in English. She also encountered some language problems, such as the lack of vocabulary skills (particularly, non-field-related). In addition, writing the Discussion section was quite challenging to her due to her difficulty with situating her findings in relation to the larger literature. However, she was able to draw on various strategies to compensate for these difficulties. In particular, given the lack of departmental formal writing-related support and her advisor’s “anti-writing” approach, she used the strategies of building her own network of peers and senior lab members as well as reading published RAs to get assistance necessary to produce an English-medium RA.

The centrality of Mei’s English-medium academic publishing experiences was her negotiation with the power relations with her faculty advisor, Dr. Power. In order to move from peripheral participation to fuller participation in the disciplinary academic community, it was her goal to gain agency and exercise it as a competent and responsible author in the context of the novice-expert interaction. However, her negotiation with the power relations with Dr. Power and attempts to gain agency involved both success and failure on a number of levels. Due to Dr. Power’s “laissez faire” supervisory approach, she was left alone to write main drafts in the writing process. What made her more
frustrated was that she was not treated as a contributing coauthor. When Dr. Power, who minimally participated in the writing process, accepted the corresponding authorship, the control of the work shifted from Mei to him. Mei suffered from Dr. Power’s exertion of power and dismissive attitude, since they diminished her publication efforts. With a strong desire to learn the practices of academic publishing, however, she turned her frustration into her attempts to reposition herself as an active agent in the power structure of the advisor-advisee relationship. Her attempts were partially successful. Although her marginal status did not change over time, she achieved a certain degree of success in building the ownership of her work by making textual revisions as a form of responding to the reviewer comments in the revise-and-resubmit process. Nevertheless, Dr. Power still denied her access to the journal gatekeepers by excluding her from writing the resubmission cover letter to the editor or not sharing the review reports with her. Overall, Mei’s story shows that learning to write for publication in English as a form of disciplinary enculturation is not unidirectional process of knowledge transmission from the expert (i.e., faculty advisor) to the novice (i.e., NNES graduate student), but a complex, locally situated process that involves dynamic negotiation of expertise and power.
CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The dominance of English in global scholarship has resulted in increasing pressure for academics to publish in English-medium international journals. A failure to publish in English in the current climate results in researchers’ disconnecting themselves to the international academic communities and jeopardizing their chances of employment and promotion (Harwood & Hadley, 2004). Given the high stakes involved in publishing in English-medium international journals, there is an increasing demand for doctoral students to participate in English-medium academic publishing. Many universities worldwide now require their doctoral students to publish in English-medium international journals as a pre-requisite for graduation (Huang, 2010). According to Li (2006a), however, “little attention, if any, has been given to novices as contributors of new knowledge in disciplines” (p. 160). The lack of focus on NNES novice scholars’ contribution to global scholarship through English-medium scholarly publication, particularly in the U.S. contexts, deserves research attention. In an effort to expand the current understanding of NNES novice scholars’ contribution to knowledge construction in the international academic communities, the present study focused on NNES doctoral students in the U.S. As broadly situated in the context of sociocultural theory, the study attempted to yield a holistic understanding of NNES doctoral students’ first attempts to
publish in Anglophone Center journals. Drawing specifically on the three notions of discourse community (Swales, 1990), LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990), it explored the difficulties that NNES doctoral students faced in writing for publication in English, the strategies that they utilized to overcome their difficulties and achieved success in English-medium academic publishing, and the macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing NNES students’ writing-for-publication process and strategies.

More specifically, adopting the notion of discourse community (Swales, 1990), this study examined how NNES doctoral students’ membership in multiple discourse communities (i.e., academic communities in the U.S. and home countries) shaped their publication efforts and participation in English-medium academic publishing. In addition, it is often assumed that NNES doctoral students face a range of difficulties in writing for publication in English due to the possible lack of linguistic, cultural, social, and discursive knowledge of the discipline. Hence, taking the perspective of social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990) which emphasizes the social relationships and networks that help the individual access desirable resources, the present study explored how NNES doctoral students accessed and utilized “socioacademic relationships” (Leki, 2006) as social capital to overcome their difficulties and achieve success in English-medium academic publication. More importantly, the present study responded to Casanave’s (2003a) call
for more sociopolitically-oriented case studies. According to Casanave (2003a), written texts and writing processes are socially and politically situated. Nevertheless, most L2 writing scholarship has primarily focused on linguistic and textual aspects of L2 writing (Casanave, 2003a). In order to fill the gap in the literature, this study looked into macro and micro sociopolitical forces influencing NNES doctoral students’ writing-for-publication process. In particular, drawing on the critical perspective of LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991), this study focused on how NNES doctoral students responded to old timers’ (i.e., faculty advisors) exercising power and control over them and what coping strategies (i.e., accommodation and/or resistance) they utilized to gain agency and negotiate their ways to move toward fuller membership.

This chapter presents a cross-case analysis of themes that emerged from the findings as well as answers to the study’s research questions. The chapter is organized around the research questions by combining main themes and sections that address answers to the study’s research questions. The main themes include (1) the NNES doctoral students’ difficulties outweighed their successes; (2) academic research networks played a significant role in supporting NNES doctoral students’ success in English-medium academic publication; (3) power inequity in the co-authorship between the faculty advisors and the NNES doctoral students restricted the students’ development of autonomy and L2 AAL as well as their interaction with the disciplinary academic
community; and (4) the NNES doctoral students’ published articles were sociopolitical artifacts as a result of accommodation and resistance in the context of unequal power relations. After the discussion of the cross-case analysis of the themes and the answers to the study’s research questions, the chapter discusses the pedagogical implications, followed by a brief review of the study’s limitations and recommendations for future research. Finally, closing comments summarizing contribution of the study are addressed.

8.1. Background Information about the Participants

Before the cross-case analysis of the themes and the answers to the research questions are presented, it is necessary to remind readers of the key information about the four research participants from East Asian countries: Sungju, Jun, Ken, and Mei. Sungju and Jun were doctoral students in the social sciences, while Ken and Mei were doctoral candidates in the sciences. All the participants defined themselves as Periphery scholars, since they ultimately planned to return to their home country after graduation. They also identified themselves as quantitative researchers. However, they had different kinds of publishing experiences when they started to write for international publication. Sungju and Jun were L1 published authors. These two students in the social sciences had publishing experiences in their L1 before they started their doctoral program in the U.S. On the other hand, Ken and Mei, who were in the sciences, did not have publishing
experiences in their L1. Table 8.1 provides the important background information about the four research participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sungju</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Ken</th>
<th>Mei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay in the U.S.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic field</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in the doctoral program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rated English proficiency</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing experiences in L1</td>
<td>7 first-author RAs and 8 co-authored RAs</td>
<td>1 second-author RA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing experiences in L2</td>
<td>1 first-author RA accepted by an Anglophone peer-review journal</td>
<td>2 first-author RAs accepted by Anglophone peer-review journals</td>
<td>1 first-author RA</td>
<td>1 first-author RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career goal</td>
<td>Professorship in Korea</td>
<td>professorship in China</td>
<td>Professorship in Japan</td>
<td>Professional researcher in Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1. Key Background Information about Research Participants

8.2. Cross-case Analysis of the Themes and Answers to the Research Questions

8.2.1. Theme 1 and Research question 1
Research Question 1: What difficulties and successes do NNES doctoral students in a U.S. university experience in their attempts to publish in English-medium international journals?

It has been widely accepted that NNES scholars are important contributors to global scholarship, in that they enrich and extend the knowledge base of the mainstream Center academic communities (Flowerdew, 2001; Liu, 2004). Journal editors interviewed in Flowerdew’s (2001) study reported that NNES scholars’ major contributions included (1) testing out dominant theories in different geographic contexts and bringing in alternative viewpoints and (2) drawing attention to unexploited resources in various geographic contexts. Nonetheless, NNES scholars’ underrepresentation in global scholarship has been a concern. In order to enhance NNES scholars’ scholarly visibility in global scholarship, it is important to identify the difficulties and challenges that limit or impede NNES scholars’ participation in the international academic communities. A number of researchers have investigated the difficulties that NNES scholars face when publishing in Anglophone Center journals. It has been widely documented that the difficulties are both discursive (language-related) and non-discursive (e.g., published materials, research funds, and academic networks) (Canagarigh, 1996, 2001; Ferguson, 2007). Although the NES/NNES dichotomy has been questioned (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999, 2001;
Swales, 2004), it has been suggested that the difficulties in meeting the standards of international journals tend to put NNES scholars at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their NES counterparts when they compete for publication space in the international academic communities.

To date, relatively little attention has been paid to scholarly writing by NNES novice academics in the Center. In order to fill this gap, the present study examined the publication efforts of NNES doctoral students who were geographically situated in an Anglophone context. In addition, most research on L2 writing-for-publication purposes has primarily focused on the difficulties that NNES scholars encounter in English-medium academic publishing. In order to gain a more balanced view of the English-medium publishing experiences of NNES scholars, the present study investigated the difficulties as well as successes that NNES doctoral students in the U.S. experienced in publishing their work in English-medium international journals. An important finding from this study is that the students’ difficulties outweighed their successes. In the next section, details of the students’ difficulties and successes are discussed.

**Theme 1: The NNES doctoral students’ difficulties outweighed their successes.**

The students’ academic publishing experiences consisted of both successes and difficulties. All focal students were successfully able to publish their work in English-
medium international journals. They achieved successes as they worked to write for publication in English. The students’ successes were identified in three broad areas: (1) meeting the publication demands, (2) developing and using various coping strategies, and (3) activating and exercising agency (in the cases of Jun and Mei). The focal students’ successes are summarized in Table 8.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Successes</th>
<th>Sungju (science edu)</th>
<th>Jun (geography)</th>
<th>Ken (biochemistry)</th>
<th>Mei (biochemistry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the publication demands</td>
<td>-meeting the institutional and non-institutional publication demands for doctoral graduation and future employment</td>
<td>-meeting the non-institutional publication demand for future employment</td>
<td>-fulfilling the institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation</td>
<td>-fulfilling the institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and using various coping strategies</td>
<td>-using L1 -learning from published RAs -using codified language -building academic research networks</td>
<td>-using L1 -learning from published RAs -syntactic borrowing from published texts -using online dictionaries -building academic research networks -meeting the advisor during the office hours weekly</td>
<td>-drawing on existing skills of writing technical details -learning from published RAs -using codified language -using online dictionaries -building academic research networks</td>
<td>-drawing on existing skills of writing technical details -learning from published RAs -building academic research networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activating and exercising agency</td>
<td>-no reported agency</td>
<td>-activating and exercising agency</td>
<td>-no reported agency</td>
<td>-activating and exercising agency to some extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2. The Focal students’ Successes in English-medium Academic Publishing
Perhaps the biggest success that the students achieved was that they all successfully published their research work in English-medium international journals. In addition, they developed and used various coping strategies (e.g., using L1, relying on published RAs, and using online dictionaries) to overcome some of the discursive difficulties (i.e., linguistic, rhetorical, and genre-related difficulties) (see more details in section 8.2.2). Moreover, some of the students were able to take the ownership of their learning by negotiating unequal power relations with the faculty advisors and activating and exercising their agency (see more details in section 8.2.3).

Despite the successes mentioned above, the students encountered difficulties in two areas, (1) discursive difficulties (i.e., linguistic and rhetorical difficulties) and (2) sociopolitical difficulties (i.e., the advisor’s anti-writing approach and denied access to journal gatekeepers). Some of the discursive difficulties were overcome by developing and using coping strategies. For example, the students relied on published RAs to not only develop the knowledge of the disciplinary field, but also acquire the writing style and the conventions of the genre of research writing in their disciplinary academic community. However, the sociopolitical difficulties presented greater challenges to the students. Most of these sociopolitical difficulties seemed to be insurmountable and outweighed the students’ successes. The students’ difficulties in English-medium academic publishing are summarized in Table 8.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Difficulties</th>
<th>Sungju (Science Edu)</th>
<th>Jun (Geography)</th>
<th>Ken (Biochemistry)</th>
<th>Mei (Biochemistry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discursive difficulties</td>
<td>Linguistic difficulties -both Field-related and non-field-related vocabulary (e.g., adverbs) -grammar (e.g., verb tenses, modals)</td>
<td>-both Field-related and non-field-related vocabulary</td>
<td>-non-field-related vocabulary</td>
<td>-non-field-related vocabulary (e.g., hedge words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty with meeting the rhetorical conventions of English writing -rhetorical differences between L1 and L2 (indirect writing (Korean) and inductive approach versus direct writing (English) and deductive approach)</td>
<td>-rhetorical differences between L1 and L2 (reader-responsible language (Chinese) versus writer-responsible language (English))</td>
<td>-none</td>
<td>-none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty with meeting the requirements of the genre of research writing -non-applicable (since Sungju only wrote the Methods and Results sections)</td>
<td>-Introduction and Discussion sections</td>
<td>-Introduction section</td>
<td>-Introduction and Discussion sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-political difficulties -the lack of control over the coauthoring process -denied access to journal gatekeepers</td>
<td>-no departmental writing support -the advisor’s confidentiality rules -the advisor’s lack of availability</td>
<td>-no departmental writing support -the advisor’s text appropriation -denied access to journal gatekeepers</td>
<td>-no departmental writing support -the advisor’s laissez faire approach -the advisor’s anti-writing approach -denied access to journal gatekeepers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3. The Focal Students’ Difficulties in English-medium Academic Publishing
It was found that one primary source of the difficulties faced by the focal students was language problems. Like more experienced NNES scholars in previous studies (Jernudd & Baldauf, 1987; Flowerdew, 1999a, b, 2007; Medgyes & Kapaln, 1999; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), the students in the present study reported that they had a range of difficulties when writing a RA in English. The most serious sentence-level linguistic problems identified by the students were related to lexis. The students’ vocabulary ability was generally limited. Also, they sometimes used vocabulary that was informal or inappropriate. Their trouble with lexical choices often resulted in writing that lacked precision or confused Center-based readers. In addition to these commonalities, the differences in the students’ difficulties with vocabulary are worth noting. Some differences emerged depending on the amount of educational experiences in the U.S. In the cases of Sungju and Jun, who had studied in the U.S. for less than 2 years, they had difficulty in both field-related and non-field-related vocabulary. This may be because most of their educational experiences had been gained in their L1. On the contrary, for Ken and Mei, who had studied in the U.S. for a longer period of time (7 to 10 years), they found relatively little difficulty with field-related vocabulary because a large amount of their field-related knowledge were obtained while they were at U.S. universities. Yet, their semi-technical or general vocabulary outside their knowledge of technical terms (non-field-related vocabulary) was somewhat limited.
The second most frequently mentioned sentence-level difficulties were grammar-related problems (e.g., subject-verb agreement, verb tenses, and singular versus plural). Even though some of the focal students (Jun and Mei) possessed an advanced-level of English proficiency, grammar-related problems were shared by all focal students. Sungju and Ken, who had relatively low English language proficiency suffered from these grammar-related problems more than Jun and Mei. These problems were pointed out by not only the students, but also their faculty advisors. For example, Ken’s co-advisor drew attention to the fact that such frequent errors as the misuse of definite articles or incorrect subject/verb agreement were confusing and irritating. Overall, these findings are consistent with previous studies providing evidence that linguistic difficulties at the sentence level are common problems to NNES academics when they write for publication in English. For instance, Flowerdew (1999b) reported that Hong Kong academics felt challenged by a “less rich vocabulary” and “less facility in expression” (p. 235). Benfield and Howard (2000) also highlight NNES scholars’ problems with word choice and sentence syntax.

Another major source of the difficulties that the students encountered was the problems derived from rhetorical differences between writing in English and their L1s, which made the students’ writing divergent from the accepted norms of the Center academic communities (Flowerdew, 2001; Li, 2002; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Melander,
Swales, & Fredrickson, 1997; Swales, 1990). It has been suggested that the stylistic divergence between the rhetorical conventions and cultural values of NNES scholars and those of the Anglophone academic communities often results in NNES scholars’ texts that are rhetorically flawed or weak. For instance, Cho (2004) and ElMalik and Nesi (2008) observed that Korean and Sudanese scholarly writers failed to make explicit and bold claims about the significance of their research work. NNES scholars in these studies consciously or unconsciously failed to make the kind of rhetorical claims or appeals expected by the Center academic communities due to their reliance on L1 rhetorical conventions or cultural values. In their study of Hungarian scholars’ publishing experiences, Curry and Lillis (2004) suggest that the adoption of L1 discursive conventions and regional styles often make NNES scholars’ academic texts problematic for Center-based audiences. Divergences from the expected norms of the mainstream Center academic communities are likely to prevent these scholars from effectively persuading Center-based audiences for the significance and credibility of their research work. In this study, this type of difficulties was particularly pertinent to Sungju and Jun, who were published L1 writers. Both Sungju and Jun experienced negative transfer of L1 when writing a RA in English. For instance, Sungju’s unfamiliarity with English RA writing, which is characterized as “direct and deductive,” became a problem since Korean academic writing is generally organized indirectly and inductively. Jun also encountered
difficulties due to the differences between reader-responsible language (i.e., Chinese) and writer-responsible language (i.e., English). The rhetorical differences between English and their L1s revealed by Sungju and Jun confirm Flowerdew’s (1999b) study that found that L1 use (i.e., negative L1 transfer) was one of the disadvantages of NNES authors. Flowerdew’s study suggests that differences between rhetorical conventions in L1 and L2 English may compound linguistic problems encountered by NNES novice scholars. However, it is interesting to note that Ken and Mei in this study reported that the rhetorical dimension did not seem to be a major barrier to them, partly because the genre of research writing in their discipline (in the natural sciences) is more prototypical (e.g., following the IMRD rhetorical pattern) than research writing in other disciplines, such as humanities or social sciences (Swales, 1990).

With regard to NNES academics’ difficulty with meeting the requirements of the genre of research writing, previous studies have indicated that the Introduction, Literature Review, and Discussion sections are often challenging to write (Flowerdew, 1999a; Misak et al., 2005; Shaw, 1991; Uzuner, 2008). For instance, NNES doctoral students in Shaw’s (1991) study reported that the Introduction and the Discussion sections of the RA were the most difficult parts to write, whereas students expressed mixed reactions to the Literature Review depending on the type of approaches they used in writing this part. It was found that students who saw the Literature Review part as merely reporting other
people’s findings found the part easy to write, while those taking a more selective and critical approach felt more difficulty in writing this part. It has been suggested that difficulties with these three sections stem from NNES authors’ failure to position their own arguments in relation to the literature and/or evidence and their failure to create what Swales (1990) refers to as “a research space.” A similar finding emerged from this study. The Introduction and Discussion sections were found to be the most challenging to the focal students. Their problems with these sections were also spotted by their advisors and journal reviewers. For example, Jun had a problem with constructing the Introduction section. He explained that a major difference between Chinese and English RA writing was that in Chinese RA writing, little attempt is made to discuss relevant previous studies in the Introduction section (Mu & Carrington, 2007), while in English RA writing, authors are expected to provide thorough literature review incorporated into the Introduction section to “establish a territory and niche” (Swale, 1990). This divergence between L1 and L2 rhetorical conventions made it difficult for him to summarize relevant previous studies and incorporate them into the Introduction section to provide the reader with sufficient information on the territory in which his research was situated and to elaborate on the gap in research (Samraj, 2002). This difficulty was attributed to the fact that Chinese, a reader-responsible language relies heavily on readers’ background knowledge. In addition, the journal reviewers commented that in the Results/Discussion
section Jun failed to situate his study in relation to a larger context of the field and to build the contribution of his study. Ken also found the Introduction section difficulty to write. His difficulty primarily came from his lack of experiences with RA writing in both his L1 Japanese and L2 English. Moreover, Jun and Mei were challenged by writing the Results/Discussion section. They had difficulty with making arguments for the relevance and importance of their findings in relation to the existing literature, which is referred to as “establish and occupy a niche” (Swales, 1990). For Jun, his problem seemed to be derived from the difference between reader-responsible language (Chinese) and writer-responsible language (English). Due to his reliance on Chinese writing style that emphasizes readers’ background knowledge, he had problems with presenting the analysis and interpretation of the study results in a coherent way. In the case of Mei, in addition, the difficulty stemmed from the fact that as a novice, she was insecure about her knowledge about the research topic and tended to make claims for her own findings that seemed too strong, given the evidence presented. Overall, although such difficulties that Jun, Ken, and Mei experienced may be largely related to their limited understanding of the genre of research writing, the findings of the study corroborate previous studies (Flowerdew, 2001; Li, 2002; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Melander, Swales, & Fredrickson, 1997; Swales, 1990) that have suggested that the differences between the NNES scholars’
L1 discursive conventions and cultural values and those of the mainstream Center academic communities result in rhetorical flaw or weakness in texts by NNES scholars.

In addition to the discursive difficulties, the students encountered various sociopolitical difficulties derived from macro (the institutional and/or non-institutional publication pressure) and micro (the power relations with the faculty advisors) sociopolitical forces (see more details in section 8.2.3). As mentioned earlier, most of the sociopolitical difficulties seemed to be insurmountable and presented great challenges to the students. For example, the students’ negotiation of the imbalanced power relationships with the advisors appeared to be complex since it involved multidimensional issues of language, culture, and power. The students employed either a strategy of accommodation or resistance to deal with the unequal power relations with the faculty advisors in the sociopolitical context of fulfilling the institutional and/or non-institutional publication demands. However, the students still faced sociopolitical constraints beyond their control that impeded their development of autonomy and L2 AAL and restricted their interaction with the disciplinary academic community. Regardless of the focal students’ strategies to negotiate the asymmetrical power relations, power distance between them and their faculty advisors did not seem to be shortened, since the advisors held powerful political privilege to determine the students’ writing-for-publication process and graduation.
Summary of Theme 1 and Answers to Research Question 1

Much of the research on L2 writing-for-publication purposes has primarily focused on the difficulties that NNES scholars encounter in English-medium academic publishing. In order to move away from the deficit model of looking at the English-medium publishing experiences of NNES scholars, the present study investigated the difficulties as well as successes that NNES doctoral students in the U.S. experienced in publishing their work in English-medium international journals. The findings of this study revealed that the NNES doctoral students experienced both successes and difficulties as they worked to publish their research work in English-medium international journals. The students’ successes were identified in three broad areas: (1) meeting the publication demands, (2) developing and using various coping strategies, and (3) activating and exercising agency (in the cases of Jun and Mei). However, the students’ difficulties outweighed the students’ successes. The students experienced a range of discursive difficulties not only at the linguistic and rhetorical levels, but also in meeting the requirements of the genre of research writing. In addition to these discursive difficulties, the students faced some sociopolitical constraints beyond their control that to some extent restricted what they could accomplish. In particular, the unbalanced power relations with the faculty advisors in the co-authorship caused the students difficulties in taking the ownership of learning.
Given the range of discursive difficulties identified, this study adds to a growing number of studies (e.g., Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2001, 2007; Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Ferguson, 2007; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005; Lillis & Curry, 2006) that provide strong evidence for arguing that language problems impose an additional burden on NNES academics. Many journals suggest or require that NNES authors have a NES proofread their manuscript before submission (Li & Flowerdew, 2007). In fact, in my personal email communication with journal editors in applied linguistics (although it was not included in the data analysis), the common suggestion made by them was “ask a NES to read the manuscript,” even though they were clearly aware of language barriers faced by NNES authors. This indicates that despite their tolerance of NNES textual features, journal gatekeepers of Anglophone Center journals still seem to operate based on the native English standard (Li, 2006a). Coates, Sturgeon, Bohannan, and Pasini (2002) indicate that although many factors could lead to the acceptance or rejection of an article, on equal scientific merit, articles that contained English language errors are less likely to be accepted. This situation makes NNES academics, like the NNES doctoral students in the study, feel compelled to meet the native English standard. Given that language problems constitute an additional obstacle to competing for international publication space, Li and Flowerdew (2007) suggest that academic journals should provide more realistic and concrete support (e.g., providing
mentoring service or editorial help, instead of having them consult a NES) for NNES authors to overcome their language barriers in English and achieve success in English-medium academic publication. In addition, Belcher (2007) asserts that the role of journal gatekeepers is significant in supporting and empowering NNES scholars in English-medium academic publication. She recommends that journal editors carefully recruit reviewers who show willingness to “take the time to compose well-considered, constructively critical, collegial reviews, even of papers that appear unlikely ever to be accepted” (p. 19).

It is worth noting that the “privileged” NNES doctoral students (Salager-Meyer, 2008, p. 125) in this study who were studying in an Anglophone country did not face non-discursive difficulties, which are known to be common challenges to NNES academics in Periphery countries. Canagarajah (1996, 2001) explains that scholars in Sri Lanka were restricted by various materialistic limitations. Flowerdew (2001) also addresses that NNES scholars in Periphery countries may lack access to the latest literature and have inadequate research facilities, such as outdated equipment and technology. In fact, Sungju and Jun reported that when they conducted research in their native countries, South Korea and China, they encountered limited access to the latest published articles or suffered from a lack of research funding. However, while they were in the U.S., they had relatively easy and convenient access to published materials through
the school library when writing for publication. In addition, none of the students had problems with accessing research facilities. More importantly, the students had convenient access to not only NNES academics, but also NES academics, who provided a variety of resources and materials necessary for English-medium academic publishing. This suggests that scholars in Anglophone settings, whether they are NESs or NNESs, may be materially privileged when competing for international publication space.

8.2.2. Theme 2 and Research question 2

Research Question 2: What strategies do NNES doctoral students use to overcome their difficulties and secure English-medium academic publication?

Given NNES scholars’ underrepresentation in global scholarship, it is imperative to examine strategies employed by successful NNES authors of research articles, because it can facilitate NNES scholars’ publication productivity and scholarly visibility by raising NNES scholars’ awareness of effective strategies and demystifying the publication process. Although much attention has been given to the strategies used by experienced and novice NNES scholars in Periphery contexts (e.g., Cheung, 2010; Gosden, 1996; Okamura, 2006; St. John, 1998), relatively little investigation has been done to identify strategies adopted by NNES scholars, particularly NNES novice scholars in Anglophone
settings. Therefore, this study investigated the strategies that the NNES doctoral students in the U.S. utilize to cope with difficulties and achieve success in English-medium academic publishing. It was found that, while experiencing difficulties in English-medium academic publishing and taking a relatively peripheral role, the focal students still tried to participate meaningfully in the writing-for-publication process. They utilized a variety of strategies to overcome their challenges. While seeking others’ support, they made accommodations to their own needs. The study disclosed linguistic/textual strategies as well as social strategies that the focal students utilized to tackle their challenges.

A common linguistic/textual strategy employed by the focal students was to utilize “material resources” (Benson, 2001), such as written resources (e.g., published RAs and books, online dictionaries, grammar checkers, and writing manuals). The students felt that these written resources offered valuable linguistic and rhetorical assistance to overcome their language barriers. In particular, the students whose advisors’ mentorship was often not available (Jun and Mei) tended to rely more on written sources. Among many written resources, the students regarded published RAs as the most valuable, albeit how they used these published RAs differed. Another linguistic strategy frequently used by the students was the use of L1. Regardless of their English proficiency levels, the use
of L1 played a facilitative role for the focal students (except for Mei) in their L2 English writing.

In addition to these linguistic/textual strategies, the social strategy identified in this study was to build academic research networks. Much of the research on L2 writing-for-publication purposes has focused on individual cognitive and linguistic competence to explore the writer’s publishing experiences (Curry & Lillis, 2010). Problematizing this approach to writing, in which the emphasis is on individual cognitive and linguistic competence, the present study paid special attention to the NNES doctoral students’ strategy of using social resources and relationships (e.g., academic peers, faculty advisors, and language professionals), which is a form of “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990). According to Plickert, Rochelle, and Wellman (2007), social capital is “embedded in interpersonal relations that can provide custom-tailored helpful resources that are flexible, efficient and effective” (p. 406). It highlights the benefits gained by access to particular relationships, resources, skills, or understanding. In the next section, the students’ strategy of building and using academic research networks is discussed.

Theme 2: Academic research networks played a significant role in supporting NNES doctoral students’ success in English-medium academic publication.
The present study supports the argument for the need to “broaden this emphasis on individual cognitive, linguistic, and/or rhetorical foci to consider the wider range of activities and social connections entailed in writing” (Curry & Lillis, 2010, p. 284). It has been indicated that for securing English-medium publications, academics need not only linguistic competence (e.g., Flowerdew, 2001; Swales, 2004; Uzuner, 2008), but also “non-discursive” resources (e.g., material, financial, and social resources) (Canagarajah, 1996, 2001). In particular, social relationships (e.g., colleagues, supervisors, journal and book editors), which are considered as “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990), play a significant role in NNES academics’ success in English-medium academic publication (Curry & Lillis, 2010).

Bourdieu’s (1986, 1990) notion of social capital emphasizes the social relationships and networks that help an individual access a variety of resources (Stanton-Salazar, 1997, 2001). Social capital serves as a vehicle to enhance an individual’s access to human, information, and other forms of capital (Coleman, 1988; Lin, 2001; Stanton-Salazar & Dornbusch, 1995). A growing number of studies have demonstrated NNES experienced and novice scholars’ active use of social relationships for their academic achievement (e.g., Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005; Kerans, 2001; Lillis & Curry, 2006; McNab, 1988; Misak et al., 2005). These studies support the view that a published article is an artifact resulting from the participation of a range of people in text
production. In his report on a hypothetical case of a Dutch-authored research article, Burrough-Boenisch (2003) introduces the term “shapers” (e.g., colleagues, supervisors, language correctors) and discusses the roles played by a variety of shapers involved in text production by NNES authors. Similarly, Li and Flowerdew (2007) focused on the role of shapers in scholarly writing of one group of Chinese science doctoral students. The authors highlight the benefits and drawbacks of supervisors, peers, and language professionals as shapers of these students’ RAs. In line with these two studies, in their nine-year longitudinal study, Curry and Lillis (2010) adopted the concept of social capital in order to explore the academic publishing experiences of 50 psychology and education scholars in southern and central Europe. The authors focused on these experienced NNES scholars’ participation in local and transnational research networks to secure academic publication. In their examination they focused on “literacy brokers,” people who provide resources and materials necessary for successful English-medium academic publication (e.g., editors, translators, proofreaders). The study suggests that strong and durable local networks play a pivotal role in NNES Periphery scholars’ participation in transnational research networks, which facilitates their publications in both English and local languages. The referenced studies above have suggested that building academic and social support networks are vital for NNES authors to produce English-medium texts for international publication.
The findings of the present study correspond with what the aforementioned studies have suggested. To secure English-medium academic publication, perhaps the most important strategy employed by the focal students was to build academic research networks. These academic research networks are “network capital” (Plickert et al., 2007), which provides access to social capital. In this study the concept of “mediation” (Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010) was drawn to examine the nature and impact of literacy and network brokers on the focal students’ research and English-medium text production. Lillis and Curry (2006) used this concept to describe “the range of ways in which people are involved in helping others interact with written texts, whether formally or informally, paid or unpaid” (p. 13). In the present study, the focal students were active social agents and established their academic research networks to obtain assistance and resources necessary to publish their research work in Anglophone Center journals. As a form of social capital, they built important relationships with a number of “literacy brokers” who “mediated” their text production as well as “network brokers” who provided materials, research funds, and resources. The size of the focal students’ academic research networks varied (comprised of two to six brokers). Four types of brokers were identified: faculty advisors, academic peers, language professionals, and academic professionals outside the U.S. Table 8.4 summarizes the network and literacy brokers involved in the students’ academic research networks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Literacy brokers</th>
<th>Network brokers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sungju (science education)</td>
<td>✤ 2 NES coauthors (Dr. Goodman and Dr. Braine)</td>
<td>✤ 2 NNES scholars in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✤ 1 NNES colleague in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun (geography)</td>
<td>✤ 1 NNES coauthor (Dr. Chan)</td>
<td>✤ none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken (biochemistry)</td>
<td>✤ 1 NES coauthor (Dr. Writer)</td>
<td>✤ NES co-advisor (Dr. Writer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✤ NES advisor (Dr. Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✤ 1 NNES scholar in Germany (Dr. Schmitz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✤ 2 NNES labmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei (biochemistry)</td>
<td>✤ 1 NES coauthor (Dr. Power)</td>
<td>✤ NES advisor (Dr. Power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ 1 NES labmate</td>
<td>✤ 1 NNES lab senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✤ 1 NNES labmate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4. The Network and Literacy Brokers Involved in the Students’ Academic Research Networks

Similar to the Chinese doctoral students in Li and Flowerdew’s (2007) study, the students seemed to build their academic research networks based on “the principles of convenience (accessibility) and economy (incurring little or no expense)” (p. 113). These two principles explain the students’ seeking assistance primarily from advisors and peers around them. The Internet (e.g., emails) also enabled them to access and seek help from academic professionals outside of the U.S. with no or little expense.

Although the focal students had relatively easy access to both NESs and NNESs, it was found that NESs were preferred shapers for the manuscripts by the students. It may be because of the students’ belief that NES help was “essential” for producing English-medium texts at an appropriate level for international publication. In fact, the NESs who served as literacy brokers were attributed to promoting the students’ L2 AAL acquisition.
through modeling literacy practices, helping to develop discipline-specific rhetorical knowledge, and establishing the expectations of the disciplinary academic community.

Table 8.5 presents the advantages of each type of brokers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of brokers</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty advisors</td>
<td>❖ Providing mentoring to learn discipline-specific writing conventions and gain disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic peers</td>
<td>❖ Providing feedback on content and/or language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES peers</td>
<td>❖ Providing feedback on language through face-to-face interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNES peers</td>
<td>❖ Offering help with research and sharing tips for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language professionals</td>
<td>❖ Providing help with language problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES local editor</td>
<td>❖ Offering help with organization and language problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES ESL writing teachers</td>
<td>❖ Convenience access via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic professionals outside the U.S.</td>
<td>❖ Offering textual resources and sharing expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❖ Providing help with data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5. The Advantages of Each Type of Brokers

As shown in Table 8.5, each type of brokers contributed to the students’ research and text production. However, it is important to note that working with some of these brokers was not always advantageous (Li & Flowerdew, 2007), since “the mediation of academic texts is not a neutral enterprise but rather involves participants of unequal status and power” (Lillis & Curry, 2006, p. 13). The contribution of each type of brokers will be discussed in detail below.
Faculty Advisors

In their research networks, all focal students had their (co)advisors, who were the expert members of the target discourse community. The relationships with the advisors were an important source of social capital. They coauthored with their advisors although the amount of the individual advisors’ participation differed. The advisors played the roles of network and/or literacy brokers. Most of the students regarded the advisors’ participation as an important avenue for disciplinary knowledge building. In particular, they believed to some extent that feedback from the advisors could help them move from the periphery toward fuller and more central participation in the practices of the discourse community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This parallels Belcher’s (1994) contention that faculty advisors have the most potential for shaping L2 graduate students’ academic success and literacy development. Similar to supervisors who shaped their NNES doctoral students’ RAs in the study by Li and Flowerdew (2007), some of the advisors in the present study not only attended to matters of language and content, but also imparted their knowledge of the genre of the research writing. For example, in the cases of Sungju and Ken, who had particular difficulty with writing in English and had lacking experience with writing RAs in English, their advisors provided help in locating citations, organizing paragraphs, presenting ideas clearly, connecting and sequencing ideas, using appropriate means of expressions, and correcting grammar and mechanics. Thus, for Sungju and Ken,
writing up a RA was less difficult and less time-consuming than it was for Mei, who primarily had to rely on her peers’ expertise and linguistic assistance.

It should be noted that despite the advantages of working with the advisors, one disadvantage was visible regarding the revisions or corrections of student papers by the advisors. Certain aspects of the advisors’ supervisory approaches appeared to negatively influence the students’ learning of writing for publication. For example, Sungju’s advisor and Ken’s co-advisor believed that it was an advisor’s responsibility to revise or correct papers for students because of two reasons: (1) students’ publications were important contributions to the “research achievement” of their research groups; and (2) students’ publications would also make winning further grants easier in competitions with other research groups. This partly explains why the advisors took the control of the students’ writing work. Besides, they appropriated their advisees’ drafts with an intention of helping them notice L2 language features. Although the students generally appreciated the advisor’s careful and close revisions and corrections, they indicated that this hampered their development of autonomy and decreased motivation for improving writing skills in English. This sociopolitical aspect of coauthoring with the advisors will be discussed in more detail in section 8.2.3.
Academic Peers

Academic peers or senior-level students within the field (a type of academic professionals) served as network brokers or literacy brokers (i.e., peer readers and correctors). Working with academic peers represented important collaborative learning opportunities. Sungju and Mei particularly found working with peers from the same research group conducive to their learning since these peers shared disciplinary knowledge and writing conventions and were willing to provide comments or suggestions through face-to-face interaction. An interesting finding was that the students tended to have NNES peers as network brokers, while they preferred NES peers as literacy brokers. For example, Mei relied on her NNES lab senior to get assistance for research, whereas she asked her NES labmate for feedback on writing. From the perspective of LPP, feedback from peers or senior-level students enabled the students to expand the boundaries of their linguistic and rhetorical knowledge and gain additional information that potentially supported their research claims. Mei explicitly stated that the interaction with her NNES lab senior helped her gain valuable insights for her scientific research. In addition, comments and suggestions from her NES peer, whether written on drafts or expressed verbally, had notable effects on the content and style of her paper. Sungju also recognized the usefulness of peer feedback, particularly for improving the clarity of his ideas in the paper.
However, some of the focal students reported a disadvantage of NES peers as readers and correctors. Unlike the Chinese graduate students’ NNES peers in Li and Flowerdew’s (2007) study, the NES peers in this study did not have linguistic metalanguage to explain what made the focal students’ writing erroneous, as exemplified in Mei’s case. This sometimes made it difficult for the focal students to understand corrections or comments by their NES peers.

*Language Professionals*

Jun was the only one who sought assistance from language professionals (two NES ESL writing teachers and a NES local editor). Unlike the other participants, he considered the help of language professionals valuable. This belief came from his positive experiences with his former ESL writing teachers who provided useful feedback on the Introduction section of his paper. Working with a NES local editor was a primary source of help for him, since he was not allowed to interact with his fellow doctoral students due to his advisor’s confidentiality rules. The NES local editor, Kathy used the “track changes” facility in Word to make comments and suggest changes in the language. She mostly focused on lower-order problems, such as replacing wording, rectifying grammar, and reorganizing sentences.
However, Jun encountered several constraints as to working with her. The first constraint was the high cost for her editing services. Without any particular funding source, it was difficult for Jun to cover the high cost for getting editorial assistance. This explains why he chose the NES local editor, whose rate for editing services was relatively lower than other local editors. The second constraint was the lack of face-to-face intervention by Kathy. Although their relationship was similar to that of the employer and the employee, there seemed to be NES-NNES power relations between them. Kathy positioned herself as a language expert and considered Jun as a linguistic novice. While she determined how their communication was to be done, Jun was quite receptive to her decisions. Since she preferred to communicate via email, Jun never had face-to-face consultation with her. For this reason, Jun did not have an opportunity to explain his intentions in particular sentences or paragraphs. Jun’s experience shows that email communication made it difficult to have meaningful interaction with the NES local editor to improve his paper. Language correctors’ insufficient face-to-face intervention practice has been addressed by several studies. For example, a NES local editor in Flowerdew’s (2000) study and NS revisers in Ventola and Mauranen’s (1991) study did not have face-to-face consultation when they assisted their NNES authors. Li and Flowerdew’s (2007) reported that a language corrector had difficulty when correcting a paper by a NNES doctoral student with insufficient face-to-face contact with the author. The authors
concluded that language correctors’ editing work for NNES authors may be more effective when it is done face-to-face.

The third constraint was the cognitive constraint (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003). Similar to NES revisers who adopted a minimalist approach to editing manuscripts by Helsinki authors in Ventola and Mauranen’s (1991) study, the NES local editor in this study mostly used a pragmatic approach of focusing on lower-order problems. As an outsider of Jun’s discipline, she seemed to leave the responsibility of making changes to higher-order problems (e.g., text organization, appropriateness for the genre and writing style) to Jun. However, he did not realize this until he received reviewer comments on the writing style of his paper.

*Academic Professionals outside the U.S.*

While not all students had transnational scholars in their research networks, Sungju and Ken sought assistance from NNES academic professionals outside the U.S. These professionals generally served as network brokers for the students. For example, Sungju worked with two professors and a graduate student in Korea to collect and analyze his research data. Ken also gained assistance from a German scientist to complete his laboratory experiment. It is important to note that the role of the Internet (e.g., emails) was significant for the students to access academic professionals outside the U.S. and
gain material resources and expertise from them. The students’ transnational network relationships indicate “the mobilization of social capital” (Curry & Lillis, 2010). That is, the students built transnational relationships by traveling long distances via email.

**Summary of Theme 2 and Answers to Research Question 2**

Although much attention has been given to the strategies used by experienced and novice NNES scholars in Periphery contexts (e.g., Cheung, 2010; Gosden, 1996; Okamura, 2006; St. John, 1998), relatively little investigation has been done to identify strategies adopted by NNES scholars, particularly NNES novice scholars in Anglophone settings. Therefore, this study investigated the strategies that the NNES doctoral students in the U.S. utilize to cope with difficulties and achieve success in English-medium academic publishing. In particular, adopting the notion of social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990), the present study focused on the NNES doctoral students’ use of social resources and relationships (e.g., academic peers, faculty advisors, and language professionals). While experiencing difficulties in English-medium academic publishing and taking a relatively peripheral role, the focal students still tried to participate meaningfully in the writing-for-publication process. The study disclosed social strategies as well as linguistic/textual strategies that the focal students utilized to tackle their challenges. While the social strategy identified was to build academic research networks, the
linguistic/textual strategies included getting linguistic and rhetorical assistance from published texts and using L1.

Drawing on the notion of social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990), the present study explored how the NNES doctoral students built and used academic research networks to secure English-medium academic publication. The findings of this study support previous studies providing evidence that a published RA is an artifact resulting from interventions of a range of “literacy brokers” who participate in academic or professional writers’ text production (e.g., Lillis & Curry, 2006; Curry & Lillis, 2010; Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Li & Flowerdew, 2007). Although some of the focal students (especially, Sungju and Ken) in this study had relatively low English proficiency, assistance from a variety of literacy brokers enabled them to successfully publish their paper in Center Anglophone journals. Therefore, the study supports the view that access to professional networks and social resources may be more important factors than the writer’s NES or NNES status (whether or not the writer is using English as a native language) (Salager-Meyer, 2008). It suggests that NNES novice scholars’ expertise combined with the knowledge and resources that a range of brokers offer can make the publishing process more efficient and productive (Lillis & Curry, 2010), although the disadvantages of working with these brokers cannot be overlooked.
In addition to the social strategy above, one common linguistic/textual strategy employed by the focal students was to utilize “material resources” (Benson, 2001), such as written resources (e.g., published RAs and books, online dictionaries, grammar checkers, and writing manuals). The students felt that these written resources offered valuable linguistic and rhetorical assistance to overcome their language barriers. In particular, the students whose advisors’ mentorship was often not available (Jun and Mei) tended to rely more on written sources. Among many written resources, the students regarded published RAs as the most valuable, although how they used these published RAs differed. Like the NNES doctoral students in Cheung’s (2010) study in Hong Kong, checking the past issues of the target journal was a common strategy shared by the focal students. Sungju mostly skimmed through published RAs to get main ideas and gain disciplinary knowledge, while Jun, Ken, and Mei closely examined published RAs to see what was required and expected of them in terms of format, content, and writing style. Mei extensively read published scientific texts to learn the rhetorical conventions of the scientific academic community. Jun also deliberately used published RAs and made notes as he read in order to acquire disciplinary terminology and field-related concepts (Riazi, 1997; Buckingham, 2008). In particular, he used copied sentences for what Kamler and Thomson (2006) refer to as “syntactic borrowing.” These reading resources helped them not only develop the knowledge of the disciplinary field, but also acquire the writing
style and the conventions of the genre of research writing in their disciplinary academic
community. In short, the findings of the study echo previous studies (Angelova &
Riazantseva, 1999; Buckingham, 2008; Dong, 1998; Ferenz, 2005; Flowerdew, 1999a,
1999b; Gosden, 1996; Kwan, 2010; Li, 2005, 2007; Okamura, 20006; Tardy, 2005) in
which NNES academics resorted to published texts to strengthen discipline-specific
competence as well as acquire the conventions of the academic genre of the target
discourse community.

Another linguistic strategy frequently used by the students was the use of the L1. In
their early studies, St. John (1987) and Gosden (1996) reported the RA writing processes
of Spanish and Japanese scientists. A strategy frequently used by these scientists in
Periphery countries was initial writing in L1 and subsequent L1 to L2 translation. Similar
patterns were found in the present study. Regardless of their English proficiency levels,
the use of L1 played a facilitative role for the students (except for Mei) in their L2
English writing. In Mei’s case, she had not been trained to write academic papers in her
L1. Sungju and Jun recognized the benefits of using L1 as a compensating strategy,
although they found that it had a negative influence on their L2 English writing to some
extent. Thus, the use of L1 was certainly a “double-edged sword” to them, since despite
negative L1 transfer, it drove their L2 writing process and reduced their cognitive load
(Wolfersberger, 2003). Due to his intensive academic training in L1 writing, Sungju
tended to rely on the L1 more than the other participants. He first wrote in the L1 to solidify content and organization and then translated into English. He preferred to use L1-to-L2 translation because it helped him “think more deeply and better express [his] thoughts” (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992, p. 204). Unlike Sungju, however, Jun and Ken tended to use their L1s for planning and generating and organizing ideas. In the actual writing process, they mostly wrote directly in English because they found L1 to L2 translation time-consuming and difficult to convey the exact meanings of words and expressions from L1 to L2. To sum up, although the focal students used their L1s in different ways, using L1 was essentially their compensating strategy for “keeping the standard” (Uzawa & Cumming, 1989) in L2 English writing.

8.2.3. Themes 3 and 4 and Research question 3

Research Question 3: What are the social and political power-infused relationships that influence NNES doctoral students’ writing-for-publication process? How do NNES doctoral students negotiate those power-infused relationships to learn to write for publication in English?

Adopting the critical view of LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991), this study examined the sociopolitical dimensions of the NNES doctoral students’ English-medium academic
publishing. In particular, the study responded to Casanave’s (2003a) call for more sociopolitically-oriented case studies in L2 AAL research to enable the TESOL profession to better understand and respond to NNES scholars’ situations in English-medium academic publishing. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), LPP emphasizes newcomers’ access to the community of practice (e.g., access to a variety of information, resources, and members of the community) for their legitimate peripherality. However, LPP is a conflictual process of negotiation and transformation, since legitimate peripherality is situated in “social structures involving power relations” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 36). Old timers exercise power and control over newcomers by manipulating access to resources, information, and opportunities for participation, which may hinder newcomers’ LPP. Casanave (2003a) draws particular attention to the role that the power factor plays in academic writing and publishing. According to her, writing processes and written products are situated in social and political contexts. In other words, written texts are socially constructed, in that they are “material objects fashioned by people” (Casanave, 2003a, p. 83). They are also politically situated since they are “produced in power-infused setting such as classrooms and discourse communities, and are used to further political as well as intellectual and instruction agendas” (Casanave, 2003a, p. 83). To illustrate the issue of power in academic publishing, in her earlier book, “Writing Games” (Casanave, 2002), she describes how NNES writers struggle to grapple with the
linguistic and rhetorical norms and expectations of the Center academic communities as well as the ways to respond to and negotiate with co-authors and journal gatekeepers in order to achieve success in English-medium academic publication. Despite the important role that the issue of power plays in academic writing and publishing, there is still a paucity of research on social and political aspects of L2 academic writing, with the exception of Li’s (2006a) study. Li (2006a) is one of the few researchers responding to Casanave’s (2003a) call for more sociopolitically-oriented case studies. Li examined how a Chinese doctoral student of physics in China made publication efforts for international publication. Her study demonstrated three sociopolitical aspects of the students’ publication experiences: (1) the writing-for-publication process influenced by the institutional publication requirement for doctoral graduation, (2) the power-infused relationships with two supervisors, and (3) the interaction with the journal gatekeepers. Followed by Li’s (2006a) study, the present study provides some useful information concerning the sociopolitical realities of English-medium academic publishing by NNES students in the U.S. Published papers are seen as sociopolitical artifacts as a result of “accommodations as well as conflicts among agents with inequities of power” (Li, 2006a, p. 473). This study focused on the situated social and political interaction (e.g., struggles and negotiation) of the NNES doctoral students and their faculty advisors in the writing-
for-publication process in relation to the wider context of “structural power”⁵ (Layder, 1985) (e.g., institutional policies and evaluation criteria) to provide a holistic understanding of the sociopolitical dimensions of the NNES doctoral students’ English-medium academic publishing. The study found that the focal students’ writing-for-publication process was influenced by (1) the macro sociopolitical force: the institutional and/or non-institutional publication pressure and (2) the micro sociopolitical force: the power-infused relationships with faculty advisors. In relation to the macro sociopolitical force, the students’ membership in multiple discourse communities (i.e., academic communities in the U.S. and home countries) (Swales, 1990) shaped their publication efforts and participation in English-medium academic publishing. With regard to the institutional publication pressure, Ken and Mei had to meet the departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation, while Sungju was required to fulfill the publication requirement set by his faculty advisor. In addition, Sungju and Jun faced publication pressure beyond the institutional level. As L1 published writers, they came with the membership of the Periphery academic communities. They envisioned their future professional careers in their home countries and were closely networked with NNES scholars in their native countries. Therefore, Sungju and Jun were under pressure to publish in both Anglophone Center journals and L1 domestic journals. However, the

⁵ Layder (1985) defines “structural power” as “the sources (e.g. means of production, means of violence, monopoly of skills or information) that social groups (e.g. classes, or occupational groups) collectively possess, and which situates them in some pre-established, unequal social relation to other groups” (p. 132).
pressure to publish in Anglophone Center journals was much greater to them because publications in Anglophone journals are considered higher prestige and are often more powerful factors than publications in L1 domestic journals as to employment and promotion in their home countries.

With regard to the micro sociopolitical force, the students had to negotiate the power-infused relationships with faculty advisors in the co-authoring process. Two salient themes that emerged from the findings will be discussed below.

$Theme \ 3$: $Power \ inequity \ in \ the \ co-authorship \ between \ the \ faculty \ advisors \ and \ the \ NNES \ doctoral \ students \ restricted \ the \ students’ \ development \ of \ autonomy \ and \ L2 \ advanced \ academic \ literacy \ as \ well \ as \ their \ interaction \ with \ the \ disciplinary \ academic \ community.$

Not surprisingly, it was found that co-authorship with the faculty advisors played a role in helping the focal students produce refereed publications. Co-authorship helped the students move through the struggles and anxieties of the high-stakes task of publishing in Anglophone Center journals to some extent. However, this study also highlights the potentially negative influences of the unequal power balance in the co-authorship on the NNES doctoral students’ development of autonomy and L2 AAL as well as their interaction with the disciplinary academic community. Power inequity in authority and
expertise is an inherent component of a community of practice (Li, 2006a). It is seen that power distance is greater when a novice student interacts with an expert advisor (Cheng, 2013). Lave and Wenger (1991) point out that old timers exert power and control over newcomers by manipulating access to resources, information, and opportunities for participation, which may hinder newcomers’ LPP. In this study the advisors held considerable “gatekeeping” powers – powers to determine the timelines of publication and graduation. They were in extremely powerful positions and wielded tremendous influence over the students’ writing-for-publication process. Coauthoring with the advisors also involved “issues of power – the power to define others and to force them to behave in ways consonant with that construction” (Leki, 2001, p. 61).

One notable finding from the present study was that the unequally distributed power between the advisors and the students restricted the students’ development of autonomy and decreased their motivation for improving writing skills in English. This was evident in the cases of Sungju and Ken. The advisors clearly positioned themselves as expert members of the communities of practice and their NNES advisees as marginal members. Most of them adopted the directive and structured supervisory approaches and tended to take over most of the responsibility in the process of writing and publishing. In the cases of Sungju and Ken, in the coauthoring process the advisors specifically used a functional approach (Lee, 2008) and allocated writing tasks to the students. That is, the focus
seemed to be on how to get the writing done with the greatest efficiency and least expenditure of time and energy through splitting up the writing tasks (i.e., While the students wrote drafts, the advisors focused on rewriting or revising the students’ drafts.). In this way the advisors took charge and determined the extent to which the NNES students could contribute as authors. For instance, although Sungju was the first and corresponding author, he was given a peripheral role by his advisor, Dr. Goodman. Dr. Goodman determined the timeline of the manuscript writing and submission and decided on who wrote what sections of the paper. Sungju was positioned as someone who was suitable for writing the technical sections of the paper (the Methods and Results sections) that required less language skills. In addition, Sungju’s NNES status seemed to influence how he was treated as a coauthor by his advisor. Due to his own perceptions of journal gatekeepers’ potential bias against papers by NNES academics and his belief that NNES academics’ English language errors, particularly errors in early sections of the paper would lead to immediate editorial rejection, Dr. Goodman excluded Sungju from writing the Introduction section of the paper. Because of his perceived power of the advisor, Sungju accepted the marginal role imposed by Dr. Goodman, despite his feelings of disappointment and frustration. Moreover, Dr. Goodman’s excessive control of the writing work decreased Sungju’s motivation for improving writing skills in English. He often rewrote or corrected Sungju’s drafts without providing feedback or comments and
ended up appropriating Sungju’s drafts. While his initial enthusiastic effort in improving English writing skills was eroded, his adoption of the “lowering the standard” strategy (Uzawa & Cumming, 1989) (i.e., using the codified language) was reinforced.

Similarly, given the lack of departmental writing-based support for meeting the publication requirement for doctoral graduation, Ken relied on his co-advisor, Dr. Writer. As he faced the tensions between the demands of mentoring as an advisor and publishing as a professional scientist, Dr. Writer was reluctant to relinquish responsibility to Ken. Thus, Ken was not given an opportunity to act with great autonomy. Dr. Writer assigned specific writing tasks to Ken and extensively and repeatedly rewrote Ken’s drafts. In addition, due to Ken’s NNES status and limited English writing ability, he used the comprehensive feedback approach and appropriated Ken’s drafts without providing explicit feedback. For this reason, like Sungju, Ken easily fell into adopting the “lowering the standard” strategy (Uzawa & Cumming, 1989) (i.e., using the codified language). The writing process highly controlled by Dr. Writer decreased Ken’s motivation to improve writing skills in English.

Another notable finding from the present study was that the advisors’ powerful positions and their specific beliefs or attitudes hindered the students’ interaction with the institutional academic community. This indicates that the advisors “manipulated” access to resources and members of the community, which became a hindrance for the students’
LPP. They served as gatekeepers to academic networks; they decided on who to work with and who not to work with. In a study examining the difficulties that NNES doctoral students enrolled in a U.S. university faced in the advisor-advisee relationships, Kim (2007) found that faculty advisors’ unavailability and indifferent attitudes were major challenges to these students. This was true of Jun and Mei. These students had less dependent relations with their advisors due to the laissez-faire approach adopted by the advisors. Yet, the imbalance of power still existed between the two parties. Because the interaction between them and their advisors was less frequent and formal, the students were often left alone with little guidance from the advisors. Thus, they seemed to be expected to develop a sense of independence in order to complete their writing tasks. However, it did not mean that they were allowed to make every decision in the writing process. Although the advisors were often unavailable or did not closely work with their NNES advisees, their powerful positions still forced the students to adopt specific beliefs or attitudes that prevented them from interacting with the institutional academic community. For example, Jun’s NNES advisor, Dr. Chan, believed that it was very important to protect research data and subsequent research write-ups for publication, particularly for NNES academics to succeed in the Center academic community. Her “confidentiality” rule forced Jun to write in isolation, which resulted in restricting his interaction with specific members of the institutional academic community (e.g., peers or
senior doctoral students in his doctoral program). Therefore, the lack of interaction with peers or senior doctoral students added another layer to the challenges faced by Jun. In the case of Mei, her advisor’s (Dr. Power’s) somewhat negative attitudes toward research writing courses hindered Mei’s interaction with language specialists. Dr. Power seemed to believe that English was less significant in scientific publishing and that it was not worthwhile to take academic writing courses or to visit the writing center. Thus, Mei was not allowed to take research writing courses and work with writing tutors at the writing center. Therefore, it restricted Mei’s interaction with university language specialists who were involved in teaching academic or research writing (e.g., writing instructors, writing tutors).

More significantly, the advisors used their power to deny the NNES students’ access to journal editors and reviewers, who are the central members of the target discourse community. This eventually hindered the students’ opportunity to learn about some of the important professional practices involved in the academic publishing process and negatively affected their confidence about future English-medium academic publications. The journal’s refereeing procedure allows authors to negotiate with referees in terms of knowledge construction (Li, 2006a). Thus, the interaction and negotiation with journal gatekeepers is an important practice of the disciplinary academic community. However, when the focal students underwent the “revise-and-resubmit” process, they
(except for Jun) were denied direct access to journal editors and reviewers because the advisors had political privilege to control this interaction. For example, Sungju and Reviewer C had a dispute over whether and how his study was relevant to the field of science education. Lacking confidence about writing rebuttals to Reviewer C, Sungju consulted Dr. Goodman. Instead of helping him with language barriers as well as potential problems in cross-cultural communication with the reviewer, Dr. Goodman “ghost-wrote” responses to Reviewer C’s comments. Dr. Goodman’s resubmission letter that included counter-arguments with Reviewer C seemed to help Sungju challenge the authority of the reviewer and finally resolved the dispute. However, it deprived him of an opportunity to learn how to communicate and negotiate with the journal reviewers for knowledge construction and successful academic publication.

In another example, Dr. Power denied Mei’s access to the journal editors and reviewers. Since he did not seem to consider her as a contributing coauthor, he wrote responses to reviewers’ reports by himself without her input. Due to the denied access to the journal gatekeepers, she could not fully understand the important practice of negotiating with the journal gatekeepers in the academic publishing process and felt that she might not be able to publish on her own in the future. In short, the advisors’ powerful roles inhibited the students’ opportunity to negotiate knowledge-building and co-produce texts with the journal gatekeepers. With little participation in interaction with the journal
gatekeepers, the students only gained a partial understanding of the professional practices of the disciplinary academic community, which negatively influenced their confidence about future L2 academic publishing.

These findings corroborate previous studies by Blakeslee (1997) and Huang (2010). The two studies found that the asymmetrical power relations between the supervisor and the NNES student impeded the learning of the latter. Blakeslee (1997) examined how a NNES graduate student of physics and his supervisor interacted to coauthor a RA for publication. The supervisor provided implicit feedback and expected his NNES doctoral student to figure out how to write a good RA paper on his own. However, the supervisor’s implicit approach was not sufficient enough for the NNES doctoral student to acquire new rhetorical conventions of the genre of research writing. The student’s lack of progress made the supervisor impatient. As a result, the supervisor took over the responsibility of the writing task. Similarly, in the context of Taiwan, Huang (2010) interviewed 11 NNES doctoral students and three advisors in scientific disciplines with regard to their English-medium academic publishing experiences. The study showed that the students took little responsibility for writing manuscripts because of their perceived power of advisors. This hampered the students’ development of autonomy and ownership of their manuscripts. Without a sense of ownership, they consequently lost the motivation to improve writing skills in English. These studies support Morita’s (2004) view that
although the theoretical perspective of LPP assumes that experts assist and scaffold novices’ learning, “such assistance may not always be readily available to all learners” (p. 598). Overall, the findings of the present study suggest that faculty advisors need to be aware of the distribution of authority and power and of the potential influence of their powerful roles on students’ autonomy and development of L2 AAL. With balanced authority and expertise, they can better help students gain and exercise agency and move toward fuller participation in the target discourse community.

*Theme 4: The NNES doctoral students’ published articles were sociopolitical artifacts as a result of accommodation and resistance in the context of unequal power relations.*

The present study focused on the power inequality in authority and expertise between NNES students and their faculty advisors. Previous studies concerning peer collaboration between NNES students and their NES peers (e.g., Cheung, 2013; Leki, 2001; Morita, 2004) have demonstrated that power inequality exists even between these two novice groups, with NES peers taking more powerful and central roles and the NNES students being placed in the periphery and that this power inequity influences the NNES students’ literacy development. It is assumed that when these students interact with faculty advisors, power distance is even greater between the two parties. This imbalance
of power between the two parties seems obvious and may persist. However, the power
dynamic between the two parties may change as students gain knowledge and authority
in the field (Li, 2006a). As Lave and Wenger (1991) indicate, in this study the focal
students’ LPP was not a smooth process, but a conflictual process of negotiation with the
imbalanced power relations with their advisors. Thus, the important sociopolitical
dimension of the focal students’ writing-for-publication process was the negotiation of
the power-infused relationships with their advisors in order to move from peripheral
participation to fuller participation in the communities of practice, that is, learning how to
position themselves in the power relations with the advisors and exercise agency as L2
scholarly authors so that they could be recognized as legitimate and competent members
of the disciplinary academic communities. It is worthwhile noting that the focal students’
negotiation of the imbalanced power relationships with the advisors seemed to be quite
complex, since it involved multidimensional issues of language, culture, and power. A
small body of research has focused specifically on L2 graduate students’ interactions with
faculty, primarily investigating the effects of power differentials on these relationships
and the struggle of L2 graduate students to negotiate this power inequity and exercise
their agency and wills (e.g., Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 1992). Similarly, in her
longitudinal study of L2 undergraduate students’ experiences in an U.S. university, Leki
(2006) examined these L2 students’ efforts to manage their socioacademic relationships
with faculty and to construct comfortable subject positions for themselves in the context of unequal power relations. Her study highlighted “L2 college students’ struggles to inhabit comfortable subject positions and even fight back, asserting their own agency and their own power to assign, not just be assigned, identity through evaluations and judgments of the instructors and professors with whom they daily interact” (p. 138). She found that some faculty refused to accommodate L2 students’ learning needs due to “lack of awareness of problems, lack of willingness to make adjustments, or lack of ideas about how to do so” (p. 142). Nevertheless, the L2 students developed and used two main coping strategies: (1) understanding and accommodating to faculty motivation and personality and (2) using language (e.g., writing short personal messages to faculty) in order to “re-structure the contexts in which they interacted with faculty, to manage the socioacademic relationships they participated in, and to develop subject positions for themselves that they felt comfortable occupying given the constraints of their various communities of practice” (p. 147)

In the present study, it was found that the ways in which the focal students engaged in negotiating power differentials with the faculty advisors varied, depending on the specific sociopolitical context of the novice-expert interaction as well as on the individual students’ cultural values, educational experiences, and professional goals. For this reason, not all focal students were able to activate and exercise a sense of agency as scholarly
authors in the situated negotiation of power. In the cases of Sungju and Ken, for instance, as they were constantly reminded of their lack of power as well as their NNES status and limited English writing ability, their coping strategy was essentially “accommodation” (Leki, 1995, p. 250) to the marginal position imposed by their advisors. Even though they felt frustrated about the advisors’ taking over the control of their writing work and appropriating their drafts, they conformed to their interpretation of what the institutional authorities wanted. This accommodation strategy was partly derived from the students’ cultural norms of showing respect to teachers as well as their familiarity with directive supervision, which was prevalent in graduate programs in their home countries.

On the other hand, Jun’ and Mei’ cases present interesting contrasts to Sungju’s and Ken’s since they showed resistance to the peripheral position imposed by their advisors. Their resistance was closely related to their “agency” which is defined as “socioculturally mediated capacity to act” (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112). The resistance led to “the change of agency from lacking agency, activation of agency, to application of agency” (Cheng, 2013, p. 20). In other words, their peripherality demonstrated “a rich notion of agency” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 53), which allowed them to “take actions and carry out new roles and identities as reactions to their social and political connections and interactions with other people in the CoP” (Cheng, 2013, p. 13). The change of agency enabled them to gain the ownership of their work and develop knowledge about discipline-specific
publishing practices. In their advisor-advisee relationships, they were very frustrated, since the advisors’ “laissez-faire” supervisory styles did not match up with the “parental” supervisory style expected in Chinese educational culture. In the initial stage of the coauthoring process, they were positioned marginally by the advisors. They showed pseudo-compliance to this peripheral position due to the perceived power of the advisors. However, the activation of their agency was triggered when they realized that the uneven power relations with their advisors seemed to have an adverse impact on their learning of writing for publication. This activated agency was applied when they adopted a coping strategy of “resistance” (Leki, 1995, p. 250) to counteract their powerless positioning. They turned their frustration into agency to mitigate the unequal power relations with their advisors by taking various forms of resistance. As a result, they achieved relative success in negotiating the power relations with the advisors. Perhaps Jun stood out most in terms of mitigating the power differentials with his advisor and resisting marginalization to build knowledge about the professional practices of the target discourse community. Since he received collaboration-based graduate training in China, he was initially frustrated and even resentful about being forced to write in isolation. A mild form of resistance on his part was that he hired a NES local editor. In this way, in complying with Dr. Chan’s “confidentiality” rules, he was still able to get assistance from someone outside of his field. Perhaps participating in my study without informing his
advisor was another mild form of resistance to get emotional support from me, who was a senior doctoral student to him. A stronger form of resistance to marginalization was evident when he repositioned himself and became an active agent in the power structure of the advisor-advisee relationship after a lot of frustration about his failure to accommodate the journal reviewer’s suggestions. To draw his less supportive advisor’s attention to his revisions of the paper based on the reviewers’ comments, he explicitly expressed his needs to his advisor. He started to actively use Dr. Chan’s office hours to meet her in person and reported his revision progress to her on a regular basis. Consequently, his efforts made Dr. Chan participate in the revise-and-resubmit process, which helped him learn how to understand, interpret, and address the comments of the journal reviewers for successful revisions.

In another example, Mei’s agency was triggered and activated when she realized that Dr. Power’s powerful position and dismissive attitude seemed to diminish her publication efforts. She started to resist marginalization imposed by her advisor and repositioned herself and actively worked to elicit his attention to her writing work. She also demonstrated strong engagement in pursuing transformation in her role as an author. That is, when she found out about the rejection of the paper, she selected a different journal herself, revised the manuscript according to the theme of the journal, and handed it to the advisor for submission. After the paper was submitted to the new target journal,
she regularly checked with him regarding the status of review. Fortunately, her bid for agency became successful to some extent. When the journal editors recommended “revise and resubmit,” she approached him in an active but prudent manner to get access to the review reports and drew his attention to her revisions of the paper based on the reviewer comments. In this way she gained some control over the revise-and-resubmit process.

Overall, the focal students’ published articles were sociopolitical artifacts as a result of accommodations and resistance between agents of different power status (Li, 2006a). The situated nature of negotiation with the power relations in English-medium academic publishing is important to recognize, given that disciplinary instructors and the applied linguistics literature may characterize L2 students monolithically as linguistic or cultural minorities. The focal students - a seemingly homogeneous group in terms of cultural/ethnic background - responded to and negotiated the asymmetrical power relations in different ways. The students adopted either a strategy of accommodation or resistance to grapple with the unequal power relations with the faculty advisors in the sociopolitical context of fulfilling the institutional and/or non-institutional publication demands. The development of ownership as well as knowledge about discipline-specific publishing practices took place when the students’ agency was activated and applied.

However, it should be noted that despite the change of agency displayed as well as the assistance and resources brought into their writing-for-publication process, the focal
students faced sociopolitical constraints beyond their control that to some extent restricted what they could accomplish. For instance, regardless of the focal students’ strategies to negotiate the asymmetrical power relations, the advisors seemed to overlook the potential impact of their powerful roles on their NNES advisees’ ability to take full advantage of their L2 publishing experiences. This suggests that some NNES graduate students’ difficulties in the writing-for-publication process came from the process of negotiating sociopolitical power-infused relationships with agents of different power statuses. As Anderson, Day, and McLaughlin (2006) assert, therefore, “[o]ne needs to be alert to the oppressive and constraining effects that an advisor’s exercise of authority may have on a student’s effort and sense of self” (p. 166). Krase (2007) calls for a need for faculty advisors to “consciously and consistently monitor our students’ views of the advisor/advisee partnership, gauging their expectations with [advisors’] own to co-construct a partnership whose parameters are well known to both parties” (p. 68). It is also important to explicitly teach institutional assumptions and expectations to NNES graduate students and help them find ways for “clearly, assertively, and respectfully articulating their needs within the context of the discursive and interpersonal negotiations that infuse graduate-level scholarship” (Krase, 2007, p.68).
Summary of Themes 3 and 4 and Answers to Research Question 3

This study examined the sociopolitical dimensions of the NNES doctoral students’ English-medium academic publishing. Feeling a sense of being caught between two academic cultures, the focal students negotiated the complex sociopolitical realities of meeting the publication demands by U.S. and home academic cultures. The study found that the students’ writing-for-publication process was influenced by two power-infused relationships between them and (1) the sociopolitical context in which English-medium academic publication was a requirement for doctoral graduation in the U.S. and was a prestige for employment and scholarly recognition in their home countries, and (2) faculty advisors who held expertise and power.

In order to gain a more holistic understanding of the NNES students’ English-medium academic publishing experiences, the present study examined the macro sociopolitical force that influenced the students’ writing-for-publication process. This study was also concerned with how NNES doctoral students’ membership in multiple discourse communities (i.e., academic communities in the U.S. and home countries) shaped their publication efforts and participation in English-medium academic publishing. Previous studies (e.g., Huang, 2010; Li, 2006a, 2007) have illustrated the difficulties that NNES doctoral students in China and Taiwan faced in fulfilling the institutional
requirement of publishing in Anglophone journals for graduation. Unlike these NNES doctoral students in non-Anglophone settings, the focal students in this study had a sense of being caught between two academic cultures and had to negotiate the complex sociopolitical realities of meeting the publication demands by U.S. and home academic cultures, while studying in a U.S. university. These institutional and non-institutional publication demands by these two academic cultures complicate the portrayal of NNES graduate students engaged in English-medium academic publishing.

Previous studies have shown that NNES scholars in Periphery countries often face pressure to publish in both English and their L1s (Casanave, 1998; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew & Li, 2009). These scholars need to publish in English for promotion and international recognition and to publish in their L1s for local networking and a sense of responsibility (Huang, 2011). It was the case for Sungju and Jun who ultimately planned to return to their home countries. They faced publication pressure beyond the institutional level. As L1 published writers, they came with the membership of the Periphery academic communities. They also envisioned their future professional careers in their home countries and were closely networked with NNES scholars in their native countries. Therefore, unlike their NES peers, they were under pressure to publish in both Anglophone Center journals and L1 domestic journals. However, the pressure to publish in Anglophone Center journals was much greater to them because publications in
Anglophone journals are considered higher prestige and are often more powerful factors than publications in L1 domestic journals as to employment and promotion in their home countries. This reflects Periphery scholars’ high pressure to participate in the Center academic communities through English-medium academic publishing, as a number of researchers have documented (e.g., Canagarajah, 1996; Cheung, 2009, 2010; Curry & Lillis, 2004; ElMalik & Nesi, 2008; Englander, 2009; Flowerdew, 1999a, b, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Gosden, 1992; Li, 2002, 2005, 2006a, b, c, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010; Shi, 2003; St. John, 1987).

With regard to the institutional publication pressure, Ken and Mei had to meet the departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation, while Sungju was required to fulfill the publication requirement set by his faculty advisor. Therefore, publishing in Anglophone peer-review journals was a decisive factor for their doctoral graduation and ultimately for their survival in a U.S. academic setting, as Ken called this situation “publish or no degree” (Interview 3; April 12, 2011). The students perceived this institutional publication requirement as a valuable learning opportunity as well as a positive influence on their professional career. None of the students considered it as merely a hurdle to get over in order to graduate. However, given the lack of institutional writing-focused support (particularly, limited support for research writing), they felt disadvantaged vis-à-vis their NES peers when fulfilling this publication requirement. In
was particularly because they had to invest more time and energy in language learning than their NES peers.

It is important to note that the aforementioned institutional and non-institutional publication pressure influenced the focal students’ publishing strategies. The students used a variety of strategies to adapt to their sociopolitical contexts of academic publishing. For example, Sungju purposely chose a SCI-indexed Center journal which was considered as “unreachable” by Korean scholars. Since the start of this journal roughly 50 years ago, only 10 papers by Korean authors had been published. His sociopolitical motivation to publish his work in this journal was to increase his “market value” in his native country. In Jun’s case, notwithstanding his advisor’s lukewarm attitude toward coauthoring, his sociopolitical motivation to work with her was his belief that coauthoring with her would increase his chances of getting published. However, some of these sociopolitically-driven strategies seemed to be too goal-oriented and therefore detrimental to their learning. For instance, although his NES advisor was not involved in his research, Sungju decided to coauthor with him in the belief that the advisor’s status as a Center scholar would increase his chances of getting published. Because he gave higher priority to being published than his own learning, he was willing to accept the marginalized role imposed by his advisor, albeit he was officially the first and corresponding author.
In another example, given the lack of departmental support for meeting the publication requirement for doctoral graduation, Ken relied on his co-advisor. He adopted the “codified language” (i.e., using short sentences and simple sentence structures) to complete his writing tasks within the timeline of manuscript writing set by his co-advisor. His use of the codified language was also reinforced by the co-advisor’s appropriation of his writing. Consequently, heavy reliance on his co-advisor and the adoption of the codified language restricted his development of research writing skills in English. Overall, the students’ adopting these sociopolitically-driven and goal-oriented strategies while positioned marginally in relations of power seemed to hinder their development of ownership and L2 academic writing ability.

The power relations with the faculty advisors functioned as a micro sociopolitical force which affected the focal students’ writing-for-publication process in a number of ways. An important theme that emerged from the findings was that this micro sociopolitical force influenced the students’ development as a scholarly writer in two broad ways: (1) the unequally distributed power between the advisors and the students restricted the students’ development of autonomy and decreased their motivation for improving writing skills in English; and (2) the advisors’ powerful positions and their specific beliefs or attitudes hindered the students’ interaction with the institutional academic community. Another important theme was that the NNES doctoral students’
published articles were sociopolitical artifacts as a result of accommodation and resistance in the context of unequal power relations. In order to participate and be recognized as legitimate and competent scholarly authors, the students had to negotiate the imbalanced power relationships with their faculty advisors. This negotiation seemed to be complex since it involved multidimensional issues of language, culture, and power. The students adopted either a strategy of accommodation or resistance to grapple with the unequal power relations with the faculty advisors in the sociopolitical context of fulfilling the institutional and/or non-institutional publication demands. For instance, while Sungju and Ken primarily adopted the strategy of “accommodation” to respond to the marginalization ascribed to them, Jun and Mei’s strategy was largely “resistant” to the marginal position given to them by their advisors. The strategy of accommodation or resistance led the students to successful publications in English-medium international journals. Sungju and Ken chose to accommodate the advisors’ demands and rules, partly because it was natural for them to surrender to the advisors’ powerful positions, given their novice status and submissive attitude. However, Jun and Mei were more conscious of their strategies and shifted from the strategy of accommodation to the alternative strategy of resistance. Resisting the advisors’ demands and rules was the strategy fraught with dangers and yet most useful to Jun and Mei since it helped them activate and exercise their agency, which led to the development of ownership as well as knowledge.
about discipline-specific publishing practices. To judge by the experiences of the students, the faculty advisors in this study was concerned with the goal of publishing research work in Anglophone Center journals. However, they seemed less concerned with the students’ ability to take full advantage of their English-medium publishing experiences and appeared to overlook the potentially negative impact of their powerful positions on the students’ development as a L2 scholarly writer.

8.3. Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study suggest several pedagogical implications arising from the findings of the study for EAP/ESP professionals and disciplinary faculty advisors who work with NNES graduate students.

This study supports the argument for the “specificity” in EAP/ESP instruction to meet the diverse needs of NNES graduate students across the disciplines (Hyland, 2002). The specificity in ESP/EAP instruction refers to teaching “literacy skills which are appropriate to the purposes and understanding of particular academic and professional communities” (Hyland, 2002, p. 385). According to Hyland (2002), “The discourses of the academy do not form an undifferentiated, unitary mass but a variety of subject-specific literacies” (p. 389) and therefore, academic literacy skills are not simply transferable across a range of disciplines. He argues that ESP/EAP teachers should find
effective ways to teach discipline-specific language and writing conventions to students. The need for the specificity was evident in this study. The study shows that NNES graduate students did not have positive attitudes toward the effectiveness of academic writing courses taught by language specialists. For this reason, Jun and Ken were unwilling to take additional academic writing courses offered by the ESL program or visiting the writing center. The oft-cited explanation for their negative attitudes was that the support provided by the writing courses did not adequately cater for their diverse needs to develop an understanding of the writing conventions of the disciplinary discourse community as well as to improve linguistic and discipline-specific writing skills. This reflects the lack of “specificity” in the ESL academic writing courses that the focal students had taken. The students voiced their needs for more discipline-specific and long-term language support. Therefore, the findings of the study support the need to re-examine the effectiveness of existing EAP/ESP courses and establish the specificity in order to better assist students in developing academic literacy skills to “participate in particular academic and cultural contexts” (Hyland, 2002, p. 393).

Another pedagogical suggestion is to promote “critical pragmatism” suggested by a number of L2 researchers (e.g., Benesch, 2001; Flowerdew, 2005; Harwood & Hadley, 2004; Li, 2006c; Sheldon, 2011; Tardy, 2004). Critical pragmatism refers to a
pedagogical approach of adopting strengths of “pragmatic pedagogy” and “critical pedagogy.” Li (2006c) defines critical pragmatism as follows (p. 280):

The former is concerned with demystifying for students, hence providing access to, the dominant Anglo-American discourse conventions, while the latter is geared to illuminating alternative practices and emphasizing academic discourse practices being socially constructed and thus open to challenge and change.

One way to promote a “pragmatic” element in ESP/EAP instruction is to raise students’ awareness of the linguistic and rhetorical norms of the target discourse community (Flowerdew, 2007). This would help students understand the target norms and find ways to cope with the difficulties that they face in publishing in English-medium international journals. To raise students’ awareness of the target linguistic and rhetorical norms, Casanave (2003b) discussed her pedagogical use of applied linguistic literature as teaching materials in a multidisciplinary graduate EAP class in Japan. Published applied linguistic articles in her class were used for three main purposes: (1) to provide information about issues in academic writing; (2) to make comparisons of form and style with research articles in students’ own fields; and (3) served as resources for common and formulaic expressions. Through the use of literature, EAP/ESP teachers can enable students to develop a discourse awareness of different sections of a paper, particularly those sections which prove more challenging than others (i.e., the Introduction and the Discussion). Moreover, it would be useful to use intercultural text-based literature that
has examined remarkable differences in the rhetorical structure and devices of RAs in different linguistic/cultural contexts of publication, such as the Spanish local context and the English international context (Dueñas, 2012). In short, the use of literature can help students with their transition from the role of the student to that of the emerging scholar (Casanave, 2003b). Similarly, Harwood and Hadley (2004) suggest the use of corpus data (e.g., “showing how first personal pronouns can personalize claims and act as a vehicle for self-promotion” (p. 369)) for EAP/ESP teachers as well as students. They point out that corpus data can provide useful insights into the writing conventions and discourse practices of various disciplines and offer students a foundation to make more informed decisions about whether to conform to or flout the linguistic and rhetorical norms of the Center academic communities. Another useful way to promote the pragmatic element is to engage students in what Li (2007) calls “an intraview” – that is, to keep a record of one’s writing process (e.g., recording writing progress on weblogs in Yuan’s case in Li’s (2007) study). This “intraview” approach can facilitate students’ analytic perspectives on the genre of research writing and disciplinary writing conventions. Moreover, open discussion on comparing and contrasting good research writing in students’ L1s and in English can foster cross-cultural awareness and draw students’ attention to discipline-specific conventions (Dong, 1997).
In addition to the promotion of the pragmatic element, EAP/ESP instructors should also employ the critical approach to raise NNES students’ awareness of various social and political aspects of academic publishing. As mentioned repeatedly, published articles are sociopolitical artifacts (Casanave, 2003a). Casanave (2003b) calls for “the need for students to develop a sense of the social and political nature of how knowledge is negotiated and shared through language in academic communities, and to wean them away from thinking that their problems and goals are exclusively linguistic” (p. 44). Students should be taught how to effectively negotiate with various agents with inequalities of power. For example, EAP/ESP teachers can invite experienced published authors to address various social and political issues as to academic publishing, such as their experiences with others with power inequalities, potential reviewer bias, and the pressure to publish in international journals. In-class discussion on the usefulness and limitations of the NES-NNES dichotomy as well as a range of strategies and resources that NNES scholars can use can also develop NNES students’ agency and increase their confidence in competing for publication in the global academic community (Huang, 2010).

The present study supports the argument for building collaboration between EAP/ESP professionals and disciplinary specialists (Huang, 2010; Li, 2006a). Writing RAs is a complex task that requires not only a good command of language, but also a
strong competence in disciplinary knowledge. However, EAP/ESP instructors are not content specialists in students’ disciplinary fields, and it is impossible for them to understand the specific genres and writing conventions of all disciplines (Buckingham, 2008). Conversely, although disciplinary professionals represent disciplinary text culture, they may not be in a position to fully understand NNES students’ linguistic and rhetorical difficulties and support them in L2 AAL development (Buckingham, 2008). This situation can be improved through collaboration between EAP/ESP specialists and various disciplinary departments. It would be beneficial if disciplinary and language experts form a teaching team and complement each other with respective expertise. Cargill and O’Connor (2006) provide a useful empirical basis for an endeavor in that direction. They organized a research writing workshop in China that promoted collaboration between language and disciplinary professionals. As shown in Belcher’s (1994) study, mentoring support provided by the two groups of professionals is another way to bridge the gap between linguistic knowledge and discipline-specific content knowledge. Furthermore, through collaboration, ESP/EAP teachers can serve as “mediators of literacy” (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001; Li, 2006b) who “educate not only students but also content teachers as to the nature of academic literacy” (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001, p. 19). The collaboration approach would
strengthen the influence of EAP/ESP and disciplinary professionals on NNES novice scholars’ attempts to publish in English-medium international journals.

Academic departments should also promote adequate formal and informal support for their graduate students, including NNES students. In the present study, Ken and Mei had to fulfill the departmental publication requirement for doctoral graduation. However, the department did not provide sufficient formal writing-based support. This placed the NNES students in a disadvantaged position where they had to strive for international publication as well as graduation with limited resources and support. Ken’s advisor, Dr. Fund (who was a former graduate studies chair) explained that although the department was aware of the need to provide research writing courses for graduate students, heavy teaching and research loads prevented faculty from offering such courses. He added that although graduate seminar courses offered some support for writing and research, graduate students normally relied on informal learning opportunities (e.g., working with advisors or peers) to fulfill the publication requirement. This might partly explain why Mei struggled a lot because of her advisor’s unavailability and inaccessibility.

In light of the learning needs of NNES graduate students, academic departments should find ways to redress the balance between informal and formal learning at the graduate level. For instance, they should establish formal routes to learning, such as offering preparatory research workshops or training courses. Specifically, the integration
of a course on “academic writing for publication” into the doctoral curriculum would provide students with formal training and stimulus to improve their research writing skills (Huang, 2010). This course may teach linguistic skills and the writing conventions of the target discourse community as well as provide information about academic publishing and review processes. In this course the instructor may also introduce students to various publishing opportunities and keep students informed about potential publication venues. Furthermore, social networks and support systems need to be established between academic departments and university-based writing facilities. For instance, a dialogue needs to be opened between the university-based writing center and academic departments in order to provide meaningful assistance for NNES students (Dong, 1997).

Since the advisor-advisee relationship plays an important role in graduate students’ success in learning (Chang and Strauss, 2010), some suggestions could be made for faculty advisors in order to empower NNES students to become contributing members of the disciplinary academic community. There is a need for faculty advisors to recognize students’ perceptions of power distribution in the advisor-advisee relationship and offer space for open conversation to mediate power imbalance (Huang, 2010). Undoubtedly, the focal students in this study benefitted from coauthoring with their advisors in various ways. Nevertheless, the unbalanced power in authority and expertise between the advisors and the students functioned as the social and political forces that negatively
influenced the students’ learning of writing for publishing. For example, the advisors seemed to believe that they and their NNES students were located on different extremes of the expert-novice continuum. The advisors’ certain beliefs or attitudes hindered the students’ interaction with the institutional academic community. As mentioned earlier, negotiating the power relations with faculty advisors may add an additional layer of difficulty to the challenges that NNES students already face. Therefore, institutional support is needed to help faculty advisors raise their awareness of the distribution of authority and of the potential influence of their powerful roles on students’ autonomy and development of L2 AAL (Huang, 2010). Faculty advisors should understand students’ expectations of the advisor-advisee relationships and adjust their supervisory orientations according to students’ needs. With balanced authority and expertise, they can better help students gain and exercise agency and move toward fuller participation in the target discourse community.

Another suggestion for faculty advisors is to open space for metadiscussions (i.e., discussing different aspects of graduate supervision) to make their feedback more effective for students (Dysthe, 2002). The importance of feedback from faculty advisors can be explained in light of LPP. Writing for publication helps students participate in the communities of practice and can give them “legitimacy” as new members. Faculty advisors’ feedback on students’ writing serves as “scaffolding” in order to initiate
students into their communities of practice. Studies by Hasrati (2005) and Li (2005, 2006a) have illustrated how advisors’ mentoring and feedback can help multilingual students develop rhetorical knowledge of disciplinary genres and consequently ease their transition into their respective academic communities. Despite the significance of faculty advisors’ feedback, some of the focal students in this study did not receive adequate feedback from their advisors. For example, Mei’s advisor attended to only surface linguistic features of writing, without paying attention to the content of what she wrote. In addition, Sungju’s advisor and Ken’s co-advisor corrected all errors in their advisees’ drafts and appropriated their writing. They also provided no feedback or offered feedback in an implicit manner. In discussing the role of faculty advisors in graduate students’ success in learning, Allison, Cooley, Lewkowicz, and Nunan (1998) remark that “not all supervisors have the knowledge and skills needed to identify exactly what it is that needs to be done in order to improve the comprehensibility of a given piece of writing” (p. 199).

To better support NNES graduate students, faculty advisors should provide opportunities for discussing the types of feedback that are useful in different phases of the writing work, ways to make implicit expectations explicit, and the multiple roles of advisors and students at different stages of academic writing (Dysthe, 2002). When faculty advisors cannot provide the type of help that students need, it would be helpful to refer students to resources that are useful to them. For instance, faulty advisors should encourage students
to seek and utilize social support, such as pairing up NES and NNES students for proofreading and organizing informal peer-response groups (Aitchison, 2010). They should also provide explicit directions and demonstrations of how to use writing-based resources, such as the writing center or research writing courses.

Furthermore, the frustration, dissatisfaction, and isolation that the focal students felt regarding the advisors’ supervisory approaches suggest an urgent need for faculty training in cross-cultural awareness and communication skills in the graduate supervision (Dong, 1997). For instance, the influence of the culturally varied expectations of the advisor’s role in supervision was evident from the study results. For instance, when the advisors’ “laissez-faire” supervisory styles did not match up with the “parental” supervisory style expected in Chinese educational culture, Jun and Mei were frustrated and even resentful. However, the influence of the cultural norms and previous educational experiences on the students’ interaction with the advisors did not seem to be recognized by the advisors. Krase (2007) illustrated how mismatches of expectations of supervision led to a dysfunctional relationship between a NNES graduate student and her NES advisor. The study found that cross-cultural misunderstanding and different expectations of the relationship (in this case, the student’s desire for a more directive supervisory approach and the supervisor’s more egalitarian view of the advisor-advisee relationship) resulted in ineffective communication between the student and the advisor.
Given that international students’ enrollment in higher education institutions has increased, the demand for culturally sensitive supervision cannot be ignored (Dong, 1997). Sensitivity to NNES students’ needs and a willingness to adjust one’s own communication skills are crucial aspects of graduate supervision. For example, Leong (2010) argues that understanding Confucian group norms may help faculty advisors understand Chinese students who “prefer not to express their true opinions so as not to embarrass or offend others” (Chan, 1999, p. 299). Faculty advisors need to be aware that their supervisory approaches may need to be adjusted when they deal with NNES students. Universities should support faculty advisors in becoming culturally responsive mentors and supporters so that they can empower their NNES students to take responsibility for their own learning (Dong, 1997).

Last but not least, there are some important considerations for NNES doctoral students to build effective advisor-advisee relationships. As mentioned earlier, good advisor-advisee relationships play a critical role in doctoral students’ success in disciplinary enculturation, including research and publication. Since NNES students may lack cultural knowledge about doctoral education in English-speaking universities, they should seek opportunities (e.g., attending workshops) to learn about the expectations of doctoral education and to give careful thought to their own expectations and attitudes toward doctoral supervision (Neumann, 2003). It is also helpful for NNES students to
have personal knowledge of their advisors and consult senior doctoral students or peers to find ways to clearly and respectively express their needs and have open and frequent communication with their advisors to prevent potential misunderstanding or gap in terms of doctoral supervision.

8.4. Limitations

While this study provides useful insights into NNES doctoral students’ difficulties and strategies in L2 academic publishing, as well as the social and political forces facilitating or hindering their writing-for-publication process, this study has some limitations. First, due to the qualitative nature of the study, the findings from this study should be viewed cautiously. Because the sample size was small, the study was in a specific context, and it dealt with a particular group of students, the findings cannot be generalized beyond such a group. To validate the findings of the present study, future research should engage a larger number of participants in different Anglophone contexts.

Second, this study is constrained by its primary focus on the NNES doctoral students’ L2 academic publishing experiences, mainly through the students’ self-reports. Given the important role of faculty advisors in shaping NNES graduate students’ papers, the original design of this study included observation data of advisor-advisee interaction (i.e., writing conferences between advisors and students). However, low advisor
participation made it impossible to gather this type of data. Moreover, two of the focal students did not give me permission to contact their advisors for interviews. The students also might not have wanted to discuss certain aspects of their interaction with their advisors, either because of respect for their advisors or because they feared that their identity or the identity of their advisors could be revealed. This prevented the study from presenting rich accounts of advisors’ own perspectives of supervisory practices and NNES doctoral students’ academic publishing. Incorporating faculty advisors’ specific supervisory practices and perspectives into the study design through direct observations would broaden our understanding of how NNES graduate students’ papers are shaped through advisor-advisee interactions.

8.5. Recommendations for Future Research

Although the present study depicted a more or less orderly picture of the English-medium academic publishing experiences of NNES doctoral students in the U.S., there are still further questions to be answered.

Given that the field of inquiry on NNES novice scholars’ English-medium academic publishing experiences is still in its infancy, further research is still needed to explore NNES novice scholars’ publication efforts in Anglophone settings. As mentioned above, despite its contributions, this study has some limitations that prevent its findings
to be generalized to a larger population. Therefore, future research with different student populations and contexts can enrich the current understanding of NNES graduate students’ L2 academic publishing experiences. For instance, further inquiry can explore how NNES graduate students in different disciplines (e.g., humanities) negotiate the demands of English-medium academic publishing. The examination on the disciplinary knowledge construction through English-medium academic publishing has traditionally been concerned with NNES scholars in the hard sciences (Cargill & O’Connor, 2006; Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Li, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007; Li & Flowerdew, 2007) and the applied linguistics (Cheung, 2010; Liu, 2004). As a result, publishing experiences of NNES scholars from different disciplines, such as the humanities, have been overlooked. Each discipline has its own conventions and genres, and disciplinary circumstances influence how students conduct research and construct their research papers for publication. Thus, it remains unclear about whether and to what extent findings of previous studies apply to NNES graduate students in other disciplines, such as the humanities. Given the lack of disciplinary diversity in research on English-medium academic publishing, future studies should expand the scope of research by examining how NNES graduate students from diverse disciplines learn the forms of their disciplinary communication, how they adapt themselves to these forms, what difficulties and special tasks they face in the disciplinary publication process.
The issue of NNES novice scholars’ identity development and transformation deserves research attention. According to Ivanic (1998, cited in Shi, 2003), academic writing is “an act of intellectual identity which is dynamic, socioculturally shaped, and signifies power relations between reader and writer” (p. 373). Academic writing as an act of intellectual identity poses difficulties and struggles to NNES writers, due to the conflicts between their already established L1 identities, cultural values, ways of thinking, and the linguistic and rhetorical demands of scholarly writing in English. Only a few studies (Englander, 2009; Shi, 2003) have discussed and illustrated how the complexities of NNES scholars’ perceived intellectual identities influence their scholarly writing practices. Drawing on Ivanic’s (1998) concept of intellectual identity and autobiographical self, Shi (2003) and Englander (2009) revealed the struggles that Chinese and Mexican scholars experienced in their scholarly writing due to their dual identities. Further exploration is needed to get a more comprehensive understanding of how NNES novice scholars develop and transform their intellectual identities through writing for scholarly publication.

It would be worthwhile to conduct a comparative study examining the academic publishing experiences of NES and NNES novice scholars. There has been an ongoing debate over whether NNES academics are disadvantaged vis-à-vis NES counterparts when it comes to publishing in international journals. Some researchers have argued that
many difficulties are experienced by both groups of NES and NNES academics (e.g., Casanave, 2008; Gosden, 1992). For example, Misak et al. (2005), drawing on their extensive experience of editing the *Croatian Medical Journal*, state that “Our experience has shown that both NES and NNES authors, especially inexperienced ones, share the same problems where the presentation of results, specific scientific discourse, and manuscript organization are concerned” (p. 124). However, citing Goffman’s “stigma” label, Flowerdew (2008) contends that NNES academics are disadvantaged vis-à-vis their NES counterparts due to their language barriers and unfamiliarity with the writing conventions of the Center community (e.g., Flowerdew, 2008). In responding to this ongoing debate, it would be worthwhile conducting empirical research on the differences and similarities in the academic publishing experiences of NES and NNES novice scholars. In addition, future research could examine how novice scholars and experienced ones are engaged in L2 academic publishing. Swales (2004) argues that the most important distinction in publishing is not between NESs and NNESs, but “between experienced or ‘senior’ research/scholars and less experienced or ‘junior’ ones – between those who know the academic ropes in their chosen specialisms and those who are learning them” (p. 56). A recent study by Okamura (2006) rightly addresses this issue. The author explored the differences and similarities in learning and writing strategies used by inexperienced and experienced Japanese scholars. More research is needed to
illuminates the difficulties and strategies of NNES novice and experienced scholars. This would shed light on the developmental patterns of coping strategies as well as transformations in scholarly identity, which may occur over time.

Another valuable line of research would be to explore the publishing experiences of NNES female graduate students. The present study included only one NNES female doctoral student since it was difficult to recruit female students who had had at least one paper published in an English-medium international journal. Previous studies have suggested that women are less productive than men in the sciences when it comes to publication productivity (e.g., Ayalon, 2003; Charles & Bradley, 2002; Fox, 2001; Jacobs, 1999, 2004; Stack, 2002). For instance, Yair (2009) found that with regard to scholarly publication, females were substantially disadvantaged than males in the liberal arts. Cho (2009) argues that gender may influence students’ access to socializing opportunities for academic enculturation. For example, in her study on NNES graduate students’ disciplinary enculturation, the author found that Ling, a mother of a small child, had limited opportunity to attend social gatherings that could provide opportunities for academic enculturation. Given that an increasing number of females attend graduate programs, future research from a feminist perspective can empower NNES female students to participate more actively in the global academic community through English-medium academic publication.
8.6. Concluding Remarks

This study was partly motivated by my tutoring experience with NNES graduate students who were writing for publication in English. As a writing center tutor, I had met many NNES graduate students who had various levels of difficulties in writing for international publication. In particular, they seemed to come to their studies in a U.S. higher institution without sufficient knowledge of the disciplinary writing conventions and the language requirements of the Center academic communities. Not surprisingly, due to my NNES and novice researcher status, I was in a similar situation to them, although I had worked with them as a writing tutor. Listening to these students’ difficulties and frustration reminded me of my own personal struggle as a NNES doctoral student in writing for publication in English. In fact, my first English-medium publication came after two rejections (with some harsh criticism) from international refereed journals. This experience had made me realize the need for supporting NNES graduate students in English-medium academic publishing. I felt that conducting empirical research would be a necessary step to help these students. Therefore, drawing on the theoretical underpinnings of discourse community (Swales, 1990), LPP (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1990), in this study I explored the academic publishing experiences of four NNES doctoral students enrolled in a U.S. university. In particular, my situated voice as a novice NNS researcher was a powerful one in that it enabled me to
examine various issues from an insider’s perspective. Focusing on the social and political aspects of the students’ writing-for-publication process, this study also contributes to a small, but growing number of sociopolitically-oriented case studies in L2 AAL scholarship.

The findings of this study corroborate many of the earlier research findings of difficulties that NNES scholars encounter at the linguistic and rhetorical levels in their publication efforts toward international publication and of linguistic and textual strategies that these scholars adopt to overcome their difficulties. As many other studies have reported, all my participants felt that they were disadvantaged at the linguistic, rhetorical, and genre levels in comparison to their NES counterparts (e.g., Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Ferguson, 2011; Tardy, 2004). This finding is discouraging for those scholars (e.g., Canagarajah, 2003, Ferguson, 2007; Salager-Meyer, 2008) who have argued for embracing different varieties of English in global scholarship since it indicates that Anglophone Center journals in any discipline seem to operate strictly based on native English standard to determine the acceptance or rejection of an article (Li, 2006a). This study also provides some new understandings of the academic publishing experiences of NNES novice scholars in an Anglophone context. One of the new understandings to emerge from this study was that the students were active social agents trying to use various materials and social resources to publish their research work in Anglophone
Center journals. Another important finding in the study was that the students’ learning of writing for publication was both facilitated and constrained by both macro and micro sociopolitical realities surrounding them.

This multiple case study is obviously limited in its capacity for generalization. However, it has demonstrated that NNES graduate students’ attempts to participate in the Center academic communities through English-medium academic publishing should be seen as a complicated phenomenon revealing the influences of sociopolitical power-infused contexts on NNES students’ writing-for-publication process. Although my participants and I shared a similar background as NNES doctoral students enrolled in a U.S. university, they were different from me in that they all planned to return to their home country after graduation and some of them were strongly connected to their L1 academic community. Their professional goals as Periphery scholars made them feel caught between U.S. and home academic cultures and situated them in complex sociopolitical contexts in which they had to fulfill publication demands. It was surprising to me that my participants in different disciplines voluntarily or involuntarily coauthored with their faculty advisors and this coauthoring with the oldtimers often created a power-infused context for them. In this power-infused context, the faculty advisors and the students appeared to have different views of what “success” meant, which created tensions and conflicts between these two groups in the co-authoring process. The faculty
advisors I interviewed showed sympathy and some admiration for their NNES doctoral students. They seemed understanding and generous for NNES doctoral students who might need special attention linguistically and culturally. Yet, they had political agenda to increase publication productivity in their research group (to secure future research funding and improve the reputation of the research group) and to help the students fulfill the publication demands and graduate, which was often given more importance than students’ actual learning. Therefore, the faculty advisors equated being published with success. On the other hand, the students reported that they considered their development of autonomy and English writing ability as success, although meeting the publication demands was also important to them. The mismatch between these two groups in their views of success made the students struggle to take the ownership of their learning and gain agency in the context of unequal power relations, although the students could not deny that co-authoring with the faculty advisors was advantageous in publishing in English-medium international journals. This suggests the importance of not studying the academic publishing experiences of NNES graduate students stripped of their sociopolitical contexts.

What seems interesting from a pedagogical perspective is that all my participants were able to develop and use various strategies for coping with their difficulties. Some of them even altered their strategies and pursued new ones when their first attempts were
not successful. The interviews during this study provided a space for them to identify what coping strategies they already used and learn others that they had not thought of before. Developing and utilizing these strategies to overcome their difficulties was a positive part of their academic publishing experiences. Certainly, it was a big accomplishment to them. This observation reinforced my belief that regardless of their English language proficiency, they were capable human beings. Therefore, I suggest that an understanding of the difficulties and strategies of NNES doctoral students will inform both language and disciplinary professionals to develop students’ capacity to control their learning, particularly in various sociopolitical contexts. Conflict or power inequity may be unavoidable in any social relations (Leki, 2001). To empower NNES graduate students, language professionals and TESOL educators should foster a learning environment which will help them identify power-infused relationships among agents of different power statuses and utilize these relationships to create a more facilitative learning space for the development of disciplinary knowledge and linguistic growth. More importantly, efforts should aim at strengthening NNES graduate students’ capacity to cope with a variety of challenges. Such efforts may include a critical analysis of the NES/NNES dichotomy and awareness-raising activities as well as the provision of a substantial amount of resources and ongoing support for NNES graduate students who feel motivated to acquire knowledge and skills necessary for international scholarly publication, but frustrated by
various sociopolitical power-infused contexts. It is my hope that this study will increase critical awareness of the social and political aspects of NNES novice scholars’ realities in English-medium academic publishing as well as will stimulate further attention, research, and action related to NNES novice scholars’ English-medium academic publishing.
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Appendix A: Participant Recruitment Letter

Invitation to Study on Non-native English Speaking Doctoral Students’
Academic Publication Experiences

Dear Student,

My name is Sun Yung Song, and I am a doctoral candidate in Foreign and Second
Language Education at OSU. I am writing to invite you, if you are a non-native English
speaking doctoral student, to participate in my dissertation study on non-native English
speaking doctoral students’ academic publishing experiences. This study is funded by the
Center for the Study and Teaching of Writing (CSTW).

The purpose of the study is to examine how non-native English speaking doctoral
students negotiate the process of scholarly publication in English (challenges, strategies,
etc.). The study adopts a qualitative multiple-case study approach. In order to participate
in the study, you must have at least one research article published in an international
refereed journal (or have submitted a research article to a refereed journal and received
reviewer comments for revision).

The primary data collection methods are face-to-face interviews, emails and short
electronic questionnaires. Participants will be given an incentive (a gift card worth $30)
at the completion of the study. At least one of the benefits of the study will be to help
non-native English speaking doctoral students achieve greater success in the task of
getting published.

Please feel free to contact me at song.222@osu.edu or my advisor, Dr. Alan Hirvela at
hirvela.1@osu.edu, if you are interested in participating or have questions about the study.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sun Yung Song
Appendix B: Demographic Information and Personal Background

1. Name:
2. Gender:
3. Age:
4. What country are you from?
5. What is your native language?
6. What language(s) do you speak other than your native language and English?
7. Educational level:
8. Discipline area (specifically):
9. Your current position:
10. How long have you studied in the U.S.?
11. Please describe where you obtained your undergraduate degree and master’s degree and indicate specific areas you specialized in.
12. The number of publications in international refereed journals:
13. The type(s) of your published articles
   The number of the quantitative papers (e.g., experiment-based research):
   The number of the qualitative papers (e.g., interview-based research):
   Others (e.g., conference proceedings):
14. Are you the first author of the published paper(s)?
15. For your published article(s), do you have co-author(s)? If so, what is the relationship with them? (e.g., colleagues, advisor, etc.)
16. Do you still keep the rough drafts of your published paper(s)?
17. Do you still keep a copy of the reviewer comments that you have received?
18. Please provide the citation of your recent published article(s) (e.g., Shi, L. (2002). How Western-trained Chinese TESOL professionals publish in their home environment. *TESOL Quarterly, 36,* 625-634.)

19. How did you choose the journal(s) in which your paper(s) were published? (e.g., My advisor recommended several potential journals for my publication.)

20. What were your biggest challenges when getting your paper published in a refereed journal? (e.g., language problems, the organization of the introduction or discussion, lack of research skills, etc.)

21. What is the main reason that you have attempted to get your research articles published in refereed journals?

22. Have you experienced being rejected from journal reviewers? If so, please briefly describe your experience. (e.g., I submitted a research article to xxx journal, but my paper got rejected mainly because…. )

23. Are you currently preparing a research article for publication?

24. Have you published a paper in a journal in your native language? If so, how many publications?

25. Do you like writing in English?

26. Do you like writing in your native language?

27. How would you rate your writing skills in English?


28. How would you rate your writing skills in your native language?


29. Please briefly discuss your short-term and long-term professional goals (e.g., to become a faculty member at a university in the U.S.).

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for your time and help!
Appendix C: Online Questionnaire on Difficulties in Writing for Publication in English
(adopted from Gurel, 2010)

The questionnaire consists of 24 statements that address linguistic and rhetorical difficulties (13 items), difficulties with the genre of research writing (8 items), and sociopolitical difficulties (3 items). Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the statements where 1 means strongly disagree and 7 means strongly agree.

I. Linguistic and Rhetorical Difficulties

Do you find the following areas problematic for you when you are preparing a paper for English-medium publication?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading the relevant literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing the whole text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using appropriate vocabulary and expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing correct field-related vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using proper grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using proper mechanical elements (e.g., correct citation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>styles, punctuation, spelling, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlining and organizing each section of the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using proper connectors and transitional words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting ideas in a clear, logical way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting problem statements clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding plagiarism (paraphrasing, using direct quotes, citing sources properly, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Difficulties with the Genre of Research Writing

Do you find it difficult to write the following sections of a manuscript when you are preparing a paper for English-medium publication?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Sociopolitical difficulties

Do you find support or assistance from your advisor or co-author(s) to be helpful and beneficial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My advisor (or co-author(s)) helps me find a topic when I prepare for researching and writing for publication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assistance that my advisor (or co-author(s)) gives me is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find the feedback from my advisor (or co-author(s)) helpful and useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Semi-structured Interview #3

1. What kind of reading and writing activities did you do when you were still doing the research?
2. How did you select the headings and subheadings? Any difficulty in selecting those?
3. Do you feel that you are familiar with the general publication process? If so, why? If not, why?
4. What do you want to know more about the publication process?
5. Do you do anything to improve your English skills?
6. What constitutes good writing in your field?
7. What is good writing in your native language (L1)? Any big conflicts between L1 and English writing? Do you think in Chinese and then write in English?
8. How did you deal with plagiarism issues? Any problems with paraphrasing or citing sources particularly in the literature review?
9. What aspects of the journal guidelines did you read for your first publication? Was it helpful to read the journal guidelines? If so, in what ways?
10. What were your challenges for each step of the process (e.g., challenges for doing the research, writing a draft, responding to the reviewer comments, etc.)?
   Research-related challenges (e.g., problems with getting research materials or participants):
   Writing-related challenges (e.g., writing the introduction or conclusion):
11. What strategies did you use to overcome each of your challenges?
   Strategies for research-related challenges (e.g., getting help from the advisor):
   Strategies for writing-related challenges (e.g., getting help from a native speaker):
Appendix E: Semi-structured Interview #4

1. How would you describe your relationship with your advisor when it comes to working together for research and publication? Any areas in the relationship that you wish to be improved?

2. Could you tell me about your lab experience in your native country? What is the difference between your lab experience in your native country and your current experience in the U.S.? Do you think that there is a hierarchy here or is it more egalitarian?

3. You’re currently working with your advisor for your current paper for publication. What are your expectations of your academic advisor in terms of publication? What roles do you think your advisor should play to help you write for publication?

4. How do you see yourself as a researcher and writer now? Any difference before and after the first publication? Can you use any analogy to describe yourself? What kind of researcher are you? What research paradigm are you in?

5. What kind of support or help do you expect from your advisor, department or the university to improve publication-related skills?

6. What do you think about your program curriculum? Are you satisfied with it?

7. What would you recommend to other non-native doctoral students in your field who first attempt to write for publication?