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Career in academia has never been as challenging as it is today. There are stringent qualifications and other requirements for entering into the profession, such as publications in top ranking international journals even before completing the doctoral work, which is considered an essential qualification. It is taken for granted that all candidates for university teaching positions have a few journal articles, rather than book chapters, already published before they apply for university jobs. The pressures and constraints after submission and certainly during the first few years of joining the profession only increase. The saying “publish or perish” is certainly more relevant today than ever before. A necessary consequence of this trend is that the new entrants to academia often feel burnt out quite early in their career. Another factor that adds to such a grim situation is the aspiration of every university almost globally to improve their standing on the competitive positioning in international rankings. Considering the significance of publishing in top ranking journals by academic staff as one of the main contributors to improve the ranking of universities, there has been very little attention paid to help the newly initiated academics to overcome such counterproductive pressures and demands on them for excellence in publishing.
The present volume goes a long way to address this issue. It is an excellent attempt to bring together valuable experiences of established as well as newly initiated scholars from the world of academia to represent a divergent range of perceptions of scholars, research guides, well-published authors, including reviewers, and journal editors, offering their individual perspectives on academic publishing. The focus on constructive and helpful perceptions on issues such as the construction and dissemination of disciplinary knowledge, the review processes and editorial practices of reputed journals, while at the same time discussing theoretical as well as practical implications for research publications will make this volume of enormous help to newly initiated scholars in the profession. The main strength of the this collection is the way it integrates publishing experiences of highly visible academics with available research in the field. Overall, the volume challenges the myth that difficulties in publishing are only faced by those scholars whose first language is other than English. It is often forgotten that academic publishing is an uphill task for all academics irrespective of their first language background.
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Just as for well-established members of academic discourse communities, writing for scholarly publication includes a mixed bag of merits, motivations, risks, and pressures for junior scholars and doctoral students. Kamler (2008) argues that “if students publish in their formative years, they are more likely to do so as established academics or informed professionals in their chosen fields of practice” (p. 292). Watts (2012) views writing for publication as part of doctoral research experience within doctoral education. She states that “the extent to which, for example, publishing can contribute to a ‘de-stressing’ of the assessment process, particularly the viva element, is one consideration” (p. 1104)
that needs to be taken into account in exploring the merits of publishing during candidature. She also refers to the significance of negotiation with gatekeepers, observing that

the opportunity to engage in a dialogue with reviewers can provide insight and different perspectives on doctoral work that may not emerge in supervision. Through the critical exchange of ideas and receipt of challenging feedback, this instrumental approach to publishing has the potential to shape the thesis and the general direction of the research in creative ways. (p. 1104)

Wellington (2010) refers to both extrinsic and intrinsic motivations for scholarly publication during doctoral candidature. Enhancing one’s resume and profile, and achieving status and credibility in a research domain, are among the extrinsic motivations. Boosting self-confidence, gaining self-satisfaction, and developing and organizing ideas are some of the intrinsic ones. Barnacle and Mewburn (2010) argue that scholarly publication also contributes to shaping and establishing a scholarly identity and persona.

On the other hand, pointing out the significance of scholarly publication for doctoral students, Paré (2010) highlights the risk of “pre-mature” publication and warns that “[a]lthough the imperative is undeniable, and the desire to help students is laudable, the dangers of rushing students into the public exposure of publication need to be considered” (p. 30). Similarly, Watts (2012) refers to the “risk-laden” nature of writing for publication and points out that doctoral students need to be informed of the risks involved in this academic endeavor. She highlights high rejection rates by journal gatekeepers and the time-consuming nature of refashioning and resubmitting a paper to an alternative journal without a definite chance of success. She also underlines that “guidance about rejection rates, review processes and the likely timeline from submission to publication is valuable” (p. 1105), and argues that it is a significant, yet overlooked, responsibility of supervisors to inform students about relevant and target journals in their fields.

Literature also highlights extensive pressure for scholarly output in the course of doctoral candidature. Academic publication has serious
implications for future academic lives and careers of junior scholars in
the competitive context of academia (Kwan, 2010). “The literature pro-
vides no doubt that the competitive ‘bar’ for doctoral students is rising
in terms of both quantity and quality” (Jones, 2013, p. 89). Casanave
(2010) notes that “we seem to take it for granted now that (a) it is
important to publish work from dissertations and (b) it is important
not to wait to do this until we have diplomas in our hands” (p. 47).
Hesitant about “jumping on the publishing bandwagon” (p. 48) during
the doctorate, she enumerates heavy teaching loads, personal respon-
sibilities, family obligations, long commutes, financial issues, health
problems, exhaustion, and limited faculty-student and student-student
contact, and consequently minimal support and feedback as a number
of pressures and challenges that her doctoral students were dealing with.
Underlining “an increase in publication-related anxiety among graduate
students”, Paré (2010) believes that the anxiety related to academic pub-
lication can be counterproductive for students rather than helpful.

In spite of the ever-increasing expectations and pressures on junior
scholars and inherent (dis)advantages of early academic productivity for
junior scholars, writing blocks and publishing impotency are common
problems in the context of the doctoral education and among doctoral
students (Jones, 2013; Lee & Kamler, 2008). This highlights the urgent
exigency of an in-depth understanding of discursive and non-discursive
challenges that these scholars encounter in communicating their
research as well as macro and micro policies, interventions, and strate-
gies that can alleviate those struggles and support novice academics’ vis-
ibility and participation in global forum. There is no doubt that such
knowledge base requires further scholarly discussions about and empiri-
cal inquiry into scholarly publication practices of novice scholars in dif-
ferent geo-linguistic contexts. By the same token, this book addresses
the complex yet under-represented topic of writing for scholarly pub-
lication by doctoral students and junior scholars. It approaches this topic
in a novel way, bringing together international experts and junior schol-
ars themselves from a variety of disciplines to discuss both research in
the field and personal publishing experiences.

Drawing on the perspectives and experiences of authors, supervisors,
reviewers, and editors, it seeks to present a rich and nuanced picture of
the practices and challenges faced by both Anglophone and English as an additional language (EAL) junior scholars in writing for publication. The book will raise the key issues for writers and their mentors, addressing some topics for the first time, and challenge the unexamined view that it is only EAL scholars who experience difficulties in writing for scholarly publication. The volume, therefore, highlights central themes of writing for publication, including mentoring and collaborative writing, the writing experience, text mediation, the review process, journal practices, editorial decision-making, and so on. It also makes the strong case for taking a more inclusive approach to research in this domain than in the past, ensuring that the voices of both native English speaking and non-native English speaking scholars are heard. Thus, by sharing the voices of both Anglophone and non-Anglophone novice scholars, it aims to present a balanced picture of scholarly publication landscape, open a forum for further discussion of scholarly publication practices of Anglophone novice scholars, and offer useful theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical implications for research and practice in this domain.

In sum, the book is a serious attempt to explore the experiences of different participants in the process of scholarly publication, both through empirical research and personal histories. In particular, the book intends to illuminate some of the following key issues:

1. The Anglophone vs. EAL dichotomy and the supposedly linguistic advantage of Anglophone scholars as a reductionist explanation for the complexities of scholarly publication,
2. The discursive and non-discursive challenges and problems that junior scholars (both Anglophone and EAL) encounter in publishing,
3. The strategies, pedagogies, and practices employed by junior scholars and their mentors as well as interventions that can scaffold their development as academic writers.

We have organized the book into four parts, opening with our own perspectives on scholarly publishing and followed by papers addressing the views of participants from those who author submissions, mentor junior scholars, and assess texts for journal submission.
Part I: Perspectives on Scholarly Publication

In Chapter 2, Ken Hyland reprises his argument regarding the ‘myth’ of disadvantage in publishing suffered by those whose first language is not English. While recognizing the enormous challenges of gaining acceptance for research in prestigious journals, he argues that these difficulties are not only faced by Non-Native English speakers and framing such problems in this way creates a deficit view of second language writers and a “demoralizing discourse of disadvantage”. Following a critical review of the evidence, he argues a crude native vs. non-native polarisation not only draws on an outmoded respect for ‘native speaker’ competence but serves to demoralize L2 researchers and marginalize the difficulties of novice L1 English academics.

In Chapter 3, Pejman Habibie also examines the native vs. non-native English-speaking question in terms of what he calls the Lucky Anglophone Scholar Doctrine which depicts Kachru’s Inner Circle as a safe haven in which academic publication is guaranteed. Anglophone scholars are also portrayed as an undifferentiated mass bestowed with symbolic, social, and cultural capitals for scholarly publication by virtue of their native speaker status. He points out that this discourse has underrepresented the publication practices of Anglophone scholars and promoted a research agenda which focuses exclusively on EAL scholars. Together with Hyland’s chapter, then, this is a call for a more inclusive and balanced view of academic publishing and research in this domain.

In Chapter 4, Christopher Tribble takes the discussion into the realm of EAP and the support practitioners can offer novice writers. Here, he questions the claims made by proponents of English as a Lingua Franca (Academic)—ELFA—that genre-based EAP programs unfairly impose native models on non-native speakers of English encouraging conformity to an unfair status quo. Drawing on recent research literature and an study of published academic writing, he argues that notions of nativeness is open to serious challenge and that genre informed instruction premised on an apprenticeship model offers a more useful basis for supporting novice writers.
Part II: Perspectives of Authors

The second part turns to look at how authors understand their experience of academic publishing; and in Chapter 5, Ismaeil Fazel looks at writing for scholarly publication experiences of two Anglophone doctoral students at a Canadian research-intensive university. Drawing on the notion of genre knowledge, he presents the discursive and non-discursive issues and challenges facing these junior scholars in the process of producing and disseminating scholarship in international English-medium journals. Pilar Mur-Dueñas (Chapter 6) also adopts a self-reflective auto-ethnographic perspective in discussing her experience as a NNES (Spanish) academic undertaking research in English. The chapter focuses on the process of her enculturation into and membership of the field of applied linguistics. Drawing on a questionnaire on a series of reflective questions and her personal text histories, she analyses her publication practices, challenges, and strategies.

In Chapter 7, Fang Xu explores two current approaches which inform multilingual novice writers understanding of writing for publication. Reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of what she refers to as “the linguistic approach” and “the genre approach,” she discusses how both might lead to writers’ seeing themselves as being linguistically disadvantaged. She argues that both approaches have a shared view in understanding language as both analytical and holistic, but that the genre approach helps writers achieve a more fluent and idiomatic control of language to overcome its “last mile problem.” Drawing on a case study of a Chinese linguist learning to write for publication, she illustrates how memorization can facilitate academic genre acquisition. In the final chapter in this part, Christine Pearson Casanave presents the view of an experienced native English-speaking scholar, arguing that, contrary to common wisdom, writing for publication does not become easier over time but more difficult. She believes that difficulty increases because successful writing for publication does not depend primarily
on language proficiency. Instead, it involves other complex factors that affect L1 and L2 scholars alike, such as inquiry and thinking skills, a developing expertise, and tenacity. She welcomes the fact that writing becomes more challenging because it should always comprise continuous learning and involvement in increasingly complex and interesting projects.

Part III: Perspectives of Mentors

The third part of the book focuses on mentoring and opens with a paper by Elena Shvidko and Dwight Atkinson who trace the journey from being student to becoming a published writer. They point out that the process remains a mystery because no two cases are exactly the same. Following a review of the literature, they present results from interviews with three non-native and three native English-speaking applied linguists who have recently experienced this transition. The interviews show the diversity of experience based on individual characteristics; writing support from institutions, advisors, and other more experienced writers; and how much time these writers can devote to writing. The study confirms that the native vs. non-native distinction is of limited use in understanding the highly dimensional phenomenon of academic writing. In Chapter 10, Ron Darvin and Bonny Norton examine the potential of collaborative writing between student and supervisor as a means of academic socialization. Drawing on their model of investment, they discuss how investing in socializing practices is located at the intersection of identity, capital, and ideology and student and supervisor can reframe their identities to engage in authentic collaboration to produce work that bears the inscription of both identities. Recognizing the advantages and challenges of such an approach, they assert that collaborative writing can be a transformative and mutually beneficial process of academic socialization.

Margaret Cargill looks at a different approach to mentoring in Chapter 11 by focusing on the value of “Writing for Publication” workshops. Based on her years of experience, Cargill presents such
workshops as a valuable format to support novice authors and those who supervise and mentor them. She points out that the participants of her Collaborative Interdisciplinary Publication Skills Education workshops report significantly increased confidence to write and publish scientific research articles, and to mentor their students in these tasks. She believes that the advantages of the workshop format are its flexibility, the ability to target specific participant needs at optimal times in the writing trajectory and taking advantage of synergies between different types of presenter. In Chapter 12, Dana R. Ferris focuses on the role that doctoral supervisors and other mentors can play in helping these scholars to climb the learning curve (or “crack the code”) and become successful academic writers. In this chapter she explores the types of feedback and other instructional interactions that can be helpful in scaffolding the writing process and support co-authoring.

Yongyan Li closes this part by also considering mentorship. She does this by exploring findings from a series of qualitative case studies. Her discussion highlights four dimensions: features of junior scientists’ drafts of research papers; senior authors’ practices of revising papers for junior scientists; junior scientists’ responses to senior authors’ revisions; and supervisory relationship and its impact on junior scientists’ publication success. The chapter ends by suggesting that further research based on ethnographic approaches is needed to better understand the processes and practices of mentoring junior scientists for research publication.

Part IV: Perspectives of Assessors

The final part contains two chapters which consider the much-maligned players in publishing: editors and reviewers. In Chapter 14, Sue Starfield and Brian Paltridge take issue with the term “gatekeeper” and argue that the role of journal editors is more complex and nuanced than this. They see editors as mediating between reviewers, authors, and the disciplinary community in terms of its expectations for papers in their scholarly journals. This may be in terms of the author’s choice of topic and/or methodology, as well as the contribution the article makes to the
research area. Drawing on their own experience, they discuss how these issues are treated by editors and make suggestions for how novice writers can consider these matters as they submit their work for scholarly publication. Finally, Christine M. Tardy turns to the unsung heroes of academic publishing, the peer reviewers. Reviewers play a key role in scholarly publishing, yet are often seen as mysterious and intimidating figures by junior scholars. The chapters sets out to demystify their role by exploring submissions from the reviewers’ perspective. Drawing on existing research as well as her personal experiences as a reviewer and journal editor, Tardy delves into issues that junior scholars commonly encounter as they become socialized into publication norms and practices and offers recommendations to overcome them.
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Part I

Perspectives on Scholarly Publication
The dominance of English in academic publishing has raised questions of communicative disadvantage and the possible “linguistic injustice” against an author’s mother tongue (Clavero, 2010). Native English speakers are thought to have an advantage as they acquire the language naturalistically while second language users must invest more time, effort, and money into formally learning it and may experience greater difficulties when writing in English. Attitude surveys reveal that English as an Additional Language (EAL) authors often believe that editors and referees are prejudiced against them for any non-standard language uses while Flowerdew (2008) even claims that EAL writers are “stigmatized” by journal editors and reviewers. In this chapter, I critically examine the evidence for linguistic disadvantage and argue that framing publication
problems as a crude Native vs. non-Native polarization demoralizes EAL writers and ignores the very real writing problems experienced by many L1 English scholars.

**Global Publishing and Disadvantage**

On the face of it, the expansion of international publishing is a positive development, both for academics and for developing nations seeking to become part of the “knowledge economy.” Globalization not only expands opportunities for increased scholarly dialogue by broadening the corpus of academic literature, but also the involvement of EAL researchers enriches knowledge, raises previously unexplored issues in the mainstream, and changes rhetorical practices (Canagarajah, 1996; Flowerdew, 2001). While partly driven by new technologies such as online delivery and Open Access “writer pays” business models, the growth of publishing is the result of a huge expansion of researchers, with UNESCO reporting 7.8 million full-time equivalent researchers in 2013, an increase of 21% since 2007 (UNESCO, 2017). This growth in researchers has been accompanied by a massive increase in article submissions, especially from BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China—the ‘emerging economies’) and other non-established nations. The USA continues to dominate the global output of research papers with a share of about 23%, but China has moved into second place, with 17% of global output, followed by the UK (7%), Germany (6%), Japan (6%), and France (4%).

Thus five countries are responsible for 63% of the world’s journal articles, while 23 countries account for 90% (Thomson Reuters, 2012; Ware & Mabe, 2014). The rank order changes for citations, however, with the US at 36% and China at 11th place with 6%. So although increased financial investment has stimulated the participation of EAL researchers in global publishing, this has not yet had an equal impact on published output or on the influence of their papers as measured by citations to them. Academic publishing clearly makes sophisticated demands on writers. But while all newcomers feel challenged and
intimidated by writing for publication, attention has largely focused on the difficulties of non-Anglophone authors. Some writers suggest that Native speakers of English are unfairly advantaged in scientific publication as it is easier for them to access the literature in English and to craft texts acceptable to journal gatekeepers (e.g., Clavero, 2010; Guardiano, Favilla, & Calaresu, 2007).

This view receives some support from several quantitative studies which have found that submissions to medical journals from countries with low English proficiency scores, low Gross Domestic Product, or little research funding are less likely to be accepted for publication (e.g., Man, Weinkauf, Tsang, & Sin, 2004). Saposnik, Ovbiagele, Raptis, Fisher, and Johnston (2014), for example, analyzed all 15,000 contributions submitted to the journal Stroke between 2004 and 2011 and found that acceptance rates were higher for submissions from countries where English was the Native language. Similarly, Okike, Kocher, Mehlman, Heckman, and Bhandari (2008) and Ross et al. (2006) found a preference for articles from authors in the US and Canada. However, the effects of English proficiency on the submitted texts was not examined directly in these studies, but assumed on the basis of where the corresponding authors resided. In fact, Saposnik et al. suggest a number of reasons for these findings:

It is possible that some reviewers are more critical of the quality of research or give lower priority scores to borderline articles written by non-English speakers. Contrarily, regional constraints (e.g., low investment in research, suboptimal research training, limited education in how to write scientific articles, etc.) may also explain the parallel lower submissions and acceptance rates for non-English-speaking countries and for those with low expenditures in research. Other financial incentives (e.g., scientists receiving bonuses per performance and submitting higher number of lower quality publications) may also play a role. (Saposnik et al., 2014, p. 1866)

This catalogue of possibilities reflects a wider uncertainty about the role of language in the acceptance or rejection of papers for submission.
Many EAL authors report a sense of inequality compared with NES scholars when writing in English. Surveys of Polish (Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008), Slovakian (Kurilova, 1998), Mexican (Hanauer & Englander, 2011), Spanish (Ferguson, Pérez-Llantada, & Plo, 2011), and southern/eastern European (Lillis & Curry, 2010) researchers reveal that many EAL authors feel some sense of disadvantage relative to Anglophone scholars.

Almost 80% of the Mainland Chinese doctoral researchers in Li’s (2002) study felt disadvantaged compared with their Native English-speaking counterparts, for example, and Hwang’s (2005) Korean academics believed that Native English speakers were able to write much faster than themselves. Flowerdew’s (1999) survey of 600 Hong Kong academics found that over two thirds felt they were at a disadvantage compared with Native English Speakers when writing for publication, with about half citing language issues as the main problem. But follow-up interviews showed that 75% were confident that they would get their research published. Perez-Llantada’s (2014) Spanish scholars and Tardy’s (2004) international graduate students also identified problems in having to use English, particularly the time needed to learn English to a high level, but both groups acknowledged the benefits of having a common language for scientific exchange. These mixed results were also reported in Murray and Dingwall’s (2001) study of 250 Swiss academics and Ammon’s (1990) survey of German scientists.

Overall, then, these studies reflect the context-dependent nature of attitude surveys, suggesting the very different levels of support and resources individuals enjoy and their educational backgrounds. While many respondents complain that writing in English is time-consuming and laborious, substantial numbers feel no disadvantage at all. How authors answer questions about disadvantage are likely to be influenced by who they believe they are in competition with, whether they are asked to assess advantage in normative or moral terms, and how competent they believe they are in English (Ferguson et al., 2011). Nor is it clear whether the respondents are aware of the difficulties experienced
by the Native-English speakers they are comparing themselves with. Even proficient NES academics suspect that others write more easily and quickly than themselves. Personal and national circumstances are also important, so we might expect scholars from small multilingual countries, like Switzerland, to feel less disadvantaged than those from countries with very different language systems to English, such as Korea and China.

A comment by one of my respondents in Hong Kong summarized much of the attitudinal research:

I wouldn’t say English is an obstacle but it’s a challenge because it’s not my first language. Mastering the academic style is very challenging. Not just knowing how to write grammatical English but whether I can write in such a sophisticated way that the reviewers of prestigious journals would like to publish my manuscript. (Cantonese speaker—Education)

Attitudes are cross cut by proficiency, first language, discipline and publishing experience, and, of course, many EAL authors successfully publish their papers.

**Non-Anglophone Authors: Texts and Practices**

While there is a huge literature reporting EAL authors’ perceptions, there are fewer studies of submitted texts or the processes used to create them. Those that do exist are necessarily small scale and cover a range of different contexts and disciplines which makes it difficult to generalize about issues of equity. They show, however, that academic writing in English can present considerable challenges to non-Anglophone scholars, although these do not always prevent them gaining acceptance for their work.

A small comparative study of English language papers published by Sudanese and British medical researchers, for example, found a great deal more adherence to the conventions of impersonalization, hedging, and nominalization in the British papers (El Malik & Nesi, 2008). Loi (2010) found that a sample of Chinese research article introductions in
educational psychology employed a simpler rhetorical structure compared to those in English, and Burrough-Boenisch (2003) highlights the problems that multilingual authors’ may have with word order, word choice, and register. The fact that these studies were conducted using published papers suggests that the problems found were not terminal. In fact, Moreno, Rey-Rocha, Burgess, López-Navarro, and Sachdev (2012) found that the lower English proficiency level of their Spanish researchers was only one factor in the difficulties they experienced in writing articles.

In addition to text analyses, there is a body of case study research which has focused on the processes of text creation, pointing to the protracted time and effort needed to write for publication in English (e.g., Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Lillis and Curry, 2010). St John (1987), for instance, found that her Spanish researchers spent considerable time over precise expression through changes in word order and lexis. Similarly, Gosden (1995) discovered that the research writing practices of junior scientists mainly involved mechanical editing to improve expression, using Japanese-English reference texts, and phrase by phrase translation from their L1. Li’s (2006) longitudinal account shows how a Chinese doctoral student of physics slogged through six drafts and several painstaking resubmissions before her paper was finally accepted for publication.

Overall, this research suggests that texts by EAL authors may be more laborious for them. Once again, however, we lack the comparative data which might help put these difficulties into perspective. There is currently little research into the problems experienced by Anglophone authors, although Myers (1990) and Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) have documented the struggles of even well-published Native English speaking authors trying to publish. In short, assertions that EAL authors have greater difficulties in writing than their Native English counterparts are largely speculative. Writing for publication is a specialized competence which both Native and non-Native English speakers must acquire, a fact which is obscured by two key assumptions of the linguistic disadvantage theory.
Problematic Assumption 1: The Native/Non-Native Divide

While the need for a certain proficiency in a foreign language inevitably creates an added burden for authors, there are difficulties in framing linguistic disadvantage in terms of a Native/non-Native divide. The Native speaker’s advantage is attributed to a combination of “natural” acquisition and the idea that Native speakers own and control their mother tongue. The term “Native speaker,” however, has been roundly critiqued in recent years (e.g., Davies, 2003) and Escudero and Sharwood Smith (2001) suggest we should understand it as a gradient term whereby individuals approximate more or less to a Native-speaker prototype.

Ferguson et al. (2011, p. 42) see two main problems in using the term to frame linguistic disadvantage:

The first is that academic writing, or academic literacy, is not part of the Native speaker’s inheritance: it is acquired rather through lengthy formal education and is far from a universal skill. A second is that the non-Native speaker category, like the Native category, is a very loose one, encompassing individuals of very varying levels of proficiency, some of whose languages are linguistically related to English and some of whose are linguistically distant.

While the idea of Native speaker might imply the advantages gained by having internalized the language through “natural acquisition”, rather than through deliberate learning, academic English is no one’s first language. In fact, “Native-speakerhood” refers more accurately to the acquisition of syntactic and phonological skills as a result of early childhood socialization and not competence in writing, which requires prolonged formal education. We don’t learn to write in the same way that we learn to speak, but through years of schooling.

Academic writing is a specific domain of expertise comprising a subset of lexico-grammatical features and rhetorical conventions which have evolved to perform certain valued functions for those who use
them. It is a disciplinary-specific linguistic code which captures the cultural profile that emerges through considerable investment of time and effort. As a result, many literate and well-educated NESs lack the necessary know-how to produce publishable papers while countless EAL scholars, benefiting from the experience gained from EAP courses and years of doctoral apprenticeship, find themselves more “academically bilingual.”

Several of my informants in Hong Kong, for example, cited their training and experience as reasons why they actually found it easier to write in English than their first language:

I only publish in English. I think I can only write in English (laughs). Because we were trained to do that all through the PhD years. Then you find you can’t write in Chinese. It is not just the writing but thinking about research might be different. That’s why, you know, after a while getting used to their way and you wouldn’t be able to do a different way. (Cantonese speaker—Business studies)

I think it’s just the way I have been educated and the way I have been socialized into academia was to write in English, yes. I published one paper a long time ago in Polish but I haven’t written in any other language than English since then. (Polish speaker—Linguistics)

The conventions of academic discourse are, perhaps, equally daunting to Native English speakers who also struggle to produce polished prose (Casanave & Vandrick, 2003) and US students appear as prone to anxiety about their academic writing as international students (Swales, 2004, p. 57).

Moreover, with perhaps a quarter of the world’s population able to speak English to some degree, labeling any particular individual as a Native or non-Native speaker is perilous. There are non-Native English speakers in the academic center at leading research universities as well as at the periphery, and those who have studied in an English-speaking country or are members of international research groups as well as those who have never left home. In fact, the Native/non-Native distinction seems to break down entirely at advanced levels of academic writing (e.g., Römer, 2009). Gaining familiarity with academic rhetorical
practices is often a painful and protracted experience for both NES and NNES research students because it involves the individual acquiring a new and “very clearly structured set of symbols which he can use in locating himself in the world” (Hudson, 1996, p. 14).

Research shows that a key issue for many novices is the lack of a disciplinary appropriate conceptual framework which allows them to speak with authority: like NNES academics, L1 authors must develop a sense of self as an academic writer (e.g., Badenhurst, Moloney, Rosales, Dyer, & Ru, 2015). Cameron, Nairn, and Higgins (2009) and Shirey (2013), for example, talk of the strong emotions of self-doubt, anxiety, and erosion of confidence experienced by novice L1 academic writers, many seriously troubled by the fear of rejection (Oermann & Hays, 2011). Similarly, Aitchison, Catterall, Ross, and Burgin’s (2012) study of 36 doctoral students and their supervisors in the sciences found writing to be “emotional work” which created strong feelings of both joy and pleasure and pain and frustration. None found writing easy or enjoyable and it involved considerable struggles for all of them.

Swales (2004, p. 56), in fact, argues that the most important distinction in publishing is not between Native and non-Native English speakers but

between experienced or “senior” researcher/scholars and less experienced or “junior” ones – between those who know the academic ropes in their chosen specialisms and those who are learning them.

Like language proficiency, academic literacy is also a variable competence which develops with practice and experience. Moreno et al.’s (2012) 1717 Spanish postdoctoral researchers, for example, felt that the experience of writing for publication in English was far more important than language proficiency in gaining acceptance for papers. Irrespective of first language, craft skills, the ability to navigate submissions, and a general publication savvy improve with practice (e.g., Mur Dueñas, 2012). Experts certainly seem to have the edge over novices with both a greater command of the discipline’s rhetorical resources (Hyland, 2015) and the savvy to steer a paper through the review process (e.g., Myers, 1990). Pagel, Kendall, and Gibbs (2002), for example, found that
postdoctoral fellows in a leading medical research school had greater
difficulty with writing and publishing than faculty members, struggling
to imagine an appropriate audience and lacking an awareness of the
research topics which interest colleagues.

The Native-non-Native distinction is, therefore, a crude instrument
with which to explain publishing success and to assume that NESs share
the same communicative competence ignores the extensive research into
the specialist literacy skills demanded by academic writing. We need,
then, to separate communicative performance from mother-tongue sta-
tus when looking at English for publication and to see that expertise
develops with practice.

Problematic Assumption 2: The Primacy of Language

While the stereotype of “non-Native speaker” is frequently invoked to
explain the vulnerability of novice EAL writers in the review process,
non-discursive physical and financial barriers may well be greater than
linguistic ones (e.g., Wood, 2001). The degree of training and expe-
rience in scientific writing, geographical location, or even the num-
ber and type of collaborators, may be more powerful determinants of
publication success. Two key factors here are those of situatedness and
isolation.

Despite taking place on a global stage, scholarly writing is always a
situated practice which occurs in local academic communities. It is car-
rried out and learnt through very local and concrete interactions with
particular texts and particular others and so bares the stamp of specific
cultural traditions and ways of seeing problems. This situatedness of the
researcher creates powerful affordances for global research as it allows
multilingual scholars to bring insider awareness about local contexts or
issues that mainstream academic communities are not aware of. It can,
therefore, often seem to be a very peripheral participation indeed to
those working alone or on the edge of academic activity.
Academics on the periphery may feel out-of-the-loop on current developments in their field and become frustrated that they are unable to consult with peers and mentors. Gosden, refers to these impediments as isolation which can refer to a range of issues:

The broad term ‘isolation’ covers many causes, for example: not carefully reading ‘Instructions to Authors’; unfamiliarity with the journal and its academic level; not previewing previous literature well and relating to others’ work, possibly due to a lack of literature/library facilities; a lack of awareness of what constitutes publishable research; and unfamiliarity with the broad (and unwritten) ‘rules of the game’. Gosden (1992, p. 133)

This sense of isolation from the mainstream is obviously a major impediment to researchers in Less Developed Countries (LDCs) but also afflicts anyone working ‘off-network’ in poorly resourced institutions with small library budgets and little research activity in relatively wealthy parts of the world.

Isolation seems to be felt particularly by junior academics returning home to take up positions in less prestigious places after completing graduate-level study at research intensive universities abroad. They can experience an acute sense of exclusion from the mainstream conversations of the discipline in what Geertz (1983) refers to as the “exile from Eden syndrome” whereby “one starts [an academic career] at the center of things and then moves toward the edges” (1983, p. 158). Scholars who miss the opportunity to discuss issues with their mentors has been reported for Egyptian (Swales, 1990), Hong Kong (Flowerdew, 2007), and Japanese (Casanave, 1998) returnees. The notions of situatedness and isolation thus help to foreground both the unique contributions multilingual scholars make to global scholarship and the distance they often feel from the center.

There are various aspects of “isolation” and a particularly serious hurdle for peripheral scholars is overcoming a lack of up-to-date technologies, poor access to the literature, and insufficient funds to conduct appropriate experiments. Restricted access to the literature prevents researchers entering academic conversations in a relevant way, making
their contributions sound badly framed or “old news” (Canagarajah, 1996). Not all EAL authors face the same problems of course, and these difficulties are not restricted to EAL academics. Canagarajah (1996, p. 440) notes that his arguments might equally apply “to the periphery within the center: the marginalized communities and poorly facilitated institutions in the technologically advanced nations”.

But while Anglophone scholars working in climates of cutbacks to university funding also suffer, it is those researching in LDCs who suffer the most. There is, as a result, a statistically significant difference between the high and low income countries in terms of the rejection rate of submitted manuscripts (Patel & Youl-ri, 2007) with acceptances of only 4.8% in top psychiatry journals (Singh, 2006) and just 0.3% in anesthesiology (Bould et al., 2010) for authors in low income countries. A study of 400 published clinical trials found a considerable manuscript selection bias against low income countries due to a mistrust of the data (Yousefi-Nooraie, Shakiba, & Mortaz-Hejri, 2006), and it is almost a law of publication that the percentage of articles from LDCs decreases as the Impact factor of the journal increases (Rohra, 2011). Simply, research conducted in the richest countries is more likely to be accepted for publication with the acceptance rate of papers from countries increasing by 27% with every million US$ invested in research (Saposnik et al., 2014).

Peripheral scholars also have to contend with a system which celebrates local knowledge generated in the Anglophone centres of research as an unmarked universal discourse with a claim to global relevance. Several of my informants in Hong Kong recognized the hegemonic status of “global knowledge”:

You have to set the study in a bigger context, one that is going to echo with the wider discipline. Nobody is really that interested in what is going on in HK schools, nobody outside HK that is, and you have to put it into their terms. Critical perspectives or how it contrasts to overseas studies. (Applied Linguistics researcher)

Framing the local as global, or as a point of exotic contrast to the center, is a key strategy helping academics in non-Anglophone locations to
secure their work for publication in ISI-indexed venues. Another strategy is working with overseas partners. So, about half the ISI indexed papers with an African-affiliated author are co-authored with partners from outside the continent.

In sum, the disadvantages of physical, scholarly, and financial isolation may be greater than those of language. Certainly, these factors are frequently associated with poor linguistic skills, at least in non-English speaking periphery countries, but a crude Native vs. non-Native dichotomy fails to capture a far more complex picture.

Non-Anglophone Authors and Journal Gatekeepers

Despite all the problems, more non-Anglophone researchers are writing successfully for publication than ever before, outnumbering NESs in many fields. In 2014, for example, academics in China published some 264,000 SCI-indexed articles, accounting for 15% of the world total, up from less than 50,000 in 2001 (ISTIC, 2015) and leading the number of papers in the engineering index (SCImago, 2014). In applied linguistics and language teaching, the increase seems particularly marked. Swales (2004, p. 41), for example, shows “a steady and welcome decline” in the dominance of papers by US authors in *TESOL Quarterly*, while Hewings (2002) observes a doubling of the articles originating outside the US and UK in *English for Specific Purposes*. In the sciences the picture is even more marked, with 60% of articles in *The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery* now from EAL authors (Benfield, 2007) and EAL submissions dominating leading journals like *Science* and *Nature* (Wood, 2001).

The substantial increase in EAL authors has also been documented by Hyland (2015, 2016). Based on the family name and country of affiliation of the first author, I found there were three times more papers from EAL authors in 2011 compared with 2000 in the top five journals (by 5 year Impact Factor) in each of six disciplines. Overall, EAL submissions are increasingly getting into the most prestigious ISI-ranked
journals, although the greatest increases are in the least context-dependent and rhetorically demanding science fields. For many authors, then, it seems that Native-speakerness confers fewer advantages than might be supposed. It is true that journal editors have concerns about language problems in EAL submissions (e.g., Benfield & Howard, 2000; Flowerdew, 2001) and that reviewers frequently comment on these (e.g., Mungra & Webber, 2010). However, studies of reviews written in response to both Native and non-Native English scholars’ submissions tend to strongly focus on the research itself, rather than its presentation (e.g., Gosden, 2003; Hewings, 2004).

Critical comments on EAL writers’ manuscripts largely address content and methodology (Mungra & Webber, 2010; Mur Dueñas 2012) and the quality of the language is rarely a decisive factor in rejection (Coniam, 2012). In one study which set out to look for reviewer bias against EAL writers, Belcher (2007) found that reviewers’ comments showed that unsuccessful EAL authors’ papers contained the same problems as those of rejected L1 English authors. She observes that:

For some off-network Native-English scholars, even staying in control of surface textual features seemed challenging. Thus, it appears, from this small sample, that at least some number of rejected papers, whether authored by EL or EIL scholars, networked or off-networked, share many of the same shortcomings.

Thus the same language problems also characterize the writing of L1 users of English. In fact, Benfield and Howard found only slightly more reviewer criticisms of writing in non-Anglophone submissions.

The question of what reviewers mean by “language” is also relevant here. Authors often remark that reviewers’ comments on non-Native-like features in their manuscripts are often indefinite and unhelpful (Kourilová, 1998). As Kerans points out, most reviewers lack the metalanguage needed to talk about rhetorical problems thus… they rush to blame ‘the English’ vaguely whenever they are confused by [an English L2] writer’s manuscript. (Kerans, 2001, p. 339).
In her study of text revisions in response to reviewers’ language criticisms, for instance, Englander (2006) suggests that it is not the English that is usually the problem but that authors violate the reviewers’ expectations of academic writing. It is control of the register rather than the language which is at issue. This is not to say that difficulties with English syntax, lexis, or discourse do not complicate the task of non-Anglophone academics, but it calls into question a coarse Native vs. non-Native dichotomy and encourages us to think beyond linguistic bias. A lack of resources and writing expertise could be far more important obstacles for both EAL and Native English authors.

I am not, of course, claiming peer review to be perfect: it is a flawed process and bias exists, but there is little evidence to support the idea that there is a widespread and systematic bias against writers whose first language is not English.

Some Final Observations

In this paper, I have sought to question the view that EAL scholars are disadvantaged in the competitive world of academic publishing by virtue of their status as second language writers. I have argued that it is a framing largely based on unexamined assumptions and a lack of research into Anglophone practices.

The “disadvantage orthodoxy” position, in fact, provides a limited picture of writing for publication and does a serious disservice to both Native and non-Native English speaking writers. It has two damaging consequences:

1. By focusing on language shortcomings it perpetuates a myth of L2 deficit which discourages EAL authors and tells them to look for prejudice rather than revision.
2. It marginalizes the challenges faced by NES authors by depicting Kachru’s Inner Circle as a kind of safe house where academic publication can be taken for granted.
Anglophone scholars, especially those at the beginning of their careers, must also cope with the same publish or perish demands to keep their jobs and climb the ladder, but writing as an L1 English scholar does not guarantee a successful publishing career any more than working as an isolated, off-network EIL author condemn one to failure. Authorial agency and individual experience, too often ignored in these debates, are key dynamics as individuals are not simply products of their environment.

Crucially, we need to see L2 writing as embedded in wider social, institutional, and political contexts rather than as something which exists in isolation from them. The difficulties experienced by EAL writers are not due to deficit but broader discourse practices which are often invisible to writers, reviewers, and editors. Writing is a way of knowing, and those who write understand that it is a difficult and messy business. Exposing students to others’ processes as well as others’ texts may help to convey something of this and help reassure novice writers that even celebrity authors have their blocks and rejections (Hyland, 2015).

Finally, issues of linguistic disadvantage become largely irrelevant at these advanced levels of writing. Here both NES and EAL novice authors are engaged in employing new and unfamiliar literacy skills to craft their texts for exacting specialist readers. It is a site where technical issues of grammatical accuracy have less relevance than rhetorical knowledge, persistence, and an awareness of an authorial self. Genre and identity, not L1 vs L2 dichotomies, can better elucidate the character of multilingual writers (see also Tribble, 2017). What is apparent, however, is that literacy is not a single monolithic accomplishment, or part of a Native speaker heritage but a series of socially situated, discipline-sensitive practices which have to be learnt. Scholars who publish in a second language now represent a majority, but they continue to struggle with minority status. However, attributing publication to that fact alone over-simplifies a more complex picture and does not help to solve the very real problems experienced by both EAL and Native English speaking writers.
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Introduction

One of the repercussions of the “globalization and marketization” of academia (Flowerdew, 2007), neo-liberalization of Higher Education (Harvey, 2007), and consequently “intensive regimes of measurement and audit” (Paltridge, Starfield, & Tardy, 2016, p. 113) is that scholarly publication in high-index international journals has become a major marker of efficiency for both individual scholars and academic institutions all over the world. The critical role of scholarly productivity in academic visibility, survival, and sustainability has spurred research interests in geo-politics of scholarly publication and relevant pedagogical interventions across a number of disciplinary boundaries including applied linguistics, English for academic purposes (EAP), education, and writing studies, shaping the fast-growing field of English for research publication purposes (ERPP). By the same token,
investigating research communication practices of scholars in different geo-linguistic contexts has constituted a major research stream within ERPP over the past three decades. Given the serious implications of scholarly publication for academic lives and careers of novice scholars, recent years have witnessed a growing research focus on exploring factors that influence and challenge the participation of junior scholars in global scholarship arena.

However, a review of the literature in this domain does not yield many findings (Casanave, 1998; Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Tardy, 2004). More importantly, the existent research has mainly focused on knowledge communication practices of English as an additional language (EAL) junior scholars; as if, it was only those scholars who are challenged by the unquestioning *publish or perish* ideology of current academia. This makes junior EAL scholars more *advantaged* compared to their Anglophone peers in that respect though. Highlighting the dearth of research into knowledge production and dissemination practices of Anglophone scholars, this chapter problematizes the privileged doctrine in the domain of scholarly publication which has deemed Anglophone scholars as a geo-linguistically advantaged mass in academic productivity, and consequently marginalized scholarly publication practices of Anglophone scholars in ERPP research. In what follows, I will discuss the discourse of this “*Lucky Anglophone Scholar*” orthodoxy (Habibie, 2016), debunking some of its inherent fallacies in light of the existent literature as well as scant yet emergent research into graduate writing and scholarly publication practices of Anglophone junior scholars (e.g., Habibie, 2015, 2016; Simpson, Caplan, Cox, & Philips, 2016).

**Writing for Scholarly Publication: A Chronic Dysfunction**

“Writing dysfunction is common in academia” and publishing impotency plagues many academics around the globe, especially junior scholars and doctoral students (Belcher, 2009, p. 1). Boice (1990) reports that
“[he has] consistently seen people whose inexperience in discussing their [scholarly writing] blocks exceeded their shyness for revealing almost anything else, even sexual dysfunctions” (p. 1). He underlines that “most knowledge about writing problems is conjectural. Most is limited to single factors such as perfectionism or procrastination” (p. 8). He believes that the question of “[w]hy is it then that so few of us write for publication?” has been traditionally ignored in academia (p. 7). He suggests that “it may be that we subscribe to Social Darwinism, supposing that only the fittest survive” (p. 7). However, he argues that the best answer to the above question “may be that we are only beginning to understand the reasons” (p. 8). Boice’s account draws attention to the chronic nature of writing dysfunction in academia, and highlights that “becoming an academic writer can be challenging, and attempting to increase written output can present significant problems, even for academics who are knowledgeable in their subject areas” (Murray, Thow, Moore, & Murphy, 2008, p. 119). It also criticizes academia for not playing a more active and accountable role in facilitating writing for scholarly publication and making it “more democratic” (Boice, 1990, p. 8).

Almost three decades later, it seems that some of Boice’s (1990) observations and conclusions still hold true. That is, the general assumption still exists that literacy in academic publication comes with a higher or doctoral degree and writing for scholarly publication is what academics do naturally and willingly (Kapp, Albertyn, & Frick, 2011). In spite of institutional incentives and multidimensional benefits of scholarly publication “many researchers and prospective authors approach writing with antipathy and fear” (Brewer, Marmon, & McMahan-Landers, 2004, p. 16); and “the results of doctoral research are not widely or systematically disseminated through peer-reviewed journal publication” (Kamler, 2008, p. 283). However, the growing research interest in research communication practices of academics, especially over the past two decades, definitely indicates that academia is paying attention to Boice’s (1990) key question that why only a minority of academics write for publication. In other words, our knowledge base on different aspects of writing for scholarly publication is not conjectural anymore; rather it is informed by the increasing body of
research and scholarly interest spurred by the emergence and expansion of the field of ERPP.

Empirical research in the domain of scholarly publication dates back to St. John’s (1987) pioneering work on the experiences of 30 Spanish scholars. Since then, publishing experiences and practices of academics in different geo-linguistic contexts have attracted scholarly attention and constitute a considerable part of the existing literature in ERPP. A major thread in this literature concerns the struggles and difficulties that scholars face in getting their scholarly works in print in prestigious international journals. With scholarly publication as one of the essential requirements for tenure, promotion, and in many cases even graduation, recent research has also zoomed in on knowledge production and dissemination practices of junior scholars and doctoral candidates exploring the factors and mechanisms that affect their (in)visibility and participation or marginalization in global scholarship.

Thanks to the recency of this research stream, it goes without saying that a review of the literature does not produce sizable findings. However, what is noteworthy even in this minimal literature is that the current research gaze of ERPP has focused exclusively on scholarly publication practices of EAL novice scholars leaving the experiences of Anglophone junior scholars out of its scope of inquiry. This begs the question as to why research communication practices of Anglophone scholars as legitimate members of their communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) are peripheral in ERPP research? The answer to this question should be sought in the “Lucky Anglophone Scholar” doctrine and its privileged discourse which has framed the research lens in this domain to a great extent.

**Lucky Anglophone Scholar Doctrine**

Although the literature highlights the ever-increasing visibility and participation of EAL scholars in communicating and gatekeeping scholarship globally (Hyland, 2015; Swales, 2004), the predominant sense is still that EAL scholars are geo-linguistically disadvantaged compared to their Anglophone peers when it comes to writing for scholarly
publication. Thriving on native vs. non-native bipolarity, the discourse of the “Lucky Anglophone Scholar” doctrine projects a utopian image of the so-called Inner Circle (Kachru, 1985) in which Anglophone scholars constitute a geo-linguistically homogenous population who participate in the construction and dissemination of scholarship naturally and willingly as a result of their native speaker status and/or membership in prestigious, well-resourced institutions of higher education. On the other hand, EAL scholars are depicted as “an undifferentiated mass which is handicapped by a lack of proficiency in English … at greater risk … [and therefore] in greater need” for help (Hyland, 2015, p. 186). In other words, in this distorted image EAL scholars are portrayed as those who have fallen victim to the Englicization of academic discourse as opposed to Anglophone scholars who have emerged victorious in this “monolingual onslaught” and academic crusade (Mauranen, Pérez-Llantada, & Swales, 2010, p. 647). Against this backdrop, now let’s bring to the fore some of the arguments and inherent fallacies of this misrepresentative discourse and highlight the implications for future direction of research into writing for scholarly publication practices of junior scholars.

Safe Haven

As noted above in this biased orthodoxy, the Inner Circle has been poorly sketched “as a safe haven in which academic publication is taken for granted and guaranteed” (Habibie, 2016, p. 65) as if Anglophone scholars were miraculously saved from the sweeping hurricane of neo-liberalization of academic institutions and its consequent regimes of assessment, evaluation, and accountability. However, there is no doubt that the transition of academic institutions into knowledge factories (Hadley, 2015) was triggered in the Inner Circle academic context, and was implemented through the neoliberal and capitalist discourses and polices of Thacherism in the UK and “Reaganomics” (Chun, 2017) in the US in 1970s and 80s. Therefore, Anglophone scholars are themselves the very first victims of the unquestioning publish or perish orthodoxy, whereas EAL scholars experienced the ripple effects of
the neoliberal tsunami much later in the so-called outer and expanding Circles (Kachru, 1985). As for EAL scholars, academic publication has a decisive role in future academic lives and careers of Anglophone scholars, especially junior scholars. Therefore, when it comes to scholarly publication, the grass is not definitely greener on the other side of the fence, and the sword of Damocles is hung over the heads of academics globally irrespective of their native language or nationality.

Icon of Linguistic Perfectionism

The second fallacy concerns the native-English-speaking status of Anglophone scholars and discursive and non-discursive challenges and struggles involved in knowledge production and communication. The exclusivist discourse of the “Lucky Anglophone Scholar” orthodoxy argues that the native-speaker status of Anglophone scholars privileges them in scholarly publication in English-medium international journals, as it makes them aware of generic expectations and discursive practices of their target discourse community (Swales, 1990). In other words, the native speakerhood offers a less challenging shortcut for legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) of these scholars and their enculturation into the discourses and practices of their communities of practice. However, “[n]ot only does this offer a deficit view of scholars whose first language is not English, but it underestimates the difficulties many native English-speaking academics face when writing for publication” (Hyland, 2015, p. 186).

What this reductionist argument overlooks is that academic literacy in the form of writing for scholarly publication is a socio-rhetorical practice which transcends individual linguistic competence and textual and mechanical writing performance. It is not about the synchronic status of being native or non-native. It is about the diachronic, identity-transformative process of becoming native in a language that is no one’s native language (Hyland, 2016), and in a practice that is not passed down by inheritance or pre-determined by geographic variables (Ferguson, Pérez-Llantada, & Plo, 2011). It is a complex, developmental process wherein one assimilates a Discourse, learns about the
competing discourses within and beyond it, becomes agile in operationalizing its valued registers and genres and rhetorical tactics, develops enough expertise and courage to innovate or (re)shape established conventions and conversations, and gains the competence and capacity to “craft knowledge” (Kellogg, 2008) deemed valued in a discourse community.

The “native/non-native distinction breaks down entirely at advanced levels of academic writing” (Hyland, 2015, p. 58). That is, compared to EAL scholars, Anglophone scholars arguably experience less struggle in sentence level and grammatical aspect of academic writing. However, formal or structural knowledge (even if we take it for granted for Anglophones) is only one of the dimensions of generic competence which encompasses process, socio-rhetorical, and subject-matter knowledge as well (Tardy, 2009). The native status of Anglophone scholars does not make them genetically or naturally (more) cognizant of those aspects of scholarly writing and academic genre(s). Plus, Anglophone scholars are not a homogenous “group which shares the same competence in specialist literacy skills demanded by academic writing” (Hyland, 2015, p. 58). Such multidimensional literacy develops through a long enculturation process wherein junior scholars are socialized into the discourses and literacy practices of their target academic discourse communities through explicit instruction and/or in apprenticeship-like relationships with more experienced members of their community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In other words, being a native speaker “refers more accurately to the acquisition of syntactic and phonological knowledge as a result of early childhood socialization and not the acquisition of writing, which requires prolonged formal education” (Hyland, 2015, p. 56). The emergent literature on scholarly publication and dissertation writing practices of Anglophone junior scholars (see Fairbanks & Dias, 2016; Habibie, 2015, 2016; Rogers, Zawacki, & Baker, 2016) highlights structural, process, socio-rhetorical, and content dimensions of academic genre knowledge as problematic areas, and indicates that junior Anglophone scholars share similar discursive challenges with their EAL peers (e.g., Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007) in producing and communicating academic texts.
Similarly, the native status of Anglophone junior scholars does not alleviate non-discursive and affective challenges that they encounter in their academic trajectories and initiation and socialization into scholarly publication. Lack of resilience, health issues, personal and family problems, advisor-advisee friction, time and energy constraints, discouragement, self-doubt, anxiety, lack of confidence, fear of critical feedback and rejection, peripherality or “off-networkedness” (Swales, 2004), isolation from academic and social life, targeting appropriate journals, negotiation with gatekeepers, and attrition are only some of the struggles that are similarly experienced by Anglophone junior scholars, especially those in under-resourced academic institutions (Casanave, 2016; Habibie, 2015). Anglophone scholars might even face more serious affective struggles when seeking help regarding academic writing and publishing from other novice and established members of their academic community. They might see that as opening themselves up to criticism and losing credibility within their discourse communities (Habibie, 2015). After all, native speakers are still deemed as the icons of linguistic perfectionism.

Socialization Process

The discourse of the “Lucky Anglophone Scholar” orthodoxy also takes it for granted that all Anglophone novice scholars study or work in prestigious and well-resourced institutions of higher education, and that such affiliation warrants a smooth developmental process for these scholars and guarantees availability and access to sustained support mechanisms for scholarly productivity. As noted earlier, initiation into target academic discourse communities and participation in their valued discourses and practices such as scholarly publication involves a long process of explicit education and academic apprenticeship. In other words, ideally novice scholars in general undergo such a socialization process within the academic context of graduate education and in a mentorship relationship with other members of their communities of practice including advisors, supervisors, and more experienced peers. Although the context of the doctoral education as a community of
practice and pedagogical opportunities within it can potentially scaffold junior scholars’ initiation and socialization into scholarly publication, those inherent capacities are not necessarily available or used to their full potential in many cases. That is, realistically, the extent and quality of research communication support mechanisms including for-credit or non-credit writing for scholarly publication courses, workshops, writing groups, retreats, boot camps as well as writing center services vary considerably across different Inner Circle academic institutions as well as academic trajectories of individual Anglophone novice scholars (see Habibie, 2015; Caplan & Cox, 2016).

In spite of the overlapping needs and challenges of Anglophone and EAL scholars for developing research communication expertise, the stigma of academic writing education for Anglophone junior scholars is surprisingly rampant and strong in academia. Many stakeholders at both administration and faculty levels still consider academic literacy in general and academic writing in particular as the Anglophone doctoral student’s habitus (Bourdieu, 1977) and one of their innate dispositions. That is, Anglophone junior scholars are expected to have developed an understanding of discursive expectations and socio-rhetorical practices of their academic discourse communities by the time they enter doctoral education. That is why, “we still see little explicit teaching of writing at the graduate level” for Anglophone students in the Inner Circle academic context (Fairbanks & Dias, 2016, p. 140). Also there still exists “a strong perception that writing courses are remedial, so the courses are only for international students” (Fairbanks & Dias, 2016, p. 156). Consequently, many Anglophone students “rarely receive help with academic writing during their university careers, and are often less ‘academically bilingual’ than their English as an additional language counterparts” (Hyland, 2009, p. 85).

Similarly, many faculty members do not take it as their responsibility to explicitly or implicitly address writing for scholarly publication in their graduate courses, or dovetail course assignments and coursework with what graduate students do beyond the context of the class in order to scaffold their scholarly publication practices (see Casanave, 2010). Still many consider academic writing as an accessory and add-on to research under the assumption or pretext that research is the focal point
of the doctoral program (see Fairbanks & Dias, 2016; Habibie, 2015). To them, it seems utterly unreasonable to teach and support someone to learn writing for scholarly publication who (a) is a native speaker of English; (b) intends to write for publication in an English-medium journal and has already acquired the skills set, supposedly because of his or her native and/or doctoral status; and (c) is supposedly in academia to do research and graduate in the shortest amount of time possible.

However, what is missed here is that scholarly writing and publishing demand elite discipline-specific epistemological, socio-rhetorical, and generic literacies. Plus, in spite of the ever-increasing expectations for scholarly publishing, writing for publication is not addressed explicitly or implicitly in the curriculum at undergraduate or postgraduate levels in many disciplines (Murray & Newton, 2008). Therefore, junior scholars including Anglophone ones are less likely to have been exposed to or developed such high-order knowledge and skills set prior to embarking on their doctoral education and “can turn out to have rather vague understandings of the whole process of academic publishing” (Delamont, Atkinson, & Parry, 2004, p. 174). More importantly, scholarly writing is not the *icing on the cake*, but it is an essential component of the doctoral education. Research does not exist without writing, and there is no point in doing research if the findings are not to be disseminated. Writing embodies research and a scholar’s researcher and writer identities are inseparable.

Additionally, implementation and success of institutional support interventions such as scholarly publication seminars, workshops, and writing center services hinge upon a number of key factors and considerations. They require a meticulous coordination among departments, faculty members, and writing centers regarding the education of writing for scholarly publication. It is also imperative that junior scholars be considered as “a unique population of students with unique needs” (Philips, 2016, p. 159). More importantly, although “writing centers have historically downplayed the need for tutors to be disciplinary experts” (Philips, 2016, p. 163), they demand advisors and instructors that are both disciplinary and (meta)discursively expert in the required academic genres and practices of scholarly publication, not those who can merely address cosmetic aspects of general academic writing.
Besides, as noted earlier, Anglophone junior scholars’ affective and mental barriers in using such services are also a key consideration.

Therefore, even if we take the existence of such individual and group support mechanisms for granted, there is still no guarantee that those requirements are necessarily taken into account in designing and delivering stages. That is why in many cases those initiatives are ad hoc, limited, and sporadic. Even the structured ones may not necessarily meet the expectations of novice scholars in terms of quantity and quality and ultimately facilitate their socialization into their disciplinary discourse and practices (see Habibie, 2015). Plus, writing centers are undergraduate-centric to a great extent. That is, writing support services offered at those venues are not necessarily tailored to the needs of novice scholars (Philips, 2013). They are more focused on graduate genres such as thesis and grant proposals and technical and stylistic aspects of academic writing, and may not address the journal article genre, submission, and review processes specifically (see Habibie, 2015).

Similarly, sustainable access to supervisory and peer mentorship as one of the default modes of developing epistemological and socio-rhetorical literacies or achieving (co)authorship opportunities is contingent upon individual and socio-contextual variables. It is misleading to assume that such a support mechanism is structured and available homogeneously for Anglophone junior scholars within the Inner Circle academic context. As this assumption overlooks the fact that (a) supervisors are overburdened with their teaching, supervising, administrative and personal responsibilities; (b) they have different perceptions of and approaches to mentorship and graduate assistantship and are very different in the extent and quality of their hand-holding and support; (c) mentorship as a form of socialization is a bidirectional or multilateral process where power, agency, contestation, or resistance is “not a fixed or assured attribute of those who are older, more experienced, and so on, but can also be demonstrated by novices who contest practices or demonstrate expertise or understanding lacking in their mentors” (Duff & Talmy, 2012, p. 108). That is, students are not neutral elements in such a relationship and the chemistry between them and their supervisors and their mutual expectations and joint responsibilities and benefits complicate this complex equation (Delamont et al., 2004); and most
importantly, (d) even if we take the existence of mentorship as a given, an apprenticeship-based pedagogy “requires teachers with a deep understanding of the rhetorical practices of their disciplines” as those teachers have to be “capable of providing the explicit attention to and instruction in the rhetorical practices that such a pedagogy demands” (Paré, 2010, p. 31). In other words, such a pedagogy demands pedagogues who are engaged in that activity— that is, teachers who ‘have learned the genres of their profession and are successful in them’ – and [italics in the original]who are also able to induct students into their discipline’s discourse practices. (p. 36)

Last but not least, research production and communication in the twenty first century demands a skills set beyond generic and socio-rhetorical expertise. The rapid advancement of technology, especially in the past two decades, has rewired our brains and altered and reshaped our thinking, learning, and the nature of our knowledge production and dissemination processes and practices to a large extent. Learning has become a networked, continual, interdisciplinary, less formal, technology-mediated, self-organizing practice. In this complex knowledge economy where information is produced, disseminated, and consumed at an exponential rate, knowledge management has become as significant as knowledge itself (Siemens, 2005). In other words, knowing where to find relevant knowledge, how to sieve through it, and how to evaluate it is a key research skills set and an integral research communication literacy. This digital research and information literacy “is an area strongly shaped by technology developments in research databases, internet-based search and information management tools, citation management software, and developments in digital writing and presentation technologies” (Fairbanks & Dias, 2016, p. 153). There is no doubt that “[s]cholars can no longer ignore the need to learn these digital tools, especially new scholars seeking to enter a competitive job market and careers in academia” (Fairbanks & Dias, 2016, p. 153).

Membership in a well-resourced prestigious higher education institution within the Inner Circle does not necessarily warrant the development of this pivotal literacy for Anglophone junior scholars. In other
words, existence and access do not make Anglophone scholars digital natives or translate into informed use and “normalization” (Bax, 2011) of those technologies in their research practices. The development of such a specific literacy hinges upon one’s general digital fluency (digital competence and performance), faculty awareness and support, and structured institutional education. In the words of Rose, an Anglophone doctoral student in Habibie (2015), “there’s really absolutely no support” in this regard in current academia as “profs [professors] are generally out of their depth when it comes to that kind of work, so really cannot provide any support, and in fact are looking for that kind of support and advice themselves”.

In sum, writing for scholarly publication literacy develops “when it receives serious institutional attention and skilled support from knowledgeable supervisors and others who understand academic writing as complex disciplinary and identity work” (Kamler, 2008, p. 284). However, that is not necessarily the case in the Inner Circle academic context, and many Anglophone junior scholars cannot avail themselves of necessary support interventions as legitimate members of prestigious academic institutions. A combination of personal and socio-contextual variables can make existence, access, and sustainability of the supposedly taken-for-granted research communication support within the academic context of the Inner Circle very subjective, case by case, unreliable, and even a rare commodity. The findings of recent studies showcase this lack or scarcity of scaffolding, highlighting the “sink or swim” approach as the dominant model for learning scholarly publication in a Canadian academic context (see Habibie, 2015). In the absence of necessary scaffolding mechanisms, many Anglophone junior scholars are forced to rely on their own initiatives and capabilities, and seek alternative support resources in order to strategize their academic literacy development and scholarly publication practices. There is no doubt that a change in the status quo requires that academic institutions understand that “emerging scholars need to be supported in more explicit, strategic and generous ways than currently happens, so that we produce more confident graduates who know how to publish in a wide variety of contexts, including international refereed journals” (Kamler, 2008, p. 292).
Conclusion

This chapter presented a critical perspective on the *Lucky Anglophone Scholar Doctrine* as the privileged discourse in ERPP, bringing to light some of its underlying fallacies. In that respect, it highlighted that scholarly productivity cannot be taken for granted by virtue of native speaker status or membership in Inner Circle academic context. It argued that scholarly publication is a complex, multi-layered practice which demands specialist socio-rhetorical situated literacies beyond formal and structural knowledge of academic prose. It requires “the ability to communicate competently in an academic discourse community” (Wingate, 2015, p. 6). That is, “the ability to understand what happens in real world communicative events and to use this understanding to participate in them” (Paltridge et al., 2016, p. 167). The final socio-rhetorical artifact manifests an elite academic discourse in whose embodiment one’s native language plays a far less significant role than other individual and socio-contextual variables. Therefore, just like their EAL peers, Anglophone novice scholars need to develop the necessary generic, socio-rhetorical, and digital literacy and fluency, and socialization into community-specific conventions and conversations is a similarly arduous journey for all junior scholars irrespective of their native language.

More importantly, the unorthodox argument of this chapter at this juncture aimed at highlighting the issue that as a result of the *Lucky Anglophone Scholar Doctrine* research in ERPP has exclusively focused on writing for scholarly publication practices of EAL scholars. In other words, this is a call for the exigency of an inclusive research agenda which equally addresses scholarly publication practices of Anglophone scholars as an extremely marginalized and under-represented population in ERPP research demography. Such a comprehensive research direction will provide us with a more balanced, nuanced, and comparative picture of knowledge communication practices of both EAL and Anglophone scholars focusing on their difference, similarities, and overlaps. It sheds more light on their discursive and non-discursive challenges for enculturation into the discourses and practices of their academic discourse communities and the production and dissemination of scholarship, the
ways in which they develop the required literacies within and beyond their communities of practice, and the quality and quantity of support policies and practices in different academic contexts.

This knowledge base will help academic institutions, supervisors, and other stakeholders to tailor macro and micro policies, pedagogical initiatives, and support mechanisms that are more group-specific and context-sensitive. It helps avoid one-size-fits-all interventions generally developed based on a deficit model which merely considers EAL international students as the target clientele. Finally, it ensures that junior scholars survive in the competitive world of academia, thrive in the production of scholarly publications, and advance their visibility in inter/national fora.
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Introduction

Coming to terms with the discourses of their chosen disciplines is a major challenge for all students starting their academic studies, and this challenge continues for early-career researchers who wish to publish the results of their investigations. This has meant that one of the central tasks of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) instructors has been to help students gain control of relevant disciplinary registers and genres (cf. Swales, 1988). This is a process which goes beyond mere conventional conformity, as writing for academic purposes requires an understanding of disciplinary epistemology and the wider cultural context in which knowledge is made, controlled and transferred—it is not just a matter of ‘learning English’.
This can present a dilemma to EAP teachers as a large part of our professional practice is associated with the selection of exemplar texts which can be used in curriculum and syllabus development and as the basis for instructional materials. While it is patently obvious that these texts will be written in ‘English’, when it comes to deciding which *kind* of English, or *whose* English will be used in teaching and learning, the answers are not so clear.

In my own experience as an EAP teacher and teacher educator, I have found that insights from Systemic Functional Linguistics (e.g., Martin, 1992), Genre Analysis (e.g., Swales, 1994) and Corpus Linguistics (Hyland, 2008; Nesi & Gardner, 2012) have offered the theoretical insights I have needed to begin to answer the questions touched on above. Alongside these theoretical frameworks, Swales’ (1990) notion of the ‘allowable contribution’ and Bazerman’s ‘expert performance’ (Bazerman, 1994) have helped me establish the criteria I have needed for selecting the texts which will support the scaffolding of student writing in a genre based teaching/learning cycle (Martin, 2009).

Given this experience, I was intrigued to see that a claim was being made by Jenkins (2014) in favour of a new, ‘paradigm changing’, approach to EAP, i.e. English as a Lingua Franca for Academic purposes (ELFA). I was, however, also surprised to find in this account the claim that most EAP instruction in higher education conforms ‘by default to native academic English’ (Jenkins, 2014, p. 48), and that EAP/Genre approaches and Corpus studies:

> … are more nuanced and exploratory, and less concerned with norms and standards, but are still premised on native academic English as internationally appropriate. (ibid., p. 49, my emphasis)

My task in this chapter is, therefore, to look critically at the premises of this new paradigm, and to assess the extent to which it would be helpful to our students to reorient EAPWI so that it is aligned with this new approach. In so doing, I will review the paradigms that are in contention in EAPWI, discuss the way in which arguments have been constructed to justify the precedence of one approach over another, and consider the evidence that exists for Academic writing being divided
into categories such as ‘native-speaker’ and ELFA. Following this review, I will make some practical proposals for an approach to EAP which is informed by this present discussion. This will, I hope, offer a practical approach to supporting the academic writing development of students and early career researchers, whatever their mother tongue is.

**Earlier EAPWI Paradigms**

A number of paradigms have emerged from the research and institutional practices which have framed EAPWI during the last half century. Briefly, these can be summarised as in Fig. 4.1 below.

**English as a Lingua Franca (Academic) or ELFA**

In such a contested space, I was interested to note Jenkins’s proposal for ‘a single paradigm shifting approach’ (Jenkins, 2014, pp. 48–49) which would resolve some of contradictions which appear to bedevil the EAP project. This paradigm, it was claimed, is of central importance as:

ELFA challenges dominant assumptions about academic English (that it should defer to native versions with NESs acting as gatekeepers), and instead regards it as a social phenomenon that is dependent on context, and in which voice and identity are key concerns. (ibid., p. 61)

Alongside the socio-linguistic justification for ELFA, Jenkins also appears to be arguing that ELFA is more than a discoursal practice, and that it might also be considered to be a distinct variety. In support of this stance, Jenkins comments that:

… some features seem to be particularly prominent in ELFA settings. The following three features, extended use of the progressive aspect, innovative use of the ‘vague’ expression more or less, and use of chunking to manage discourse, all draw on the ELFA Corpus. (ibid., p. 63)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual / Rhetorical</td>
<td>- Draws on a tradition of instruction in rhetoric and essayist literacy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(North American Freshman writing programmes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emphasis on rhetorical modes (e.g. exposition, comparison etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Popularised through “Process Approach” (White &amp; Arndt 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre Informed EAPWI</td>
<td>- Originates in Register Analysis (e.g. Halliday et al. 1964), English for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Purposes (Swales 1988), and Systemic Functional Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Martin 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Draws on new tools in genre and corpus analysis (e.g. Swales 1981,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sees academic writing as embedded in disciplinary practices and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>epistemologies, and that apprentice writers can build a critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understanding of relevant genres through analysis of relevant text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exemplars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Literacies</td>
<td>- Starts from an ethnographic view of language use in academic setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understands ‘Literacies’ to be social practices (Lea &amp; Street 1998), and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>argues that students are assessed against inconsistent or inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards of academic discourse, and challenges the deficit models of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student academic literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited institutional impact to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Critical&quot; approaches to EAPWI</td>
<td>- Starting point found in Fairclough’s (1989) Critical Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and in work on linguistic imperialism (Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- &quot;Critical&quot; EAP implies alignment with a social good, and championing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>those who are unable to speak for themselves (Benesch, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Challenged by several scholars (e.g Widdowson 2004) because rather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>than supporting students who are having to face institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>challenges, these so-called critical approaches might rather put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students at risk of failure in the name of an ideological stance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4.1** Paradigms in EAPWI
I have several concerns with this newly proposed paradigm for EAPWI. I will present these below.

**Unpacking ELFA**

There seem to be some significant problems with the ELFA paradigm for EAPWI that Jenkins (2014) argues for. These relate not only to the way in which Jenkins’s argument in favour of ELFA has been constructed, but also to some of the core premises on which this argument is based.

**Hierarchies and Value Judgements**

An initial problem is that Jenkins (2014) constructs a ‘bad, better, best’ hierarchy to justify her own Paradigm Changing ELFA. Thus many current practices in EAP (including Genre Informed EAP) are presented as being Conforming Approaches that are ‘premised on native academic English as internationally appropriate’ (Jenkins, 2014, pp. 48–49). Jenkins (2014) considers this ‘bad’ set to be less acceptable than the Challenging Approaches she then describes. These map onto Academic literacies and Critical EAP and receive a much cleaner bill of health as they question what lies behind linguistic conformity. They do not, however, change the EAP paradigm, as they are also premised on notions of nativeness in Academic Writing—and this is where ELFA would appear to come in. Purporting to have the advantage of being critical (where Genre Informed EAP is not), and paradigm changing (which the Challenging approaches do not manage), Jenkins’s ELFA claims to supersede earlier approaches and is, thereby, at the pinnacle of the hierarchy of all approaches to EAP. As such, it is, of course, unassailable in its critical virtue.

**Data**

Although it might seem that a case has been made for ELFA’s superiority, I would argue that there are some issues that still need to be attended to before we should all jump on to this particular bandwagon. The first of these is that the main resource that has been used in making
the case for written ELFA thus far is the very small 1.5 million word WrELFA corpus (Mauranen, 2012). While this does offer an interesting perspective on institutional language use, the corpus is too small and too idiosyncratic to offer insights which can form the basis for strong generalisations. Comprising unedited research papers (50% of the total), PhD examiner reports (26%), and research blog transcripts (24%), the corpus cannot offer insights into language use in the kinds of written genres that matter to students entering higher education or engaging in research—i.e. assessed student writing or published research articles. Furthermore, the tiny amount of published research which has been undertaken into written ELFA does little to indicate that WrELFA use contrasts systematically from wider disciplinary use. Thus Carey (2013) concludes:

…the tendency of academic ELF users to deploy approximated chunks should not be overstated, as the majority of the chunks investigated here do indeed conform to convention, both in their function and form. (ibid., p. 226)

If Written ELFA’s empirical foundations are open to question, it is also possible to argue that there is a deep conceptual flaw at the heart of the WrELFA project, and that this also reduces the strength of its claim to be paradigm changing. This is the problem of nativeness.

Nativeness

Setting aside matters of rhetoric or data, a more important concern can be found when considering the claim that Genre-based EAP is ‘still premised on native academic English’ (Jenkins, 2014, pp. 48–49). The question here is whether there is such a thing as ‘native academic English’. While applied linguistics has long recognised that even the term Native Speaker is problematic, in the context of written academic communication, (both assessed student writing and published work), the notion of the Native Writer is, I would argue, undefinable, indescribable and unhelpful.
First comes the problem of defining ‘Nativeness’. Davies sums up the challenge neatly when he states:

… when we look for a definition of the native speaker which will act as an applied linguistic benchmark, the concept slips away and we wonder whether after all Lewis Carroll’s Snark is only a Boojum. (Davies, 2003, p. 1)

If nativeness is difficult to define, it is also difficult to describe as can be seen in the three examples below:

- *riverrun, past Eve and Adam’s, from swerve of shore to bend of bay, brings us by a commodius vicus of recirculation back to Howth Castle and Environs.* (Joyce, J. 1939)
- *Dis poetry is like a riddim dat drops
De tongue fires a riddim dat shoots like shots
Dis poetry is designed fe rantin
Dance hall style, big mouth chanting,
Dis poetry nar put yu to sleep* (Benjamin Zephania)
- *But in disagreement with the Divisional Court, I would declare that the stop power conferred by para 2(1) of Schedule 7 is incompatible with article 10 of the Convention in relation to journalistic material in that it is not subject to adequate safeguards against its arbitrary exercise and I would, therefore, allow the appeal in relation to that issue.* (Lord Justice Richards, Miranda vs. Secretary of State)

While all three texts are the production of outstanding practitioners in their respective fields, describing them as Native Speaker writing is next to meaningless. Yes, they have been written by people who have English as their mother tongue, but this is the limit of their common ground. Whatever excellence they have does not derive from the mother tongue status of their writers.

By contrast, the following text has little in common with the preceding ‘native’ English writing, but, as an instance of published disciplinary
writing, it can easily be identified as an ‘expert performance’ (Bazerman, 1994) within its field.

* Simulium (Chirostilbia) Enderlein, 1921 is composed by 14 species distributed over seven countries in South America (Adler and Crosskey, 2015). This subgenus is composed of two species groups (Coscaron, 1987; Coscaron and Coscaron-Arias, 1997): S. pertinax and S. subpallidum. (Hamada et al., 2015) [D Corpus—Acta Tropica]

What matters, in this instance, is the way in which the text will share lexis, grammar and discourse conventions with other texts in the same and analogous genres, and the fact that this text was found in a published research article in a leading international journal and, thereby, can be identified as an ‘allowable contribution’ (Swales, 1990). By the same token, the first language status of the author of this text is of no concern when it comes to assessing its effectiveness as an instance of academic communication. Any attempt to describe it as native-like, or otherwise, is beside the point as it is the author’s disciplinary expertise (Rampton, 1990; Römer, 2009) which matters when it comes to judging this kind of academic writing, not the author’s first language.

**Re-theorising EAPWI**

A re-theorising of EAPWI may offer a means of escaping from any notions of nativeness and allowing us to focus on the needs of students and researchers. One way of starting this process is to unpack the dichotomies which are implicit in the different approaches to EAPWI that were outlined above. By doing this, it begins to be possible to describe the start and end points of any proposed EAPWI programme, and, thereby, frame the curriculum and syllabus that have to be elaborated to best address the needs of the programme’s end users.

Following this strategy, we find that dichotomies which are implicit in Genre Informed approaches to EAPWI (Jenkins’ ‘conforming’ approaches) can be summarised as:
Critics of these kinds of EAPWI programmes have claimed that they oblige students slavishly to copy models, to deny their own voices and to subsume their identities in obedience to the demands of an alien academic culture. While there may be some justice for these criticisms where ‘one-size-fits-nobody’ course books or writing programmes are concerned, I would argue that if approaches such as those proposed in Swales and Feak (1994) or implemented by Charles (2012) are considered, then Genre informed EAP deserves a more balanced appreciation.

The dichotomies which frame both Jenkins’s challenging and ELFA paradigms stand in stark contrast to those which inform Genre-based approaches. Where Swalesian genre based EAPWI programmes attempt to support learners as they engage with new disciplinary discourses, their critical counterparts appear to want them to challenge and resist existing textual practices. In the case of ELFA, while genre-informed pedagogy attempts to scaffold learners’ understanding of context and text so that they can move towards an autonomous engagement with disciplinary literacies, ELFA appears to be chasing the red herring of an uncodifiable ELFA variety which stands in contrast to an undefinable native speaker standard. We can summarise these dichotomies as:

- Challenging approaches
  - individuals vs. institutions
  - outsiders vs. insiders
  - insurgents vs. hegemons
- ELFA
  - non-native vs. native
  - ELFA vs. native?
I would argue that it is not pedagogically appropriate either to encourage our students to enter into conflict with those institutions they have elected to engage with, or to attempt to struggle against a chimerical native-speaker norm. In real world settings, participants in EAP programmes have very limited time available to them and are committed to an engagement with very high stakes academic challenges. Our first job as EAP practitioners is to help them meet and overcome these challenges, while recognising that as educational professionals, we also have an obligation, in line with Academic Literacies arguments, to challenge the institutional inconsistency and confusion which apprentice writers frequently have to face when studying in Higher Education or attempting to publish their research.

**Enquiries**

In order to ground this discussion in data, I felt it was useful to consider a question which underlies much of the preceding discussion. This is:

*To what extent do postgraduate students or scholars who wish to be published internationally have to: ‘follow the norms of native academic English’.*

In order to investigate this, I assembled a data set made up of examples taken from internationally published disciplinary writing and attempted to assess the extent to which these textual instances conform to or diverge from disciplinary discoursal norms and canonical lexico-grammatical norms. The data I worked with were drawn from high impact journals from four contrasting disciplinary areas (4 million words) (Fig. 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Articles Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal of Memory and Language</td>
<td>M8L</td>
<td>1,026,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Acta Tropica (Biomedical Science)</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>1,053,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business studies</td>
<td>Journal of Economics and Business</td>
<td>E&amp;B</td>
<td>1,057,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Power and Energy Systems</td>
<td>EPES</td>
<td>1,079,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>651</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,217,187</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.2  D-corpus composition
I hold that these kinds of journals are now far beyond the control of ‘native-speaker’ hegemons. As an example, consider *Acta Tropica*. This journal’s editors are mostly from outer or expanding circle countries (Kachru, 1990), e.g. Sweden, Germany and Brazil, with the majority of the editorial board also based in these regions (29 out of 40). Similarly, in a recent poll of *Acta Tropica* D corpus authors (see Tribble, 2017), 88% of corresponding authors who responded to the survey do not have English as a first language, and survey responses indicate little or no use of the kinds of native speaker copy editing of journal submissions which Lillis and Curry (2011) report on.

The data in this corpus were considered from three perspectives:

– Discoursal
– Lexico-grammatical
– Disciplinary

**Discoursal Conformity**

Working with *Acta Tropica* data in this instance, I extracted 10 arbitrarily selected articles from the AT corpus (1 in 10 articles), with no attempt being made to filter for author mother tongue status. These articles were then manually analysed to identify major sections by using primary headings across all 10 articles, these results being, in turn, reviewed to identify convergence and/or divergence. In Fig. 4.3, below, stages that are shared across all the articles are marked with an emboldened X. The shading identifies two articles which strongly diverge from the structure shared by the remaining 8 instances.

The main finding from this stage of the analysis is that there is evidence of a strong convergence across almost all of the articles on an IMRD structure (Introduction / Materials & Methods / Results / Discussion). Given the disciplinary context, this should not come as a surprise, but it demonstrates clearly how a discipline’s epistemology has an impact on the structure of texts which are, in effect, instantiations of disciplinary practices. In the present case, the two major exceptions to the convergence identified above (i.e., articles which do not share the
centrally important RESULTS stage) turn out to be exceptions which can prove rules. Thus, Article #4 is a descriptive study of a newly discovered species and Article #6 is a methodology review commenting on theoretical frameworks rather than reporting an experimental procedure.

**Lexicogrammatical Divergence**

Working again with the same *Acta Tropica* data set of 10 arbitrarily selected articles from the AT corpus (1 in 10 articles), three important sections were selected for analysis:

- complete abstract
- opening paragraph of Introduction
- opening paragraph of Discussion or Conclusion (whichever was present in the text)

A manual analysis of all text extracts was then undertaken to identify instances of non-canonical language use (Rozycki & Johnson, 2013). The preliminary analysis was saved in the form shown in Fig. 4.4 below.

Once all text extracts were analysed, the commentary results were transferred to a spreadsheet, edited to ensure consistency of wording...
An analysis of reported cases of cutaneous leishmaniasis (CL) was performed using *[the] data registered in the southern Ecuadorian Amazon region* during the 27 years from 1986 to 2012. *The* cases/subjects with both the suspected CL lesions and the amastigote-positive results were recruited for the analysis. The yearly occurrence of cases showed a markedly higher number during the six years, 1998 and 1999. After 1994, when the insecticide spraying campaign using *helicopter* in 1993-1994, the number dropped remarkably. Then, the yearly occurrence gradually fluctuated from 101 cases in 1996 to 81 in 2000, maintaining a low number of cases after the campaign. The monthly occurrence of cases showed a markedly high number during March and August, suggesting a correlation to the rainy season (months) in the areas. A statistical significance was found between the monthly average number of the CL case and the average precipitation (p = 0.01474). It was suggested that the time of transmission of CL would depend on the rainy seasons at each endemic area of Ecuador, which has diverse climatic features depending on the geographic regions. Such information at given leishmaniasis-endemic areas of Ecuador would be important for the future planning of disease control. Molecular analysis and characterization of clinical samples revealed the presence of Leishmania (Vianna) braziliensis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABSTRACT</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An analysis of reported cases of cutaneous leishmaniasis (CL) was</td>
<td>5 [redundant determiner]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performed using *[the] data registered in the southern Ecuadorian</td>
<td>6 [missing determiner]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon region* during the 27 years from 1986 to 2012. <em>The</em> cases/subjects</td>
<td>7 [redundant determiner]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with both the suspected CL lesions and the amastigote-positive results</td>
<td>8 [unclear wording]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were recruited for the analysis. The yearly occurrence of cases showed</td>
<td>9 [plural needed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a markedly higher number during the six years, 1998 and 1999. After 1994,</td>
<td>10 [missing determiner]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when the insecticide spraying campaign using <em>helicopter</em> in 1993-1994,</td>
<td>11 [adverb] At that time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the number dropped remarkably. Then, the yearly occurrence gradually</td>
<td>12 [lexical choice] large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluctuated from 101 cases in 1996 to 81 in 2000, maintaining a low</td>
<td>13 [preposition] with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of cases after the campaign. The monthly occurrence of cases</td>
<td>14 [unclear wording] A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showed a markedly high number during March and August, suggesting a</td>
<td>statistically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correlation to the rainy season (months) in the areas. A statistical</td>
<td>significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance was found between the monthly average number of the CL case</td>
<td>15 [preposition] for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the average precipitation (p = 0.01474). It was suggested that the</td>
<td>16 [preposition] in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time of transmission of CL would depend on the rainy seasons at each</td>
<td>17 [determiner + plural form]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endemic area of Ecuador, which has diverse climatic features depending</td>
<td>climatic features depending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the geographic regions. Such information at given leishmaniasis</td>
<td>the geographic regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endemic areas of Ecuador would be important for the future planning of</td>
<td>18 [preposition] for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disease control. Molecular analysis and characterization of clinical</td>
<td>19 [redundant determiner]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samples revealed the presence of Leishmania (Vianna) braziliensis.</td>
<td>20 [missing determiner] the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.4 Lexico-grammatical divergence—analysis

and quantified using Excel’s count function. These results (sorted by frequency) are given below (Fig. 4.5).

This analysis clearly demonstrates that there is a substantial level of non-canonical use in important text stages across a set of published, edited articles in a prestigious high-impact international research journal. More precisely, 103 instances of non-canonical use were found across the extracts from ten articles (6239 words), i.e. approximately one non-canonical uses every 60 words. Importantly, these findings indicate that the claims made by proponents of ELFA that non-canonical language use can lead to the exclusion of ‘non-native’ writers from publishing opportunities are open to refutation. What this preliminary study demonstrates is that in the data under consideration, there is a general acceptance of non-canonical usage in expert discourses.
The implications from this study (in the case of Acta Tropica at least) are that clause level divergence from canonical grammar norms is not a barrier to academic publishing, so long as the text which the author presents for publication is scientifically sound, does not impose an excessive comprehension burden on an international readership, and conforms to genre expectations at stage and move level.
Disciplinary Convergence and Divergence

In order to gain insights into the degree of divergence or convergence between the 4 million word D corpus of international journal articles (Tribble, 2017) and other English language medium publications, two additional data sets were drawn on. The first of these is 3.4 million word collection which Hyland (2008) compiled in order to investigate variation across disciplines. This will be referred to as the H corpus. See Fig. 4.6 for a breakdown of its sub-components.

![Fig. 4.6 H corpus composition](image)

Although this corpus is not publicly available, the results from Hyland’s (2008) research are published and have been used as comparators in the present study. The second data set is a 15.4 million word written academic subset extracted from the BNC (2007)\(^1\).

Two strategies were used for the analysis of the corpus. The first involved Keyword analysis (Scott & Tribble, 2006), where Keywords are those words whose frequency is unusually high in comparison with some norm. Alongside Keyword analysis, N-grams were also investigated (see Biber, 2006; Cortes, 2004; Hyland, 2008).

Two patterns emerge through this analysis. Keywords, as you would expect, reveal the disciplinary divergence which is an obvious concomitant of the contrasting foci of the four articles in the D corpus. This contrast can be seen both in terms of the high frequency key-nouns (as in Fig. 4.7 below) and high frequency lexical nouns (Fig. 4.8 below).

N-grams offer evidence of both convergence and divergence in relation to what Hyland (2008) calls *Research oriented, Participant oriented and Text oriented* clusters, categories which map onto Halliday’s Ideational, Interpersonal and Textual Systemic Functional discourse functions. Figure 4.9 below shows the shared ngrams from the top 50 ngrams across the four data sets in the D corpus. These give a strong insight into the rhetorical and discourse organising devices that writers across a range of disciplines have in common.

Examples from the unshared ngrams are given below. These show how contrasts in topical focus and disciplinary epistemology are instantiated in the texts that are published in the different journals. Thus we find *enzyme linked immunosorbent assay* in Acta Tropica, and *participants were asked to* in Memory & Language (Fig. 4.10).

Parallel analyses of the N-grams in the BNC Academic Corpus and Hyland’s H corpus findings show similar patterns of *intra-disciplinary convergence* and *inter-disciplinary divergence*. However, importantly, there is no evidence of systematic use of non-canonical n-grams or n-grams that might be thought of indicating ELFA usage. It is interesting to note that this accords with the findings regarding ngram usage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>as a function of</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>as a result of</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>as well as the</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>in addition to the</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>in the absence of</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>in the case of</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>in the context of</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>in the form of</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>on the other hand</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>the difference between the</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the results of the</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with respect to the</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4.9** D Shared Ngrams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT</th>
<th>EP&amp;EE</th>
<th>E&amp;B</th>
<th>M&amp;L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>according to the manufacturer</td>
<td>effectiveness of the proposed</td>
<td>an increase in the</td>
<td>a main effect of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dna was extracted from</td>
<td>in this paper</td>
<td>as a percentage of</td>
<td>a social critique of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enzyme linked immunosorbent assay</td>
<td>in this paper the</td>
<td>as a proxy for</td>
<td>distinction a social critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the control of</td>
<td>is assumed to be</td>
<td>federal reserve bank of</td>
<td>participants were asked to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the detection of</td>
<td>is defined as the</td>
<td>in this paper we</td>
<td>social critique of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the first time</td>
<td>of the power system</td>
<td>in this section we</td>
<td>the beginning of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the presence of</td>
<td>of the proposed method</td>
<td>is negative and significant</td>
<td>the degree to which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the present study</td>
<td>performance of the proposed</td>
<td>of the financial crisis</td>
<td>the extent to which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in this study we</td>
<td>the effectiveness of the</td>
<td>the dependent variable is</td>
<td>the main effect of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the present study</td>
<td>the performance of the</td>
<td>the impact of the</td>
<td>the structure of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4.10** Unshared D Corpus n-grams
in ELFA in Carey (2013). Carey’s study is well worth commenting on at this point as his conclusions are particularly germane to the present argument.

Drawing on Sinclair and Mauranen’s (2006) Linear Unit Grammar (LUG) Carey offers an account of lexical bundle usage in Mauranen’s ELFA Corpus of spoken interactions (Mauranen, 2008) and the smaller WrELFA corpus (Mauranen, 2012). Rather than focusing on what he calls the ‘colourful’ and apparently unique ELF formulations which Kecskes (2007), Seidlhofer (2009) and others have concentrated on in the past, Carey uses the LUG categories OI (chunks for Organizing Interaction) and OT (chunks Organizing Text), specifically focusing on the extent to which conventional OT chunks are drawn on in ELFA production, and the extent to which approximations of these chunks are resorted to when:

… ELF users’ capacity for holistic storage and retrieval as well as the broad trends toward approximation that might indicate emerging ELF-specific phraseological preferences. (Carey, 2013, p. 211)

The lexical bundle use which Carey eventually studied included a small set of multi-word chunks: *in my view / from my point of view / so to speak / at the same time / on the one hand / on one hand / on the other hand / on the other (x)*. Significantly, Carey concludes that his findings partially contradict the notion that these chunks are merely “‘islands of reliability,’ in Granger’s (1998) terms” (Carey, 2013, p. 226), and argues that:

… the tendency of academic ELF users to deploy approximated chunks should not be overstated, as the majority of the chunks investigated here do indeed conform to convention, both in their function and form. (ibid., p. 226)

Carey’s conclusions from his study of empirical data were that ‘high-stakes, expert ELF practice without ENL linguistic gatekeepers’. (ibid., p. 212) is more likely to be characterised by *conventional* usage than the kinds of ELF inventiveness which Seidlhofer, Jenkins, and others have described, a conclusion which is supported by the results from this present study.
Applications

So where do we go from here? If paradigm transforming ELFA proves to be an Emperor with a rather restricted wardrobe, is there a way forward for those involved in the daily challenge of delivering EAP Writing Instruction programmes? From my own experience, I would argue that we already have a well theorised and feasible set of solutions. As with any pedagogic practices, they are not perfect, but they certainly provide a basis for action. In the case of current practice at King’s College London, we are building on earlier work (Wingate & Tribble, 2012) and continuing to draw on genre informed approaches. This has enabled me and colleagues at King’s (Dr Ursula Wingate and Dr Nick Andon) to offer a new Academic Literacies programme to all students on the MA in TESOL, irrespective of their L1 status. This course provides 10 hour hours of instruction, delivered in Term 1 (6 hours) and Term 2 (4 hours). The materials we have developed are based on multiple instances of assessed student disciplinary writing—high scoring (more expert) & low scoring (less expert). For the first time we have been trying to draw both on genre approaches to academic writing and to academic reading (see D. Rose, M. Rose, Farrington, & Page, 2008). The course helps students to prepare for two major assessed assignments they have to deal with in Term 1 and Term 2 and focuses on the reading into writing challenge, genre awareness and knowledge, argument development (Macro-theme, Hyper-theme—see Martin, 2009), and citational practices in applied linguistics. At the moment we are not addressing issues at and below the clause—but there is the potential to do this using local and publicly available (e.g., BAWE) corpus resources. At the time of writing this course is being delivered for the first time and is awaiting evaluation. Once this has been completed, our plan is to disseminate the findings to wider audiences.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have attempted to reconcile some conflicting paradigms in EAPWI and to identify which paradigm has the potential to offer practical solutions to supporting students’ acquisition of relevant
academic literacies. In doing this I have considered how some of the major approaches to pedagogy in this area have been developed, looked at the theory that informs them, and discussed some of the apparent limitations of a new approach which has made great claims to be paradigm changing. Jenkins (2014) set out two research questions:

What is ‘academic English’ according to an ELFA perspective? Given ELF(A)’s attested variability, can we (try to) describe academic ELF in any meaningful and useful way? If so, how is it different from traditional descriptions of academic English? If not, what can we propose to take the place of existing (albeit highly idealized) descriptions? [...] If ELFA is conceptually different from traditional academic English, can it be taught and learnt? (ibid., p. 68)

On the evidence currently available, I am not persuaded that WrELFA can be delineated along the lines Jenkins suggests—and I don’t see it as offering a new direction for EAPWI. Rather, I would argue that the notion of WrELFA has very little of practical pedagogic value to offer, although, as with Academic Literacies, I would accept that it offers an interesting critique of the ways in which universities and academic power brokers often do considerable disservice to international users of English. I would further argue that the kinds of approach exemplified in Wingate and Tribble (2012) offer more feasible models for EAPWI. These include approaches in which: EAP instructors teach writing on the basis of subject specific texts and materials that they receive from subject lecturers; EAP instructors and subject lecturers plan writing activities together and carry out team teaching; and disciplinary writing is taught by the subject lecturer. If such approaches are adopted, they have the potential to ensure that EAPWI courses are both inclusive and discipline and context specific. Such programmes render WrELFA irrelevant because they recognise that all students (whatever their mother tongue status) need induction into disciplinary writing; they are linked to the teaching of a discipline’s epistemology and content; and they empower students and future researchers to actively participate in a discipline’s communicative and social practices.
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Part II
Perspectives of Authors
Introduction

In surveying the empirical literature on writing for scholarly publication, what becomes easily apparent is the skewed attention to the challenges and constraints—particularly, discursive issues—encountered by EAL faculty (e.g., Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2001; Gosden, 1996) or EAL doctoral students (e.g., Cheung, 2010; Ho, 2017; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007) in getting their research published. Notwithstanding “the fact that all newcomers feel challenged and intimidated by writing for publication,” as argued by Hyland (2009), thus, far the relevant research “has largely focused on the obstacles faced by non-native speaking researchers in getting into print” (p. 86). Little empirical research, except for Habibie (2016), has attended to issues encountered by Anglophone doctoral students in academic publication,
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which points to an evident void in research in this vein. In this chapter, I will present a case study of the experiences of two Anglophone doctoral students at a Canadian research-intensive university, focusing on the issues and challenges they faced in writing for publication. Before explaining the case study, however, the conceptual framework undergirding the study will be laid out.

Learning to Write and Publish: A Genre Knowledge Perspective

Learning how to publish academically goes beyond a mere knowledge of how to compose a research article to include developing an insight into the norms, conventions, and conversations (Bazerman, 1980, 1985) of a given discourse community (Swales, 1990). In order for novices to engage in the disciplinary practices of their scholarly communities as competent and legitimate members, they need to learn the valued genres of discourse community, an important one being the genre of research article. When novice scholars write for scholarly publication, they are in fact “learning to write for a professional peer audience, the process by which novices are socialized into the academic community; it is the recognized route to insider status” (Hyland, 2012, p. 61).

For the purposes of this chapter, I draw on Tardy’s (2009) notion of “genre knowledge,” as a conceptual lens, to analyze and interpret the writing-for-publication challenges experienced by the two doctoral students in this study. Tardy (2009)’s expanded model of genre knowledge encompasses the following four different, yet interacting, genre knowledge domains, namely formal knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, process knowledge, and subject-matter knowledge. Formal knowledge, in this model, refers to an understanding of the textual and structural features of a genre—e.g., structural organization, linguistic features, and other textual conventions common to the genre. Process knowledge refers to an understanding of the processes involved in enacting and disseminating the genre, including how the genre works within a network of other related genres. Rhetorical knowledge includes an understanding
of a genre’s intended purpose within the broader context where it operates, including an awareness of the power dynamics. This domain of genre knowledge also demands an awareness of one’s own positioning and expectations of the intended readership of the genre. Finally, subject-matter knowledge is an essential domain that encompasses content and background knowledge of one’s discipline.

Tardy (2009) argues that these four domains of genre knowledge work together to enable the writer to effectively enact and communicate in the genre. She further notes that these domains are considered to be integrated and overlapping rather than isolated from one another. With further engagement in the target genre, these four knowledge domains become increasingly integrated. It is also important to note that genre knowledge development, according to Tardy (2009), does not occur in a linear but rather in a recursive fashion. The strength of this framework, vis-à-vis other models of genre knowledge, lies in the fact that it goes beyond a traditional focus on the discursive and linguistic elements of the genre, and offers a useful holistic view of how genre knowledge is developed. Although Tardy’s (2009) multidimension model is primarily a genre learning model, I find it useful in identifying the areas in which novice scholars face challenges in writing for publication.

The Study

The research question that I try to address in this chapter is: What are the issues and challenges facing these two Anglophone doctoral students, as novice scholars, in getting published in English-medium international refereed journals? This research question has been modified from an earlier, broader research project which investigated—both EAL and Anglophone—doctoral students’ writing for publication experiences in Canadian academic context. The inclusion criteria, in the larger study, required the participants to (a) be enrolled as full-time doctoral students in a Canadian university, (b) have had past (successful or otherwise) attempts in writing for scholarly publication in English (journal articles or book chapters), and (c) be planning to write for publication
within the time frame of the study—16 months from the outset of the study. Data were collected from four Anglophone, two bilingual, and nine EAL doctoral students meeting the recruitment criteria. In this chapter, though, I draw on the data gleaned from two Anglophone doctoral students to address the aforementioned research question. I posted multiple recruitment advertisements on the bulletin boards of the particular department in question, and these two participants volunteered to participate in the study.

Participants

Ben and Heather (pseudonyms) were both Canadian-born Anglophone doctoral students in language education at a Canadian research-intensive university, and both aspired to attain academic positions in their field in the future. At the start of the study, Heather and Ben were in their second and third year of the doctoral program, respectively. It is worth noting that Heather, during her master’s program, had served on the editorial board of an in-house journal affiliated with the university. Both Ben and Heather had managed to publish academically, prior to their participation in the study. Ben had copublished a book chapter with his doctoral supervisor in his first year of the doctoral program. Heather, prior to the commencement of her doctoral program, had managed to publish two journal articles co-authored with a professor in her (master’s) department. Besides having published prior to the study, the participants managed to produce publications within the study period as well. Ben published a co-authored book chapter with his doctoral supervisor, and Heather was able to publish a sole-authored journal article and an article in a newsletter. Furthermore, she had been invited (by her mentor) to co-author a book chapter, which had been accepted for publication at the completion of the study. Also, during the study period, she started reviewing for a scholarly journal and a conference in her field. It is worth noting that Ben and Heather had over six years of experience as ESL educators, mainly in the Canadian context.
Data Collection and Analysis

A case-study method was selected for this research. Chief amongst the benefits of a case study design is its capacity to provide “a thick description of a complex social issue embedded within a cultural context,” which can potentially lead to “rich and in-depth insights that no other method can yield” (Yin, 2009, p. 155). Similarly, Duff (2008) argues that “when done well”—an important condition—case studies display “a high degree of completeness, depth of analysis, and readability,” and they are effective in generating “new hypotheses, models, and understandings” about the target phenomena (p. 43). In this research design, each doctoral student constituted a case that was studied longitudinally (16 months) and in detail. In this sixteen-month, qualitative case study, questionnaires, multiple semistructured interviews, submission trajectories, and communications with journal editors and reviewers were used as the chief sources of data. The data used here, however, are mainly from the interviews conducted with Ben and Heather. In total, over the span of 16 months, I conducted four and six interviews with Heather and Ben respectively. Duration of the interviews ranged from 20 to 60 minutes; the first and final interviews with each participant were longer. The garnered data were subject to iterative thematic analysis (Clarke & Braun, 2014).

In doing the thematic analysis, I followed the conventional steps—as advised by Clarke and Braun (2014)—including familiarizing myself with the data, identifying features of the data potentially pertinent to the research questions, coding emergent patterns, collating relevant codes under found themes, and deciding on the prominent and pertinent themes to address the research questions of the study. To assist with the analysis, the qualitative software package, NVivo 11 was used to code and categorize the recurring and notable themes. It was also used to gather up all the chunks of data (including quotations) associated with each code so that the data chunks under each code could be viewed together.
Findings

In what follows, drawing on the categorization of genre knowledge (Tardy, 2009), the participants’ challenges in writing for publication are presented.

Formal Knowledge

Somewhat surprisingly, the findings revealed that the discursive and linguistic forms (formal knowledge) of the journal article genre can be potentially challenging even for some Anglophone novice writers. Strikingly, after submitting a sole-authored manuscript to a well-known North American journal in language education, Heather received a somewhat shocking language-related remark: “Get it proofread by a native speaker,” which astonished her, prompting her to say “I am a native speaker” (emphasis in the original interview). What further exasperated Heather was that the peer reviewer had also pointed out 3 grammar mistakes in the manuscript. It is also interesting to note that Heather mentioned that she in fact kept a list of academic lexical bundles and collocations—e.g., “coconstruct a conversation”—that she encountered in academic texts and research articles. Explaining the reason as to why she did so, Heather was explicit in saying that: “We [native speakers] do not speak this language [and these words] at home.” In addition, the participants found certain sections of the journal article difficult to write. Heather found the literature review section to be the most difficult part of the journal article to write. Referring to the importance of, and her difficulty in, writing a solid literature review, Heather noted:

In lit review, there is a lot of selection that has to be done; that is, how your whole thing gets framed and it sets everything up for how are you going to do the interpretations and discussions. So what you review in the literature determines what conclusions you can come to in the end, which seem so backwards and ridiculous because normally you would do the lit review then you would do the research and then you would come
to whatever conclusion you come to but in fact that is not how it works. You have to do a lit review that … sort of connects you back to your conclusions so I find that hard, because I never know how many citations are important to have, how detailed it should be, or how broad my scope should be. I have challenges sort of in doing that.

Much like Heather, Ben also felt it was difficult to write the literature review section. He also thought writing the introduction to journal articles is difficult, because:

It’s the first thing that you have to write. Some people say don’t start with the introduction and that’s probably a good idea, because you are trying to write the introduction but you don’t have something to write about, yet it is very hard. So I do not know what the best way of doing it is, but it’s not easy.

Ben also pointed out that he lacked a clear understanding of the genre differences between the empirical and conceptual journal articles:

Some people publish conceptual article, right? So how do you organize that? where do you begin? I mean what if you don’t have a study set up you know. Like what if you want to write something conceptual. I am still figuring it out, it’s tough and I don’t really know the answer to a lot of questions like these most basic things.

Having provided the main findings pertinent to the formal knowledge of the genre, I now turn to the findings related to challenges in the process knowledge of the genre.

**Process Knowledge**

Another important challenge was that the participants felt that they did not have adequate familiarity with the process of scholarly publication. When I interviewed Ben, at the beginning of the study, he expressed concern about his inadequate familiarity with the process of publication:
But how are you supposed to learn about the process? So that’s what is difficult to me … not knowing how the process works. I do not know. It’s all foreign territory. This is all like a new, unexplored kind of territory as far as I am concerned.

Another remarkable challenge in the process of writing for publication was selecting an appropriate publication venue and deciding where (and where not) to publish, as shown in the following comment by Ben:

I don’t know which journals are exactly at the top and second tier… even like finding out about well-respected journals, I am not sure exactly… What makes me worried is now I am starting to wonder maybe I will get published and I will be all excited and then it will turn out oops that’s a tier three publication and nobody cares. I never considered it before. I just thought published is published, if you are published in a peer review journal. … but maybe it turns out … that doesn’t count… So you want something with a little bit of prestige, so selecting a journal is a bit tough.

Besides being uncertain about the hierarchical value of academic journals, Ben was also concerned about selecting a suspicious or predatory journal by mistake, “So you don’t want to send it to something [a journal] that is kind of a shady, fly by night journal.” Another process-related challenge was found to be inadequate access to samples and exemplars in the genre of peer review, as illustrated in Ben’s comments:

No one shares real examples of journal reports. … I have no sense of how normal is it for me to have all these errors or all these mistakes or all these like ‘you have to do this much editing or polishing’. I don’t know what kinds of comments do people get on their article. Do a lot of people get really negative comments? Does that mean my article is particularly bad, I have no idea because I don’t know how much work other people do on their article. The only things I only ever see are papers after they’ve been published, so they are in their final form. They are polished. They’re beautiful… [but] papers don’t start out perfect. Studies don’t start out perfect.

Another challenging aspect of writing for publication, as perceived by the participants, was developing an understanding of how the research
article genre differs in its purpose and function from other genres with which they were more familiar (i.e., grad student genres like term paper and thesis). Pointing out these difficulties, Heather commented:

I am still learning about that because I thought I knew what a journal was, I thought it was like a research report but it is not. It turns out that most of the time it ends up being in a lot of ways a position paper with some data so yeah and I guess I thought that it was a way to report your data, your study that had been done, but it turns out in a journal article you can’t report everything that you did so it is not a report. Your thesis is more like a report I feel because you can put everything in there, because you wanna show you know it all.

Furthermore, the two doctoral students in this study had difficulty in dealing with critical peer reviews or rejections, which can be potentially demoralizing. Peer reviews can also at times be unclear and confusing, or may even send mixed or conflicting messages to the author, which can be particularly disconcerting to a novice author, who may be in the early stages of testing the waters, so to speak. For instance, Heather, reflecting on the reviews she had received, remarked:

Okay, first reviewer…very positive [but] not constructive, … second reviewer constructive and had plenty of interesting feedback….and third reviewer totally insulting…was basically like the fit is terrible; and there were like 3 grammar mistakes there so you should get it proofread by a native-speaker, so I was like okayyy [shocked].

Obviously perplexed by the conflicting reviews, and especially affronted by the third reviewer, Heather said she was “crushed…and thought… [she]…could not do anything” and “lost momentum.” On another occasion, upon receiving a rejection on a submission, Heather was emotionally devastated and demoralized:

To be honest when I first read it I was so upset that … I just closed it all and cried … because I was really excited, and actually no one prepared me for how hard it was to get published. People told me you just submit this and submit that and I totally thought that it would be fine like I
didn’t anticipate at all being rejected, not at all, which was perhaps naive of me. Yeah, I was really upset because it was my baby I was really excited about it I thought it was really original really interesting I thought it was well written and I didn’t understand. Rejection never feels good there is nothing good about that and I am pretty hard on myself as well.

In addition, engagement with editors was perceived to be quite a challenge for the participants. To illustrate, Ben—even at the conclusion of the study and despite having co-published with his supervisor—did not feel confident enough in communicating and negotiating with editors. Referring to his co-authorship experience with his mentor, Ben remarked: “I don’t feel like I have enough experience with editors. I have just had very brief and sort of second-hand, removed experiences. Like I am not the one dealing with them [editors and reviewers].”

**Rhetorical Knowledge**

The findings indicated that the participants also experienced some challenges pertaining to the rhetorical dimension of the research article genre. For instance, Heather pointed out that she found it difficult to rhetorically frame her work, such that it would be appealing to the audience and would adhere to the conventions of the genre: “I think the hardest part of writing for publication is … spinning it [the article] in a way that is sort of interesting to other people, so turning that into something that obeys all the political rules is very hard.” From a different yet related perspective, in the first interview, Ben referred to his lack of familiarity with the generic expectations of the research article genre, and asked: “what are they [journal editors and reviewers] looking for? I am not sure …I don’t really know.” It is worth mentioning that the findings did not show any issues related to the subject-matter domain. This, however, does not necessarily mean that the participants did not face any challenges in this regard. It is quite conceivable that such issues were not captured in the interviews.
Discussion

Overall, the findings suggest that the Anglophone doctoral students in the study experienced issues and challenges in the three domains of formal, process, and rhetorical knowledge, as it relates to scholarly publication. As noted earlier, the extant literature has particularly focused on and foregrounded EAL novice scholars’ discursive challenges in writing for publication, which seems to suggest the underlying premise that Anglophone novices, by mere dint of being a native speaker of English and without training, can effortlessly write for publication. The findings of this study, however, indicated that the Anglophone doctoral students in the study, much like their EAL counterparts (e.g., Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007), found writing for publication hard and fraught with pitfalls and challenges. With respect to discursive challenges, much like the EAL doctoral student in Flowerdew (2000), Heather had received critical, language-related comments on her submission. This finding also resonates with those of Flowerdew (1999a) in that the participants reported problems in grammar and lexis in writing for publication. Interestingly, it was also found that even Anglophone writers might receive critical cliché comments like “Get it proofread by a native speaker,” which Heather had received from a journal reviewer. This suggests that being a native speaker does not necessarily make one immune from criticism on academic language and literacy. Obviously, like the participant in Flowerdew (2000), Heather felt resentful and exasperated. Such cliché comments, which have been amply reported in the relevant literature on EAL writers, reflect an explicit (erroneous) presumption espoused by some journal reviewers regarding the supremacy of the so-called “native speaker” English over other so-called nonorthodox varieties of English.

Moreover, despite being a native speaker, Heather thought that she still did not have perfect familiarity with—and thus had to learn—academic terms and lexis, which echoes similar views expressed by the EAL participants in Flowerdew (1999a, 1999b). With regard to difficulties in writing different sections of the article, both of the Anglophone doctoral students in this study found the literature review section to be the hardest section of the research article genre to write, which is similar
to the findings reported in the case of Samantha, the Anglophone doctoral student in Habibie (2016). Interestingly, Ben found writing introductions to be challenging, which aligns with the findings in Habibie (2016) and Flowerdew (1999b). However, unlike the findings reported in Habibie (2016) and Flowerdew (1999b), neither of the participants expressed difficulty in writing the discussion section of the article. It is also interesting to note that Ben, like the Anglophone doctoral student in Habibie (2016), was not adequately familiar with the differences between empirical and conceptual genres. When it comes to writing for publication, inadequate acquaintance with academic genres—including related genres like peer review—potentially poses an important problem for novice writers, as it has been noted in the literature (Paltridge, 2015; Paltridge & Starfield, 2016; Paré, 2010; Thomson & Kamler, 2013). Highlighting the importance of genre knowledge, Tardy (2004) argues that “when genre or discourse patterns do not follow the expectations of the gatekeepers, they are more likely to be viewed as non-standard and to be excluded from publication” (p. 250).

The findings also indicated that the participants did not have sufficient access to samples of the peer review genre (Ben). Novices in the academia, including the participants in the study, need access to, and experience with, the genre chains that work together, culminating in the publication of the research article genre. What happens between the two points of submitting an article and the actual publication of the article in a refereed journal is in fact a chain of actions and stages not easily visible to novice scholars and graduate students. According to Pecorari (2006), “publishing a research article (a public genre) involves producing ancillary texts such as a submission letter and responses to reviewers’ comments, which are occluded genres” (p. 3). Developing familiarity with a given genre, in part, necessitates sufficient access to model texts in the genre. In fact, modeling and emulating texts can potentially have a “socializing” effect on learners (Duff, 2010, p. 173; Duff & Anderson, 2015). Where there is ample access to texts in a particular genre, through reading and textual analysis, learners can potentially learn from and emulate the research article genre, as has been empirically shown in the extant literature (e.g., Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007). It is thus crucial for emerging scholars to have access to and
learn from model texts and samples exemplifying the genres involved in the publication process—including both the public (published) genre and the related supporting genres (like peer review reports, responses to reviews, and even letters to the editor—accompanying revisions). Important to note, however, is that if sample texts and exemplars are to be modeled and emulated by novice writers, a sound knowledge of and effective training on appropriate textual borrowing practices would be necessary (e.g., Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Shi, 2010, 2012).

Furthermore, the findings indicated that the Anglophone doctoral students faced a number of challenges in the process of scholarly publication, particularly and notably in terms of navigating the peer review process, engagement with gatekeepers, and targeting the right publication venue, which have also been reported in the literature on EAL doctoral students. A key challenge facing the participants was dealing with critical feedback from journal reviewers and editors. One of the Anglophone participants in the study, Heather, felt dejected and demoralized after receiving critical feedback (in the peer-review process). This resonates with the findings of Flowerdew (2000), Li (2006b), and Cho (2004) in that their participants faced similar affective challenges. It is worth noting that the participants in these studies were, like the Anglophone doctoral students in this study, novice scholars, who indicate such affective issues are not unique to EAL writers but rather relate to the novice status of the writers. As Hyland (2015) argues, criticism goes with the territory of peer review, and it can be “threatening and disheartening” to those who are new to the genre (p. 172). Another related challenge found in the study was communication and engagement with journal editors and reviewers, which aligns with the findings in Li (2006b). It is interesting to note that, while Ben found co-authoring with his supervisor helpful, he referred to his experience (of engagement with editors and reviewers) as being “second hand,” that is to say, he thought it was the supervisor who was mostly in direct communication and negotiation with editors and reviewers, which points to an important and likely limitation in copublication experiences with mentors. Clearly, it is essential for emerging scholars to learn the skills and subtleties of how to properly and dialogically engage in negotiations with journal gatekeepers.
The participants also lacked adequate familiarity with the hierarchy of journals in their field, and experienced challenges in targeting journals and identifying predatory journals, as has been reported in the literature on scholarly publication (Henson, 2007). One of the Anglophone doctoral students in the study, Ben, thought he did not have adequate familiarity with the standing and value of academic journals. He was also worried about the danger of inadvertently publishing in a predatory journal. Quite clearly, selecting the right publication venue for one’s text might not always be easy for a novice scholar.

Conclusion

Although the findings of this case study may not be generalizable to the broader population of Anglophone doctoral students, they can potentially contribute to a better understanding of the complexities and challenges encountered by Anglophone doctoral students, as novices in academia. The findings highlighted that writing for scholarly publication is challenging for the Anglophone doctoral students. It appears that their Anglophone status did not afford them a particular advantage over their EAL counterparts, which has been emphasized in the existing literature.

As argued by Habibie and Hyland in this volume, it is, thus, reasonable to conclude that when it comes to writing for publication, it is the novice, rather than the native speaker, status of writers that matters most. The finding that both Anglophone and EAL novices face discursive and nondiscursive challenges resonates also with Swales’s (2004) argument that there are important differences “between those who know the academic ropes in their chosen specialisms and those who are learning them” (p. 56). Quite conceivably, the discursive and nondiscursive challenges, traditionally attributed to language differences, can be indicative of the novice status of scholars. The findings of this study highlight the exigency for more studies investigating the issues and challenges facing Anglophone novice academics in writing for publication. There is also a need for comparative, particularly longitudinal, case studies involving both EAL and Anglophone doctoral students to develop a better understanding of the issues and challenges commonly
encountered by novice scholars. Future studies can also include the additional perspective of journal editors and supervisors to cast more light on the novice-expert differences in writing for scholarly publication. Casting more light on the challenges, constraints, and catalysts to scholarly publication by novice academics can then, in turn, further inform developing useful support and educational practices in writing for scholarly publication.
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Introduction

I am grateful to the editors of the book to have asked me to author this chapter as it has given me a great opportunity to reflect on my own research trajectory, enculturation into, and development as a writer and scholar within Applied Linguistics, as well as on the evolution of my English academic discursive practices. When looking back at my academic career from a recently obtained tenured position at the Universidad de Zaragoza (Spain), there are three intertwined influential aspects that stand out in my trajectory. First, my linguistic status as a multilingual (L1 Spanish, L2 English) academic, second, my belonging to the outer circle, or the semiperiphery (Bennett, 2014a), subject to specific social and economic circumstances, and third, my strive to be part of two conjoined communities, the Spanish-national and the
international Applied Linguistics community. There is no doubt that I have faced opportunities as well as challenges in my efforts to affiliate with and contribute to both a local and a global community. The ensuing self-reflective auto-ethnographic recount will allow me to focus on those opportunities and challenges, and describe the strategies used to develop my academic literacy in English within a specific sociocultural and disciplinary context (Canagarajah, 2012).

To delve deeper into my motivations for publishing in English, as well as the challenges faced and the strategies deployed, I will make use of the ENEIDA questionnaire (Moreno, Burgess, Sachdev, López-Navarro, & Rey-Rocha, 2013). This questionnaire was originally developed to better understand the needs and strategies of research staff at five Spanish institutions with regard to the writing and publishing of research articles in scientific journals. Also, some questions provided by Belcher and Connor (2001) have been followed to construct this self-reflective auto-ethnographic narrative. These questions had the purpose of guiding the contributors in their book to reflect on their multiliteracy experiences. The specific questions driving my reflection on my academic discursive practices can be found in the Appendix. Finally, I will turn to my personal “text histories” (Lillis & Curry, 2010) to provide a richer narrative of my experiences publishing research internationally in English. The narrative will mainly revolve around such experiences, even if at the end, I will also focus on other academic genres and discursive practices.

Opportunities, Motivations, and Attitudes

One of the greatest opportunities has been my membership in a research group since my initial steps in academia. The group has received institutional, local, and national support in the form of funding, allowing me to participate in national and international conferences as well as to carry out research stays. Through these experiences, I have been able to form very valuable local and transnational academic research networks. This has been fundamental in my growing as a scholar and in my scholarly publication trajectory. Lillis and Curry’s
statement that “[P]articipation in academic research networks seems to offer a key way for scholars to manage their writing for publication—particularly for publishing in English—within the resource constraints of their daily research, writing and work activity” holds completely true for me. Another opportunity has been choosing a research topic that has garnered great research interest within Applied Linguistics in general and within English for Academic Purposes in particular: the intercultural analysis of academic written texts. My research has consistently contributed to the study of L2 scholars’ writing, with the ultimate aim of unveiling possible difficulties (Spanish) scholars may have when writing in English for an international audience. In so doing, I have also come to terms with my own tensions in how to frame my research output in English, and for different audiences.

A combination of external and internal motivations have led me to devote a great amount of my professional life to carry out and publish research in English. Among the factors indicated in Moreno et al. (2013) that most influence my decision to publish my research in English are in this order:

1. a desire to communicate the results of my research to the international scientific community,
2. a desire for my research work to be recognized,
3. a desire to meet the requirements for professional promotion,
4. a desire to develop intellectually (as a result of editor’s and peer reviewers’ comments),
5. a desire to get cited more frequently, and
6. a desire for stimulating challenges.

These motivations are very much in line with those reported by other (Spanish) nonnative scholars in different disciplines, namely, to communicate their research to a wider audience, to gain recognition for their work in a wider international context and to have their work rewarded institutionally (e.g., Curry & Lillis, 2004; Gea-Valor, Rey-Rocha, & Moreno, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Lorés-Sanz, Mur-Dueñas, Rey-Rocha, & Moreno, 2014; Pérez-Llantada, Plo, &
Ferguson, 2010). Overall, I feel satisfied with my publication practices and outcomes, as I have been able to successfully publish most of my research, although in a great number of occasions not in the sites originally targeted. However, the amount of time and effort that I have put into it has at times been extraordinary.

As regards my attitudes toward the use of English in international publications, I see a lot of benefits in sharing a common language for global academic communication despite the great efforts that need to be made to contribute to such communication. It is true that some likely dangers of using English as the single vehicle for international exchange of academic knowledge have been underlined. Among these dangers are domain loss (e.g., Ferguson, 2007), and an undesired homogeneization not only of English academic discourse (e.g., Mauranen, Pérez-Llantada, & Swales, 2010), but also of national academic discourse styles in other languages (e.g., Bennett, 2014b; Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2014). Nevertheless, some evident positive aspects can also be ascertained and are indeed acknowledged by L2 English scholars (e.g., Ferguson, Pérez-Llantada, & Plo, 2011; Lorés-Sanz et al., 2014; Mur-Dueñas, Lorés-Sanz, Rey-Rocha, & Moreno, 2014; Pérez-Llantada et al., 2010). I very much identify myself with the views reported in this previous research of scholars from different disciplines in my cultural context. Spanish scholars generally report a stance of “pragmatic resignation” (Pérez-Llantada et al., 2010) to the idea of English growing as a vehicle for scientific publication and dissemination of research.

However, it should be stressed that in order for the adoption of English for international scholarly communication not to place L2 English scholars at a disadvantageous position, it needs be used as a lingua franca (e.g., Ammon, 2012; Mauranen, 2012). This would entail greater flexibility in the acceptance of divergent rhetorical options and styles rather than imposing Anglo-centred conventions, as argued in Ferguson et al. (2011), Bennett (2014b), Martín, Rey-Rocha, Burgess, and Moreno (2014), among others. In my experience, English should be conceived of as a lingua franca to a greater extent, also in the field of Applied Linguistics. As will be stressed later on, I have been guided in my publication endeavors to adopt some rhetorical options that were
not natural to me, given my linguistic and cultural background, but expected in Anglophone international written academic discourse.

**Initial Difficulties and Sustained Challenges**

In my attempts to reach publications in international high-impact journals, I have mostly faced discursive challenges, which will be discussed in detail below. Although significantly less prominent, as a novice L2 scholar I have also faced nondiscursive challenges, which I will also bring to the fore.

All my research production has been in English, because in my area and department (English Studies), “English has become naturalized, that is, unquestioningly accepted as the primary language of publishing” (Curry & Lillis, 2014, p. 3), and I would add not just primary, but solely. However, I soon realized that it was not only a matter of writing research in English, but also crucially of adjusting to the specific, expected academic (culture-bound) conventions of a national or an international audience. This entailed developing genre awareness and academic literacy in English, as well as intercultural skills, and almost birhetorical literacy in English. However, as it will be highlighted below, such needs were (and may still be) poorly met in my academic context, where there is not a tradition of teaching academic writing at secondary, undergraduate or graduate levels and where writing centers hardly exist.

In my development of genre knowledge (Tardy, 2009) of the research article and book chapter in English, rhetorical and formal knowledge have been specially challenging. As regards rhetorical knowledge, efforts have been made to write up research in ways that are expected by an international community. The sections of research articles and chapters that I have found, and still find, more challenging to write are the discussion, conclusion, and the introduction. When writing the discussion, I find it especially challenging to discursively frame the interpretation of data and establish connections between my data and previous work. When writing the conclusion, what is difficult to me is to round the
paper off and especially to highlight the main contributions made by the study presented. When writing the introduction, it is particularly complex for me to argue for a research space in the discipline and to promote the specific contribution of the study. These three sections are also the ones that other L2 (Spanish) scholars have reported having most difficulty with in drafting English papers (e.g., Ferguson et al., 2011; Moreno, Rey-Rocha, Burgess, López-Navarro, & Sachdev, 2012; Mur-Dueñas et al., 2014; Pérez-Llantada et al., 2010).

While it may be true that the same rhetorical difficulties can be experienced by English native and nonnative novice scholars alike, L2 academics need to leave behind some enduring writing traditions in their cultural contexts when writing in the L2. It has been documented in intercultural studies in different disciplines (e.g., Burgess, 2002; Loi & Evans, 2010; Sheldon, 2011), and in my own research regarding the writing practices of Spanish business management scholars (Mur-Dueñas, 2010, 2014), that L2 scholars tend not to use promotional strategies in their English manuscripts. This lower use of promotion seems to be due to culturally entrenched positive politeness strategies emphasising in-group and involvement relations and to a collectivistic (rather than individualistic) stance being socially nurtured. Similarly, previous intercultural research has stressed that expressing research aims upfront is not a common rhetorical option in languages other than English used in rather national or local contexts. As a result, L2 (novice) writers should not only develop their English academic writing conventions, but also negotiate and come to terms with what may be rather unexpected, or culturally distant, writing conventions, when trying to publish their research in international, frequently Anglophone-centred, journals.

Especially at the beginning of my research career, I found myself readjusting my writing in English to accommodate to expected rhetorical conventions that differed from my own practices (and preferences). These are some comments taken from reports recommending major revision of my manuscripts submitted to international, prestigious English-medium journals which point at rhetorical, genre-related issues:
The need for this research is poorly justified (i.e. the author fails to find the research niche or gap).

It would also be helpful if the research questions or hypotheses could be clearly worded at the end of the introduction. In this way, the focus of the article will become clearer as sometimes the message is somewhat dispersed.

The introductory section contains says very little about the objectives of the study, if we exclude the generic claims on page …

There is no clearly formulated research question.

The author wants to contribute to …, but s/he does not specify why this is relevant, nor does s/he explain her/his choice of topic …, languages and discipline ….

In the light of these comments I made rhetorical changes, especially in the Introduction of my drafts, in my revised papers, and in subsequent ones addressed to top sites of publication in the field. Such rhetorical changes entailed the use of “marketing” strategies, presenting the study as relevant and necessary to fill in a specific research space, highlighting the contribution to be made, and including explicit statements of purpose and/or research questions. This process of developing rhetorical genre knowledge led me to adopt more effective practices (in terms of responding to expected conventions).

Of course, it should be noted that failure to adjust to prevailing rhetorical conventions was not a cause of rejection of my papers. Admittedly, in very few occasions, even in my initial manuscripts, did I receive straight rejection reports, but I was given the chance to respond to such changes. In so doing, I better understood that the readership and their expectations regarding the microstructure of my papers should be very much born in mind.

I would also like to refer to recurrent comments received on my use of language and style, which reflects my need to pay attention to formal genre knowledge. Such comments can be explained bearing in mind my linguistic and cultural background. My L1 background has probably led me to use (too) forceful language, (too) long sentences, and
a (rather) wordy style in my academic writing in English. It is known that Romance languages and contexts tend to favor verbose and convoluted writing styles in general, and in academic discourse in particular. In addition, academic written discourse in languages other than English have been shown to present a lower number of hedges and make use of a more categorical style. Such rhetorical preferences in other languages and contexts are again possibly due to rhetorical preferences as well as to the size of the audience addressed and the likely refutation that may thus be encountered (e.g., Bulgarian [Vassileva, 2001]; German [Kreutz & Harres, 1997]; French and Norwegian [Vold, 2006]; Spanish [Vázquez-Orta, 2010]).

The academic discourse used is good, in general. However, there is a tendency to use too long and complex sentences, which are often difficult to understand.

The article is written fluently, although it some parts may need revision as the language sounds unnatural or too wordy.

The article is well written although there are sometimes paragraphs that are too long or too wordy. Also some expressions do not sound natural in English.

In the Introduction (p. 4-5) the author makes a statement that should be toned down.

Also some sentences were very long and difficult to process (e.g. page 3, “…” and first sentence, last paragraph page 15) - although I acknowledge that this may not be a problem for other readers.

As in the previous case, I tried to discursively respond to these comments on preferred linguistic and stylistic choices by trying to break sentences down, and by increasing the number of hedges and reducing the number of boosters in my academic prose. I still find myself receiving similar comments despite me being alert to these discrepancies between my “natural” way of expressing meaning in English academic discourse and the likely expectations of gatekeepers of international publications. This points to further formal genre knowledge to be developed when drafting English-medium articles for an international readership.
Finally, although not frequently, I have received comments on the requirement to have my papers revised by a native speaker (of English). All this attests to the need I foregrounded above for “greater flexibility on the part of editors/reviewers in accepting the discourse patterns which may be considered as ‘anomalies’ for the members of the Anglophone international community” (Martín et al., 2014). Such greater flexibility would make the process of international English-medium publication less costly and time consuming for L2 scholars.

*The paper needs substantial linguistic improvement: […]*. Overall, *a linguistic revision through the help of a native speaker, would be advisable.*

Not only did I receive comments related to rhetorical, linguistic, and stylistic issues, but also, importantly, content ones, regarding specifically the methodology and the theoretical soundness of the study. Through the former comments, I developed rhetorical and formal knowledge, and through the latter I developed subject-matter knowledge, contributing overall to building genre knowledge of the research article in English (Tardy, 2009).

*However, the corpus investigated does not seem to be sufficient, since …* It is clear that a significantly larger corpus will provide more data and thus make conclusions more reliable.

*The author needs to review relevant research in … and to polish their theoretical framework for the ensuing data analysis.*

*I have one major objection about the contents of the paper: it provides no definition of …, nor of the main types of …, and, probably as a result from this absence, it misleadingly assumes that…*

*However, I have some reservations about the methodological soundness of some parts of the analysis and discussion presented by the author.*

These comments have enabled me to reconsider research choices, and overall, to gain a better understanding of some concepts and issues within the discipline raised by gatekeepers. They have been important in my development and growth as an applied linguist.
Besides these important discursive challenges, I have also encountered some nondiscursive ones. It has been a great challenge to find the time to carry out research, present it in different fora, draft manuscripts, and revise them, when working in a context in which teaching loads have increased, department staff reduced, and administrative duties grown exponentially. In addition, as a novice scholar, I found myself in a difficult position to refuse to take certain proposals and commitments in all spheres of academic life. Things thus being, I have undertaken such a time-consuming task as writing research in English and seeking publication in international journals at the expense of my family life and leisure time.

In addition, I have received little institutional support to contribute to the development of my discursive practices in English. In the current context in which institutionally and national (multilingual) scholars are pressed to publish our research outcomes in English, there should be “an increase in university language support, such as in-house editing and translating services, and sufficient funding for the implementation of specialized courses in ERPP both for students in higher education and teaching/research staff” (Martín et al., 2014, p. 65). The need for specific institutional support and training to the university staff features prominently in survey-based research on (Spanish) scholars’ publication practices (e.g., Belcher, 2007; Ferguson et al., 2011; Fernández-Polo y Cal Varela, 2009; Gea-Valor et al., 2014; Lorés-Sanz et al., 2014; Mur-Dueñas et al., 2014). Another claim made is to have further support from high impact journals in the form of language review and advisory services to alleviate the potential linguistic disadvantage of L2 English scholars (e.g., Ferguson et al., 2011).

**Strategies Deployed**

As highlighted above, the scarce institutional support to academic writing, and English academic writing in particular in our context, has led—and leads me—to count on my research networks to get feedback on content, rhetorical, language, and stylistic aspects of my manuscripts in English. Thus, before submitting any of my papers for publication,
one or two of my close colleagues—to whom I am most grateful—read through it and give me comments. Seeking the advice of non-native English speakers who are very familiar with my field is to me the most common strategy. I do not usually have my papers edited or revised by native English speakers, unless encouraged to do so by reviewers and/or editors, as in the case of the comment highlighted above.

I have had little or no specific training in writing for publication, other than my supervisors’ feedback throughout the writing process of my PhD thesis and my upcoming papers. I have also developed genre knowledge and academic discursive practices in English thanks to my colleagues’ comments on my written work, and those from gatekeepers, editors, and reviewers of the journals to which I have submitted my research output. These “conversations” have entailed great learning opportunities and have allowed me to develop rhetorical, formal, and subject-matter genre knowledge, as highlighted above, and also process genre knowledge, getting familiar with academic publication practices. Overall, my text histories have entailed diverse learning paths leading me to build genre knowledge and overall effective discursive practices in English that met the expectations of the international applied linguistics community.

In addition, I have read extensively on academic writing and studied manuals (e.g., Hyland, 2004; Swales & Feak, 2001, 2004) due to my research focus and my constant strive to develop academic literacy in English. Also, I have been involved in teaching ERPP (English for Research Publication Purposes) (Cargill & Burgess, 2008) in my university context, when there have been sporadic initiatives in the institution to promote scholars’ academic writing skills in English. Through this process, I have also gained insights into the challenges of my colleagues in other disciplines.

Something that has already been signaled by previous research and which I consider of outmost importance for novice (L2) writers is the need to understand the publication genre chain (Swales, 2004) and the nature, function, and dynamics of occluded genres (Swales, 1996), such as editor’s letters, referees’ reports, and more importantly the author’s response letter. These practices and genres should, therefore, be included in much needed discipline- and culture-specific ERPP training.
In line with previous research on the process of English-medium publication by non-Anglophone scholars (Belcher, 2007; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Shaw, 2017; Uzuner, 2008), I think it is perseverance which has led me to be granted publication and to be overall satisfied with my research outputs from the outset of my research career. This perseverance has entailed carefully considering the referees’ comments on my manuscripts, responding to them both in the text and in point-by-point replies to their reports, and going through different rounds of revisions of my papers.

Overall, I have gained academic literacy within the discipline, and I have developed my academic writing skills in English through the different personal text histories I have gone through, and my interaction with “literacy brokers” (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Of great importance to me have been academic “literacy brokers,” “academics who work in universities or research institutions” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93), and among them those coming from my research network as well as gatekeepers, i.e., reviewers and editors. In addition, in my progressive enculturation into the discipline, I have found it especially useful to be a reviewer for English-medium international journals and carrying out editing work. Through my personal text histories and constructing those of other members of the discipline, I have acquired knowledge and expertise in the writing and the publication practices. In this respect, I feel that my self-confidence levels as an L2 reader and writer of academic English discourse have risen, leading me to consider myself a member of the discipline willing to continue contributing to it.

**Around and Beyond Publishing Research Articles in English**

Most of my reflections have revolved around the process of publication research articles, as the genre *par excellence* in academia (Swales, 2004) for high-impact English-medium journals, as this has posed the greatest challenges to me as a novice scholar. However, the research article and also book chapters can be taken to be the last unit in a genre chain.
(Swales, 2004), preceded by other academic genres, namely, the conference abstract, and the paper presentation. This has been a common practice in my academic career and that of others, including the novice Anglophone scholar in Habibie (2016).

Participation in different international academic fora has been essential to me. To be granted acceptance at an international forum, which can foster the formation of research networks (Lillis & Curry, 2010), first, a conference abstract needs to be drafted and submitted, and a paper written and presented. These are frequently the first steps taken towards a research article or book chapter publication. Contributions to conferences are, therefore, of great importance for a novice scholar’s apprenticeship. These have been possible in my case as I have been a member of a research group financially supported by different institutions from the beginning of my academic career.

Novice (non-)native English scholars see themselves having to craft many other (peripheral) academic genres, again without much training or support. That is the case, for instance, of book reviews, which I see as a highly demanding task and not sufficiently considered in evaluation systems. Reviewing a book gives the opportunity to read and revise it thoroughly and also to situate it within the research, assessing its main strengths and likely shortcomings, which also allows for the development of important skills and competences for novice (L2) scholars.

Novice (L2) scholars need to progressively develop knowledge of further academic genres, especially, “occluded” ones (Swales, 1996) in the publication process, which can also pose difficulties. Even if journals often use checklists and highlight issues reviewers need to comment on, there are not usually specific guidelines on how to write a referee report, so its drafting can be challenging. I have developed genre knowledge in this case by intuition and imitation of exemplars I received as author.

Overall, then, I have placed most time and effort on the process of getting English-medium research articles and book chapters accepted for publication. However, in order for me as a novice (L2) scholar to become a member of the discipline, I have sought to strengthen my academic discursive practices, which encompass many other academic texts and continuous academic genre knowledge development.
I hope to have shown how as a NNES outer circle novice scholar, my academic writing experience has been very much socially, linguistically and culturally driven. As Curry and Lillis (2014, p. 4) contend, “[v]iewing academic writing for publication as a social practice shifts the predominant research focus on academic writers as isolated individuals to a view of academic writers as scholars working within social contexts and contending with the power relations of these contexts.”

I have stressed the idea that being a non-Anglophone scholar can entail some greater cost and investment in seeing one’s research published internationally. Nevertheless, throughout my recount, I have also indicated that other factors play a significant role in that endeavor. These factors are in line with Shaw’s (2017) conclusion from his ethnographic study of ten biomedical articles by Spanish authors in English; Shaw states that whereas their L2 status entails an additional burden, other factors may be equally important, namely, degree of expertise of the author in manipulating the rhetorical and discoursal resources of the discipline, perseverance, physical and social distance from the Anglophone center, and the degree of internationalization of the author’s discipline.

I have managed most of the times to successfully navigate the process of publication in English-medium international journals, when determined to get my results disseminated widely. This has been possible thanks to successful interactions with academic literacy brokers, my learning to handle the rhetoric of the discipline, my perseverance in drafting and redrafting papers, my local and transnational academic network, and the nature and wide-reaching effects of my research topic.

Finally, I have underlined in this self-reflective autoethnography the need for further disciplinary, as well as linguistic- and cultural-specific ERPP training for (L2) scholars. Institutions, seeking to increase their cultural capital, are calling for further high impact publications; as such, they should offer the training required. I have also highlighted the need for Anglophone and non-Anglophone gatekeepers not to impose a single type of Anglo-centric English academic discourse, and rather allow for varying (and enriching) rhetorical, linguistic, and stylistic choices.
Appendix

ENEIDA questionnaire (Moreno et al., 2013)

13—When you decide to publish a research article in a scientific journal to what extent do the following factors influence your decision to publish them in Spanish? Or in English?
17—To what extent have the following factors led you, as corresponding author, not to consider or to decide against publishing research articles in journals in Spanish? And in English?
20—How do you feel when you write up the results of your research for publication in journals in English?
24—Please think about the articles that you have sent to scientific journals as corresponding author over the last ten years. How often have the following occurred?
25—Indicate how much difficulty you experience in writing the following sections of the research articles or the documentation involved in their publication in English.
28—Which of the following writing strategies have you used most frequently in the case of the articles you have published as corresponding author?

Belcher and Connor’s (2001, pp. 209–2011) guiding questions:

5—Did you feel (or do you still feel) that your L1 literacy helped/helps or hindered/hinders your developing L2 reading and writing competencies?
10—How would you describe your self-confidence levels as an L2 reader and writer and as an L1 reader and writer?
13—Is academic writing something that you enjoy doing, or do you see it more as a necessary evil? Does your L2 or L1 literacy have an impact on your attitude toward academic writing?
14—What kinds of academic writing do you typically do? Which do you most prefer (e.g., research articles, book reviews, proposal, manuscript reviews)? Does your L1 or L2 affect your preferences?
15—What type (or stage) of writing do you find the most difficult?
16—Is audience important to you as you do your professional writing? For instance, do you try to visualize a specific audience as you compose? Do you feel you can anticipate the reactions of native-speakers of your L2? Do you try to write for an international audience, or does this vary, depending on purpose and the type of text?
17—Do you consciously think about your “voice” in your professional writing, i.e., the way you come across the persona you present? Do you feel that being an L2 affects your “voice”?
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Much literature in the past two decades has sought to describe and explain multilingual novice writers’ difficulties in writing for publication (WFP). Studies have shown that despite their successful experiences in publishing, multilingual writers tend to frame their writing problems in WFP in terms of linguistic disadvantage (e.g., Casanave & Li, 2008; Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 1999; Li, 2002). In explaining reasons for writer sense of linguistic disadvantage, recent conversations have pointed out difficulties in framing these problems in terms of a reductionist native-speaker/non-native-speaker (NS/NNS) divide (e.g., Hyland, 2016)—a stance I also endorse. Many of the conversations have highlighted the sophistication of academic genre knowledge rather than that of lexicogrammatical knowledge in the development of advanced academic literacy and as such have brought to the fore how views of language are relevant to the issue. To further explore the complexity involved in this
argument, I examine how approaches of learning the language to write might also be of crucial relevance to the issue.

I argue that the linguistic approach targeting native-speaker proficiency gives support to a deficit view of language; and that genre teaching is very helpful for raising genre awareness, but not helpful enough for those who engage in WFP to overcome the last mile problem—how to efficiently commit language options to memory so as to achieve a fluent and idiomatic control of language that manifests genre awareness. I thus propose that specific language acquisition methods be employed in the genre approach. I begin by a critical review of two current approaches (although not mutually exclusive), which have possibly informed novice writers learning the language for publication. Pointing out why both approaches might be relevant to writer sense of language disadvantage, I discuss the possibility that the two complement each other. Drawing on a case study of a Chinese linguist learning to write for publishing, I illustrate how the writer employs methods of language acquisition to help overcome writing difficulties and the complexities involved.

**Potential Strengths of “The Linguistic Approach”**

I use “the linguistic approach” in this chapter to represent an overall tendency among some multilingual novice writers who attach more importance to (developing) language competence than other things in their process of learning the language to write for publication. This is a broader definition than what the linguistic approach is usually understood in L2 writing scholarship. The principal approaches to teaching L2 writing might include a number of orientations (Hyland, 2003a), in which the linguistic approach often refers to the structural orientation which focuses on grammar and vocabulary in learning to write. Given that views of language change and approaches to language learning must change accordingly, I expand the scope of “the linguistic approach” a bit, in the hope of exploring some hidden strengths of this approach.
To be specific, with the overall goal of language development, writer views of language might influence their ways to learn the language to write. From Saussure to Chomsky, linguists view language as only systematic, rule-governed behavior. With this structural view, writer attention is directed to grammar and vocabulary to the neglect of all else; learning the language to write aims for improvement of syntactic complexity and grammatical accuracy (Hyland, 2003a). But often overlooked in the discussions of the linguistic approach is another approach informed by a different view of language. And in the language acquisition field, this view of language has well transformed our understanding of what it means by language and language acquisition.

Unlike structuralists, some linguists take a dual nature view of language, dual nature in the sense of language being both analytical and holistic. These linguists firmly believe the importance of acquiring language routines, patterns, and conventionalized forms in the process of (second) language acquisition (e.g., Fillmore, 1979; Skehan, 1998; Sinclair, 1991; Widdowson, 1989). To them, the learning of multiword sequences is more important and efficient than that of grammar rules (Widdowson, 1989).

This view of language has received continual endorsement with the development of linguistics in different directions. In the study of L1 linguistic capacities, Pawley and Syder (1983) note that nativelike selection and nativelike fluency rest to a considerable extent on knowledge of memorized sequences. Empirical evidence from psycholinguistic studies (Jiang & Nekrasova, 2007) further provides clear and straightforward support for a holistic view of formulaic representation and processing in both L1 and L2. Due to development of corpus linguistics, research has also “revealed quite unsuspected patterns,” phenomena which “traditional descriptive frameworks are normally not able to account for” (Sinclair, 1991, p. xvii). In Sinclair’s terms (1991), the idiom principle concerns the routine base of language, the open-choice principle the rule base. He argues that in preparing our utterances or comprehending others, we primarily turn to those multiword sequences rather than creating utterances from or analyzing them into single words. This predominance of the idiom principle, in Sinclair’s view, brings what he
called the “efficiency of effort” (1991, p. 110)—the efficiency in the speakers’ retrieval and hearers’ processing of language.

In the development of advanced academic literacy, the linguistic approach informed by the dual nature view of language has started to manifest its potential strengths. Plenty of scholarly work has been done in categorizing and explicating lexical bundles in a wide spectrum of academic disciplines (Hyland, 2004). In genre-based pedagogy, genre schemata (Swales, 1990) in forms of language exemplars have been increasingly made visible to novice writers for the purpose of genre awareness raising (Tardy, 2016). Numerous language resources are also available online, such as the Academic Collocations List and the n-grams list based on the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). For writers who engage in WFP, therefore, the question is in what specific ways they can learn and memorize these sequences, bundles, and n-grams and transform them into their own knowledge.

The efficiency of learning the sequences through specific methods of reading and memorization has been increasingly supported by empirical evidence in L2 writing studies. Case studies of Chinese university students (Ding, 2004) show that the learning and memorization of multiword sequences enable writers to bypass conscious knowledge of grammar, and help them to achieve accurate and precise expressions and to keep pace with idea development during the composing process. Also, informed by a genre view of language (to be elaborated in the next section), a longitudinal case study (Li & Schmitt, 2009) followed a Chinese MA student over the course of an academic year, who learned 166 new multiword sequences mainly through academic reading. More importantly, she improved the degree of appropriateness in the use of these sequences. Her improved mastery entails “knowing more about the lexical item, more about where and when to use the item appropriately in particular contexts, and about being able to use it with more automaticity” (p. 94). Although WFP may have higher requirements than those in classroom learning, this finding seems to suggest that learning methods informed by a dual nature view of language could potentially help with language acquisition and rhetorical knowledge development at the same time.
Drawbacks of the Linguistic Approach to WFP

In WFP, nevertheless, the linguistic approach could bring harm to novice writers because of its two tendencies, i.e., taking learning to write as a context-free cognitive phenomenon, and using NS proficiency as a baseline of writing development. Given that WFP involves multiple shaping forces of topic, discourse communities, and sociohistoric context in textual production, overlooking the role of context in WFP fails to help writers confront real-world writing challenges. The idealized notion of the educated NS speaker as a model in writing development may further support a language deficit view. The notion suggests a reductionist NS/NNS dichotomy as a distinction between the omniscient and the defective. Since the NNSs’ linguistic competence is believed to be fundamentally flawed, writer attention in the linguistic approach would thus be directed to how one cannot do, rather than how one can do with the available resources (Larsen-Freeman, 2007).

Unfortunately, these two tendencies in the linguistic approach have been deeply rooted in the disciplinary history of SLA, hence a long-term influence. In the latter half of the last century, an early cognitive view in the SLA field takes language as a mental construct, a linguistic system stored in one’s mind. Though various terms like interlanguage (Selinker, 1972) and approximative system (Nemser, 1971) are used to describe the process of language acquisition, they share the perspective in which language learners go through successive stages of learning, where the educated NS proficiency is taken as the linguistic norm—the ultimate target of acquisition (Larsen-Freeman, 2007). Since the mid-1990s, the cognitive lens of SLA has been questioned for overlooking language use/learning in social contexts of discourse and communication. Continual attempts have been made in field reconceptualizations of SLA, incorporating the sociocognitive, sociocultural, and ecological perspectives. However, as Firth and Wagner (2007) usefully observe, what seem to have remained in the mainstream SLA for the past 30 years are the cognitive traditions, in which “the native speaker continues to predominate as the baseline or target that learners should seek to emulate; learning is conceived as a cognitive process that is in essence context-neutral” (p. 804).
The linguistic approach might be appealing to multilingual novice writers who want to continue developing their English language competence. The dual nature view of language can also bring writers a sense of learning efficiency. But it is important to note what Hyland (2003a) cautions: “writing cannot be distilled down to a set of cognitive or technical abilities or a system of rules, and that learning to write in a second language is not simply a matter of opportunities to compose and revise” (p. 27). Given that the language learning has to situate in the academic genre of WFP, I turn now to review the genre approach.

**Strengths of “The Genre Approach” to WFP**

Overall, the genre approach differs from the linguistic approach by focusing on the development of genre competence in social contexts of discourse and communication. In this approach, the socially informed genre theory of language highlights the ways language functions in social contexts and sees language as “embedded in (and constitutive of) social realities” (Hyland, 2003b, p. 21). Departing from this understanding, the genre approach sets up the goals that writer use of language follow socially recognized ways, and that the ways in which language attributes to meaning vary with social contexts (Johns, 2008; Swales, 1990).

By this change of view, the genre approach is able to deconstruct the NS/NNS dichotomy in WFP. Unlike the structural orientation in the linguistic approach, which highlights lexico-grammar for no obvious reason, the genre approach contributes to an overall purpose. By situating language learning and use in discourse communities, the baseline of writing development is changed from a universal and idealized NS proficiency to what is expected in scientific research articles, the expectation being co-constructed by discourse communities in specific disciplines.

The baseline change brings about corresponding changes in the focus of learning, which pose challenges for novice writers regardless of their language background. Unlike the linguistic approach that focuses on language issues in general, the genre approach holds that to meet the expectations in scientific research articles, writers not only need to build
language competence, but more important, develop rhetorical and genre knowledge—a painstaking process equally daunting to NS novice writers (Hyland, 2016). Through analyzing revision of manuscripts by NNS scientists, Englander (2006) demonstrates that the changes that a number of NNS scientists made at the lexicogrammatical level were not mere syntactic corrections, but more about how to control the register of the manuscripts that is expected in English-medium research articles. As Englander (2006) concludes, “only after revision to the register of the manuscripts were the scientists able to appropriately demonstrate the five practices that Hyland (2000) states are required: establish novelty, make justifiable claim, acknowledge prior work, offer evidence of findings and demonstrate disciplinary ethos” (p. 156). The study shows that register, although instantiated at the lexicogrammatical level, is rhetorical and contextual in nature. To learn to identify and control the register, learning to write for publication requires writers to enter the discourse community and its culture, and develop expertise through a long period of disciplinary apprenticeship and enculturation. For all L1 and L2 novice writers, this is no easy matter. It might also be safe to predict that degrees of the difficulties in the control of register vary from person to person, both within and between the NS and NNS writer groups.

Some NNS writers tend to think that it is primarily language that manifests genre awareness, and thus consider the linguistic approach fundamental. This is understandable. In the foreign language learning contexts such as China, many, if not all, L2 novice writers have experienced language learning, through their formative years of education, as a system of rules rather than its application in a diversity of rhetorical contexts. Recently, in a few teacher-training workshops I have conducted (in collaboration with Paul Kei Matsuda), contextualizing L2 writing appeared an elusive concept for college teachers. Many found it difficult to implement the concept in teaching. This was possibly related to the exam orientation in teaching college English writing. Instead of the need to develop students’ sense of audience and purpose in and through contextualized writing tasks, teachers looked for the type of writing pedagogies which help students to diminish grammatical errors, produce eye-catchy complex sentences, and so achieve high scores in
high-stakes writing exams. In addition, a widely held belief among these writing teachers was that college students’ low level of language proficiency made it impossible to develop genre competence. As such, language development and writing development were regarded as separate from and independent of each other.

To a great extent, genre-based pedagogy in both EAP and SFL schools has incorporated both writing development and language development in genre awareness-raising activities. There is a substantial literature describing diverse classroom activities to enhance students’ genre awareness (Devitt, 2004; Rose & Martin, 2012; Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2000; Tardy, 2016). In these activities, students are engaged in explicit analysis of genre texts and contexts as well as flexible experimentation in genre play. Objects of genre analysis and exploration might include rhetorical move structures, patterns in lexico-grammatical features, hedges and boosters, patterns of citation use, and also variations across genres and situations. Notably, Tardy (2016) and a few other genre adherents have been trailblazers in innovating teaching methods that can engage students as both analysts and producers of genres. For example, Tardy helps students to put awareness into action through sequenced genre exploration activities. The sequenced activities, from genre prototype, genre rewrite, genre bending, to genre parody, are extremely useful in helping students to “consider not just the available options, but also how such options shift for different users, contexts, and genres” (p. 166). Thus, genre-based teaching is capable of providing students with not just linguistic tools, but also metacognitive tools for analyzing, examining, exploring, and reflecting on genre manipulation and innovation.

The Last Mile Problem in the Genre Approach to WFP

While the genre approach is successful in terms of genre awareness raising, it does not overcome the last mile problem in WFP. This raises the issue of what writers do with the language options after the genre awareness-raising activities in class. If genre awareness-raising activities have
made language options visible and available, the next problem to be solved is how to commit the language options to the writer’s memory so as to facilitate a fluent and idiomatic control of language in WFP. Thus, the question shifts from what to learn to how to learn it.

The last mile problem of the genre approach that I am specifying here inevitably points to a long-term internalization process for a fluent and idiomatic production of academic discourse. But just because acquisition of academic genre discourse has to take a long and painstaking process (Hyland, 2016), it does not mean that we do not have to provide specific support for writers to go through the process efficiently. Such efficiency, as I will be arguing in the following section, could be achieved if we were to take a proper method of language acquisition in the development of genre expertise. Yet, given that the genre approach does not seem to highlight language acquisition, the language learning component after genre awareness raising is largely left to novice writers, who may have to figure it out on their own. The writing difficulties and frustrations the writers possibly confront in this phase might well lead to a sense of language disadvantage.

This point also indicates another important need to reflect on our own views of language and literacy. In studies of academic literacy development, an underlying assumption seems to be that those who engage in WFP already have an “advanced” level of language proficiency. The advanced level is actually hard to define. Research demonstrates that language proficiency affects writing in various ways (Cumming, 1989; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996), but the question may well not be answerable as to the threshold level of the language proficiency for an appropriate academic genre performance. The difficulty of defining the level of language proficiency relates to how language is viewed. If language is viewed as only a structural system of grammatical rules, we assume a fairly high level of language proficiency for those who engage in WFP because not many grammatical errors are found in their manuscript submissions. Yet, if language is viewed as both analytical and holistic, the level of language proficiency would be defined alternatively, placing more weight on a fluent and idiomatic control of language than on grammatical accuracy and syntactic complexity. Taking this latter view of language would help us better understand why a great many multilingual writers have reported
to keep experiencing language-related problems in WFP, and why this writer group also includes a fair number of applied linguists and TESOL professionals (e.g., Braine, 2005), who presumably have a relatively good command of grammar. The abundant empirical evidence of this (see a synthesis by Uzuner, 2008) warrants multilingual writers’ serious needs of language acquisition, though such needs may vary.

**Two Approaches Complementing Each Other?**

Genre teaching may be successful in the classroom, with both SFL and EAP offering clear and well-established pedagogies. But WFP has higher requirements that perhaps neither approach can meet at this point. On the one hand, “pedagogies focused primarily on language development run the risk of perpetuating a deficit orientation toward multilingual writers” (Shapiro, Cox, Shuck, & Simnitt, 2016, p. 32). On the other hand, while classroom teaching of genre mainly provides an opportunity for students to “experiment with generic forms, content, and practices” (Tardy, 2016, p. 166), the high-stakes writing game of publish or perish ultimately tests out the efficiency of the learning method, the result of language and genre acquisition. The issue thus boils down to one question: Can we make the two approaches complement each other?

Yes, we can. As I see it, what we need to push forward at this point is incorporating the idiomatic/holistic approach of language acquisition in the genre approach. The linguistic approach is problematic not because it focuses on language learning, but because it holds a wrong, structuralist view of language learning. People taking this approach look at language learning as that of acquiring grammar plus vocabulary, to the neglect of acquiring sequences, which mark idiomaticity and competence in academic discourse (Sinclair, 1991). An academic genre is perhaps made up of many such sequences which NS novice academic writers may not know.

To attain the goal of making the two approaches hand in hand, specific language learning methods informed by idiom/memory-based view of language should be deemed valuable for their help to commit language resources to writer memory. These methods may include, among
many others, repeated reading of valued texts and learning text by heart. After all, without a memory base of the sequences embedded in co-text, it would be hard to imagine that writers have a fluent and idiomatic control of language in WFP. At the same time, issues of attention to rhetorical features in genre convention, variation, and innovation cannot be peripheral to the employment of these strategies of language acquisition.

In the following section, I report on a case of a Chinese linguist who employed various strategies of learning the language to write for publication. Drawing on this case, I illustrate how some of the learning strategies could help to address writing challenges in WFP and the complexities still involved.

**An Illustration: A Chinese Linguist Learning the Language for Publication**

The linguist, Zhao, is a case drawn from my ongoing research work since 2016 with six Chinese mainland linguists writing for publishing. For the case reported here, I have conducted in-depth reflective interviews with him regularly, kept close communications with him, and collected all his manuscripts, manuscript review comments, and publications in English. Zhao received all his education in the mainland and specialized in SLA and language teacher education. About ten years earlier when I first met Zhao at a university in Beijing, he was then a senior undergraduate collecting research data for his teacher. In 2016, he had become an associate professor of applied linguistics, more productive than his peers in international publications. By the time I wrote this chapter, Zhao had published over 60 research articles in Chinese-medium key journals of foreign language studies and 14 articles in both peer-reviewed English-medium journals on applied linguistics and edited books in TESOL teacher education.

Despite his success in scholarly publishing, and to my surprise, he expressed a strong sentiment about being linguistically disadvantaged. He reflected that while he had taught English writing in university for years, manuscript reviewers frequently pointed out that language,
not research, was the major weakness in his submissions. His reaction was that, “I felt devastated and thought I would have to relearn the language all over again.” In the interviews, Zhao said that he kept adjusting his language learning strategies to facilitate his WFP. Initially he tried a professional copyediting service and asked friends for help. One strategy he used for some time was to avoid writing from scratch and instead create a small corpus of journal articles in his field. He then looked for language expressions in the corpus for each sentence and paragraph he wanted to construct. Eventually he published an article using this strategy, and yet he felt “meaningless and agentless” after the publication.

In his process of learning to write, a turning point occurred after he chose to repeatedly recite and retell well-known scholars’ published journal articles. He described his learning of language in writing this way,

During those days, as long as I read of celebrity figures’ articles, as long as I found those language expressions in the native-speaking VIPs’ articles, I copied them, recited, recited, and recited. The cruelest thing that I treated myself was like this. For one week, I recited Introductions in all the papers I selected. After reciting each Introduction, I covered the pages and started to retell. If I couldn’t retell, it meant I was unable to master a certain sentence frame or a fixed expression. I opened the journal, took a look, and recited again. Very effective! The [language] issue was really an issue to me. I wanted to get rid of it, or else I would have to live under that shadow. And then, when I submitted manuscripts, the reviewers and editors no longer commented that my language read awkward or clumsy. (my translation)

Notably, the memorization strategy seemed to bring Zhao automatization in producing multiword sequences that meet genre conventions of journal articles. As he recalled, he was so familiar with the moves and steps and corresponding language frames, to the extent that he did not have to think about language while composing the text. “If any student of mine now asks me to help revise Introduction or any section of a research article, I could fluently produce the text that should follow the conventions of a standard research article.” It should be worth noting that this fluent production of text was not patchwriting or
plagiarism. The fluent and idiomatic control of language seemed to have come largely from his extreme familiarity with genre schemata already entrenched in his mind.

However, despite success in publications, Zhao still found “the impossibility of having the touch similar to that of a native speaker.” He referred to his NNS difficulties in terms of achieving the preciseness, flexibility, and appropriateness of language use, and attributed the difficulties to his NNS identity. As he reflected, he did not know how a word corresponds with a certain mood as required in the particular context. For him, the degree of intensity in academic appraisals was especially hard to control, and this should have been related to his NNS identity.

Although a brief sketch, the case shows that Zhao confronted writing challenges through the effective employment of memorization strategies. His learning of multiword sequences in academic discourse seemed to help with automaticity and idiomaticity of his text production. With a growing body of conventionalized forms stored in his mind, he was able to avoid “clumsy” language and keep writing for publishing successfully. From the diversity of his strategies to cope with language problems, for instance, building a corpus of journal articles, composing text from textual borrowing, learning research articles by heart, it is tempting to conclude that his language learning belief, habit, and strategies highlighting the acquisition of multiword sequences made him approach the genre conventions rapidly and efficiently.

Among all his strategies of learning to write, Zhao reported that learning journal articles by heart had the most amazing effect on his production of academic text. Attitudes toward text memorization as a language learning strategy appear controversial in many ways. Whereas in the West some researchers call for a reconceptualizing of the relationships between text, memory, learning, and plagiarism (e.g., Pennycook, 1996), in China, people tend to deny the practice of text memorization because of the fresh memory of the Confucian authoritarian education and researchers also tend to distance themselves from an approach they do not like (Ding, 2004). Yet, China is also one of the places where learning text by heart is most frequently used in literacy education.
Despite paradoxes in attitudes and practice, the effect of the particular strategy of learning academic texts by heart seemed to illustrate that the nature of multilingual novice scholars learning to write for publication is neither about language acquisition nor rhetorical knowledge development alone, but a synthesis of the two. To achieve the positive effect of the strategy, Zhao’s memorization process was not an undirected one. In illustration of the relationships among genres, schemata, and acquisition, Swales (1990) suggests that “procedures may derive from both previous experience and prior texts and contribute to the formation of formal schemata” (p. 85, emphasis original). Clearly, Zhao’s improved ability to construct multiword sequences in WFP came from neither learning a set of decontextualized grammar rules and vocabulary, nor benefiting from academic genre awareness-raising activities such as identifying move structures and language patterns. Learning academic texts by heart helped to build up a bridge between language acquisition and rhetorical knowledge development. It offered him a specific way to improving his formation of the particular set of multiword sequences representative of the focus genre.

As the case indicated, Zhao still had some difficulties in expressing mood and modality. Understandably, this can be one of the major challenges shared by many novice L2 writers. In an empirical study, Hyland (2000) observes that L2 writers have considerable difficulty attending to how academic writers weaken their commitment and withhold certainty from the propositions. This difficulty is perhaps also something L1 novice writers struggle with. As Swales (1990) wisely cautions, “schemata alone reflect a microcosmic cognitive world dangerously adrift from communicative purpose and discoursal context” (p. 91). Thus, consciously identifying what is salient in genre convention, variation, and innovation as well as understanding the discoursal context including the power relationship between reader and writer becomes extremely important when the memorization strategy is being employed. For a fluent and idiomatic control of language that manifests genre awareness, memorization strategies could be effective when writer attention was to be purposely directed to how rhetorical strategies achieve the desired effect in the valued texts.

Unfortunately, taking NS proficiency as the baseline made Zhao attribute the challenges to the NNS identities. For this, changing the baseline
from NS proficiency to highly competent multilinguals might help. Once the baseline is changed, forms of capital relevant to the chosen baseline are changed accordingly. Research shows that for multilinguals engaged in academic work, English language competence as a form of cultural capital does not necessarily have the same value across disciplines (Chang & Kanno, 2010) and may not always be critical to NNSs’ academic success. More attention could be shifted to other forms of cultural capital, including writers’ insider perspectives, a critical awareness for cross-genre similarities and differences, and the multiple voices and identities already possessed by multilingual mature writers (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001). These forms of cultural capital, invisible as they are, constitute valuable strengths and advantages of multilingual scholars—a point that has often been masked by an over-simplistic view of NS/NNS divide or “linguistic disadvantage.”

Concluding Thoughts

This chapter has discussed how various ways of employing “the linguistic approach” and “the genre approach” might relate to a writer sense of linguistic disadvantage in WFP and calls for that the two approaches complement each other. I should admit that most teachers and researchers do not see the two as mutually independent, and my critical review of the two also shows that they already inform each other in certain ways. The intention is not about comparison of the approaches, but for a better understanding of the nexus between the two. Identifying the nexus between the linguistic approach and the genre approach provides a point of departure for us to explore more possibilities of helping multilingual novice writers, who often have the needs and goals concerning language development as well as writing development.

Research work can be conducted to reach a more complete understanding of the nexus between the two approaches in the context of WFP. Since the acquisition of multiword sequences in academic discourse requires a certain level of awareness for rhetorical concerns, the approaches of learning the language to write for publication can be investigated from three vantage points: reading, writing, and beliefs consequently held. Questions may include: How do writers notice
sequences with rhetorical features in academic readings? What prevent writers from attending to sequences and rhetorical features that are present in a text? What do writers think about learning and using sequences in WFP? What beliefs do they hold and what strategies do they use? Qualitative case studies, especially longitudinal ones, may help reveal whether and how writers build rhetorical awareness while learning to use sequences over time.

A final point about furthering the understanding of the nexus of the two approaches concerns the dual nature view of language. It seems no easy matter to balance between language as analytical and as formulaic (Ding, 2004). In WFP, my observations show the complexity of the issue in two ways. One, those who know the importance of learning the formulaic language to write for publication still show weaknesses in their formulaic knowledge. Two, multilingual novice writers with a good command of grammar may still make hard, metalinguistic, and conscious efforts to “re-bundle” multiword sequences they are exposed to in academic discourse. As such, future studies may explore the role of conscious re-bundling in the process of acquiring the language to write for publication.
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Introduction

Even though I’m an educated native speaker of English, writing for publication has never been easy for me, or for many other of my L1 English colleagues and graduate students that I have talked with about their writing. I wish I could say it has gotten easier over the years, but I can’t make such a blanket statement. Maybe in some ways it has, but in many important ways, it has not. Yes, I am fluent and comfortable in academic discourse in English, I have acquired much of the terminology of my field, and I can manipulate grammar and syntax to my advantage. However, only a portion of writing for publication depends on a writer’s comfort level with English and knowledge of specialist terminology.
This reality is probably what Hyland (2016; Chapter 3 this volume) was referring to in his commentary on “the myth of linguistic injustice” against the mother tongues of L2 scholars who publish in English. It is a common belief that L2 scholars often have trouble getting published because their English is not up to par, but Hyland provides evidence to the contrary, including evidence that L1 writers have difficulties as well. The peer-review process is not perfect, Hyland reminds us, but there is little evidence of systematic bias. I believe with Hyland, contrary to the views of Flowerdew (2008), that journal editors do not routinely stigmatize L2 authors, and that the stigma label itself is inappropriate (Casanave, 2008). Language-level problems by either L1 or L2 writers are distracting, to be sure, but they are relatively easy to fix, and experienced reviewers of articles submitted for publication can usually see through these. Larger more complex writing problems are less amenable to quick fixes.

My point is that, after a certain threshold level of language proficiency is reached, usually required for admission to graduate schools, and after both L1 and L2 scholars have become comfortable with their discipline-specific terminology (a second language to all of us), the larger problems with academic writing for publication lie outside this realm of language. These problems include the ability to situate one’s own work in a body of literature, to synthesize and comment on that literature knowledgeably, and to construct a convincing and coherent argument. Nevertheless, the myth persists among some L2 scholars in particular that L1 scholars can “write effortlessly” and that difficulties experienced by L2 academic writers result from insufficient proficiency in English (Wang, 2017, p. 174). If this were the case, turning L2 scholars into successful academic writers would not pose serious obstacles, and L1 academic scholars by definition would have few problems writing for publication in their native languages. But this is certainly not the case. In this chapter, I explore some of these ideas with examples from my own experiences trying to write for publication over the last three decades. I’ll first discuss ways that writing for publication does or can get easier, and then describe ways that, for me at least, it gets more difficult.
Easier or Harder with Time?

Common sense tells us that the more we engage in a difficult activity, the easier it should get. Practice, experience, and familiarity all should combine to diminish the anguish of learning and perfecting something new and challenging, like writing for publication, particularly if we are writing in an L1 or in a highly developed academic L2. Indeed, as difficult activities become routinized, they no longer pose challenges, as has been pointed out by studies on expertise (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993; Johnson, 2005). This is certainly a message that I would like to be able to convey to struggling novice writers: Be patient; it will get easier.

But I can’t in all honesty convey such a message in this simple form. In fact, the more I think about my own experiences writing for publication over the last several decades, the more challenging I have felt it to be. The studies on expertise would thus classify me as someone still struggling for expertise, in contrast to experienced non-experts, defined as technically proficient writers who are no longer working at the “edge of their competence” but who instead rely on routinized knowledge (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987, 1993). The experienced non-expert may have many years in a field, in other words, but is no longer expanding her knowledge via progressive problem solving. My message to writers who do not consider themselves to be experts and who seek an easier time of writing for publication is thus to shift their visions and goals to ones that embrace increased complexity and challenge, throughout a career. The struggles will continue, but at different levels and in different areas. Don’t wish them away, or you risk becoming a technician of sorts who is no longer developing expertise. Find ways to make things harder, not easier.

So let me reiterate that although I am considered to be a fairly good writer in English, my L1, I think I have never found writing for publication to be easy, as opposed to writing up a shopping list or composing even a lengthy email letter to a friend. I don’t know how common my situation is. I sometimes wonder about L1 and L2 scholars who manage to publish a book or several articles every year, and I conclude (with no evidence other than the deceptive appearance of finished products
at a rate that leaves me gasping for breath) that they must find writing for publication a lot easier than I do, know ways to recycle existing work cleverly, or be driven by forces in the academic world that I have resisted. That, or else they work at their writing 18 hours a day, which I had no stamina for even in my younger years.

However, if language proficiency is not a major obstacle, and if over time we become familiar with the procedures involved in writing for publication, and if certain aspects of writing might get easier over time, why, then, do some of us find it so difficult to write for publication? One of my points in this chapter is that only a portion of writing for publication depends on a writer’s language proficiency, comfort level with academic English, and familiarity with procedures. Other difficulties arise, some of which might have been invisible or undeveloped in our first efforts to write for publication, such as the fact that the publications that “count” are ones that tend to be critically reviewed by others and that the journals that “count” are ones that have depressingly low acceptance rates, sometimes as low as 5 or 10%. These difficulties are externally imposed. Some others, which I will discuss, come from other realities and pressures, and interact with these externally imposed difficulties. But I’ll first describe some ways that writing for publication does or can get easier over time.

Ways that Writing for Publication Gets Easier

Writing for publication does indeed get easier in some ways for a number of reasons, so that eventually we do not feel overwhelmed at the newness of everything. Here are a few of the reasons why I believe it gets easier.

First, if we commit to reading and writing and learning within a particular field or subfield, we gradually acquire the topic knowledge and specialized terminology and concepts to the point where they no longer require effort to use. Terminological familiarity alone signifies we have some knowledge of a domain. It usually begins in graduate study, of course, sometimes well before we begin writing for publication, and continues to develop as we come to read more widely in an area and
learn to incorporate field-specific terms into our writing. When we no longer have to think before selecting terms, and when family members begin to tell us they don’t understand what we are talking and writing about, this is a sign that it has become easier for us to use the specialized language of our fields. Eventually, our familiarity with our domains and their terms allows us more easily to distinguish the gratuitous display of jargon in publications we read from the essential specialized terminology, and so to make choices in our own writing.

Second, with time, we become familiar with the standards, formats, and templates for various kinds of publications as described in author guidelines for the journals we read (and are therefore likely to want to publish in) and for the book publishers we might want to contact for a book proposal. If I am planning to write another book, I no longer have to wonder what to do to prepare a proposal for a publisher. For any publisher I contact, I will need to have a clearly articulated rationale and description of the project, details about content, length, and style, statements about target audiences, ideas for marketing strategies for that particular publisher, one or more sample chapters including an introduction, a table of contents with some details about each chapter, and a timeline for when I am planning to finish a draft. For a journal article, I know that the author guidelines will stipulate content areas as well as theoretical or pedagogical focuses, article length, citation and referencing style, and submission and review procedures, while generally providing leeway for variation in scope and methods. I also know that it is a good idea to provide evidence in a submitted article that we actually have read the journal we are submitting to by citing some things from that journal. For a chapter in an edited book, the editors’ own book proposal, submitted to publishers and to potential authors, will provide guidelines for content, length, and style. Also, I know that a successful author–editor relationship will involve ongoing negotiations about and adjustments to draft chapters.

A third way that writing for publication can get easier is that I know more about my own writing styles, blocks, strategies, and goals, which I can more easily translate into concrete writing practices. I know, for example, that I must feel fresh and alert to do actual writing that is linked to thinking, particularly writing that is linked to theories,
concepts, and readings. Such writing must be done on what I call “high IQ days.” It is a waste of time for me to attempt this kind of writing if I have not slept well or if I am distracted or ill. At such times, however, instead of doing “real” writing, I can work on mechanical aspects of writing that I can accomplish on “low IQ days,” such as preparing or revising a reference list, proofreading, or downloading articles to read. I also know that if I am blocked and can’t face a computer screen, I can go on a long walk to mull over the difficulties or sit in a coffee shop with paper and pencil for notes and musings. I also know more about how to search for information I might need, both through textual searches and through connections with colleagues or experts that I can consult. In other words, it is easier now for me to move ahead with writing in one way or another, even if I feel blocked.

Fourth, and this is a benefit that comes quite late in a career, I no longer feel pressured to build a CV with publications. The sense that I don’t have to compete with other scholars or to live up to an institution’s standards or quotas or point systems is truly liberating. I am free NOT to write, or to try to write what I want (with little hope of getting unusual pieces to press, of course). This is a luxury that can make some aspects of writing for publication easier, but that comes with age and less often with youthful courage and rebelliousness. Risk in writing is always present, of course (Thesen & Cooper, 2014), but I think it is less threatening for those who are not pressured to compete.

Finally, I have found it easier over time to make a case for “good writing” in academia. My appreciation for beautiful and accessible language has continued to grow throughout my career, leading me to books and articles about good academic writing (e.g., Becker, 1986; Sword, 2009, 2012; Toor, 2011, 2013; Williams, 1997; Zinsser, 1998) and bad academic writing (e.g., Billig, 2013; Frankfurt, 2005; Pinker, 2014). I have also learned to notice instances of beautiful academic and non-fiction writing (rare) that have been published (e.g., the work of Annie Dillard, of the late Elliot Eisner, and more recently of Suhanthie Motha). I can also state with confidence that complex ideas do not need to be written in complex inaccessible language. Because I like beautiful language, and language in general, it has been a pleasure to learn more about how to
craft such writing and to find that over time it has become somewhat easier to do this as long as I commit to revising and polishing.

For graduate students, who may just be starting out in an academic field, my comments that some aspects of writing for publication require time and practice to get easier may not be encouraging. Graduate students and novice scholars do not have a lot of time to make their marks. But if a novice scholar pursues a life in academia, which is often a life of writing at many research universities throughout the world, some of these aspects will indeed get easier, with time and tenacity.

Ways that Writing Might Get Easier

I am less familiar with some other ways that writing for publication might get easier over time, particularly for scholars who work in large institutions and have access to colleagues and students to help them, an experience I have not often had. I describe them briefly here from my knowledge of the work of others.

First, some senior scholars enlist help and contributions by various junior scholars (graduate students, research assistants, and junior colleagues) they are working with, hence adding their own names to publications but without having to do all the work of a single-authored piece (Florence & Yore, 2004). Working in teams and mentoring and co-authoring with graduate students and junior scholars are not necessarily easier than single-authoring, of course, in that they and require knowledge of and experience at orchestrating projects and managing and guiding the work of team members. The very act of co-authoring even with peers carries risks and rewards (Hedgcock, 2003). Peers, indeed all collaborators, benefit from respecting each other’s work habits, trusting each other personally, sharing values and beliefs about goals and about division of tasks, and maintaining a healthy low-key ego. As described by Hedgcock (2003, p. 138), professional reputations are at stake on this co-authoring “journey that may be inherently fraught with interpersonal perils.” But the rewards are great when co-authors can pool knowledge and resources and work collaboratively on projects that will
benefit them both. In other words, co-authoring may or may not make writing for publication easier.

Second, a strategy that we can observe in the publications of some senior scholars is to recycle existing work in a variety of venues. Once we are very familiar with a writing project, including relevant readings, research approaches and methods, and findings, we do not have to start from scratch with every new publication. Emphases can be shifted according to publication venue, pieces of existing work can be expanded, paraphrases can be made from existing passages, and so on. Deep familiarity with a project can thus lead to multiple similar publications, ones that potentially could be written up more quickly and easily than the original publications were. The danger of course is that it is tempting for authors to cut and paste passages from existing work into new work without citing themselves, leading to possible self-plagiarism, and possible damage to their reputations as scholars who recycle work in the interest of self-promotion by expanding their publication lists with previously written work.

A third way that writing for publication could get easier over time is through an author’s growing virtual and/or in-person networks of compatible colleagues with whom he or she could collaborate. Collaboration could take many forms, from designing and carrying out research projects together, to co-writing, to simply inspiration furnished by ongoing discussion. Writing groups are ideal for such collaborations and consultations (Crusan, Motha, Vandrick, & Casanave, 2017). Not everyone has access to a large collegial network, virtual or present, however, and not everyone will be comfortable seeking out and trying to maintain a balanced collegial collaboration. A more solitary scholarly life of writing might be more compatible with the lifestyle and personality of such scholars. Moreover, it takes only one trusted writing partner to help us get a piece of writing done, a role that Stephanie Vandrick has played in my writing life.

In many of these cases in which writing for publication could get easier for some authors, time and experience are once again needed. There are few quick fixes.
Ways that Writing Can Get More Difficult

In this last section, I turn to the counter-intuitive notion of this chapter, namely, that writing for publication can get more difficult over time. And here I do not wish to discourage younger scholars, but simply to dispel the myth that L1 English speakers with a lot of experience and practice at writing for publication will find writing easier, by virtue of who they are and the experience they have had (see Hyland, 2016). I reviewed in the two previous sections some quite obvious ways it does or can get easier for L1 writers like me, thus feeding into the myth, but the points apply as well to L2 writers. However, numerous less visible factors often get in the way of smooth and effortless writing for publication (an experience I no longer believe is possible) for both L1 and L2 writers.

First, although it is essential for hopeful authors to have some concrete idea of what journals, editors, and publishers expect in the way of content, form, and style, too much knowledge or too many felt constraints from this knowledge can stifle efforts, creativity, and risk taking. We can find potentially constraining models simply by perusing our favorite journals and noticing the content, structure, and style of the articles. As someone who has guided the writing of doctoral students and novice scholars, I often hear myself advising them to use articles in journals they hope to submit to as models for their own writing or to follow other guidelines meticulously for theses, book chapters, and grant proposals. But if I wish to resist a conventional model of writing, perhaps as a way to better express an idea or experience, or as a way to help push the field a bit outside its normal boundaries (boundaries that tend to enclose a narrow view of preferred topics, methods, and writing styles in applied linguistics), how do I do that without ensuring automatic rejection? Moreover, how do I decide in which of the many subtle ways I might push against those boundaries? In particular, how do I strategically negotiate small shifts in what is expected so as to succeed in my efforts to publish but also to do something a little different? These goals require great expertise on the part of a writer, in writing style,
knowledge of many different kinds of research, and negotiating skills. This is expertise that many of us never achieve.

A second way in which writing for publication becomes more difficult with age and experience is that patience can diminish for the long and sometimes brutal process of bringing pieces into paper or electronic print, particularly in refereed journals. I have heard myself saying to myself that I am too old and crotchety to get another rejection and another set of critical reviews; that I don’t want to play this writing game anymore (and it is indeed a game, albeit a very serious one; Casanave, 2002); that people seem to be reviewing my work who have not done their homework and so don’t know enough about my topic to critique it; that revision according to someone else’s criteria is just too hard; that I don’t want to revise according to someone else’s criteria, particularly if they don’t seem to understand what I am trying to do; and that the whole process just takes too long. We can also tire of our own projects and agendas if we have followed them over a long career.

So why not publish online, for electronic journals that are not peer reviewed or that promise quick publication? Almost daily I get emails from journals from around the world promising such easy publication, as I am sure many of us do. Many of these journals, some of which can be considered predatory because they mainly want money, thus target naïve international scholars who face pressures to publish frequently and quickly. Learning to identify such journals must be part of a scholar’s education (Beall’s list archive; Hanson, 2014). But inexperienced scholars also need to muster the patience that sometimes I no longer have, and, if they believe in the value of this peer-review process, to learn about and commit to the process for our scholarly publications (Gosden, 2003; Paltridge, 2013a, 2013b; Weiser, 2012).

A third way in which writing for publication has become more difficult for me over time concerns how overwhelmed I feel about the explosion of information in scholarly and scientific fields. I know others feel similarly. Of course, it has always been challenging to select appropriate materials from impossibly large banks of information, even before the world turned digital. But it now feels increasingly difficult to keep up with knowledge growth in one’s field. As someone who has been around for a while, I am supposed to have some sort of grasp of my field, but in
recent years, I have felt defeated in this effort. Not only do I often feel overwhelmed at what is out there, but I know less and less about how to select carefully and efficiently what to continue studying. This feeling that “I might miss something important” is, of course, a common one, especially among less experienced scholars, but I find this anxiety does not dissipate over time and may even worsen as I become more and more aware of how hopeless my efforts to keep up are. Tenacity in these efforts comes harder these days.

A fourth difficulty in my late-career writing for publication has been to find a fresh way to look at existing and well-established theories and concepts, and to identify and draw on theories and concepts from other disciplines that have not been used before in my field. I do not believe that we should dismiss the old in favor of the new, although it certainly feels as though this is what the trends have been since the rise of digital media. I also do not believe that disciplines should build or maintain boundaries that prevent cross-pollination of ideas.

Of course, it is difficult in all stages of a career to study the original sources for a framework even in translation, and perhaps even more difficult later in a career, when the names and concepts are second nature to us, even if acquired second or third hand. We can all recognize the power that Vygotsky, Bourdieu, Bakhtin, Dewey, and others have had on the conceptual thinking of people in language- and education-related social sciences. But have we become mainly name droppers, constructing our conceptual frameworks in just a couple of paragraphs of an article or chapter, having not studied the originals sufficiently? After some time in a field, writers can recognize name-dropping, and dependence on simplistic interpretations of faddish frameworks and concepts (e.g., Vygotsky’s ZPD; Bourdieu’s symbolic capital and habitus). We often read only secondary or tertiary sources for our theories and conceptual frameworks, and neglect the originals. Novice or experienced scholar alike, we are not immune to the seduction of bandwagon fads: If I don’t cite this person from the past, or use that currently trendy buzzword, will I harm my chances of getting published (Matsuda, 2014; Pavlenko, 2018)? Will I have the patience and motivation to read some of the influential theorists of the past to look for a fresh angle to their work that could be inspiring to me? In short, it is
challenging to draw on work that seemed so fresh and attractive 20 or 30 years ago and to do more than parrot what has already been said about it.

A fifth challenge is that, with experience and increased familiarity with the literature and issues in writing, it has become more difficult to challenge myself at the “edge of my competence” (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993), i.e., to continue to expand and explore what I don’t know. By such an expansion, I don’t mean that I wish to become a dilettante, someone who knows a little about everything and who keeps spreading out into new fields and new topics. I want to find ways to work within my domain but to go beyond what I already (think I) know. Because I have been reading and writing and thinking about writing for many years, the challenge to move beyond what I have done without leaving the domain altogether imposes difficulties that were not so salient when I first began writing for publication.

One way to expand and challenge myself is to pay attention to the projects my doctoral students have done, and to learn from them about issues and readings that might be related to what I do. Mayumi Asaba at Temple University in Japan, for example, has helped me to learn about expertise and has introduced me to some of the literature in this area. Although her doctoral project is not about writing, she has caused me to ask what an “expert” writer might be, as opposed to an “experienced non-expert” (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993). I continue to think about this question, finding that it has complicated in interesting ways how I think about writing and writers.

Finally, a major challenge that still awaits me, and that I do not know if I will be able to meet, is that of doing what many of my students and colleagues do, and that is to write a publishable academic paper in a second language. As I close this chapter, I do not yet know if that goal is at the edge of my competence, or beyond it, and therefore beyond my reach. I won’t know until I try. But theoretically, this should be possible, given my early history of rather serious study of Spanish (although I never lived in a Spanish-speaking country, unless you consider California to be such a “country”!). Years ago, I read Spanish literature and wrote papers in Spanish in a master’s program, before I switched to language education, without completing the MA degree in
Spanish. I continue to use Spanish now and then in my daily life, but have not read many academic articles in Spanish or written anything remotely academic in years. At a conference on qualitative research in Guanajuato, Mexico not long ago, I attended some sessions given in Spanish, introduced my own talk in Spanish, and also purchased a book on qualitative inquiry edited by the conference organizers (Lengeling & Mora Pablo, 2013), in which some of the articles are in Spanish. Here is where I must start—with this reading.

For the moment, I am left pondering how I have managed to spend a career helping others to do what I have never done. As a native English speaker, I have the unearned privilege of not being forced to write and publish in an L2 in order to graduate or to get or keep a job, yet this is exactly what many of my graduate students do. It’s time I consider this challenge seriously, rather than spending my entire life as a second language educator who has not used a second language as part of my academic work. So in addition to the ways I have already described that writing for publication has in some ways become more difficult as I have gained experience, I am yet to face the challenge of crafting an academic piece in a style and tone appropriate to an (as yet unidentified) bilingual or Spanish academic journal. If this happens, I expect to get reviewer comments that include recommendations to “consult a native speaker for language help.” And that would come before or even in place of any substantive commentary. Sound familiar?

**Parting Thoughts**

I have no idea how typical the views expressed in this chapter are among other experienced scholars who write for publication. I can only hope that I am not discouraging less experienced L1 and L2 scholars from their writing efforts, and am instead inspiring them to seek challenges throughout their careers that push them beyond their current limits. Without the ongoing challenges, assuming they are within our reach, our scholarly lives can becoming dreadfully boring (see Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, on the *flow* experience that comes from challenge and the boredom that results from its absence).
I also hope I have dispelled what I believe to be myths, including the myth that good writers are native speakers of the language they write in or that some are born with innate talent at writing. There is too much individual variability in performances of any kind for such a generalization to be made (Ackerman, 2014). We may also be misguided in assuming, or hoping, that writing for publication automatically gets easier over time, or that it should get easier with time and experience. Clearly, some aspects do get easier, but it is likely that these aspects are ones that have to do with routinized knowledge and practices, not with deeper (dare I say, more important, and certainly more interesting) aspects of writing (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). Writing practices that have become routinized, ones that no longer challenge us, are certainly important, because as Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993, p. 111) pointed out in their comments on progressive problem solving, they form the building blocks for further challenges in writing. But to wish for more routine and less difficulty in our writing is to put an end to efforts to expand our knowledge, understanding, and skill. Such a stance presumes that we will finally “get there,” and so have nothing more to learn. Ongoing challenge is what prevents academic writers from wasting away from boredom, and what keeps all of us contributing to interesting projects in our fields.

Acknowledgements I am grateful to Stephanie Vandrick and to Ken Hyland for their comments on an earlier draft of this chapter.
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Part III

Perspectives of Mentors
In today’s competitive academic world, publishing professionally—particularly in international/English-language peer-reviewed journals—is considered a primary marker of success. Doctoral students are therefore frequently advised, and increasingly required, to publish before graduation (Habibie, 2016). Yet, academic publishing is no easy task; for Ph.D. students, it means “entering [the] unmarked territory” (Paltridge & Starfield, 2016, p. 1) of a new, complex, and often mysterious world. “Non-native” English-speaking students (NNESs) face additional challenges: They are frequently required to write in

1The NES-NNES distinction, increasingly questioned in applied linguistics generally, appears alive and well in ESP/EAP/ERPP. We therefore use it as a “live” category here without committing ourselves to it ontologically.
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English—the dominant international academic language—which they may have acquired without lengthy and intense socialization into its academic literacy practices (Gee, 2015).

Largely in response, whole fields/research areas have emerged to support NNESs learning and using academic English. Thus, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) was founded substantially to help NNES science and technology students write academic English (Johns, 2013). Similarly, the field of English for Academic Purposes (EAP—Hyland & Shaw, 2016) has focused considerable energy on developing NNESs’ academic writing skills. The newest entry—English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP)—is the most specific: Flowerdew (2013) delineates its goals as: (1) “researching the favored target genre of the research community, the research article”; (2) “investigating the social situation in which scholarly writers find themselves”; and (3) “applying the findings of this research to pedagogical intervention” (pp. 305–306).²

Yet, academic publication is widely acknowledged to be difficult for all academic writers. To put it personally, this chapter’s second author has experienced several problems highlighted in the ERPP literature, including working “on the periphery” and having submissions massively “corrected” for grammar/mechanics (Flowerdew, 2008). Academic research and writing likewise represent the single largest time/energy commitment in his life, leading to an ever-growing pile of rejected or unfinished manuscripts, and a strong sense that journal publication is harder than ever. Thus, of his three most recent empirical publications, one required five resubmissions over two years, while another required massive reconceptualization, redrafting, and approximately 100 substantial revisions spanning seven years. This is by no means to suggest that there is nothing distinctive or special about NNES scholars’ publishing experiences, but it does urge caution in generalizing, perhaps especially from an empirical literature consisting substantially of case studies.

²We have enumerated Flowerdew’s (2013) list.
Indeed, scholars have questioned the reality of binary “native-non-native” distinctions in academic publishing. Thus, Swales (2004) suggested that “the difficulties typically experienced by NNES academics in writing English are (certain mechanics…aside)...pretty similar to those...experienced by native speakers” (p. 52). More recently, Hyland (2016) has mounted a sustained argument that academic writing is a second language for all, so that claims of linguistic injustice against NNESs are questionable. Predictably, Hyland’s argument has generated strong responses (e.g., Politzer-Ahles, Holliday, Girolamo, Spychalska, & Harper Berkson, 2016).

As a modest contribution to this debate, the present study investigates the writing-for-publication experience of six early-career scholars—three NNES and three NES—individually and comparatively. Our original brief was to investigate how doctoral students made the leap from writing dissertations to writing for publication, but based on our own experience, the reality was more complex. Thus, the first author’s initial full-length international peer-reviewed publication—co-authored with her advisors—was based on her master’s thesis, while the second author’s was based on his Ph.D. qualifying paper, which his dissertation was then based on. We therefore set out to investigate the publishing experience of early-career scholars. Our research questions, developed substantially in the course of investigation following standard qualitative research practice, were as follows:

1. What publications/publication types did the participants produce before and after finishing their dissertations?
2. On what basis did the participants make their first efforts to publish?
3. What factors facilitated their writing for publication process?
4. What difficulties did the participants experience in writing for publication?
5. Did the “non-native” writers feel disadvantaged by their NNES status?

3Thus, according to one of the interpretive tradition’s pioneers, initial research questions function as “foreshadowed problems” rather than full-blown research questions (Malinowski, 1922/1984, p. 9).
Methods

The purpose of this study was to examine how six early-career academics made the transition from being (“just”) graduate students to becoming publishing writers, and what factors might have influenced this process. The study was framed in the interpretive qualitative research tradition (Erickson, 2011) and implemented by collecting and analyzing interview data, asking follow-up questions, and member-checking.

Participants

The participants were six early-career scholars in applied linguistics. We initially contacted them because we knew them as professional colleagues/graduate students (representing five of our participants), or because they were recommended by their dissertation advisors, who we knew professionally (representing one participant). The six participants were selected from a larger pool based on two sets of criteria, applied sequentially: (1) Participants had finished their doctoral degrees within five calendar years of the year of data collection (this is our operational definition of “early-career scholar”), had published/had had accepted at least one peer-reviewed journal article at time of data collection, and were actively continuing their efforts to publish; and (2) Participants represented as diverse a sample as we could find according to gender, location of Ph.D.-granting institution, nationality, and “native” language. Table 9.1 gives general information regarding each participant, with details excluded to protect anonymity. Participants came from four different “native” language groups (i.e., each NNES was from a different language group) and were teaching in five different countries.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected through qualitative semi-structured interviews (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). We conducted 40- to 45-minute interviews together via Skype with participants; these were audio-recorded.
From Student to Scholar: Making the Leap to Writing …

The same set of general questions (see Appendix) guided each interview, but unscripted follow-up questions based on participants’ responses yielded unique trajectories for each interview.

Both authors transcribed the interviews and manually coded them inductively, i.e., allowing themes to emerge from the data rather than fitting them into pre-existing codes/models (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Coding procedures included labeling phenomena, inducing categories, and developing categories in terms of properties and dimensions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) while reading transcripts recursively. As a result, both descriptive and analytic codes were created (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Our coding also followed the independent parallel coding approach (Thomas, 2006), in which multiple researchers independently code the data. Our two sets of codes were then compared to identify overlaps and differences, modified in several places, and merged into a single, final set of categories (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

While this approach made our analysis more systematic and trustworthy (at least in our eyes—e.g., our independent coding categories were substantially similar), coding is undeniably a highly interpretive process. Codes were therefore used mainly to point us back to the data in more focused/thematically oriented ways rather than providing categories for further abstraction.

Table 9.1  Participant characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>NES/NNES</th>
<th>Location of Ph.D. granting institution</th>
<th>Current employment status and location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NNES</td>
<td>Non-U.S.</td>
<td>Non-tenure-eligible, Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hai</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NNES</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Tenure-eligible, Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NES</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Non-tenure-eligible, Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NES</td>
<td>Non-U.S.</td>
<td>Tenured lecturer (European system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NNES</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Non-tenure-eligible, Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NES</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Tenure-eligible, U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aPseudonyms are used to protect participants’ identity
Results

The results are presented in five sections keyed to our five research questions. The research questions in turn reflected the most common and important themes generated via coding, which was also informed by our research interests as reflected in our interview questions (see Appendix). Fundamentally, we were interested in exploring our participants’ early and continuing attempts to publish as seen through their eyes, as interpreted additionally through our own.

Research Question 1: What publications/publication types did participants produce before and after finishing their dissertations?

Participants were generally publishing or trying to publish during or before writing their dissertations, which their published work was only sometimes based on. In this section, we describe their publishing profiles as graduate students and early-career scholars before investigating their understandings of their experience in later sections.

Thus, Terry managed to turn two “comprehensive exam” papers into international peer-reviewed publications. Both were published two years before graduation; one became the basis of her dissertation. A third paper, co-authored with her dissertation advisor, appeared in a major applied linguistics journal the same year; this was thematically connected to Terry’s dissertation.

Anna published two peer-reviewed articles in major international journals before graduating, both co-authored with her advisor and based on her dissertation research. A peer-reviewed single-authored article had appeared two years earlier and was based on work completed in her first year of doctoral studies. Anna also had a string of shorter journal publications in her native language dating back to 2006.

Renata had co-authored two peer-reviewed articles in major applied linguistics journals with faculty members before graduating; neither was based directly on her dissertation. She also co-authored two articles with
fellow graduate students and a professor, one connected to her dissertation. A single-authored work in a major journal based on her dissertation appeared three years after graduation, as did a second co-authored article. Before beginning her U.S. doctoral program, Renata had published seven (mostly shorter) articles in her native language, and one in a U.S. university linguistics journal.

Hai published in “newsletter type of publications” and local university journals as a doctoral student and early-career scholar; he had also submitted an article for publication in his second year of doctoral work. One submission—a co-authored piece—appeared two years after graduation in an electronic, peer-reviewed journal. A second piece, based on his dissertation, has been accepted for publication by an international peer-reviewed journal.

Michael published a peer-reviewed article unrelated to his dissertation the year he graduated. He has published/had accepted for publication two full-length articles (one co-authored) in a well-reputed peer-reviewed electronic journal following graduation, and one in a regional journal.

Paul had published a number of papers in regional peer-reviewed journals before finishing his dissertation (in fact, he had previously discontinued doctoral studies at a different university); one of these was based on his earlier/discontinued dissertation research. An account of Paul’s publishing journey is given below.

**Research Question 2: On what basis did the participants make their first efforts to publish?**

**Getting Started Early**

Four participants reported feeling strongly that they should publish as graduate students—in Renata’s words: “You need to start early.” Michael even reported getting this message when he started his MA-TESOL. Anna began her Ph.D. because “it was time for me to learn for publication,” and was determined to co-author with her advisor. Terry stated that:
I was kind of trained to think it’s gonna be tough to be on the job market without anything but your dissertation. And so I went into that with that kind of thinking…: A lot of really talented graduate students are already publishing and are published authors.

Hai, on the other hand, mentioned neither encouragement nor pressure to publish in graduate school; rather, he answered our question (Appendix, question 4) by referring to post-Ph.D. work: “People say publish or perish. With the Ph.D., obviously, I wanted to develop my career as a researcher.”

Paul started his Ph.D. journey in the early 2000s, at which time he felt that “there was just this real sense that [publishing]’s not for you,… you are not there yet,…which basically meant that it was just completely out of my reach.” He abandoned his Ph.D., took a full-time job, and then, in his second attempt at a Ph.D. in a different university—undertaken while working full-time, his supervisor “discouraged me from publishing because I was a part-time student.” Paul nonetheless published a variety of pieces in regional peer-reviewed journals before getting tenure and finishing his Ph.D. Since then, he has published four research articles (two from his dissertation) and two co-authored articles in major applied linguistics journals. He still feels “behind the curve” in publishing, but that things are going in the right direction.

Research Question 3: What factors facilitated their writing for publication process?

Institutional Culture of Research and Publication

As already suggested, several participants felt motivated by institutional environments which encouraged research and publication. Renata stated it directly: “I am very grateful for my graduate school and the professors that they really…encouraged us to publish.” Anna took a course in her first Ph.D. semester wherein the professor recommended book reviews as a first step in academic publishing; she wrote one, only to find that book reviews were usually invited—she got it published
anyway. As mentioned above, nothing Hai told us suggested an encouraging institutional environment, but he did report being helped by a group of fellow students after graduating. Paul, as already mentioned, was discouraged from trying to publish in his two Ph.D. programs, but his current university, which he moved to two years ago, is a hotbed of publishing activity: “I am surrounded by a lot of people who are really really active and pushing all the time. So yeah, my goals now are all about publishing in all the top journals as much as I possibly can.”

Co-authoring and Mentoring

Professors in Renata’s program were open to co-authoring with students, which she appreciated deeply:

I was first working on my dissertation in [home country], so I got published in [home country] first, which is very different from getting published in a Western context. So first I had to transition to publishing in the Western context, and I was lucky that my advisor offered me, because he knew I have data on [research area] and I think he was going to a conference,…if I want we can co-author a paper. And I think it was a very good start, and I am very grateful for him giving me this chance. And I think it was a crucial experience and I would recommend it to every graduate student to start by co-authoring a paper with [a] senior [colleague]…. This experience was helpful not only in how to structure the paper, but also in how to deal with reviewer comments, because I think it’s one of the most difficult parts in publication.

Anna, for her part, viewed co-authoring with her dissertation advisor as essential to her scholarly development. Asked what lessons she had learned about publishing, she replied, “The number one rule is to find someone who is well-published to co-author with…. If you find a great co-author you may be better than you think you are.” Anna had actively sought her advisor’s participation as co-author in graduate school (see above), and envisioned it continuing post-graduation. Thus, after describing a specific case in which the advisor’s advice was crucial in getting their paper accepted, she stated:
This experience just make me feel when I could finally wean from [advisor’s name]? Because he’s such a great supervisor and I found he know all the tricks about publishing…. So now I’m finishing the first draft of another paper and I’m still thinking that I should co-author with [him] because I do not have confidence to cope with that process myself alone.

When asked if she felt that her identity as a publishing scholar had changed since graduating, Anna replied, “I think for the next few years I will be co-authoring with [advisor]. So in terms of days I do not think I have to wean from him, and I’m still his student and I’m still learning from him.”

Terry reported mixed feelings on co-authoring with her advisor before graduation:

I felt like I was along for the ride--[the co-author] decided where to submit it and we co-wrote it and some other things…. But it was really great to see what this really prestigious journal was looking for, and it was a really great experience. But again I felt like I didn’t have much control over it.

Unlike Renata, Anna, and Terry, Paul, Michael, and Hai did not emphasize the importance of co-authoring for their development as publishing scholars, although each had co-authored previously.

Regarding mentoring more generally, Anna (as already mentioned) felt that her advisor was the key influence in her development as a publishing scholar. She also described other mentors, including one who had invited her to submit a paper to a special journal issue he was editing. Although it was subsequently rejected, he encouraged her to resubmit to another journal and gave her “at least 65 comments,” including “your literature review did not prepare for your discussion.” This comment taught Anna a valuable lesson: “For the first time in my life I know that, ok, the literature must prepare for my discussion.”

Terry also highlighted her relationship with her mentor and another professor:
[They] always really gave me very critical feedback. I mean they were tougher on me than anyone else was. And the first time they gave me feedback, I just cried privately in my office…. And then after that I just really started developing a thicker skin about it. Yeah, that was really helpful.

Finally, when asked if he received personal support in his publishing efforts, Hai praised his dissertation advisor, although the latter appeared mostly to be a sounding board: Hai laughingly said that he was “using him as a place…to ventilate most of the time.”

**Professional Involvement**

Several participants felt that their understanding of writing for publication increased as they became embedded in their professional communities. This was especially true for Paul:

[I] moved to [country name] in [date] and immediately started getting invitations to review submissions for good journals…. And that totally changed everything for me. I think seeing the submissions, [and] talking just on a regular, daily basis with people who were actively publishing all the time, just changed my whole outlook on what it was. And I suppose at that stage too I had years of rejections. I think that’s all part of it for me that helps, and I understood what that was: working with reviewers’ comments.

Michael and Hai likewise described becoming increasingly involved in reviewing for journals and conferences; for Michael, at least, this provided useful additional perspectives on writing for publication. Michael also stated that his inability to attend major conferences because he worked on the “periphery” actually motivated his writing: “It can be difficult to physically get to these conferences…so the easiest way and maybe the most effective way to have a presence in the field right now is to publish, right?”
Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation

All participants expressed the need to publish for present or future career prospects—the familiar “publish or perish” (Hai’s words) dynamic. Paul did so most avidly, given that he had recently moved from a job in which “research pressure was non-existent,” to one where it was pervasive. Anna put it directly, stating that publication “is now the hard currency [of academic employment] all over the world,” and “you are what you publish.”

At the same time, all participants expressed intrinsic forms of motivation. Thus, when asked if she anticipated a future job which emphasized publication, Renata described moving away from the “publish or perish” mindset:

I think my views have changed…. When I finished graduate school, I only applied to assistant professor positions, but because I didn’t get many offers, then the next year I applied to any kind of relevant positions…. So I got this position of a lecturer. But then I thought, as I am working, I really like teaching here in [country’s name]. It feels very rewarding because the students really want to learn…. So on the one hand, I do want to get more pushed to get published. On the other hand, I don’t want this pressure…. So somehow I am not so focused now on getting tenure. I just want to do good work and do good research, and that’s fine with me.

Anna also expressed strong intrinsic motivation:

I know that publication is very important, and as an academic I know you are what you publish. But personally I was not so much pressed to publish. I think I publish mostly because of a kind of internal motivation, and I enjoyed it. Because…I think I could live a very leisurely life [in home country] if I did not work on research, but I enjoyed it and then I tried to do something…. I tried to do what I enjoy and I tried to preach what I believe.

---

4We use the “extrinsic–intrinsic” dichotomy advisedly, due to its reductionism (thanks to “Hai” for pointing this out).
After describing his motivation to publish as “want[ing] to develop my career as a researcher” and obtain tenure, Hai added, “But I am also generally interested in research, and the writing is also part of that process.” Michael, who seems highly professionally driven, also stated that he is intrinsically motivated to do basic research in the social justice issues he is studying, which can then be applied in classrooms to “support and facilitate respectful dialogue around these issues that are part of students’ lives.”

**Learning Through (Hard) Experience**

All participants characterized submitting to international peer-reviewed journals as a difficult and emotionally fraught process, especially when experiencing rejection and dealing with reviewers’ comments. Paul’s account was the most dramatic: He described “years of rejections” after completing his dissertation:

> I was completely lost. Everything I tried to pull out of my dissertation… was rejected. I didn’t understand what rejection was at that stage and was completely frustrated and completely lost about what to do. Colleagues in [then-country of residence] weren’t helpful at that stage. I didn’t have enough connections or relations with people who were actively publishing or knew about the mental strategies involved, and dealing with rejection and targeting the right journals—all that kind of thing.

Things started to improve, however, after Paul got two articles published from his dissertation. A larger shift occurred when he moved to his current workplace, where publishing is strictly required and avidly pursued. He began to get requests to review manuscripts, which in turn gave him valuable insight into the reviewing process, and he interacted daily “with people who were actively publishing all the time.” These developments:

> changed my whole outlook on what [publishing] was. And I suppose at that stage too I had years of rejections. I think that’s all part of it for me—it helps, and I understood what that was: working with reviewers’
comments. But, yeah, funny little aside: I currently have three articles out for review, which is kinda amazing. And one of them has been rejected eight times!

Anna also told a complex tale of repeated rejection, strategizing, negotiation, and final acceptance over two years of a paper co-authored with her advisor, while Hai expressed an ambivalent attitude toward the manuscript-review process:

Every reviewer, every journal--seemingly there is some kind of coherent whole of the mindsets maybe but it's always very much contextualized and situated--I mean the things they think of as important or not important. Yeah, I mean it's just so random.... So I always feel like when I send my paper I am buying a lottery.

At the same time, such accounts generally had happy endings; even Hai felt better prepared and more agentive due to his experience:

But now that I've experienced going through [split reviewer decisions]--getting pounded and then praised (laughs)--I think I was better mentally prepared. And then I think one little change to me that is quite different, or something I couldn't have done with my first publication, was that I in fact tried to negotiate when something is not sort of right...about reviewers' comments. And, when it really shows that this person really didn't read closely enough, to say something about it...to the editor: Let the person know that I’m not exactly happy with what this person is saying.

Our participants therefore generally expressed growing confidence in their ability to write for publication, even if results were not guaranteed. In Paul’s words, which equally reflected his personal trajectory:

Definitely I am a lot more confident about all if it. I am a lot more confident about sending articles off to top journals, and a lot more confident based on the acceptance rate...for sending in proposals for conferences and things like that. All of that's really helped me. But I think a lot of it
has come from a lot of reviewing that I’ve done…. It’s having those experiences that’s given me the confidence I needed. I am sure if I were still at the rejection rate that I had…two years out of the Ph.D. I wouldn’t still be doing this. It would have just crushed my soul.

**Persistence**

Finally, five participants highlighted the importance of persisting in the face of rejection. Michael reported, “I’ve just been writing and sending things out constantly. And it’s kind of shifted recently from strings of rejections and trying to find the right place to strings of revise and submits.” When asked what advice she would give novice academic writers, Anna stated:

> It’s really important to keep trying because when I was in [native country] I never dreamed of publishing in [journal’s name]…. I thought that was the only space for real masters, not for people like me. And so when I finally [had a paper accepted by this journal], I find that: So keep trying.

Terry recounted an incident where, having had a paper rejected twice, her writing partner/advisor asked,

> Do you still believe in this piece? Like do you believe in what you’re writing? And I’m like, “Yeah, I actually do.” “So then stick with it.” So I submitted it to the third journal, which was just as good as all the others, and it got accepted.

Renata described what happened after submitting a paper that:

> seemed very clear-cut and straightforward to me, and I thought it would get easily accepted. But I got two rejections and I lost interest…. Now I am having winter break so I am planning to resubmit the paper, and I think I know which journal, so I am going to do that. But I think it’s important not to react emotionally to rejections.
Research Question 4: What difficulties did the participants experience in writing for publication?

As already described, the most common difficulty mentioned by participants was dealing with reviewer comments, both on emotional and practical levels. They noted several other difficulties as well.

Journal article length requirements were described as problematic by four participants. Anna, for instance, mentioned “difficulty controlling my word limits;” luckily, her co-author could masterfully condense her words while preserving meaning. Hai described the challenge of moving from dissertation writing to writing for publication, where “you have to be very selective what to include.” Paul likewise recounted “trying to grab chunks of my dissertation—it was like 20,000 words—and trying…to squeeze that into an 8000-word article. It was ridiculous. It was never going to work.” Terry struggled to fit her ethnographic research into research articles, leading her to consider publishing in book form.

Terry and Renata alluded to difficulties sticking to schedules when writing alone, contrasting it with co-authoring and writing with a writing partner, respectively. Renata stated:

An individual paper is much more difficult to write, and I think the main issue for me is self-discipline because when you co-author you create a schedule…. You prepare a draft, you send it to your co-author, and the co-author says I will get back to you in about two or three weeks—right?—then sends back to you the draft and says, “Please come back to me in two weeks.” So it goes really fast, and you don’t have to discipline yourself because you have deadlines. And I am a kind of a person, Unfortunately, who is motivated by deadlines.

Other difficulties described by participants were more individual: Renata, for instance, mentioned problems balancing her teaching load and research time, while Michael described struggling with feeling that he was “a bad writer.” Additional difficulties were mentioned in previous sections.
Research Question 5: Did “non-native” writers feel disadvantaged by their NNES status?

In answer to question 7 in the Appendix, it was eye-opening to hear that our “non-native” participants did not feel significantly disadvantaged as NNES writers. Anna explained:

I think the most important thing is that you can frame a convincing argument, an eloquent argument. I think as long as I have that kind of ability--yes, of course English is still not my native language, but I do not think that I write poorly myself. I have confidence in my writing.

Renata’s answer was more complex but equally clear:

I do know that some talented native speaker writers write very fast--that's my only kind of envy. I wish I could write faster. But other than that I don’t feel like I am very impeded…. It’s more about how you frame your paper and how do you manage the time. And these days there are so many international writers that I think the editor expectations and reviewer expectations are different and they got used to [it]. Yeah. And I think international writers have a very high level of writing skills these days. So it’s not a problem…. The ecology of publication has changed: There are more international writers than native speakers.

Hai reported:

No--actually no--I never felt that way. Yeah, and reviewers never even mentioned that my writing needs to go through native-speaker editing and things like that. They usually don’t say that my writing is excellent, but it is acceptable. That’s what they say I guess--yeah.

It is also interesting that two of these three participants highlighted the phenomenon of discourse framing in their answers, while the third noted the lack of comments on his grammar. Other genre/rhetorical considerations were also noted by our participants—we hope to treat this topic in a separate paper.
Discussion and Conclusion

The participants in this study described a range of experience, both positive and problematic, in writing for international peer-reviewed journal publication. In general, they found such writing intense and difficult, mirroring Hyland (2016): “Those who write know it’s a difficult and messy business” (p. 66). The most frequently mentioned difficulties concerned receiving and knowing how to respond to reviewer comments.

Yet, our participants also found writing for publication rewarding. Major facilitating factors were support from co-authors and mentors, growing experience and confidence, and persistence. Intrinsic motivation to publish and supportive institutional environments were also mentioned. Among others, Cho (2004) has described the positive aspects of co-authoring as graduate students, which three participants highlighted.

It is interesting and revealing that participants’ responses did not fall out along “native” and “non-native” lines in this study: Difficulties dealing with reviewer comments, for instance, were shared by all participants, and favored solutions, including consulting more expert others, persistence, and learning through experience, were generally shared as well. Perhaps the most provocative finding was that, despite persistent and understandable concern that NNESs are significantly disadvantaged when writing for publication (Hyland, 2016; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016), this did not hold true for our NNES participants, at least in their own views.

Gender differences, on the other hand, may be relevant: The three female participants all viewed co-authoring and/or mentoring as crucial parts of their learning-to-write-for-publication process (see also Habibe, 2016), while none of the male participants did. For instance, none of the male participants reported co-authoring with their advisor’s or senior colleagues, although all participants had co-authored.

As with all research, this study has limitations. First, it featured just six participants; in this sense, it continues a strong case study tradition, with attendant limitations, in ESP/EAP/ERPP. Thus, as with many case
studies, the sample is a “convenience sample,” leading to likely sampling bias. In fact, the very requirement that participants be publishing writers probably limited our sample to those with a positive attitude/motivation toward writing for publication—at least positive enough to continue, and thereby (in the cases represented here) to succeed.

It is also true, however, that interpretive case-based research of the kind presented here yields enhanced access to participants’ experience (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Thus, the fact that we had pre-existing relationships with five of the participants suggests that they likely talked to us more candidly (or at least familiarly) than they might have to strangers.

Finally—and within the above limitations—we conclude with summary suggestions for effective practice based on our findings: (1) Don’t get discouraged—keep trying; (2) Work with more experienced co-authors, at least in early stages of publishing; (3) Publishing gets easier—or at least more possible—with time and experience; (4) Intrinsic motivation may be as important as extrinsic motivation; and (5) NNES disadvantage is not a foregone conclusion.

Appendix: Interview Questions

1. Tell us about your experience becoming a publishing academic (open-ended question).
2. What are your main goals as a publishing scholar?
3. What are publication requirements at your current institution? How are you addressing them?
4. What are your main reasons/motivations for writing for publication?
5. Who is your target audience when writing for publication?
6. Our research focuses on the transition from being a graduate student to becoming a publishing author. Did you make such transition? If so, how would you describe it?
7. Do you feel disadvantaged or negatively positioned as an NNES in the publishing game?
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This chapter marks our tenth coauthored publication. In the past four years of our doctoral student–supervisor relationship, we have collaborated on four journal articles (Darvin & Norton, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2016a), five book chapters (Darvin & Norton, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b, 2018a, 2018b), and six conference presentations, discussing issues of identity and investment in language education. Marked by stimulating discussions, innumerable email exchanges and overlapping deadlines, our experience of coauthorship has been both an intellectually and personally rewarding process. In 2016, we had the privilege of being recognized with the TESOL Award for Distinguished Research for our article, “Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics” (2015),
and were invited to present on the collaborative research process at the TESOL Convention. By sharing our own reflections in this chapter, we would like to demonstrate how collaborative writing between student and supervisor can be a valuable component of academic socialization, one that is intertwined with other discursive practices and is made possible through a reconfiguration of power. Using legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and the model of investment (Darvin & Norton, 2015) to frame our discussion, we assert that coauthorship is a powerful form of mentorship that allows both the novice and the expert to reimagine identities and agentive possibilities.

**Academic Socialization and Legitimate Peripheral Participation**

How novices are socialized into the discourses of an academic community has been examined from a number of theoretical perspectives (Canagarajah, 2004; Casanave, 1995; Duff, 2010; Morita, 2009). Drawing on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) community of practice, Morita (2009) defines academic socialization as “learning how to participate in a competent and appropriate manner in the discursive practices of a given academic community” (p. 444). In this complex and dynamic process, students acquire the specialized ways of knowing and communicating in a given discipline, while negotiating multiple identities and relations of power. In examining the value of situated learning to become legitimate members of a community, Lave and Wenger (1991) conceptualized the process of *legitimate peripheral participation* where newcomers interact with established members of a community and become increasingly experienced in the practices that characterize it. As a descriptor of engagement in social practice, it draws on notions of legitimacy and peripherality to demonstrate how there are multiple levels of engagement and modes of inclusion in a community of practice, and that the trajectory of one’s socialization is constructed by changing locations and perspectives. Recognizing that learning involves the construction of identities, Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that one becomes a different person through the possibilities enabled by systems
of relations within a community of practice. “Learning is not merely a condition for membership, but is itself an evolving form of membership” (p. 53) and through legitimate peripheral participation, learners are able to construct “knowledgeably skilled identities in practice” (p. 55). Newcomers to an academic community negotiate not only their linguistic resources but also the “social, cultural and historical aspects of their academic socialization” (Kobayashi et al., 2017). Because communities are complex, there is no linearity in the process of acquiring skills. The end point of this participation is not to arrive at a political or metaphorical “center,” but rather to “full participation.” Through growing involvement, novices are able to gain access to resources, extend their practice and master norms and conventions so that they may achieve full membership (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

As they co-construct identities, Duff (2010) asserts that consequences and outcomes of academic discourse socialization are unpredictable, as it involves different levels of investment and agency and the navigation of institutional and disciplinary ideologies. How participants position themselves and are positioned by others shape their access to and engagement in the community of practice. While students develop new knowledge, competencies and textual identities, she also emphasizes how academic socialization is a bi- or multi-directional contingent process. Mentors themselves can be socialized into new practices, and students do not just reproduce or internalize discursive practices, but exercise agency through resistance, innovation, and self-determination.

Identity and Investment in Academic Contexts

While Lave and Wenger (1991) do articulate that legitimate peripherality is “implicated in social structures involving relations of power” (p. 36), some scholars (Barton & Tusting, 2005; Davies, 2005; Handley et al., 2006) have pointed out that Lave and Wenger do not substantially discuss the impact of power differentials that exist not only between expert and novice, but within the hierarchy of a community of practice. Barriers to entry, gatekeepers, tacit, and uncodified rules represent different mechanisms of control that shape participation in
a community of practice. To examine how power operates in the academic socialization process, we would like to use the model of investment we have constructed (Darvin & Norton, 2015) to serve as a critical framework for this paper. Originally intended to dissect the language learning process, this model recognizes that investment in learning practices occurs at the intersection of identity, capital, and ideology. For the purposes of this chapter, we use this model to understand how supervisors and students can invest in socialization practices available to them.

Fundamental to an understanding of investment is identity, which Norton (2013) defines as “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (p. 4). Understanding one’s “relationship to the world” is akin to what Bourdieu (1987) explains as “a sense of one’s place” which is also “a sense of the place of others” (p. 5). Students position themselves and others, accord or refuse them power, because of this sense developed through habitus, “a system of durable, transposable dispositions … principles which generate and organize practices and representations” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 53). Habitus is durable because it is “constructed across time and space,” shaped by ideology, reproduced through “practices and representation,” and fortified by “alliances and connections.” As disposition, habitus provides a conceptual understanding of what is reasonable and possible and a tendency to think and act in specific ways. It configures in students an idea of their rightful place in the academic community and predisposes them to do what they believe is expected of them and to develop relations that are deemed appropriate. At the same time, identity is constructed by “possibilities for the future,” and in this sense, the multiple subjectivities that converge in the self are not just constructed by habitus but also imagined and desired. Students invest in practices that will allow them to gain access to their imagined communities, whether it be the academic community as a whole, or specific disciplines and institutions they want to be affiliated with. Relations of power determine the legitimacy of their position in these communities, and to assert their rightful place in the academic
context, students need to claim more powerful identities and engage meaningfully with its established members.

How identities are positioned differently across these spaces is shaped by ideologies, which we define as “dominant ways of thinking that organize and stabilize societies while simultaneously determining modes of inclusion and exclusion” (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 72). Ideologies have the power to render themselves invisible, whether because they have been naturalized as common sense, or because they are intentionally concealed. Reproduced through institutional norms and recursive hegemonic practices, these ways of thinking shape also how forms of capital are valued. For Bourdieu (1986), capital is power. It extends from the economic/material (money, property) to the cultural (knowledge, credentials, skills) and social (networks and connections to positions of power), and how these are distributed represents the immanent structure of the social world. Students and supervisors are positioned in the academic community based on the volume, composition, and trajectory of their capital. Capital is fluid and dynamic, and the form the different types take “once they are perceived and recognized as legitimate” (Bourdieu, 1987, p. 4) is symbolic capital. The conversion of capital is frequently a site of struggle, especially if capital valued in one place is radically devalued in another.

As students and supervisors navigate the academic context, ideologies collude and compete, shaping their identities and positioning them in different ways. The value of their economic, cultural, and social capital shifts in different contexts, and is subject to, but not completely constrained by, the ideologies of different disciplines or institutions. To navigate these power-laden contexts with a greater sense of agency, students need to be recognized by others and by themselves as legitimate members of the community. It is through such recognition that they are able to claim the right to speak (Norton, 2013), and this “power to impose reception” (Bourdieu, 1977) extends to the capacity to represent one’s voice through written academic discourse. Academic socialization and legitimate peripheral participation enables such possibilities. By reflecting on our own experiences, we have sought to understand the dynamics through which student and supervisor are able to invest
in the one particular academic socialization practice: collaborative writing. Drawing on the model of investment, we reflect on our own coauthorship process and outline how this collaboration is made possible through a negotiation of ideology, capital, and identity.

The Student Speaks

Before pursuing graduate studies at the University of British Columbia (UBC) in Vancouver, Canada, I taught language and literature at secondary and university levels in Manila, and conducted workshops on critical literacy and pedagogy for teachers from different parts of the Philippines. I had completed a Masters in Literary and Cultural Studies, and written a thesis on the representation of the working class in Philippine cinema, a chapter of which was published in a local journal. After more than ten years of teaching, I took a five-year hiatus from academia working in Shanghai as a communications consultant for a technology company. In 2012, I moved to Vancouver with the goal of pursuing my PhD, but to ease myself back into academic life, I decided to pursue another Masters first, this time in Language and Literacy Education. It was during my first term at UBC that I met Bonny. Knowing about her scholarly reputation and being captivated by her work on identity and investment, I enrolled in two of her courses. She took an interest in my work, and with her guidance, the topic of my doctoral research began to take shape.

Since we were both interested in issues of power, inequality, and social transformation, it was not surprising that much of what I wanted to research intersected with her work. In the second edition (2013) of her seminal book, *Identity and Language Learning*, she talked about digital technology as an exciting area for identity studies, and how social class has remained a relatively under-researched topic in language education research. Wanting to pursue a doctoral study that would weave together my interests and experience, I decided to examine how social class differences of migrant Filipino high school students in Vancouver shaped their language and digital literacy practices. I conducted a pilot study for a course on multimodality, and the data I collected from this
research could not have come at a more opportune time. Bonny had been invited to contribute an article for a special issue on social class by Yasuko Kanno, the editor of *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*. Recognizing how this topic aligned completely with my research interests, Bonny asked me if I would be interested to coauthor with her, and, of course, I responded with a resounding yes. She accepted Yasuko’s invitation with the condition that we would coauthor the article, with me as first author.

To prepare for writing the article, Bonny and I met to discuss the findings of my pilot study, and the conclusions I drew from it. She asked questions and probed further, and we exchanged ideas about how social class can be theorized, and shared readings with each other. We discussed the strengths and limitations of a Bourdieusian framework, and explored Blommaert’s perspectives on language and inequality. When it came to citing the work of others, she encouraged me to think about the community of scholars I wanted to be part of. By understanding the article as a conversation, I had to ask myself with whom I wanted to have that conversation. I took down notes, and together we outlined how the article could be structured. As first author, I composed the first draft, and listed down ideas or questions that I had for further discussion. Bonny responded to my questions and provided feedback, and I revised further. She then took this second draft and added her own insights and revised it where necessary. After receiving the reviewers’ comments, we sat and talked about how to address them. I amended the article then sent it to her for further revision, a sequence we repeated when we received the proofreader’s suggestions a few months later. This process has become more or less a standard for all the succeeding publications we have collaborated on. Sometimes, we have more of a back and forth, and the paper goes through more than ten revisions. From the first submission to the final copy, Bonny lets me be the one to email the editors and respond to their queries and requests.

We presented our JLIE paper at a colloquium on social class in language learning and teaching at the 2014 American Association of Applied Linguistics conference in Portland. We divided the twenty minutes we had equitably, and when it came to the Q&A at the end, Bonny let me respond to the questions first, and then followed up with her
own insights. She made it a point to refer to me not just as her student, but as a colleague and fellow scholar. During the breaks and social events, she introduced me to distinguished researchers and encouraged me to engage with others in meaningful ways. She familiarized me with the different networks and alliances within the field by mapping out how people are connected through institutional affiliations and areas of interest. At the end of each day, we would exchange opinions about the presentations we attended and the insights we gained. This is how Bonny mentored me through a spirit of collaboration. By immersing me in the discursive and non-discursive practices of the academic community, she demonstrated how collaborative writing is not just a rhetorical endeavor, but a cognitive and social process, and involves expanding ways of thinking and connecting with others. From theorizing and writing to presenting and establishing networks, Bonny encouraged me to imagine a community for myself and to construct my identity not just as a student but as an emerging scholar.

The Supervisor Speaks

Like other universities worldwide, UBC is privileged to be selected for graduate studies by many outstanding international students. When I first met Ron in my graduate class, “Language, Discourse, and Identity” in September 2012, I was once again in awe of the quality of students who have chosen UBC for advanced degrees. Since I had been invited to the Philippines in 2007, and had some familiarity with its rich but fraught history, I was curious to learn more about students who had graduated from its educational system. When Ron invited me to read his MA thesis from Ateneo de Manila University, I was excited to learn more about Filipino social and cultural life. Ron’s thesis was a great delight to read, and his insights, informed by literary and cultural studies, were compelling. Thus began a strong and productive relationship, built on mutual respect, shared values, and a common vision of social justice.

I have often reflected on the responsibilities of a PhD supervisor, as I have seen many different models of supervision in a variety of
disciplines, across diverse institutions. For me, the challenge has always been to determine what investments a student has in a given research project, what their imagined identities might be, and how I can help the student navigate the PhD experience in the most rewarding and enriching way possible. The journey begins with the recognition that students have multiple identities, not only as emerging scholars, but also as artists, teachers, parents, political activists, public intellectuals and many other identities. To understand a student’s investments requires some understanding of the student’s history, social relationships, and hopes for the future, which all shape a student’s research questions and program of study. To mentor students into the academic world, I am in fact engaged in helping them to negotiate new identities and investments.

But the PhD supervisor also has multiple investments and complex identities. Supervisors, as academic scholars, are expected to mentor students with dedication and commitment. In addition to Ron, I have over the past two decades mentored over 100 graduate students, as a supervisor, a committee member, or an external examiner. I have also mentored many emerging scholars in a wide range of institutions, within Canada and the international community. However, scholars are also required to teach both undergraduate and graduate courses, to do research, to publish widely, to compete for grants, to serve on departmental committees, to review manuscripts, to run conferences, to serve on editorial boards, to host visiting scholars, to write letters of reference, to review applications for graduate admission, and to provide service to the wider community. And we all have families.

Given these multiple demands, what has made collaborative writing with Ron possible is very simply that it is a source of satisfaction and joy. Amidst the many demands that we both face on a daily basis, it is very satisfying to be able to bring greater coherence to our joint research projects through committing our ideas and research findings to writing. In this process, we engage in vigorous debate; we challenge each other; we share references; we laugh; we write and rewrite. It is mutual trust that is the cornerstone of our collaborative writing. Ron and I never use “track changes” in our respective revisions of a paper, except in the copy editing stage. Each of the multiple revisions of a paper is an independent piece, which reflects our particular stance on the evolving analysis...
and argument. This is the process I have followed to great satisfaction with many of my coauthors, including Kelleen Toohey, Peter De Costa, Christina Higgins, and Yasuko Kanno.

I do appreciate, however, that the power relationships between student and supervisor are different from those between established colleagues. Students may feel relatively vulnerable to institutional demands, insecure about their knowledge base, and unsure about their future possibilities. At the same time, relationships between student and supervisor can be collaborative rather than coercive (Cummins, 1996), and I strive to listen with great attention to what the student says, whether the topic is personal or professional. And while I have done much collaborative writing with Ron, I have always encouraged him to write his own sole-authored papers, to make individual conference presentations, and to develop his own professional networks. It is a great delight for me to see Ron grow as an independent scholar, and to be acknowledged with a prestigious 2017 “Emerging Scholar” award by the American Educational Research Association. I anticipate that our relationship will continue to thrive in complementary ways long after Ron has crossed the stage at UBC.

Discussion

Capital. The nature of academic socialization involves the both the generation and transmission of economic, cultural, and social capital from expert to novice. Through grants that she has received, Bonny is able to hire Ron as a research assistant and avail of books that would be instrumental to his research. She mentors him in his applications for scholarships and grants, and by writing recommendation letters, she extends the symbolic capital of her privileged position as an internationally renowned academic and adds credence to his identity as an emerging scholar. Through their discussions during the collaborative writing process, Bonny is able to provide knowledge that serves as cultural capital in the academic community: the content of one’s field of expertise, and an understanding of the discursive and non-discursive practices within the field. They discuss writing for different communities
involved in language education research (applied linguistics vs. second language acquisition vs. TESOL), and the attendant differences in the constructs and lexical choices they operationalize. Ron develops knowledge of the linguistic and discursive structures and conventions of different academic genres, and learns the distinction behind publishing for *TESOL Quarterly* versus *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, using the terms “student,” “learner,” or “speaker,” or detecting the embedded determinism of phrases like “leads to” or “results in.” He learns the practices behind presenting new data across various platforms to maximize its impact, and the differences in the symbolic value of publishing in a journal article versus a book chapter, and the ranking of journals. By identifying him as a coauthor, Bonny expands Ron’s social capital by connecting him to editors and scholars, and letting him lead correspondence with them regarding the publication process. During conferences, Bonny introduces him to these people and shares the goals of his research with them so that they can locate his position in the field and anticipate his potential contributions. At the same time, she helps Ron to map out the networks of scholars and their nodes of affiliation, and dissect the cultural logic that undergirds the social practices within a conference.

When powerful agents in the academic field attribute value to the forms of capital the novice acquires, he or she gains symbolic capital necessary to move from legitimate peripheral participation to full-fledged membership. While Ron secures legitimacy in this community of practice by virtue of his status as a doctoral student, how he negotiates the affordances of his capital will establish himself as a credible and productive scholar. Moving from the Philippines to Canada, the value of his capital shifts, as it is subjected to different orders of indexicality. Academic capital that a student already possesses may be valued unequally, as it travels across different disciplines, institutions, and geographical locations. While Ron has done a Masters at one of the top universities in the Philippines and published in a local journal, the value of such cultural capital can be measured differently in his new academic context. The shift from humanities to social sciences, from Asian to North American locations, from developing to developed country, and working with differently ranked universities involves a renegotiation of
his credentials and social networks. Bonny reads Ron’s Master’s thesis and recognizes the depth and breadth of his work. By giving Ron this feedback, she affirms the value of his knowledge and competencies, and accords him with symbolic capital to gain confidence about the legitimacy of his position.

While the supervisor generally transmits capital to the student in academic socialization, the process of collaborative writing, on the other hand, involves coauthors recognizing the capital each one brings. By allowing these two processes to converge, capital flows bi-directionally as student and supervisor share knowledge and competencies to produce written academic discourse. While Bonny discusses with Ron how she theorized identity and investment, and how Weedon and Bourdieu influenced her thinking, Ron shares his insights from reading Blommaert and Lareau, and his knowledge of social class and digital media. It is through this exchange that they are able to engage in meaningful debate and consolidate their perspectives in written academic discourse.

**Ideology.** Collaborative writing as a form of academic discourse production involves the negotiation of institutional and disciplinary ideologies (Duff, 2010). On one level, coauthors bring with them their life experiences and worldviews, and the process of writing a single, coherent, and substantive piece of work on a particular topic ineluctably involves collusion and competition between diverse ideologies. In the case of Ron and Bonny, their shared passion in social justice facilitates their conceptual and methodological alignment. They both adopt a more critical rather than descriptivist lens, and similarly engage with tropes of social inclusion and exclusion, and this ideological complementarity allows them to be better calibrated when it comes to interpreting data. When a draft is passed on to the editor and is reviewed by other experts in the field, the work is then pitted against other disciplinary perspectives. In the review process, Ron and Bonny are asked to qualify their ideas further, to reconsider some interpretations of the data, or to provide more data. The extent to which authors comply with suggestions for revision shapes the final output as a product of different ideologies.
On another level, the academic publication process itself is circumscribed by dominant ideologies, shaping practices, and relations of power between authors, reviewers, editors, and publishing companies. Inviting established scholars like Bonny to publish for special issues is one such practice, and she challenges this by negotiating that a graduate student not only coauthor with her but serve as first author. In some cases where she receives an invitation but does not have the bandwidth to accept, she recommends that Ron be the sole author in her stead. By securing such arrangements, Bonny challenges ideological practices that privilege established scholars in the construction of the author roster, and rejects what would be considered a more linear socialization where PhD students move from peripheral to full participation through incremental increases in exposure and involvement.

As a means of academic socialization, collaborative writing presents a complex dynamic of power, as it invokes competing ideologies governing the roles of students, supervisors, scholars, and coauthors. An asymmetric distribution of power undergirds the process of mentorship where the supervisor who possesses cultural and social capital transmits knowledge and demonstrates existing academic norms and practices, while the student learns and internalizes them. The nature of collaboration, on the other hand, assumes a more equitable relationship. When supervisor and student write collaboratively, different ideological negotiations are at work. First, when Bonny allows her identity as supervisor to operate side by side with or even supersede her identity as scholar, it has to be acknowledged that how she negotiates these identities are still governed by prevailing institutional ideologies that will value her roles as scholar and supervisor differently. If an institution values scholarly output over the breadth and quality of one’s mentorship, then it would be more difficult for a scholar/supervisor to relinquish the cultural capital of sole authorship. Second, by writing together, both student and supervisor have to negotiate the ideological contradictions of this convergence of roles. By partnering with Ron, Bonny redistributes her cultural capital, and by making him first author, bestows on him the power to steer the direction of the collaborative work and take the lead in articulating their ideas. Through this conferred responsibility, Ron’s identity as scholar is assumed rather than earned, and by investing
in this assumed identity, he is also able to invest fully in mastering disciplinary knowledge, conventions and practices that enables this position. While he assumes this authorial power, however, his capacity for resistance and contestation is limited, as academic socialization is typically circumscribed by principles of conformity and the reproduction of norms and practices.

Identity. As the supervisor and the student participate in the collaborative writing process and navigate different ideological spaces, they negotiate diverse identities as novice, expert, coauthor, and colleague. Their habituses are shaped by their positions in the social world, and concomitantly by their locations in the academic hierarchy. By internalizing their “sense of place” in this community of practice, students develop perceptions of the value of their knowledge and competencies and the legitimacy of their membership. A lack of confidence and a heightened feeling of unfamiliarity with academic norms and practices can give way to an “imposter syndrome” (Clance & Imes, 1978) where the student can feel like a perpetual outsider or even a fraud. At the same time, how powerful others position them as a legitimate member can shape their investment in the practices of the community.

When Bonny introduces Ron at conferences as a colleague or a fellow scholar, she not only asserts his identity as one who occupies a legitimate place in the community, but also positions him as a one who is equipped for full participation. When they are asked questions after their conference presentations, Bonny lets Ron as first author address the questions first, and provides additional insight afterwards. By assuming the role of first author, Ron is able to construct a space where he simultaneously leads and learns. Instead of working toward the imagined identity of author, he is accorded this identity a priori so that he can develop the competencies that it requires, destabilizing more linear assumptions of how the privilege of authorship is earned. As Bourdieu (1977) asserts, “speech always owes a major part of its value to the value of the person who utters it” (p. 652). By being accorded such value through the symbolic capital of authorship, the novice is able to recognize his capacity to impose reception and claim the right to speak.
To summarize: through the collaborative writing process, Bonny and Ron engage in academic socialization that challenges existing ideological practices and enables a multidirectional flow of capital. By overcoming barriers of entry and establishing social networks, Bonny provides Ron with opportunities for full participation in the academic community, enabling him to construct “knowledgeably skilled identities in practice.” Thrust into the publication process as a first author, he is able to receive guidance while given the freedom to explore conceptual possibilities of his own. It is through this sense of scholarly agency that he is able to invest fully in his socialization process, and seek constant improvement in the development of his academic competencies. Indeed, the dynamics between developing one’s identity and participating in the community are critical to how novices internalize, challenge, or reject the existing practices of their community. When supervisors and students become coauthors, the reconfiguration of power challenges the binary of novice/expert. Students cease to be passive recipients of others’ agency, and are able to leverage their own agentive resources and participate in more self-directed socialization (Duff & Doherty, 2015). Negotiating identities, ideologies, and capital, novices in the academic community are able to invest in their own academic socialization with greater agentive power so that they can shape their own professional trajectories.

Conclusion

In examining empowerment through education, Cummins (1996) draws a distinction between coercive and collaborative relations of power. He argues that while others may exercise power to maintain the inequitable division of resources within a community, collaborative power relations enhance the agentive possibilities of others by redistributing these resources. In this additive conception, power “is created with others rather than being imposed or exercised over others” (Cummins, 1996, p. 21). It is not a fixed, predetermined quantity but is mutually generated in interpersonal relations. In the academic community, the relation between student and supervisor holds great
potential in reconfiguring the landscape of power and enabling new possibilities. Bound by the ethos of mentorship, the identities of student and supervisor constitute and are constituted by their interactions with each other. By extending material and symbolic power to students, supervisors help them find their voices, assert their legitimate place in the scholarly world and enable more agentive participation. At the same time, successful mentorship reaffirms the position of the supervisor as an experienced scholar in this community of practice.

As a means of academic socialization, collaborative writing between student and supervisor disrupts relations of power, challenges existing ideologies, and enables a renegotiation of capital that expands the range of identities available to students and established scholars. Through the process of collaboration, economic, cultural, and social forms of capital are redistributed so that students can agentively participate in the academic community and claim their right to speak. Creating a Third Space (Bhabha, 1994) where the binaries of student/supervisor collapse, mentorship through collaboration temporarily suspends the asymmetrical relations of power that govern the academic field and enables roles in this community of practice to be reimagined. In this space, the student is not relegated to peripheral participation, but enjoys full and agentive involvement. Negotiating a space where identities are in a state of flux, where novice and expert become peers, and where established scholars interrupt their privileged status, it is possible to celebrate collaborative writing as one of the most satisfying and fulfilling practices in contemporary academic life.
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Introduction

Given the pressure on researchers worldwide to publish internationally and in English from the early stages of their careers (Belcher, 2007; Curry & Lillis, 2004), there is a clear need for models of teaching, training and mentoring of less experienced researcher authors that can be adapted effectively to the range of contexts in which they are required (e.g., Cameron et al., 2013). One such model is the Writing for Publication Workshop (WfPW). By this is meant a workshop that focuses on the actual writing of the text, rather than having an exclusive concern with the content of the article.

In this chapter I consider a range of relevant contexts, from universities to independent research workplaces, and where English is used as both a first (EL1) and an additional language (EAL). I situate the
WfPW on the continuum of potential intervention types and identify some advantages of the workshop format for providing education and training aimed at developing participants’ skills for writing research articles in English and for dealing with the publication process. Rather than restricting the focus to WfPWs in a general sense, I then analyse data from workshops run over 16 years for science researchers in Australia, Asia and Europe using the Collaborative Interdisciplinary Publication Skills Education (CIPSE) approach (Cargill, 2011). The approach incorporates three elements: analysing genre—examples of successful articles (led by an EAP practitioner); gatekeeper awareness (led ideally by a scientist collaborator); and ‘story’ development—claiming novelty and significance for the target journal audience (leadership shared). The data analysis identifies the value ascribed to the workshops by participants and provides insight into relationships between workshop contexts, features and outcomes. Based on this discussion a set of principles is presented that can guide the design of WfPWs for particular contexts (Cargill, O’Connor, & Matthews, 2014), and the identification of workshop presenters likely to be optimally effective for the context, either alone or in various combinations (Cargill & O’Connor, 2006b).

**What Distinguishes a Writing for Publication Workshop?**

This model of delivery can be distinguished both from formally established courses in educational institutions, and from the one-on-one mentoring arrangements often used by academic supervisors and article ‘brokers’, both ‘literacy’ (Lillis & Curry, 2006a) and ‘publication’ types (Kamler, 2010), and by author’s editors (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Matarese, 2016). It is also distinct from a writing retreat (Murray & Newton, 2009) based on its larger proportion of presenter input to participant writing time. All these models of intervention may include elements common to workshops, are of high potential value, and can, and do, provide valuable assistance to novice authors, as attested by the rich literature in the field. What determines the most suitable model
The value of writing for publication workshops for a particular situation seems to depend on specific contextual factors and the training history of the novice authors involved (Hanauer & Englander, 2013).

The workshops described and evaluated here are generally ad hoc and have been designed through negotiation following an invitation to present. Alternatively, they can be part of an established series of events offered as professional development to research students (master and doctoral) or early-career researchers in university or other settings, including as an adjunct to academic conferences. The feature that distinguishes them from much formal coursework on academic writing is that they assume a present or very imminent need to actually write a paper for submission to an international journal. That means that participants have completed a research project and have in hand a developing draft manuscript or their own analysed data ready to serve as the basis for a paper. The WfPWs I discuss range in length from one to five days, and have been delivered both as a university employee and on a fee-for-service consultancy basis.

Astute readers will already have noticed that the way in which I describe the participants in my workshops above gives away the fact that I work with empirical researchers, mostly researchers in the natural sciences. The workshops I discuss and the data I present come from tertiary science education contexts or science workplaces. Readers interested in how these issues play out in social science and humanities contexts may find relevant insights in the work of W. L. Belcher (2009) and Cadman (2017).

**Relevant Contexts for Presentation of WfPWs**

Novice authors of research articles to be submitted for publication in international journals published in English use English as a first (EL1) and an additional language (EAL). The number of such authors using EAL is growing rapidly, propelled in part by policies requiring the publication of a first-authored paper in a suitably indexed journal for graduation with a doctoral degree, for example in China (Li, 2006) and Indonesia (Cargill et al., 2017). EAL novice authors arguably encounter
additional difficulties in producing the accurate and nuanced English, at both lexical/syntactical and discourse levels, that is required to tell their research stories effectively (Hanauer & Englander, 2013), but all novice authors face challenges in demonstrating membership of the discourse community of their research field and meeting the requirements of journal editors and referees (Hyland, 2016). Science research laboratories worldwide are becoming increasingly multilingual, both within universities and external workplaces (Roberts, 2010), and collaboratively authored papers frequently contain author names indicating a wide range of language backgrounds (Hyland, 2016). For these reasons, my WfPWs are delivered in English, often to participants of mixed EL1 and EAL backgrounds, and with teaching about salient features of English such as tense usage and modality always explicitly included (Cargill & O’Connor, 2013). This has been found to help all the participants develop skills for mentoring colleagues and co-authors more effectively, at the same time as strengthening the ability of EAL authors to identify and address potential areas of challenge in their own writing. EL1 novice authors frequently note the usefulness of this explicit language focus in their workshop evaluations, identifying insecurity about ‘English grammar’ as a contributor to their low confidence for writing for publication (unpublished data).

**Advantages of a Workshop Format**

The WfP workshop format has demonstrated a number of advantages over the 18 years I have been working in this way. It must be remembered that my institutional location within my university has always been closely associated with a school of science, either as an employee in an education-focused central position, or latterly as an adjunct staff member of the science school itself. This location has enabled me to absorb as paramount the priorities of my scientist colleagues—getting the scientific findings published to enable uptake and impact—with my own more language- and pedagogy-focused expertise serving to inform the creation of new ways to help achieve their goals. This perspective
helps explain the clients I have worked for and the insights I have gleaned from those interactions. Others working in different contexts will easily identify disadvantages of the workshop format I discuss and lacks of alignment with their own students and their needs; my hope is that an understanding of what workshops offer may add a further dimension to the planning of interventions.

**Ability to Match Participant Needs Effectively**

Not all doctoral programmes worldwide contain coursework components. For example, many programs in the UK, Australia and New Zealand do not, and award of the degree is based on external examination of the thesis (which may include published papers), with (UK, NZ) or without (Australia) an additional oral exam or viva. Thus any special-purpose teaching required, including on writing for publication, must be deliverable in short-course or workshop formats, or students must audit (attend without assessment) courses designed for a different student group, which can take them away from their research work for extended periods, and potentially out of their content ‘comfort zone’. Similarly, training in research article writing is often sought by research workplaces such as cross-university collaborative units or research-intensive government departments, institutes or hospitals. Large foundations that fund a large number of doctoral scholarships often seek training deemed beneficial for the impact of research outcomes and which universities may not be providing. Intensive workshops suit this type of client base best, especially when participants must travel from distant sites to attend. A pre-workshop questionnaire can be distributed to elicit information on participants’ previous training, levels of confidence, experience with writing and publishing, and key goals and expectations for the workshop, allowing more effective preparation for a given group. Effective focus is possible on particular aspects of the writing for publication process, for example encouraging “self-sponsored reaching out” to international networks in the field (Bazerman, Keranen, & Encinas, 2012, p. 245).
Just-in-Time Availability

Even where coursework is part of a degree structure, it is generally offered front-on to the research component, meaning that students taking a formal course in writing for publication are much less likely to have data in hand and be actually engaged in paper writing, and may not yet fully conceive their own training need for the somewhat remote task (Cargill & O’Connor, 2012). Simulating the paper writing task within a course curriculum and associated assessment tasks is extremely challenging, especially when class members may come from a wide range of disciplines and do not have their own data to write about. On the other hand, a WfP workshop format allows participants to be selected who are in an optimum situation to benefit from the teaching offered, that is, are engaged in writing their own draft and come from closely related disciplines, so that text examples used in the teaching will be tailored to be understandable by all. This kind of workshop can be located within a school or across related research fields. If assessment is an institutional requirement, it can be provided based on progress of the participants’ drafts, or uptake of advice provided.

Flexibility in Presenter Choice

Although my preferred way of teaching WfPWs is in a collaborative team with specialists in the discipline area of the participants (Cargill & O’Connor, 2010), this is not always possible. Discipline experts (in my case, scientists) are often unwilling to devote the time required to collaborate in workshop preparation and presentation, or find it difficult to conceptualise what such collaboration could look like and what it could offer to their novice-author students (Cargill & O’Connor, 2010). Teaching WfPWs alone as an applied linguist outsider to the participants’ discourse communities is also effective, and in these cases relevant evidence on the specific requirements of the participants’ target journals for submission, and on aspects of content knowledge relevant to the teaching materials produced, is obtained from the literature, expert informants and specialised corpora, preferably constructed
by workshop participants in situ in the workshop (Burgess & Cargill, 2013). Evidence is also emerging that a relevant package of material can be delivered effectively in workshop mode by scientists teaching alone (Cargill & Smernik, 2016) where they are sufficiently skilled in the language and genre training requirements, that is, are both effective publishers themselves and also able to induct others into the discourse practices of the discipline (Paré, 2010).

**Workshops as Train-the-Trainer Events**

Another potentially important role for the WfPW is as a professional development or train-the-trainer opportunity for staff tasked with supporting novice authors in their own institutions. These staff may be supervising researchers from the disciplines, English for Academic Purposes (EAP) teachers, or both. Using WfPWs in this way can help address a triple bind faced by institutions in many locations: the increasing pressure worldwide for academics to supervise the preparation of manuscripts in English for international submission; the initial reluctance of these academics to collaborate with language professionals or act alone in the provision of such support (e.g., Cargill, O’Connor, & Li, 2012); and a dearth of English language professionals trained and experienced in the running of WfPWs as opposed to courses in academic writing. I have recently been involved in trialling three models of such professional development. The first was a five-day WfPW run for a university biology department in Indonesia, in which staff could enroll as author participants or as train-the-trainer (ToT) participants; while author participants were working on revising their own drafts, ToT participants were adapting the workshop teaching materials to make them applicable in their own teaching contexts (Cargill et al., 2017).

The second model was a collaboratively taught Masterclass format where publishing scientists in my home (science) school were introduced over 3 half-days to the CIPSE method and the teaching text that supports it (Cargill & O’Connor, 2013), observed by two trainee language professionals. This format was a variant of one offered to scientists in Kunming, China in 2009, where the WfPW was taught to
publishing scientists, with an added segment at the end that focused on using the materials to teach and mentor participants’ own students (Cargill & O’Connor, 2012). The third model was an 18-hour WfPW, taught to a mixed-discipline postgraduate student group at a Chinese university and observed by 34 English teachers from 22 other universities, who also participated in seminars that unpacked the workshop teaching, related it to the theoretical background and discussed issues of local applicability (Li & Cargill, forthcoming).

Value Ascribed to WfPWs by Participants

Another important component indicating the value of WfPWs is evaluative feedback provided by workshop participants. Evaluating WfPWs is not a straightforward matter. Although it has been claimed that only an increase in the number of papers accepted for publication can demonstrate workshop success (McGrail, Rickard, & Jones, 2006), any direct measure of acceptance of manuscripts will be confounded by a range of factors. These include above all the standard and novelty of the science being reported (Gosden, 1992), but also the level of the journal to which the manuscript is submitted, and the amount of assistance to authors which is available from other sources after the workshop (Cargill & O’Connor, 2006a). As Lillis and Curry (2006b) emphasise, the production of a published research article is very often the product of ‘networked activity’. To avoid these complications, my main collaborator in the development of CIPSE, Patrick O’Connor, and I have used as surrogate measures for workshop outcome pre- and post-workshop self-reported confidence to write and publish a paper in English. Wherever possible we have used repeated measures on the same individual, rather than mean values, and a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not confident, 7 = very confident); increases in confidence have regularly been found to be statistically significant or highly significant. This choice of evaluation method is supported by the identification of limited confidence as an important issue for both students and mentors in a study of the development of scientific communication skills in a medical context (Cameron et al., 2013).
Workshop participants have typically reported increases in confidence to write and to publish a paper in English of around 1 point on the 7-point Likert scale; for example, across four workshops taught in China in 2007–2009, confidence to write a paper increased by from 0.9 to 1.5 points, and to publish the paper by from 0.6 to 1.8 points (Cargill & O’Connor, 2012). In Spain a 4-day WfP workshop was run for 22 staff in a Cognitive Psychology Department in 2005; mean confidence to write a paper in English increased by 1.7 points on the 7-point Likert scale, and to deal with the publishing process by 2.0 points (unpublished data).

Further evidence of the value ascribed to WfPWs by participants can be seen in analyses of their responses to open-ended evaluation questions. Typically, participants have been asked to report the most useful things in the workshops for them. Marked congruence can be seen between the responses received and design features of the workshop; the transcribed comments in Table 11.1 are juxtaposed to relevant features of the workshop content/design.

For the Indonesian workshop reported in Cargill et al. (2017), 20 of 23 original participants reported on their confidence for the same four tasks both immediately post-workshop and in a re-survey 12 months later, once they had had an opportunity to implement their learning. Mean confidence to write their own papers in English increased by 1.4 points immediately post-workshop and by a further 0.2 points 12 months later, to 5.1 on the 7-point Likert scale; mean confidence to deal with the publishing process in English increased by 1.2 points immediately and a further 0.5 points 12 months later, to 5.0. Mean confidence to mentor/assist others to write increased to the same degree as that to write themselves, and to mentor/assist others to deal with publishing to a slightly higher degree than that to do the task themselves, by 1.4 points immediately and a further 0.5 points 12 months later, to 4.9 on the 7-point Likert scale (1 = not confident, 7 = very confident). These increases were not seen equally by all participants, however, with between 3 and 5 participants reporting decreased confidence for these tasks between the immediate post-workshop questionnaire and that completed 12 months later; 7–12 reported unchanged
Table 11.1  Selected comments from workshop participants, Tenerife, Spain, February 2005, in response to the prompt “What were the most useful things about the workshop for you?” and workshop features they relate to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Workshop design feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s really a useful thing the rule of thinking first</td>
<td>First step recommended: clarify results to be included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the results and then organise the introduction regarding to them</td>
<td>and develop a ‘take-home message’ (THM) for the paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend a lot of time in the structure of a paper (I think it’s very</td>
<td>Four variants of the IMRD structure are discussed for matching to journal requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important); use our own data and begin to write something in English</td>
<td>and demands of the research ‘story’; own data used for writing practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(now I’m very motivated to continue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To know about all the process of publishing paper from the beginning</td>
<td>Referee criteria are introduced early in the workshop plus strategies for choosing a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the end; to know about strategies for improvement; to connect</td>
<td>target journal to match the THM. Editorial procedures, covering letters and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension with production (I got to elaborate my abstract and</td>
<td>for effective rebuttals are presented and practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introduction, and also a global view of how end the draft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring the different sections and linking them in a coherent way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion in smaller groups (what we did first day); English</td>
<td>Genre analysis findings on moves and steps of sections are presented in summary form and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice, both listening and talking; the whole target of the</td>
<td>cohesion strategies taught and practiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of it was useful. As a psychologist, I found it useful, and as a</td>
<td>Activities are designed on sound educational principles; aim is to develop a learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher, fascinating</td>
<td>community that will continue post-workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual focus on developing participants’ own publication skills and their confidence to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teach and mentor using the method demonstrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confidence levels, and 5–9 increased levels. These findings reflect potential limitations of a one-off workshop approach, with presenters external to the work context of the participants and limited availability of ongoing support (Cannon & Hore, 1997). Nevertheless, the university that invited and supported the workshops continues an ongoing process to extend training to staff across the institution and explore ways to embed the teaching of publication skills into existing courses, initially through inclusion in research methods courses and collaboration with ESP-trained English teachers wherever possible.

It would clearly be useful to follow up student and staff participants subsequent to their completion of workshops, to track how the reported gains in confidence play out in actual writing and publishing, but only small steps in this direction have so far been practicable. In the follow-up study conducted 12 months after the Indonesian workshop mentioned previously, the fate of papers worked on in the workshop was investigated. Of 16 such papers, 7 had been submitted, 3 published in journals meeting the institutional quality target, and 4 in lower rated journals (Cargill et al., 2017). However, in the same 12 months an additional 18 papers had been published by workshop participants and 9 more submitted; most of these were co-authored with master students who had not been part of the original workshop, indicating a workload pressure that had likely affected the achievement of participants’ individual publication goals. However, all interviewed participants reported aspects of the workshop content that had been frequently useful and used in the 12 months following the workshop, in teaching and mentoring contexts (Cargill et al., 2017).

The ability of staff trained through WfPWs to adapt materials for subsequent use in their own contexts is supported by the availability of translations into local languages of the original teaching text. To date, the first edition of the book (2009) is available in Chinese (two versions), and translation of the second edition (Cargill & O’Connor, 2013) is underway; a translation into Indonesian is well advanced and expected to be available early in 2018.
Designing Writing for Publication Workshops for Maximum Effectiveness

When considering the value of WfPWs, it is helpful to think also about bigger picture questions around how such workshops can be developed for and presented in various contexts, and how decisions taken in doing so may affect perceived value. First, who are the players likely to be relevant to the task of developing publication skills and outputs in an institution, and hence to discussions around the development of a workshop? A potential list of role categories is given in Table 11.2, along with possible constraints affecting their involvement.

WfPWs based on the CIPSE approach as represented in Cargill and O’Connor (2013) include in the perspective of the presenter broadly based expertise belonging to categories 2, 4, 5, and 7 in Table 11.2, regardless of which category the presenter comes from. As shown earlier, these workshops can serve as effective professional development activities for those from all categories who have not yet engaged with the complementary expertise sets available from those in categories beyond their own. Good results have been recorded, in EL1, ESL and EFL contexts, when the presentation team has been structured to include a discipline expert in a field relevant to the workshop participants and a specialist appropriately trained in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or English for Academic Purposes (EAP). However, creating such teams can add additional layers of complexity and cost to the task of arranging a WfPW, so the question arises: under what circumstances does such a team add significant value?

Analysis of contexts and outcomes of CIPSE WfPWs (Cargill et al., 2014) has enabled the development of a two-part visual representation of answers to this question; it expands on the simple answer: “It depends”. Assuming that the lead presenter of a WfPW is an EAP/ESP specialist, the first visual addresses the degree of added value provided by including a content expert (scientist, in this case) in the presenter team. Figure 11.1 presents an analysis of contexts for a WfPW based on three descriptor scales: the training goals of the people sponsoring the workshop; the experience level of the participants; and the type of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider category</th>
<th>Responsible for</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content supervisors</td>
<td>Standard of the research; improving publication outputs</td>
<td>Academic supervisors/advisors, heads of dept/research group/lab or their delegates</td>
<td>May not publish in English/lack skills to teach article writing; very time pressured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English language teachers</td>
<td>Improving English competence</td>
<td>Teachers of courses in a language dept. or private language school</td>
<td>May be unfamiliar with aspects of English relevant to specific disciplines (and find the technical content difficult to engage with) and with research article genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. English language editors</td>
<td>Improving accuracy/appropriateness of vocabulary and grammar of document in hand</td>
<td>Provided in-house or private fee-for-service, online services also available</td>
<td>Availability; expense; discipline-specific English knowledge may be lacking; may be limited chances to negotiate meaning with authors; authors may learn little of future use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guides to research genres</td>
<td>Teaching discipline-specific article structures and related language features</td>
<td>Applied linguists with genre expertise; research communication consultants</td>
<td>Relevant expertise may be unavailable or difficult to identify in the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guides to publication processes</td>
<td>Teaching re-submission process, referee criteria, negotiation with editors, impact factors</td>
<td>Editors/referees of int’l journals, staff of publishing houses, experienced published authors/referees</td>
<td>Specific examples of criteria and letters/responses can add to effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Native English-speaking (NES) discipline colleagues</td>
<td>Advice on clarity of message and data presentation, improving English accuracy</td>
<td>Depends on location of workplace and availability of NES supporters</td>
<td>Level of imposition very high; may be unsustainable beyond once unless included in institutional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strategy advisors</td>
<td>Advice on journal to target, writing to attract right readers, place of the research in int’l discipline community</td>
<td>Head of dept/lab or experienced researcher with relevant experience</td>
<td>May lack skills to teach article writing; often time-pressured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Training coordinators</td>
<td>Identifying training needs and priorities, finding providers, arranging training</td>
<td>Human relations depts, international affairs sections, research managers</td>
<td>May have little understanding of educational factors involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
workshop programme envisaged (its relationship to participants’ workplaces or home discipline bases) (Cargill et al., 2014).

The left-hand end of the three scales represents the situation faced by many EAP teachers of courses for master and doctoral students prior to the research phase of their degrees, where value is added by involvement of discipline experts if practicable, but to a lower extent. The two columns to the right indicate situations that should be recognisable to workshop organisers, and highlight the value added in terms of achieving higher level goals, along with other design features required to support successful achievement.

Figure 11.2 reflects a situation where the WfPW presenter is a discipline expert, coming from perspectives covered by categories 1, 5, 6,
and 7 in Table 11.2. Figure 11.2 considers the degree of added value provided by including a suitably trained English language professional (categories 2 and 4, Table 11.2) in the presenting team. It should be noted that added value is always provided by including these expertise types—Fig. 11.2 compares the degree of added value in relation to the English language context of the workshop (Cargill et al., 2014). Its intention is to highlight the essential nature of including ESP expertise in WfPWs in EFL contexts, and thus to encourage the use of these workshops as professional development opportunities for discipline specialists tasked with supporting EAL novice authors who must write and publish papers in English. Figure 11.2 thus indicates how progress can be made towards ensuring that all doctoral graduates leave their universities with skills in writing and submitting their own papers in English, rather than just the one or two published papers required for graduation.

Taken together, the issues encompassed by Table 11.2 and Figs. 11.1 and 11.2 demonstrate in more detail how the WfP workshop format is able to provide the advantages noted in the earlier parts of the chapter: ability to match participant needs effectively; just-in-time availability; flexibility in presenter choice; and potential as a train-the-trainer or professional development opportunity. It is recommended that these issues be raised wherever possible when interventions are being planned to support novice article authors—including novices using English as a first language.

**Conclusions**

The chapter has discussed the value of WfPWs, defined as facilitated ad hoc group activities for approximately 20–40 people, lasting from around 1 to 5 days, and distinguished from a formal university course by their ability to be scheduled outside formal teaching sessions and in research workplaces in order to better meet the needs of those they serve: novice authors of research articles from all language backgrounds, and those who mentor and support them. The discussion has been based on evidence and insights gained from the presentation
of such workshops in Asian, European and Australian contexts over 18 years.

Aspects of value highlighted include perceived advantages of the WfPW format, including the possibility of addressing specific participant needs, delivering training at the optimal time in the writing trajectory, flexibility of presenter choice, and options for the workshop to double as a professional development opportunity for others involved in supervising or supporting novice authors of research articles. Value ascribed to WfPWs by student and staff participants include significant increases in confidence, both to write a paper in English and to deal with the publishing process, and some evidence that the increased confidence can translate into publication outputs and improved mentoring skills. Learnings identified as most useful by participants dovetail with intentional design features of the WfPWs. The ability to design WfPWs in response to ‘bigger picture’ characteristics of the context is another advantage of the format, and the final section of the chapter presents summaries of past experience to support decision-making when planning WfPWs for particular situations and groups, regardless of language background.

The pace of change is increasing in how universities and research workplaces staff and fund professional development. It is important that those committed to supporting novice authors entering the arena of scholarly publication have a wide array of well-researched formats and strategies to hand. The WfPW clearly belongs among them.
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My own interest in mentoring novice scholars began when I myself was a young scholar attempting to write for publication. I did not publish, or even attempt to publish, any of my research while still in my doctoral program. I was simply trying to survive, get through my studies, and then find employment, not to publish anything. Indeed, at the time, having my work published felt like a distant, mysterious goal that was attained by other people but certainly never me.

Since that time, over the past 20 years, I have gone on to establish a lengthy track record of publishing my work, bringing graduate students in on my projects as co-researchers and co-authors, and mentoring master’s- and doctoral-students as they have completed, written up, and published their own research. In more recent years, I have also guided other emerging scholars outside my own institution through email correspondence and as a journal reviewer and later editor. This chapter discusses lessons I have learned about guiding junior scholars in their
writing, especially for publication. After a synopsis of the literature on the challenges of mentoring graduate students as emerging writers and scholars, I describe a four-step “mentoring cycle” of moving new graduate students through and beyond their graduate studies and dissertation/thesis work to becoming published writers themselves.

Background: Research on Mentoring Scholarly Writers

There is a substantial literature, both empirical and pedagogical, about the experiences of graduate students, their relationships with their supervisors, and the ways in which they progress (or do not) towards becoming scholarly writers as they complete their thesis or dissertation work and as they write for publication during or after their graduate studies. Space in this chapter does not permit a thorough review of this extensive body of work, which crosses a range of disciplinary boundaries. Readers interested in further information might start with edited collections such as Aitchison, Kamler, and Lee (2010), Cargill and Burgess (2017), Casanave and Li (2008) or Simpson, Caplan, Cox, and Phillips (2016), with the co-authored book by Lillis and Curry (2017), or with journals that frequently publish empirical work related to advanced academic writing, such as Journal of English for Academic Purposes, Studies in Higher Education, or Teaching in Higher Education.

In this section I will examine three major (and intersecting) themes in how aspiring academic writers build their knowledge and skills about writing for publication.

Graduate Students’ Personal and Academic Struggles

A number of reports over the years, often in the form of case studies or first-person narratives (e.g., Shen, 1989) have explored the struggles that graduate student writers experience with their studies in general and with academic writing in particular. In a recent paper, Casanave (2016) talks about the attrition rate for graduate students in the U.S., the U.K.,
and Australia, which ranges from 40 to 60%. While there is a variety of reasons why students drop out of their graduate programs without completing them, she highlights some of the struggles that students may experience as a consequence of the pressures of graduate studies, including health and family issues, time management problems, lack of persistence, and writing difficulties. This attrition rate and its contributing factors, which have been well established by research over the past two decades (e.g., Crede & Borrego, 2014; Golde, 2005; Lovitts & Nelson, 2000), certainly suggest that graduate studies can be uniquely challenging on a personal level.

Beyond the real-world issues that Casanave highlights, students in graduate programs may struggle mentally and emotionally with conflicting identities, in particular being expected to sound in their writing like a confident disciplinary expert when the student likely still feels like an imposter who was erroneously admitted to graduate school. This issue of having a strong scholarly or authorial voice is especially challenging for second language (L2) students who may have been educated in cultures in which critical questioning of established authority is not at all the norm (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Bitchener, 2018; Cotterall, 2011). Finally, graduate students struggle with the writing demands of their programs: “Writing within the doctorate...is a challenging high stakes activity which can be a source of considerable anxiety” (Cotterall, 2011, p. 413). With the possible exception of some students pursuing degrees in humanities and some social science fields, few doctoral students enter their programs considering themselves particularly strong writers, yet the writing demands of graduate school are substantial and are extremely important to their future goals (see Rogers, Zawacki, & Baker, 2016).

Graduate Student Relationships with Supervisors

A primary issue also highlighted by Casanave (2016) as to why students drop out of graduate programs is students’ problems with their advisers or supervisors. Some researchers have found that students are, in general, pleased with the quality of supervision and mentoring they have
received (Heath, 2002; Simpson & Matsuda, 2008; Thein & Beach, 2010), while other studies have found that there is “a great deal of room for improvement in dissertation advising” (Rogers et al., 2016, p. 60). Students in particular complain about cryptic, unhelpful written feedback (Carless, 2006; Leki, 2006; Rogers et al., 2016) and would prefer in-person consultations to written commentary (Carless, 2006), and many graduate students experience their advisers as distant or unavailable (Casanave, 2016; de Kleijn, Meijer, Pilot, & Brekelmans, 2014; Krase, 2007).

There is a range of views about what the advisor-advisee relationship should be like (Delamont, Parry, & Atkinson, 1998). Along these lines, de Kleijn et al. (2014), who in a large survey study examined graduate students’ perceptions about their relationships with their supervisors and how those perceptions interact with the types of feedback they receive about their writing, made a complex set of observations. A close interpersonal relationship between a student and his or her supervisor was by far the strongest predictor of student satisfaction with their experiences in the graduate program. However, where the mentor-mentee relationship was not close, high-quality feedback could offset that negative factor, and students could persist and succeed even without a warm personal relationship with an adviser. It could be drawn from these reports and discussions that as long as the supervisor is competent and conscientious, neither abusing nor neglecting an advisee, it is not absolutely necessary that there be a close interpersonal relationship between the two.

**Supervisor’s Expectations and Practices**

Other researchers have examined the views of graduate advisers about their own supervisory roles and has also investigated the types of feedback that thesis and dissertation supervisors provide for their students. In an interview study of education faculty who worked with master’s level students at universities in the U.K., Anderson, Day, and McLaughlin (2006), found that these supervisors could articulate clear
goals and expectations of their advisees. They wanted their students to demonstrate autonomy and independent thought (to accept direction but not to be overly dependent upon it), to be analytical and critical in their approach to their project and not merely descriptive and/or passively accepting of the status quo positions in the field, and to show a degree of passion and personal engagement in the work that they were doing. These supervisors also specified what they viewed as the shared responsibilities of mentor and mentee. For example, they felt that students should choose their own topics, but that once the general topics were chosen, “There existed a need, therefore, [for supervisors] to shape as well as to support a student’s dissertation efforts” (p. 158) to ensure that the research conformed to standard practices in the field.

The opinions of Anderson et al.’s participants stand in contrast to the views of those studied by Bitchener, Basturkmen, and East (2010), who crossed a range of disciplines by completing in-depth case studies of 35 faculty in business, in arts and humanities, and in math and sciences at six different universities in New Zealand. As noted in a later paper by the same trio of authors (Basturkmen, East, & Bitchener, 2014), the supervisors “expressed the view that their role was to help in the creation of clear writing and observance of technical conventions” (p. 443). While the faculty participants in Bitchener et al. (2010) also expressed a desire, as in Anderson et al. (2006), for students to be independent and to exhibit critical thinking and analysis skills, they seemed far less conflicted about their roles as gatekeepers for their disciplines.

In both studies, supervisors reported taking very seriously their role in providing feedback to students. The participants in Bitchener et al. (2010) carefully described the specific different parts of a thesis or dissertation that typically were challenging for students, such as gaps and poor synthesis in literature reviews, inability to explain key concepts clearly (especially among L2 students), and unwillingness to make strong claims about their findings. As to their role in guiding students through feedback, participants noted that “[The role of the supervisor] is one that needs to be exercised with insight and understanding of what the student needs and finds most effective at the point in time when the feedback is given” (p. 80) and that often such feedback was best
delivered through in-person consultations rather than in writing, a view also expressed by the graduate students in Carless (2006).

In the Anderson et al. (2006) study, faculty supervisors described the tension they felt in providing feedback between a supervisor’s responsibility to maintain standards and students’ responsibility for moving their own work forward, noting that feedback should take the form of not “straightforward, unilateral shaping” but rather indirectly guiding the student into appropriate directions (p. 161). They also acknowledged that the supervisor’s role in upholding academic standards while guiding the student writer could lead to interpersonal tension between adviser and advisee. In contrast, in Bitchener et al. (2010) and Basturkmen et al. (2014), faculty members’ self-descriptions and analyses of their written commentary showed that they were quite directive: “Supervisors across all disciplines gave effort in providing reformulations (revising text to retain the meaning but improve its expression)” (Basturkmen et al., 2014, p. 441), and the majority of written feedback provided focused on linguistic accuracy and appropriateness.

As a real-world caveat, it is important to observe that around the world and even at different institutions within countries or regions, the expectations for academic supervision can vary considerably. In some contexts, supervising graduate students is a large, even primary, part of the faculty member’s job description. In others, it may be an uncompensated overload added to a substantial set of expectations to teach classes, conduct research, obtain grants, publish, and perform departmental and university service. Further, some supervisors may be better prepared, in terms of both temperament and skill set, to provide good mentoring than others are. In other words, various conditions may make individual students’ encounters with supervisors quite different from one instance to the next, and this factor may help to at least partially explain the dismal attrition rates and experiences reported by Casanave (2016) and others. While this section has focused primarily on the challenges faced by graduate students and on the relationship between advisers and advisees, the issues are relevant, by extension, to the novice scholar learning to write for publication as well, as we will discuss in the next section.
A Four-Stage Cycle for Mentoring Junior Scholars

With this background in mind, I offer ideas, suggestions, and examples for the lengthy process of helping advisees develop skills and expertise so that they can become successful academic writers who can disseminate their work for publication. These four steps, which start with a supervisor’s early interactions with graduate students and conclude with the mentor helping newly minted scholars transition to publishing their own work, are necessarily (re)iterative, and may even occur out of the order in which I discuss them. Nonetheless, taken together, they encompass the life cycle of scholarly mentoring. These steps also are intentionally mindful of the challenges outlined above from the literature: that graduate school (and early career experiences just beyond graduate work) can be a fraught and difficult time for many students, that mentee-mentor relationships are significant, and that graduate supervisors/mentors need to have a clear understanding of their own role and persona throughout the steps of the mentoring process, especially as it relates to providing current and former students with feedback on their research and writing.

Step 1: Build a Reader/Writer Relationship

Most academics have some choice over whom they will supervise or mentor, whether during the admissions process or after the graduate student has matriculated. Faculty may become acquainted with specific students who take classes or seminars that they teach, allowing both the mentor and mentee to observe whether they are (or could be) a good fit intellectually and interpersonally and for the faculty mentor to see how students handle deadlines and writing assignments on a smaller scale before making a bigger, longer-term commitment to work closely with them.

One of the first ways to build a mentoring relationship with a prospective advisee is through how writing assignments are designed and
implemented in classes and seminars. Many faculty tend to leave seminar papers as fairly open-ended, unstructured assignments, but such papers can instead be more intentionally utilized as an opportunity to provide some early, low-stakes writing guidance to future scholars. I treat paper assignments in my own doctoral seminars as small-scale opportunities to practice the writing process and emulate a target scholarly subgenre, such as a mini-literature review, a research proposal, or a case study write-up. Students are required to produce their papers in prescribed stages. I also give them written feedback on a finished draft of their papers and allow them to rewrite the paper after receiving my comments so that they have a formal opportunity to engage with my feedback and demonstrate uptake of it.

Through these activities in my courses, I not only mentor all of the students in my classes, but I also build the foundation of guiding and responding to the particular students whom I will directly supervise as they continue in their graduate work. It is also useful for me to observe the writing strengths and weaknesses of my advisees. For example, one of my previous doctoral students was a great storyteller with a winsome writing style—who also made many typos and never ran the spell-check before submitting his seminar papers. It was a lot easier to encourage his strengths and point out the flaws in a 15-page seminar paper than in a 200-page dissertation draft. In this way, through coursework and seminar papers, students receive early mentoring in how to present work professionally and consider the needs of an audience, training that will help them later as they disseminate their written work beyond their own academic department and supervisor(s).

Step 2: Provide Apprenticeship Through Co-authoring

As noted by Thein and Beach (2010), in today’s competitive academic job market, new Ph.Ds must have conference presentations and publications on their records if they wish to obtain a tenure-track research-focused position. Co-authoring with students is also discussed by Darvin and Norton in Chapter 10 of this volume. Co-authoring with students, while not always easy for supervisors, can be a valuable
and even critical stage in the process of guiding students toward their own publications in the future. I have co-authored, with graduate students, articles and chapters based on my research since the 1990s and have found it to be a fulfilling experience that is satisfying to me and beneficial to the students. However, there is an art to doing this kind of collaboration well, and I have learned from some mistakes along the way.

One of my earliest mistakes was being too generous with the student co-authors (and conversely unfair to myself). Concerned for the overall quality of the paper and mindful of not “exploiting” graduate students for my own selfish ends, I would do most of the work on both the research and writing, leaving very little for the students to do but still giving them full co-author credit when likely a mention in the acknowledgments would have been more appropriate. From this I learned to identify specific aspects of the task that would belong to my student co-author, for example, writing the literature review or method section, cross-checking the references, and so forth, and to empower the student to do the task without taking it over and doing it for them. A second and very important lesson I have learned is to make feedback on our respective sections of the manuscript a two-way street. I ask my co-authors for feedback on my sections of the paper, and I take their feedback seriously, just as I expect them to diligently consider my comments. In this way, I model respect for the collaborative process and make the co-authoring experience less hierarchical. Overall, my goal in co-authoring with my advisees is to give them hands-on experience with the writing, revising, and publication process, in hopes that this experience will transfer to their own independent publication processes in the future.

Step 3: Guide Them Through the Culminating Requirements

As discussed above in the Background section, thesis and dissertation supervisors often feel some tension between their roles as mentor and as gatekeeper (Anderson et al., 2006; Bitchener, 2018; Bitchener et al., 2010).
In addition to the issues highlighted by these studies, I further mention two others. First, when reading drafts written by my advisees, I am aware that their next audience after me is the other members of their examination and dissertation committees. What pleases me or might be “good enough” for me might not clear the bar for one of my colleagues; conversely, when I am a dissertation committee member but not its chair, I have to bear in mind that my criticisms/suggestions will be received not only by the student writer but likely also by his/her adviser. Thus, immediate audience considerations are always involved in how I read and how I construct feedback to the novice scholarly writer.

A second, related issue is my own relationship with the student writer and my sense of his/her emotional and mental state (see Anderson et al., 2006; Casanave, 2016). Sometimes I am well aware that the student is just desperate to be finished and wishes that I would simply give a stamp of approval to what has been presented, but I feel that I must push the student further to satisfy the requirements of the other committee members, no matter how personally sympathetic I may be to the student’s feelings.

Once I start receiving drafts of chapters, I respond to them using a fairly standard procedure. I read through the chapter, making marginal comments as I go. If I were to do a systematic analysis of my commentary, the patterns mirror those reported by Basturkmen et al. (2014) and Bitchener et al. (2010), as I tend to mark a wide range of issues, including wording and even mechanics (APA format, punctuation use, etc.). Though I do not view myself as a proofreader, if I see something erroneous or problematic, I will quickly mark it with a specific highlighter color and then let the student know in summary comments (more on this below) what those highlights represent.

I also vary my comments depending on the stage of development of the particular chapter. If we’re early in the process, I focus on organization (of the entire chapter and of individual paragraphs or sections), on argumentation and logic, and on missing information (e.g., sources that should be cited, details about the research design). Once the writer and I have gone back and forth a couple of times on the big-picture aspects of the text, I get down into the weeds of phrasing and word
choice, making suggestions for the sake of clarity and/or stronger or more appropriate argumentation.

In Fig. 12.1, I reproduced some comments that I made in the margins of the second draft of a recent dissertation writer’s introduction chapter. When I finished responding to the chapter, there were 21 marginal comments plus a brief endnote, so I included just a few comments here to provide an illustration of the foci and forms of feedback I gave. Besides the notes in the margins, for each chapter draft I compose a summary note, often attached separately as a new document with email instructions to “read this first” (so that the student doesn’t get

Comment (1): At some point I’d like more informative (content-driven) titles for these chapters—just as a stylistic preference

Comment (3): a lot of “firsts” here [the student had used the word “first” three times in the opening clause of the sentence, and I wanted more stylistic variation]

Comment (10): This paragraph seems a bit beside the point.

Comment (11), initiated by the student: Is the tense in this paragraph ok?

DF: Hmmm. On the one hand, you do “seek” and “explore,” even in the present tense. On the other hand, the study is completed and should be discussed in the past tense. Maybe you could clarify whether you’re talking about a general search for understanding (present tense) or the study itself (past tense). It’s a bit ambiguous here.

Comment (12): I’d consider deleting these three sentences and perhaps combining what’s left of this paragraph with the previous one. These sentences seem a bit obvious to me.

Comment (14): Might be worth a caveat that Braine’s study was 20 years ago; student populations in many contexts have become much more diverse since then, and teachers across the board are more sensitized and prepared for diverse students.

Summary comment: This is a good start. I had some questions within the text about how specific paragraphs/parts of paragraphs related to the big picture. Some of this could use some re-thinking or at least re-framing.

I liked the opening anecdotes about the student writers.

Fig. 12.1 Sample comments written on a dissertation chapter draft (Source Evans, 2017)
overwhelmed by the detailed in-text comments before seeing my general response to the chapter). Figure 12.2 shows a summary note I wrote after reading a chapter by the same student from Fig. 12.1.

As a supervisor, I prefer to give students’ drafts a thorough reading and compose written responses before having an in-person consultation. Some of my students will set up a meeting with me after receiving my comments (I always offer that as an option) to talk through my suggestions and come up with a revision plan. Others, if they find my written
feedback useful and self-explanatory, will simply plunge into the next round of writing and revision. Some students (as in comment 11 in Fig. 12.1) will write their own questions for me in the margins of the text, and I respond directly to the questions. Finally, some proactive students strategically schedule meetings with me several weeks after delivering their latest chapter(s), ensuring that I will read and respond to them in a timely manner with a date already on the calendar for doing so. Supervisors could, however, similarly take initiative to set such dates for face-to-face consultations.

Generally speaking, my goal as a dissertation supervisor is to clearly and efficiently guide the student writer through the process. I want students to be diligent and responsible and to produce high-quality work that they—and I—can be proud of being involved with and that they can learn from and build upon in the future. I do not, however, expect a dissertation always to be a groundbreaking or influential piece of scholarship in the field, though I have supervised some very good ones, including the one I used as an example above. I am also cognizant and accepting of the reality that there will be a range of quality across dissertation students and final products—to cite U.S. grading schemes, there will be “A”, “B,” and “C”-level dissertations, but those are all passing grades. In short, to put it into the terms of Anderson et al. (2006), I primarily view my role as a dissertation adviser from the standpoint of a teacher/mentor, and only secondarily as a gatekeeper of academic rigor. This teacher/adviser (not gatekeeper) role I adopt during the dissertation process allows me to transition naturally to a more hands-off mentoring role when students are publishing their own work.

Step 4: Help Them Get Their Work Published

As a journal editor and frequent journal reviewer for many years, I have observed that some developing academic writers get inadequate mentoring in this regard—they do nice research, but it can be poorly presented when it is submitted for publication. Thus, dedicated mentors should commit themselves to helping their advisees make the transition from doctoral student to independent published scholar (Heath, 2002;
Kamler, 2008; Thein & Beach, 2010). I characterized this chapter outline in terms of a four-step mentoring process, but in practice, Step 4 may well precede Step 3. With my students, fairly early on in their studies, I will strategize with them what kinds of papers they might produce and send out for publication before they even begin on their dissertation writing—for example, papers they have produced for doctoral seminars, conference presentations they have given, and qualifying examination papers.

Once students are ready to try writing up their work for publication, a mentor’s role in this process can be (a) to help students see the publication possibilities in work they have produced (both in terms of content and also where they might send it); and (b) to provide initial feedback and ongoing mentoring as the advisee shapes the work into a submission for publication, including how to read and respond to advice from reviewers and journal editors. When I give feedback to newer scholars writing their own papers for publication, my role in the process changes from adviser to something closer to a scholarly peer (but a more seasoned one, of course). This is not my paper, my name will not be on the publication, and I do not have to sign off on it as I literally would if I were a dissertation committee member. I want to be helpful, but I do not need to be in control. Instead, I offer them the benefit of my experience as a published author (“Here’s what has worked for me”) and as a reviewer and editor for scholarly journals (“Here are the kinds of issues that can trip up writers in their journal submissions”). In general, my feedback to mentees on their own work is a lot less directive and a lot more hedged than it would be when they are either co-authoring with me or working on a dissertation.

Once a student is getting to the later stages of dissertation writing, often my comments will begin to transition from “here’s what you need to do for this dissertation to pass muster” to “here’s what you would need to do if you go on to publish this work later.” For example, with the same student mentioned previously, I wrote this as a general comment in response to her literature review chapter:

If you did ever turn this into a journal article on “studying motivation in L2 writing,” I think you’d need to tweak the angle a bit. The purpose
of this chapter is to justify and explain the framework you used for your study, but the purpose of an article would be to summarize where the research has taken us to this point, to argue why this topic is important for the larger field of L2 writing, and to outline a possible research agenda. What you’ve done here will inform that, but I think your data chapters and conclusion will also inform it. Still, you’ve done such a superb job of capturing the literature on the topic in an orderly and logical way that it would be a shame to waste it on just your dissertation committee.

In this example, I discuss how her literature review would need to be reframed for a journal article. With other writers, I might suggest that they would need to re-analyze their data in certain ways or add a more up-to-date review of the literature if they want to publish this work—in other words, “It’s good enough for now, but it would need more work to get published.” In this way, I begin to transition my relationship with that student from dissertation coach/judge to future mentor of a post-doctoral scholar.

Concluding Thoughts

My own Ph.D. adviser once said to me, shortly after I had signed on as his advisee, “When I’m your adviser, I’m your adviser for life.” He has been retired for many years now, but he was and is true to his word—always available for advice, for letters of recommendation, and for feedback on my writing if I ask for it. I would not be where I am professionally without his support, and I want to pass that on to my own mentees. Though I have outlined in this chapter a range of ways in which I do this throughout the mentoring cycle, I would say the most important and valuable thing I do for my own current and former students is to read and respond to their work promptly, carefully, thoughtfully, and respectfully. I believe they can take constructive criticism from me because I have built trust with them over the years, but I also want to encourage them and infuse them with the confidence that I have in them. I have found this type of committed mentoring to be not only good for my students and for my field but also, without a doubt, the most satisfying part of my own academic career.
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Introduction

Learning the rules of scholarly publishing through co-authoring with senior scientists constitutes a form of “textual enculturation” for science students (Delamont & Atkinson, 2001, p. 103); it is a significant part of their “academic and scientific enculturation” during their doctoral candidature (p. 88). Historically, the academic practices of co-authorship underlie the European model of thesis-by-publication (Gould, 2016), a model, which, unsurprisingly, has long had their manifestations for science students on a wider scale beyond Europe (see, e.g., Dong, 1996; Gosden, 1995). In the past decades, the ever-growing demands for quality assurance and accountability, and the rising global competition in institutional ranking in the higher education sector have led to mounting pressure being placed on graduate writing productivity (e.g., Aitchison, Catterall, Ross, & Burgin, 2012).
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As a result, publication in international journals during candidature has increasingly been set as an explicit graduation requirement for doctoral science students, including in non-Anglophone countries (e.g., Cargill et al., 2017; Li, 2016), and is strongly encouraged for all research students. Such changes in higher education mean that, more than ever before, mentoring junior academics for publication has taken on universal significance across disciplines.

Against this backdrop, this chapter focuses on how doctoral science students, or junior/novice scientists, are mentored by senior scientists, typically their supervisors (advisors), in writing for publication. Foregrounding a range of qualitative case studies conducted in the tradition of EAP/writing research while drawing upon the wider literature, the present chapter aims to characterize the interactions between the newcomers and the old-timers during their joint endeavor of publication.

A Sketch of a Broad Scope of Relevant Literature

In the wider pertinent literature, early seminal ethnographic projects in the field of sociology of scientific knowledge detailed the production of knowledge in scientific laboratories, including knowledge construction through print-based reporting of research findings (e.g., Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984). There were occasional featuring of how novices are enculturated into their disciplinary communities (Traweek, 1988), and acknowledgement that “At the root of authority within science is the relationship of master to disciple” (Gross, 1990, pp. 13–14). Yet in these early works the scientists who were portrayed as actively engaged in novelty claims through writing and publishing activities tended to be mature, senior scientists. Report of junior scientists being mentored by senior scientists for publication is hard to find. Nevertheless, in a study that focused on experienced or leading scientists’ process of writing articles for publication, Rymer (1988) did mention in passing how graduate students learned to write through apprenticeship, which is worth a quotation here:
Frequently, graduate students are the major writers of these papers. Sometimes their mentors provide overall guidance and do some revision; at other times, senior scientists treat graduate students’ manuscripts with benign neglect; at still others, they simply use novices’ efforts as rough drafts. Thus, the graduate students of these panel members learn to write scientific discourse by a variety of apprenticeship methods. (p. 222)

In more recent social studies of science communities, novices’ enculturation process into their target disciplinary communities is a prominent issue (e.g., Delamont & Atkinson, 2001); yet the study of expert-novice interactions surrounding reporting research findings for publication remains limited. An exception, however, is Florence and Yore’s (2004) study of writing teams in two broad science disciplines, demonstrating how junior scientists achieve successful disciplinary enculturation through active participation in the rhetorical construction process of co-authoring with their mentors.

A number of recent lines of literature are also relevant to the topic of this chapter. Firstly, in recent years, in response to the growing pressure on writing output as an outcome expected of doctoral education, supervisory practices across disciplines surrounding dissertation writing and article publishing, and exploration of pedagogies for doctoral writing/publishing have increasingly engaged the interest of higher education researchers (e.g., Aitchison et al., 2012; Maher, Feldon, Timmerman, & Chao, 2014). Secondly, benefits of faculty-student co-authorship in science have been explored from the perspective of fostering researcher development and academic excellence (e.g., Hakkarainen, Hytönen, Lonka, & Makkonen, 2014). Thirdly, there has been research on doctoral science students’ learning experiences inside and outside laboratories, where supervisors’ role is referenced or described (e.g., Carrasco, Kent, & Keranen, 2012). Fourthly, insights have been gained into supervisory practices and relationships, including cross-cultural supervision surrounding science graduate students (e.g., McClure, 2005). Last but not the least, guidelines for seeking and providing mentorship for publication, a long-standing feature in science journals, continued to be found (e.g., Lee, Dennis, & Campbell, 2007).
Aside from the decades-spanning literature outlined above, qualitative case studies of mentoring junior scientists for publication emerged in the 1990s in the U.S., within two branches of writing scholarship, namely, that in English language education (e.g., Belcher, 1994; Dong, 1996), and that in rhetorical education (Blakeslee, 1997, 2001) respectively. The rise of this research interest was associated with the booming Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in Disciplines movement at American universities at the time (e.g., Russell, 2002); while on the theoretical front, situated learning theories (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991) were inspiring the application of cognitive apprenticeship models to understanding how newcomers are socialized into their target disciplinary communities.

The subsequent decades have seen collections of first-person narrative or reflective accounts by novice and senior scholars on their writing-for-publication experiences (e.g., Casanave & Li, 2008). There have also been both first-person accounts (Thein & Beach, 2010) and case studies of individual doctoral students developing academic publishing literacies (Habibie, 2016), in addition to multi-case studies of novices’ experiences of co-publishing with their advisors (Cho, 2004). Nevertheless, case studies that focus on individual junior scientists being mentored in writing for publication remain limited.

In the rest of the present chapter, in the light of some wider literature, I will look into a modest number of qualitative case studies concerning science (post)graduate students conducted by writing researchers. Specifically, some details will be culled from a range of case studies conducted by Belcher (1994), Blakeslee (1997, 2001), Dong (1996), Simpson (2013), Tardy (2006), and myself (Li, 2006) (though I will also make references to some other case studies conducted by myself). The “unit of analysis” (Merriam, 2009, p. 23) of these studies was mostly one or several junior scientists’ apprenticeship in doctoral dissertation writing or journal article publishing; the focus was either on
one side’s perspectives, or on both sides’ views and experiences. In the following, based on this focal literature, I will aim to answer the question “What do qualitative case studies tell us about mentoring junior scientists for research publication?”, along four dimensions: features of junior scientists’ drafts of research papers; senior authors’ practices of revising papers for junior scientists; junior scientists’ responses to senior authors’ revisions; and the supervisory relationship and its impact on junior scientists’ publication success. Broader literature will be drawn upon as appropriate, to complement or consolidate the lines of evidence derived from the focal case study literature.

Features of Junior Scientists’ Drafts of Research Papers

It has been suggested that “Individuals entering the research field with no or little experience with past publications qualify as novice researchers” (J. Shah, A. Shah, & Pietrobon, 2009, p. 511). Early-year doctoral science students are often such novice researchers; naturally, they are also novice academic writers. The Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) supervisors in Maher et al.’s (2014) study at an American university pointed out that many doctoral students “entered their doctoral programs unprepared to engage in authentic disciplinary writing” (p. 708). Similarly, a physics professor at a Chinese university pointed out: “The productivity has been significantly prohibited by their [the students’] poor training of English writing” (Li & Flowerdew, 2007, p. 107).

Commenting on their students’ problems in article writing, Maher et al.’s (2014) supervisor interviewees observed that their doctoral students were “very keen on the ‘What did I do’ kind of stuff”, not realizing that they were not publishing their “lab notebook” (p. 705); and that the novices also tended to “situate the task of writing for publication within the familiar parameters of previous academic performance measures”, i.e., writing for exams or homework (p. 704). These observations echo what has been revealed in qualitative case studies, which showed that doctoral students’ early attempts at research article writing tend to be heavy on “knowledge-telling” (Bereiter & Scardamalia,
by foregrounding technical details and writing lengthy Methods sections, in effect putting forward the technical aspects of the reported work as being novel (Blakeslee, 1997, 2001; Li, 2006; Simpson, 2013). It has been pointed out that this is so presumably because the novices had more familiarity with the technical aspects, rather than with the rhetorical skills needed to address their audience in the research article genre (Blakeslee, 2001). They held assumptions about genre conventions and audience expectations in the new rhetorical context, based on their prior experience with genres such as progress reports (Blakeslee, 1997, 2001) and laboratory reports (Li, 2006).

Blakeslee (1997, 2001) described the interactions between Bouzida, a graduate student of physics whose native language was French but who had learned to speak and write in English fluently at a young age, and Swendsen, his supervisor, during the process of drafting a paper for a multidisciplinary target readership. Bouzida’s initial draft was heavy on technical details; although he “chronicled many aspects of the research”, he “did not position that research as part of an argument” (Blakeslee, 2001, p. 86). In my own research, I have reported the case of a doctoral student of physics, Chen, co-authoring a paper (in the genre of letters) with his two supervisors at a Chinese university (Li, 2006). As observed by Prof. Yang, the more senior one of the two supervisors, Chen’s first draft made the reader feel lost as he tried to “report everything”, rather than configuring the details and analysis to lead to a central claim (Li, 2006, p. 466). Similarly, on reflection, Chen himself compared his first draft to a laboratory report, a genre he mastered during his undergraduate years. Simpson (2013) studied the publication efforts of Paulo, a Brazilian doctoral student of environmental science studying at an American university. In one of his two publication attempts, Paulo converted parts of his Master’s thesis (written in Portuguese) into an English manuscript (with previous collaborators during the Masters as co-authors) and submitted to a journal; but the reviewers pointed out that its Methods section was too long and reminded him that he was not writing for a “manual”, and that he needed to bring out the significance of his findings (Simpson, 2013, p. 241). Like Chen, Paulo was able to recognize the inadequacy of his writing, admitting that it was “a
typical master’s student” mistake (p. 242); yet likewise was not able to resolve the problem for himself.

**Senior Authors’ Practices of Revising Papers for Junior Scientists**

The literature reveals that junior scientists typically rely on senior authors, i.e., most often their immediate supervisors, to shape “a once relatively immature, unpublishable piece of writing” into a publishable version (Gosden, 1995, p. 53). As a PhD student, in Carrasco et al. (2012) study which was conducted at a Mexican physiology laboratory, put it: “My advisor supervises all our publications and in fact we publish through him. We sort of write up the introduction, the materials, the methods and the discussion. Then he reads it and makes a lot of corrections.” (p. 347) Meanwhile, it often seems a norm for the junior scientist who has been in charge of the reported research to be the first author; while the supervisor, irrespective of the degree of the revisions s/he has made to the paper, would be the corresponding author (usually the last listed in the authorship byline) (Carrasco et al., 2012; Hakkarainen et al., 2014). As for the approach of revision, the literature reports scenarios of a senior author taking charge, by sending a manuscript under revision back to a novice for checking from time to time (Li, 2012, 2016), or letting a novice sit beside him while he revises on computer (Tardy, 2006); the literature also describes scenarios that potentially involve more active participation on a novice’s part, whereby a senior author holds meetings with a novice to provide guidance (Blakeslee, 1997, 2001; Li, 2017).

Guidelines in the science literature suggested that “outstanding mentors” characteristically resist “the temptation to do the rewrite for the student” but instead, assist “the mentees to rewrite several times” (Lee et al., 2007, p. 795). Yet in reality, the old-timers often “ended up writing a lot of it” themselves through rewriting, under the pressure of time—that a paper has to be moved ahead, given the constraint of the candidature time and the need to build up a research group’s publication record efficiently (Maher et al., 2014, p. 703). Swendsen,
the senior author in Blakeslee (1997, 2001), frustrated at Bouzida’s lack of progress despite his active advising in both written and oral forms, took over the draft at one point and did the revision himself. In Dong’s (1996) multi-case study, Helen, a biochemistry student who had four dissertation-based articles published or accepted for publication by the end of her candidature, reported that her advisor, Prof. Pike, wrote all of the papers, “only asking his student collaborators for suggestions about revisions”, although the advisor himself said he did 75% of the writing (p. 440). Chatri, a Thai-speaking doctoral student of engineering in Tardy’s (2006) study who completed two conference papers, estimated that his immediate supervisor (other than his advisor), Roberto, a recent doctoral graduate, rewrote around 70% of his first paper and over 50% of his second paper. In my study of Chen’s case (Li, 2006), the supervisors made crucial suggestions and revisions, to reduce technical details and highlight the newsworthiness of their research. My reports on the paper production in a biochemistry laboratory at a Chinese university (Li, 2012, 2015, 2016), furthermore, seem to illustrate an extreme case, where the supervisor, Feng, only took his supervisees’ initial drafts as a “data bank” or “a pile of basic materials”, on the basis of which he produced his own version of papers (Li, 2012, p. 63).

Other than reports on senior authors’ overall significant role in supporting novices’ publication endeavors, the literature reveals that a senior scientist commonly takes charge of composing the sections of an article that carry the thrust of persuasion (Rymer, 1988). Evidence from case studies seems to highlight novices’ limited role in composing the most challenging sections of a research article. Chen’s supervisors made crucial contributions in the newsworthy sections, specifically the early and ending parts of his paper; the paper was eventually accepted for publication (Li, 2006). Bouzida left the Discussion and Conclusion in his first draft largely blank, apart from leaving the Introduction section—containing passages mostly copied from an earlier conference paper that he co-authored with Swendson and a postdoctoral fellow—for the same two co-authors to finish (Blakeslee, 2001).

A point that is well illustrated in the set of case studies, though not commonly noted in the wider literature, is that when senior scientists’ feedback on novice texts is only “suggestive and unelaborated”, with few
“explicit instruction” (Blakeslee, 2001, p. 88), novices can have trouble decoding the advice. Prof. Miller in Dong’s (1996) study, like Swendsen in Blakeslee’s (1997, 2001) study, gave numerous rounds of feedback, and yet had never checked if Mike, the advisee, understood his advice; in fact, Mike felt overwhelmed, struggling to figure out a logical argument for his research in relation to the literature by reference to the advice. Other than the difficulty that a senior scientist’s lack of explicitness in feedback can create for novices, if the old-timer does not explain *why* certain changes are made in his revision, or provide “metacommentary” (Simpson, 2013, p. 238) alongside his revisions, novices can have trouble understanding the changes, thus losing a learning opportunity. Feng, the senior scientist and expert writer in several of my studies (Li, 2012, 2015, 2016), said that he had no time to explain his changes to the novices; but hoped that they would study his changes diligently, and would consult him on the changes—yet as far as he could remember, he had never been consulted for the purpose by any of his students.

**Junior Scientists’ Responses to Senior Authors’ Revisions**

Junior scientists value advisors’ responses to their writing. It has been reported that even if a student questions his advisor’s capability to offer effective support in benchwork due to the latter’s lack of direct involvement in the laboratory, he would still value the advisor’s comments on his writing and data analysis (Pole, Sprokkereef, Burgess, & Lakin, 1997). While in course assignments instructors may be on guard against appropriating students’ work by imposing their wording and perspectives through feedback (Reid, 1994), such concerns can be turned upside down in a publication-oriented mentorship relationship, given the co-authored nature of the texts prepared for publication. Novices seem to typically defer to supervisors’ revisions and this apparently is expedited by the publication pressure that they are placed under and their lack of confidence in writing a publishable text (Blakeslee, 1997, 2001; Li, 2006, 2012, 2016; Tardy, 2006). Chen, the physics student in my study (Li, 2006), incorporated all additions from his supervisors, although he only saw the value of an added paragraph in the
introduction part later, after the paper was published. Chatri, the engineering student in Tardy’s (2006) study, felt “uneasy with some of the changes” (p. 68) made by Roberto, for the changes had introduced claims unintended in his draft; nevertheless, he accepted the changes without protest, due to time constraint and his trust in Robert’s writing experience. In the wider literature, STEM supervisor participants in Aitchison et al.’s (2012, p. 442) study reported that they sometimes did “substantial reworking” of novice text for the sake of “providing appropriate models”; yet they were frustrated by their students who merely regarded the rewrites as corrections and adopted them straight away (see also Catterall, Ross, Aitchison, & Burgin, 2011).

Apart from the general pattern of deferral, junior scientists do learn from their experience, as they are expected to. In a study addressing collaborative authoring in doctoral programs in the Finnish context, senior author participants observed that junior scientists’ contribution became more central subsequent to their experience with the first article (Hakkarainen et al., 2014). The remarks of Yuan, a doctoral student of chemistry in my research with novice Chinese scientists (Li, 2007; Li & Flowerdew, 2007), modestly illustrate that novices may grow in competence after gaining initial experience in paper writing (Tardy, 2006): having had some English paper writing experience during his Masters study, he reported how he addressed the changes that his supervisors made on his first English article in the doctoral program: “In sorting it out—most changes [by the supervisor] were accepted, some were not” (Li & Flowerdew, 2007, p. 107).

As a negative development of disagreements with the senior author, there was also evidence that novices may express dissatisfaction and complaint, feeling deprived of the opportunity to learn how to write a paper, when a supervisor makes extensive changes to their drafts without discussing with them, or just gives them instructions such as “redo this Table”, or simply takes over the data and writes up the paper on their own without involving them in the process (Huang, 2010; Martinez & Graf, 2016, p. 5). Such negative sentiments aside, it might be safe to suggest that a novice who is hard pressed by the decree of “publish SCI papers or no degree” will probably be relieved to have a senior author who can write the papers that will help his students to
meet the publication requirement (Li, 2012, 2016). Less extreme than the negative sentiments may be the expression of mixed feelings by Blakeslee’s (1997, 2001) Bouzida, Tardy’s (2006) Chatri, and Simpson’s (2013) Paulo towards their advisors’ revisions, amidst their disagreement with some aspects of the revisions. Nevertheless, all the novices chose to defer to the authority of the expert decisions by accepting the textual changes (in this case for Paulo, it involved a paper based on his doctoral dissertation and his advisor was a co-author).

**Supervisory Relationship and Its Impact on Junior Scientists’ Publication Success**

In contrast to reports on mentors actively participating in novices’ journey of learning to engage in scholarly publication (Florence & Yore, 2004; Thein & Beach, 2010), there are reports of novice scientists receiving delayed and insufficient responses (Simpson, 2013) or even feeling “abandoned”, as some graduate students of mechanical engineering at a Brazilian university lamented (Martinez & Graf, 2016, p. 5). One of the three Chinese doctoral students featured in Dong (1996), Sam (in ecology), reported having to grope in the dark by himself, with minimal assistance from his advisor in either the fieldwork or the writing. On the other hand, when the supervisor does make genuine efforts to help, supervision can also be less than fruitful, due to the supervisor’s failing to provide explicit advice (as pointed out earlier), and novices’ misunderstandings of genre conventions and holding to a perspective different from the supervisor’s (Blakeslee, 1997, 2001). Indeed, it has often been pointed out in the literature that content specialists may find it challenging to make explicit their often tacit knowledge of disciplinary genre conventions, because they themselves have acquired genre expertise by trial and error without receiving explicit instruction and they also lack meta-discursive expertise to convey their discursive knowledge (e.g., Chanock, 2017; Maher et al., 2014).

In English as an Additional Language (EAL) contexts, when doctoral science students are under the pressure of “publishing SCI papers or no degree” (Li, 2016), there is also a question of whether their supervisors
are able to help. A supervisor may have limited English proficiency, and may lack experience in publishing English papers themselves. In this case, it seems it would be up to the novices themselves to deploy whatever resources available. Based on interviews with 11 junior scientists at different stages of their doctoral study in two research-intensive universities in China, Lei and Hu (2015) characterized four roles played by the students’ supervisors: “prey” searchers (of good research topics), “managers” (of students’ progress in research and publication), “manuscript correctors” (of Chinese papers), and “masters” (who provide valuable guidance and help in research and writing). All these roles were perceived important by the novices; but a supervisor being a “master” or a dedicatedly helpful old-timer in one’s process of learning to write was only reported by 2 of the 11 students interviewed, with all the rest recounting the process as “particularly long and painful”, with little guidance from their supervisors (Lei & Hu, 2015, p. 36).

Belcher’s (1994) groundbreaking naturalistic study, noted earlier, revolved around three doctoral student/mentor relationships, with two cases involving science students, and all three (Asian) students studying at an American university. She showed that the less successful supervisory dyads were characterized by mismatches between the advisor and the advisee’s conceptions of the target disciplinary community, the goals of research writing, and the extent of hands-on support. By contrast, in the more successful case of dyad, the alignment of the two sides’ perspectives and their more “dialogic” (p. 31) relationship were shown in the advisor making “co-participatory contributions” (p. 23) to the advisee’s dissertation project, and the advisee herself being a proactive problem-solver. Belcher (1994, p. 31) cautioned, however, that “it would be dangerous to conclude that collaboration must be egalitarian in order to be successful pedagogically”, for mentoring style is only one of the many factors in a novice’s complex process of disciplinary socialization. This note found echo in my case study of the verbal teaching of an authoritarian supervisor (in a Chinese hospital) in urging and pushing his medical student supervisees to commit to writing for international publication (Li, 2017). The study, together with a few other case studies I conducted of various aspects of supervision in sciences in Chinese contexts (Li, 2005, 2012, 2016), suggests that despite the typical
portrayal of successful supervisory relationship as being more dialogic and egalitarian (e.g., Casanave & Li, 2008), more authoritarian supervisory relationships can also be conducive to novices’ enculturation and publication success.

Coda

“Writing is such a critical part of being a scientist that its development must not be taken for granted” (Lee et al., 2007, p. 795). Senior scientists have long been characterized as “the composition teachers of the next generation of scientists” (Rymer, 1988, p. 216). In the literature overview presented in the foregoing sections, I have aimed to characterize the role of co-authoring interactions between senior scientists and junior scientists in the latter’s writing development. I foregrounded findings from a small collection of qualitative case studies, and illustrated four dimensions of issues pulled out from this literature while connecting them to the wider literature: features of junior scientists’ drafts of research papers; senior authors’ practices of revising papers for junior scientists; junior scientists’ responses to senior authors’ revisions; and the supervisory relationship and its impact on junior scientists’ publication success. It is hoped that a stock-taking of this kind would lead to a deeper understanding of some issues involved in the junior scientist/senior author interactions, which can potentially inform the provision of graduate writing support, which is now widely perceived as in urgent demand in various educational contexts (Simpson, Caplan, Cox, & Phillips, 2016).

Co-authorship puts doctoral sciences students, the junior scientists, “at the very heart of collective knowledge-creation efforts”, while pushing senior authors “to the visible forefront of fostering the development of their students’ academic expertise” (Hakkarainen et al., 2014, p. 2). To gain insights into the rich details of the processes and practices of such co-authorship, ethnographic methodologies, which have been fundamentally important in academic writing research (Paltridge, Starfield, & Tardy, 2016), would continue to be needed in future research to push the theoretical and empirical boundaries in this promising area.
of research. As seen in this chapter, qualitative studies featuring science students’ experiences of being mentored for publication are limited in number, reflecting a general underrepresentation of science doctoral students’ learning experiences in the literature on doctoral education (Cumming, 2009). It is likely that the limitation has something to do with the issue of access. That is, it may be more convenient for research students and academics in (language) education and writing research to access participants in the humanities and social sciences than in sciences; the “academic tribes” (Becher & Trowler, 2001) of science disciplines may be seen as less penetrable. On the basis of my own experience of working with students and supervisors in the sciences, I would suggest, however, that the potential barrier for accessing the presumably more alien “academic tribes” can be overcome. To achieve that, it seems advisable for future researchers to act on the advice provided to EAP teachers: that they aim to develop specialized knowledge (as opposed to specialist, content knowledge) in their students’ disciplines, in terms of disciplinary culture and values, epistemological assumptions and methodologies, and genres and discourse, by engaging in ethnographic investigations of a target disciplinary community (Fergusson, 1997; Swales, 1990).
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Part IV

Perspectives of Assessors
The Many Roles of a Journal Editor

The initial invitation we received from this volume’s editors proposed that this chapter would be part of a section called ‘perspectives of gatekeepers’. Our response was to say that although journal editors are often referred to as ‘gatekeepers’, in our view, having edited two journals between us over the last 10 years, we see the role of editor more as that of a ‘custodian’ than a gatekeeper. There will no doubt be multiple perspectives on the extent to which journal editors primarily exercise a ‘gatekeeping’ function—indeed a highly negatively connotated term conjuring an all-powerful, somewhat frightening editor who
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blocks access to the symbolic resources and rewards of journal article publishing in ways that are perhaps seen as capricious and willful. Questioning whether, as journal editor, she was in fact acting as a ‘gatekeeper’, Ilona Leki (2003), then editor of the Journal of Second Language Writing, commented that ‘it is possible that readers assume editors have more power than they actually do to shape journal content’ (p. 105). Although editors do indeed ‘reject’ articles (and we indeed did), the editor’s role as we see it, is one of safeguarding and enhancing the journal’s reputation, of finding the best reviewers we can for the articles we choose to send out for review, and of shepherding and supporting worthy research articles through the review process. We aspired to hand the journal over to the next editors in as good if not better shape than when we began.

Reflecting on her time as editor of TESOL Quarterly, Sandra Lee McKay (2003) writes that the words ‘being a gatekeeper’ in the title of her chapter suggest that being an editor was a ‘solitary role’ in which she alone made decisions about the papers submitted. The reality was far different, she explains, as a number of other factors, including members of the journal’s editorial board, policies and traditions, were influential in shaping her role. Not dissimilarly, Ilona Leki evokes the ‘tangled web’ of ‘social relationships’ that surround a journal editor (Leki, 2003, p. 103). The editor she writes is ‘at the nexus of the web of these social relationships’, negotiating ‘between authors and reviewers, between readers and authors and between reviewers and readers’ (p. 126). Rather than acting as gatekeeper, she confesses that she sees herself as a ‘doorwoman’—perhaps closer to our notion of the editor as custodian. The traditional model of ‘gatekeeper’ was not favoured by the 12 journal editors Wellington (2003) interviewed about how they perceived their role; he concluded that although some may see themselves as partly exercising a gatekeeping function, ‘all editors see themselves equally as enhancers, improvers, disseminators, shapers of a field, mentors and mediators’ (p. 66).

We would argue that it is our reviewers who are the real ‘gatekeepers’ or in Leki’s words, the ‘real arbiters of a manuscript’s success’ (2003, p. 105) as they are the topic-specific specialists who we seek out to advise us on the suitability for publication of the articles submitted
to the journal. It is unlikely that any one editor will be familiar enough with all the topics submitted to their journal to make informed judgements on all papers. As the journals we edited, *English for Specific Purposes* and *TESOL Quarterly*, have quite broad remits, we were largely reliant on our reviewers’ evaluations of the articles we sent them. Of course, once the reviewer reports are in, then the editor often has to make key decisions about the article’s trajectory and play some of the multiple roles sketched out above.

One of the world’s largest academic journal publishers recently spelled out the role of journal editors as they see it:

> At Elsevier, it’s the responsibility of every editor-in-chief to maintain and develop their journal’s profile and reputation. The editor also has the final responsibility for content, ensuring that it meets the aims and scope of the journal and reflects changes in the field by presenting new and emerging research. (Zwaaf, 2013)

That said, there is no training course or manual for taking on this weighty role. As with many of the roles that academics are asked to perform throughout their careers, from examining doctoral theses to reviewing journal articles and grant proposals (see Paltridge, 2017; Starfield, 2016), we ‘learn on the job’, relying on the reviews we ourselves have received (see Paltridge, 2013) or perhaps on kindly colleagues and mentors if we are fortunate. In our experience, the journal publishers themselves provide little support, other than a session on how to use the particular online platform in use.

Becoming a journal editor entails taking on a position of great responsibility that requires constant decision making, and the consequences of these decisions have real-world implications for the lives of the many researchers who submit their articles to the journals. Sandra Lee McKay (2003) comments on editing her first issue of *TESOL Quarterly*, stating ‘I questioned myself on every decision I had as editor, from selecting and ordering the contents of the issue to editing all the copy’ (p. 98).

Becoming an editor is so much more than simply accepting an invitation from the journal publisher. When we (Brian and Sue) started out
as journal editors, we really had little knowledge of what was involved. We had both been reviewers for various journals for several years, we were actively researching, trying to publish, teaching courses, supervising doctoral students and all the myriad of other things academics generally do. Editing an academic journal involves a set of occluded routines and practices that draw largely on tacit, procedural knowledge involving evaluation and appraisal, leading to at times fairly complex decision making. This type of knowledge is notoriously difficult to articulate which is one of the main reasons it remains hidden to all but a few ‘insiders’. It is not surprising then that for many early career authors, the processes of academic publishing are variously described as a ‘black box’ (Canagarajah, 2009) or a ‘black hole’ (Day, 1996). Over the last few years, we have, through workshops that we regularly run on writing for academic publication, attempted to ‘unpack’ some of the implicit knowledge inside the ‘black box’ to share with our colleagues. We do need, however, to make it clear that the experiences we are talking about here are based solely on editing two journals in the field of Applied Linguistics: *English for Specific Purposes* for Sue and Brian and *TESOL Quarterly* for Brian.

It is interesting to note that some of the larger journal publishers such as Elsevier have begun to try to demystify aspects of the publication process via online resources such as interviews with editors and a series of ‘top tips’ articles. A recent post, based on the views of five editors, is titled ‘8 reasons I accepted your article’ (Zwaaf, 2013) and is a follow-up to an earlier post, ‘8 reasons I rejected your article’ (Thrower, 2012). Reasons for acceptance include ‘the article tells a good story’, with reason number eight for rejection being, ‘it’s boring’. How helpful these comments might be to early career researchers, however, is an interesting question and underlines the difficulties inherent in trying to articulate tacit knowledge that is shared by journal editors but much less so by early career writers wanting to publish their work in academic journals.

In this chapter, our aim is to make some of what we have learnt through our experience of editing academic journals more explicit, in the hope that readers, particularly those new to the publication process, may find the route to publication less ‘tangled’. We begin by sketching
out the contemporary contexts of academic publishing in English in order to clarify the respective responsibilities of reviewers, authors and editors.

The Reviewing/Editing Economy

Earlier in this chapter, we referred to the important role reviewers play in helping editors reach decisions on manuscripts and how reliant we are on their advice. After a recent workshop for PhD students on writing their first journal article, one of us was asked how much reviewers are paid. The response to that question took some time as we outlined the dominant economic model of academic publishing in which there are no financial rewards for reviewing, but journal publishers reap financial benefits from the free labour of academics who review. The question revealed how opaque the world of publishing can be to novice researchers and how very peripheral their participation can be.

There is an expectation that reviewing journal articles is something that all academics do. Langfeldt and Kyvik (2011, p. 200) point out that these expectations are ‘embedded in norms, seldom in formal rules or regulations’. Nevertheless, these norms ‘deal with the definition of good and valuable research and are important for the distribution of honour and credibility in the research community’. Academics review out of a sense of obligation and commitment to their field because they know that their own papers will be in need of reviewers. Reviewing can be seen to operate as a ‘gift economy’, one in which there are no ‘real’ or material rewards, but the rewards are less tangible and often lie in the realm of honour, prestige, community or contribution. Reviewing may only be a line or two on one’s résumé but it needs to be there.

In another series of interviews with editors of leading journals from a range of fields published recently in the *Times Higher Education Supplement (2017)*, many stressed the vital role of reviewers in the life of their journal. ‘The generosity of peer reviewers with their time and expertise is one of the most gratifying things about journal editorship’ said an editor. Reviewing does take time, and reviewers are a precious resource that we treat with respect and politeness, and as editors, we
appreciate the time our reviewers take to read and report on the articles we ask them to review. It is important that authors understand that with the increasing pressure on academics around the world to publish and the proliferation of academic journals, there are more and more editors looking for reviewers and more reviewers receiving more invitations to review.

As editors, we spend a substantial amount of time approaching potential reviewers. We try to find reviewers who we feel have the expertise to comment in depth on the submitted paper. We typically start by approaching members of our editorial boards who are perhaps more likely to accept an invitation to review. If they have already reviewed several papers that year, however, we might be reluctant to ask them to review again. Indeed, as specialists in their area, they may well be reviewing for other journals as well. Most journals now have a searchable reviewer database that indicates fields of reviewer expertise. If no suitable reviewers are found through these routes, we would then look at the article’s reference list for possible reviewers.

Using the online editorial system, we email reviewers the title and abstract of the article and ask if they would be prepared to review it. The online system has various templates set up by the publishing house that can be used to speed up the process. Unfortunately, we have found most of these to be unusable as they are written in a very formal, off-putting style so we spend quite a bit of time customizing them to make the tenor of the text less impersonal. Reviewers may often take several weeks to agree to review the article or to decline to review it. In addition, on some occasions, we have had to ask as many as ten to twelve people to review an article before finding someone who accepts. Other times, people have agreed to do a review but, then, despite our chasing them up, just have not delivered. This can mean a delay in getting articles reviewed as the editor then needs to begin the process of searching for reviewers all over again.

Editors also frequently have to act as mediators between reviewers and the journal publishers. The publishers are continually trying to shorten the time taken to review as many of them publish reviewing speeds (i.e. time from manuscript submission to the initial decision on the article and time from manuscript submission to the final decision).
Although this may be a positive move for authors, reviewers are often given a short turn around for reviewing, from four to six weeks, and will start to receive automated reminders once the deadline approaches or is past. This can become annoying to reviewers. The other side of the coin, however, is that reviewers are also authors who, when they submit papers for review, are no doubt pleased to have the reviews returned to them promptly. It is this reciprocal relationship that lies at the heart of the review economy. As editors, we quite often ask recently published authors in our journals to review articles for us and are disappointed when these authors decline to review.

While we have stressed how important reviewers are in the publication process, this does not mean that they are absolved of all responsibility. In most peer review systems, double-blind peer review is the norm. This means that the reviewer remains anonymous to the author, and the reviewer does not know who the author is. New scholars may not realise that they are required to remove all references to their own work prior to submission. This is called author blinding, and most journals will refer to this in their guidelines which are mandatory reading (see author’s responsibility below). Despite the anonymity provided to the reviewer, we believe that reviewers should write their reviews as if their identities were known to the author in order to reduce the likelihood of potentially destructive comments that one sometimes reads about. We have found that most of the reviewers for our journals did not give feedback of this sort, although we have occasionally needed to edit reviewer feedback where it seemed gratuitously negative or irrelevant.

Part of the reviewer’s responsibility is to actually review the paper, i.e. to spend time reading and thinking about it and writing considered feedback. Reviews which contain just a couple of sentences or which comment solely on grammatical errors and typos are not really helpful, as we may then have to seek another reviewer for the submission, thus, delaying a decision on the paper. Most journals do provide guidelines for reviewers which, although often fairly formulaic, can help those new to reviewing (see Paltridge & Starfield, 2016, for examples of these). Being a reviewer and taking part in the reviewing economy as sketched out above is, however, an important task that junior
researchers should become involved in; giving feedback to others is known to be helpful in developing one’s own writing (Caffarella & Barnett, 2000). One of the editors interviewed by Flowerdew (2001) specifically encouraged non-native speakers of English to review saying, ‘I figure they can’t possibly know how to write the papers unless they sort of are on both sides of the review process’ (p. 134). In our view, this would apply for all those in the early stages of learning to write for publication, and as Caffarella and Barnett’s study indicates, there is growing evidence for the importance of learning to give feedback in the learning of academic genres: as we are pushed to articulate what our peers need to do to improve their articles, some of the tacit knowledge about what is expected in a journal article become more consciously knowable to us.

It should be noted, however, that there is much debate and discussion about the sustainability of the peer-review system and its merits and demerits with debates about fairness, and the burden on academics (see Paltridge, 2017; Paltridge & Starfield, 2016) but so far, as a community, we have not been able to come up with a better alternative.

Given the above points, as editors, we want to send articles to reviewers in the best shape they can be. This then leads directly to the next section of this chapter in which we discuss the author’s responsibility when submitting manuscripts to journals.

The Author’s Responsibility

One of the key responsibilities of the author is to carefully select the journal they intend to submit their manuscript to. This involves some research and thinking before beginning to draft the article. Targeting a specific journal and following its guidelines that are usually available on the journal website, will certainly facilitate an article being sent out for review rather than simply being rejected ‘in house’. Editors regularly comment that one of the main reasons for an article not being sent out for review is that it has been sent to the ‘wrong’ journal. Insufficient originality is another frequent reason an article may not be sent out for review. Beyond this, the most common reasons for rejection at this
One of the most important things for any would-be contributor to a journal to do is actually to read the journal because all journals have a style, a flavour, if you will. It is very important that if people want to publish in this journal that they read copies of it and familiarize themselves with the sorts of things that we publish.

We always advise our students and prospective authors to choose a journal that they read and that people they cite publish in. Every journal engages in a series of conversations between readers and authors and articles that are ultimately accepted will, to a greater or lesser extent, participate in and contribute to these conversations. Prospective authors should read through the most recent volumes of the journal they have selected and look at not only the contents but also how the articles are put together. What sorts of arguments are authors making? Are the articles structured in fairly traditional ways or less conventionally? Who is being cited? Are these names familiar to you? Can you see your paper making a contribution to the conversations in the journal? What might it be? Indicating the nature of the study’s contribution is something that junior scholars may not do very well. In large part, this is due to modesty as typically in academia we tend to be humble, not given to boasting about our achievements. Whether it be in the introduction or the discussion/conclusion sections of the article, it is important to indicate in what ways the study is marking a contribution to the field. Our publishers tell us that busy readers often go straight to the discussion section to find the findings/contribution and, on that basis, decide whether they then wish to read the article in more detail. This, therefore, is another reason why it is important to study the journal you wish to publish in as you can look for how other authors have signalled their contribution. What kinds of language have they used? How much
hedging is there (i.e. using words like suggest, imply)? Do they use words like novel or significant to highlight their contribution?

Research into doctoral assessment shows the influence of factors such as a ‘reader friendly’ writing style (see Starfield, 2017) on reviewers and examiners. It is worth spending time prior to submission carefully editing and proof reading the article, and scholars new to publication should ask a friend or colleague to read through the paper prior to submission as it may increase the likelihood of the article getting a favourable reading (this does not mean, however, that it will necessarily be accepted for publication).

As editors, we quite often were asked how long it would take for an article to appear in print or online. Authors should be aware that despite the best efforts of editors and publishers, it can take a long time from when an article is submitted to a journal and when it finally appears in the journal—if it is accepted. It may take a while to find reviewers, they make take longer to submit their reviews, an editor may be ill. What the author cannot do is write to the editor and ask him or her to speed up the review process because they need to know the outcome of their submission for a job application or for promotion purposes. Rather, authors need to plan well ahead and allow plenty of time when they submit an article to a journal if these are amongst their reasons for submission.

The Editor’s Responsibility

Earlier in this chapter, we emphasized the crucial role of reviewers in the publication process. This should not be taken to mean that editors do not have a significant role to play. As we said earlier, editors’ roles in the publication process are complex and multi-faceted with editors being required to engage in sometimes difficult decision making.

Besides being the public face of the journal, editors mediate between authors, editorial boards and publishers as well as the less tangible ‘field’ or discipline, often needing to make decisions about the novelty, innovation and contribution of the submitted article. Where the editor does exercise what could be called a gatekeeping function is in regard to what
are known as ‘desk’ rejections where a decision is made not to send the article out for review. It seems clear that the proportion of papers rejected in this way is increasing in the higher ranked journals. For some journals, this can be 80% of submissions (Hyland, 2017) and for other journals even higher (Paltridge & Starfield, 2016). As discussed in the previous section, it is important for junior scholars to understand that the chief reason for a desk rejection appears to be that the submitted paper is not suitable for the journal.

However, although many journals have a high desk rejection rate, if a paper has been sent out for review and the author is asked to make revisions, there is a much stronger likelihood that it will be accepted for publication. For example, in 2014, 64% of the papers that *TESOL Quarterly* sent out for review were asked to make revisions to their article, and 75% of the authors who were asked to make revisions finally had their article accepted for publication (Paltridge & Starfield, 2016). What this says is that if an author is asked to revise their article, they should do this as there is now a much greater likelihood that it will be accepted for publication—provided the feedback from the editor and the reviewers has been taken on board and addressed in the re-submission.

As editors, we frequently mediate between authors and reviewers when conveying reviewer feedback. We wait until all reviews are in and then read them carefully, not simply looking at the reviewer recommendation as to rejection or revision. It is important to point out that it is extremely rare for a submission to be accepted in the first round of reviews. Sue recalls only one article that both reviewers recommended be accepted in the first round of reviews. The vast majority of articles will either receive a reject or a revise decision. If the reviewers agree on a revise outcome, the editor’s decision is fairly straightforward. All we need to do is read through the reviews, make sure they are reasonably polite and helpful and compose an email to the author inviting them to respond to the reviewer feedback and revise the article accordingly.

One of the most difficult decisions for an editor is when reviewer recommendations and feedback differ considerably, for example, one reviewer recommends revisions while another wishes to reject the paper. Sometimes reviewers can be saying quite similar things in their feedback
yet make different decisions as to their recommendation. Again, it may be up to the editor to decide on which way to go. We may also decide to seek the opinion of another reviewer to help inform our decision making.

The mentoring and mediating functions come to the fore again when the reviews may be asking the author to make revisions that appear contradictory in nature; the editor may again need to provide suggestions to the author as to what to focus on. Alternatively, the author may seek the editor’s assistance and ask for advice in making sense of the reviewer comments or conflicting recommendations from the different reviewers. As editors, we have found this quite challenging as the response to reviewers may involve quite specific topic related issues that we are less expert in.

Authors are expected to write a detailed response to the reviewers’ feedback showing how they have addressed the comments, and once we receive the revised version with the response, we would typically send it back out to the original reviewers asking them to review the revised version. We check carefully to see that the author has uploaded a response to the reviewers, and if it is not there or has not provided enough detail, we will send the paper back to the author requesting they write one, or expand on what they have written. A word of advice to authors: even if the reviewers’ comments have, in your view, been unfair, do not write an angry response.

Research is indicating that reviewer feedback may be difficult to interpret, particularly for those new to academic publishing. As academic communication is typically polite and non-face threatening, reviewers tend to make suggestions rather than give direct instructions in their reports (Paltridge, 2015, 2017). This can potentially lead to difficulties if a reviewer feels that their requested changes have not been complied with as the author interpreted them as suggestions rather than instructions.

From an editor’s perspective, the clearer a reviewer is as to the reasons for their decision and their recommendations the easier it is for the editor. Reviewers may also decide that although the paper is reasonably well put together, the author has not added anything new to the topic. We see reviewer reports that comment that the study is not novel,
reinforcing the importance of clearly indicating the paper’s contribution and significance as well as the currency of the topic.

As editors, we also consider the extent to which the topic will be of interest to an international readership or what one of the editors interviewed by Flowerdew (2001) referred to as ‘not parochial’. We may consider asking an author to broaden their perspectives to include wider implications or more widely contextualise their study. Authors need to think about who their potential readers might be, what they can assume they might know and what might need to be explicated. For example, in our role as authors, we ourselves recently published a paper with colleagues which dealt with doctoral examination. On receiving the reviewers’ reports, it was clear to us that one of the reviewers was familiar with the examination regime we were discussing while the other was not. In our revised version, we provided a much more detailed description of the context and examination procedures. We had been too parochial in our assumptions. Happily, the reviewers and the editor were satisfied with the revised version!

As McKay (2003) points out, although editors hope to be impartial in their decision making, their beliefs and values will influence the overall orientation of the journal. It is likely that during our ‘custodianship’ of *English for Specific Purposes* and *TESOL Quarterly* some of our own values and beliefs played a role in shaping the direction the journal took. We should of course acknowledge that whatever we did built on the work of previous editors like Sandra McKay and others too.

We are both, through our research and teaching, highly sensitized to ongoing debates in our field about the access of non-native speakers of English to publication in English medium journals as well as the additional challenges non-native speakers of English may face (e.g., Lillis & Curry, 2010; Subitrelu, 2016). A large proportion of published submissions in both journals are written by non-native speakers, and many of these authors are from countries outside of the occidental ‘centre’ (i.e. North America and Great Britain) where English is not the authors’ first language. Our editorial boards were reasonably diverse in their make-up and our editorials regularly commented on the diversity of submissions (see, e.g., Paltridge & Mahboob, 2017), in part as a strategy to encourage submissions from underrepresented groups. Our reviewers, in
particular those from our editorial boards, would tend to be sensitive to comments that could be perceived as discriminatory to non-native speakers. In our time at *English for Specific Purposes*, we hired our own copy editor to assist non-native speakers in particular with editorial advice once the article had been accepted, using the editorial honorarium provided by the publisher to fund this service. Having said this, it does not absolve us from perceptions by authors that we may be unfairly rejecting papers on the basis of their English. What anxious authors may not know, however, is that we often work very hard with native English-speaking writers on their article structure, argument, language use, referencing and related matters to bring their articles to the required standard and that the author’s non-native speaker status was not a typical reason for the rejection of an article (see also Paltridge, 2019).

During Sue’s time at *English for Specific Purposes*, the journal published an important article titled *Non-canonical grammar in Best Paper award winners in engineering* (Rozycki & Johnson, 2013) in which the authors examined a corpus of 14 prize-winning articles submitted to the prestigious *IEEE Transactions*, all but three of which were written by non-native speakers of English. While all the papers had received the best paper award, many features of non-canonical (non-standard) grammar were found in the papers. The authors suggest that the dominance of non-native speakers in Engineering may be a factor in the acceptance of non-canonical grammar, but it may well signal a change in attitude of authors and editors as to its acceptability which may be encouraging to non-native authors. This article also caused Sue to reflect on the degree of editing ‘required’ in articles accepted from non-native writers and to perhaps focus more on ‘readability’ over strict adherence to grammatical correctness, while trying to maintain the ‘flavour’ of an author’s idioms, similes, metaphors and argument where possible.

At times, editors’ values may clash with those of the publishers, requiring difficult choices on the part of the editors. As we explained earlier, journal publishers tend to be large commercial operations, and one of their drivers is to ensure that articles appear as rapidly as possible. When we were editing *English for Specific Purposes*, a decision was made by the publishers to move from issue-based publishing in which the editors put together an issue of the journal each quarter, deciding
which article would be the ‘lead’ article and on the order of the articles. We took turns at writing an editorial for each issue in which we commented on our choice of articles, and more generally on themes and topics that we thought might interest readers or be of broader significance to the field. In this role, we were possibly playing the role of ‘shaper of the field’ alluded to earlier.

A few years ago, a decision was made by the publisher of *English for Specific Purposes* to move to what is called ‘article-based’ publishing. This means that there is no longer an annual volume of the journal composed of four issues, but each ‘issue’ is now a volume with articles published online as soon as possible after acceptance, in the order in which they are accepted, thus, effectively diminishing the role of the editor in terms of which issue of the journal an article would appear in. We took a decision at that time to stop writing editorials as there seemed little point. It is interesting to note that the editors of our sister journal, the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, have recently come to a similar conclusion (Thompson, 2016). Although many authors are no doubt pleased that their articles are appearing in print with full publication details more rapidly, clearly the role of editors in discussing ‘the direction of the field’ (p. A1) is now limited. Editors then are also sometimes tightrope walkers: mediating between authors, reviewers and publishers, they have multiple accountabilities.

**Conclusion**

Editors, as Leki points out (2003), typically do journal work in their own time (often without release from their normal academic duties and frequently with no financial compensation, apart from a modest honorarium provided by the publisher). Journal editing is a job that never stops. For five years as an editor, Sue never went anywhere without a copy of an article in her hand, be it on a plane or in a doctor’s waiting room, she would be previewing, reviewing or copy editing. At the same time, editing an academic journal is an immensely rewarding activity, connecting one to both people and ideas in complex, interesting and sometimes challenging ways.
Describing tacit knowledge, Polanyi (1966) wrote, ‘we can know more than we can tell’ (p. 4), suggesting the impossibility of, in our particular case, ever being able to fully provide a verbal account of what is entailed in successful writing for publication. What is also needed is action—in other words, writing and submitting papers to academic journals, following the advice given by journal websites, by people like ourselves, by colleagues. Ultimately, it is through our successes and our failures that we edge through the gates.

What can be helpful to those new to academic publishing is to read journal editorials. At *TESOL Quarterly*, Brian and his co-editor wrote editorials which aimed to provide insights into the review and decision-making processes of the journal. We also aimed to do this in our book *Getting Published in Academic Journals* (Paltridge & Starfield, 2016). Similarly, many large conferences have events aimed at junior scholars where editors of the field’s journals are invited to come and talk about significant issues and respond to audience members’ questions.

To conclude, we would like to emphasise the point made by Atsushi Iida (2016) who argues that beginning authors should not be discouraged if their paper is rejected by a journal. As he points out, even if an article is rejected, there is still a lot that can be learnt from the process of being reviewed and from the reviewers’ comments on the submission.

**References**


For newer scholars, perhaps the most intimidating and mysterious figures in the publication process are the peer reviewers. After all, editors have names and direct interactions with authors, but peer reviewers are typically masked behind a veil of anonymity. They communicate with the author only through the review—a genre that is fairly flexible in its form but that nonetheless embeds and reinforces very particular, hierarchical roles between the reviewer (the evaluator) and the author (the evaluatee). It is of little surprise that the peer reviewer has been much maligned in academic lore, giving rise to numerous internet memes, academic blog posts, a Facebook group titled “Reviewer 2 Must Be Stopped,” a Twitter hashtag (#reviewer2), and even an entry in UrbanDictionary.com, where the definition of Reviewer 2 is “Actively misinterprets everything you say.”

The fear, malice, and ridicule cast on to peer reviewers may in part be related to the gatekeeping power that they hold in the publication process.
process, but their anonymity also gives reviewers a certain mystique. It allows us to project our own worst fears or villainous images onto them: *Reviewer #1 must be the person whose book I did not cite; Reviewer #2 does not seem to be familiar with this research at all.* The images we create of peer reviewers—whether they be the actual reviewers of our papers or the imaginary reviewers we build up in our heads—can be intimidating, particularly for novice scholars. In this chapter, I hope to pull back the cloak of anonymity just a bit, to share a more human perspective of peer review. Peer reviewers, in the end, are not mysterious scholars whose goal is to make publication difficult; they are, instead, the scholars we read, the people sitting in our conference presentations, the friends of our professors, and even our own graduate school colleagues. They are our *peers.* Simply put, we are all Reviewer #2.

### The Role of the Peer Reviewer in the Publication Process

Peer review, the cornerstone of academic publication, dates back about 300 years, though it did not become a common part of academic publishing until after World War II (Paltridge, 2017). Today, peer-reviewed publication is the gold standard of academic scholarship, with many universities only recognizing peer-reviewed work for tenure and promotion. At the same time, the peer review system is not uncontested. Richard Smith (2015), former editor of *The BMJ*, has described peer review as “ineffective, largely a lottery, anti-innovatory, slow, expensive, wasteful of scientific time, inefficient, easily abused, prone to bias, unable to detect fraud and irrelevant.” One study calculated the unpaid cost of peer review, estimating its worth at £1.9 billion per year (Corbyn, 2008). Not compensating reviewers allows journals to keep their costs down and, ultimately, generate more revenue. Yet, although the flaws in peer review are well known, the system persists. This is probably in part because the alternatives—e.g., letting readers assess quality or giving editors *carte blanche* in publishing decisions—seem both unrealistic and equally problematic.
Sharing her perspective as a long-time editor of the *Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW)*, Leki (2003) described reviewers as “the real arbiters of a manuscript’s success” (p. 105), because editors must rely on reviewers’ expertise in the specific subfields that manuscripts address. Van Lier (2010) similarly characterized reviewers as the “backbone of journal publishing” (p. 658). Given the volume of submissions at many journals—as well as the breadth of topics, research methodologies, and educational contexts that these submissions address—specialist reviewers are crucial in assessing manuscripts’ quality and scholarly contributions. So, in many ways, authors’ looming fear of reviewers is not misdirected: If a paper does not pass muster with peer reviewers, it probably faces a pretty steep hill to publication.

At the same time, reviewers are not the final decision makers in publication but rather function as part of a fairly complex ecology that involves a specific journal community, the editors, the other reviewers and their reviews, the topics, the timing, the journal’s history, and even the broader sociopolitical climate of a discipline. This “tangled web” (Leki, 2003) of roles and relations makes it difficult to offer broad generalizations about the process, though there certainly are some relatively durable patterns that can be shared. My understanding of this process is, of course, shaped by my own experiences as a peer reviewer and, like Leki, a former editor of *JSLW*. Because a good number of descriptions of the peer review process already exist (e.g., Paltridge, 2017; Paltridge & Starfield, 2016), I will focus here on sharing my personal perspectives into this occluded process.

**The Publication Process from the Peer Reviewer’s Perspective**

Typically, the road to publication is described from the view of the author, identifying the various stages authors go through from preparing a manuscript through to final revisions. The very same network looks a little bit different through another role. Figure 15.1, for example, attempts to compare the ways in which authors and peer reviewers
interact with the key genres in the publication process. As the figure shows, the two experience the process in distinct ways. Below, I expand on some of the details of this process from the peer reviewer’s perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key genres</th>
<th>Author’s interaction with the genre</th>
<th>Peer reviewer’s interaction with the genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(based on Paltridge, 2017, p. 34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Guidelines for authors</td>
<td>Reads to ensure manuscript meets guidelines</td>
<td>May consult during review if questions arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manuscript</td>
<td>Composes with the goal of publishing</td>
<td>Reads closely to evaluate publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Editor’s acknowledgement of manuscript submission</td>
<td>Receives after submission</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Editor’s decision</td>
<td>Receives editor decision if an in-house decision is made without peer review.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer invitation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Receives invitation and considers whether to accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acceptance of invitations to review</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Accepts or declines invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guidelines to reviewers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Reviews guidelines prior to or during review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 15.1** Authors’ and peer reviewers’ interactions with key genres in the publication process
7. Peer review report  | Reads reviews to understand editor decision  | Composes peer review report to offer and to identify areas for recommendation of revision publication and to detail strengths and suggestions

8. Editor’s acknowledgment of peer review report | n/a | Receives confirmation that report was received

9. Editor’s decision letter to author  | Reads to identify decision and options for next steps | (not always available to reviewers)

10. Sharing of peer review reports to reviewers | n/a | Reads other reports for comparison

11. Revised manuscript  | Revises to address editor’s and reviewers’ comments | Reads closely to evaluate

12. Summary of changes (response to reviewers)  | Composes to identify how all suggestions were addressed | Reads closely to determine what changes were made and how

Items 7-12 repeat with revised manuscript until paper is accepted or rejected

13. Page proofs  | Author checks page proofs before paper is published | n/a

14. Article published  | Author has published! Reviewer may read published paper |

Fig. 15.1 (continued)
The Invitation

Peer reviewers enter the web of publication genres only when an editor extends an invitation to review. At this point, the editor has already determined that the paper has publication potential, though this is no guarantee that it will reach that potential. While exact acceptance figures vary, top journals in applied linguistics tend to publish only around 5–15% of all submissions, and often at least half of the initial submissions are rejected by the editor without peer review. These numbers are important, because for many journals, reviewers agree to participate knowing that the odds are ultimately against publication. Because peer reviewers are typically themselves active scholars (i.e., very busy people), they do not always jump at the opportunity to add a manuscript review to their to-do list. The most experienced reviewers receive an ever-growing number of invitations, forcing them to turn many down. As the number of journals and submissions have increased (aided by the ease of online submissions and high pressure to publish), a major issue for editors today is securing peer reviewers.

In my experience as an editor and reviewer, there are a range of factors that influence a person’s willingness to serve as a peer reviewer:

• whether or not they serve on the journal’s editorial board (and are therefore expected to review a certain number of papers annually for the journal);
• their interest in the paper’s topic;
• their expertise in the paper’s topic and/or research methods;
• the potential quality of the paper, based on title, abstract, and (if available) a skimming of the paper itself;
• how many other reviews they are currently completing (or have recently completed);
• other current obligations, both professional and personal;
• their professional status and need for evidence of peer review as a professional service;
• their interest in being involved in the specific journal;
• their prior experiences with the journal, as an editor or author; and
• their relationship with the inviting editor.
As an editor, I developed a general sense of the likelihood of a reviewer accepting an invitation, based on a combination of the above items (and others). I was sometimes pleasantly surprised when a high-profile scholar whom I had never met agreed to review, but I suspect that, in these cases, the topic and potential quality of the manuscript was persuasive—and they just happened not to be too over committed at the time. And this is, in the end, what keeps the system functioning. Despite being very busy people, peer reviewers still do accept more and more work, and they do it because they are invested in the system of academic publication. We are all each other’s gatekeepers, so academics tend to feel a sense of obligation to support the greater goal of quality scholarship.

An uptake here for novices is that by the time, a fellow scholar has committed to reviewing a manuscript they have already determined that it is worth their time, and they have done this with the knowledge that the paper may not see publication. Accepting a review invitation demonstrates a professional commitment to one’s scholarly community and to the mentoring and development of newer scholars. While I am certain that there are also less altruistic reasons at times, I believe that this generous reading of the motives behind the peer review process is important to keep in mind, precisely because those motives are invisible: Authors only ever see the formal traces of this process (the review itself), which tend to mask the more positive community-minded intentions.

The Review Process

Once a scholar has accepted a review invitation, they are given a period of time in which to complete the review, typically 4 weeks to 3 months. That said, reviewers may request an extension, or they may fail to complete the task, so the process can go on much longer than expected.

The actual review task is difficult to generalize, as practices vary by individuals and by the circumstances of a particular manuscript. If a paper includes substantial design flaws or is not situated in current relevant scholarship, I may be able to complete a review in two hours. Far
more common for me, however, is a lengthier task. I usually begin by reading through the abstract and reference list and skimming the paper as a whole to identify its major parts and direction. I learn quite a lot from this initial read, such as where the paper fits in the larger body of scholarship, what the author is trying to accomplish, and how the paper is structured. I might notice potential concerns at this time, like relevant scholarship that is not cited, a very limited methodology section, or a literature review that seems disproportionately lengthy. Even though I try to overlook cosmetic aspects of the paper, I tend to notice unusual nondiscursive features at this stage, such as inconsistent documentation or formatting style, unusual paragraphing, or a preponderance of editing errors. While these alone will never lead me to reject a paper, they can contribute, even tacitly, to my overall impressions of the paper’s quality.

After forming a general impression of the paper, I carry out a very close reading. This may happen in the same sitting or sometimes a day or two later. This stage of review can take several hours, depending on the paper. I typically read through the manuscript on a tablet or computer, annotating closely as I read. My annotations note rhetorical issues (like focus or framing) and content issues (such as methodology or representation of scholarship). In this reading, I usually do not mark editing, language, or stylistic issues, even though I do notice them. Paltridge (2017) describes key aspects of peer review as judging the overall quality, including a critical understanding of relevant scholarship, a clearly defined focus, a comprehensive investigation of the topic, an appropriate research design, a critical analysis linked to prior research, originality, and strong written presentation. His overview echoes my own practice, and it aligns generally with the guidelines that are often sent to reviewers.

After reading the manuscript carefully, I begin typing notes, which are my precursor to an actual review. Looking back at my annotations, I create lists of the major issues, often section by section. This process helps me distill my overall assessment and begin to prioritize areas for revision. I often do not know what my final recommendation will be until I have completed this part of the process. In some cases, my bulleted lists reveal that there are a limited number of overlapping issues,
and that these can be addressed through typical revision. In other cases, I am able to see that the revisions are both substantial and numerous, possibly being too significant to address in a revision.

For manuscripts that report on empirical research, a big part of my review process is gaining a very clear understanding of the study’s design and methodology. Careful attention to the aim, research questions, methodology, and data analysis often reveal design flaws, such as problematic operationalization of central constructs. In some cases, key information about the study’s design or participants is missing, making it impossible to fully assess the research. For more theoretical papers, representation of relevant scholarship and clearly supported claims and conclusions are vital. In reality, I may not be able to spend as long as I would like to assess a paper in this way, but as an editor, I learned the critical importance of reviews that provided a very careful analysis of the design or framework. Unfortunately, there is evidence that reviewers do not catch everything, and flawed research does get published (Smith, 2015); the system is imperfect, but it is the system we currently have.

The Review Comments

In his extended study of peer review, Paltridge (2017) describes an “event sequence” (p. 34) of genres that make up the review process, the first seven of which lead up to and include the review:

- Guidelines for authors
- Research article
- Editor’s acknowledgement of article
- Editor’s decision on article or Reviewer invitations
- Acceptances of invitations to review
- Guidelines to reviewers
- Reviewers’ reports.

The reviews (or reports) are shaped by these related genres and by factors such as the paper’s quality, the reviewer’s time constraints, the journal’s expectations, and the reviewer’s expertise in the manuscript’s topic.
The discourse structure of reviews has been examined by several researchers (e.g., Fortanet, 2008; Samraj, 2016), with common moves including (1) summarizing judgement regarding suitability for publication; (2) outlining the article; (3) points of criticism; and (4) conclusion and recommendation (Fortanet, 2008, p. 35, cited in Paltridge, 2017, p. 39). Paltridge (2017) notes that the use of these moves can depend largely on the reviewer’s recommendation regarding publication. In his analysis, accepted reviews tended to omit Move 2, while Move 3 was obligatory in any review that recommends revisions or a rejection. Paltridge, like Samraj (2016), also found that major revision reviews often include more directives than reject reviews, which focused more on negative commentary. Overall, the content of reviews tends to be more negative than positive (Belcher, 2007; Paltridge, 2017), a by-product of the genre’s gatekeeping function.

I analyzed nine manuscript reviews that I wrote in 2017 and found similar patterns. Of these nine, five recommended rejection, two asked for very substantial revisions, and two asked for relatively straightforward revisions. My reject reviews focused only on the most significant issues that led to my decision rather than cataloging all of my concerns. These reviews were about 600–1000 words long, provided detailed explanation of the major issues (such as a lack of contribution or a significant design flaw), and included suggestions for how the paper might be rewritten for another journal. In contrast, my revision reviews were longer (1100–1700 words), addressed more areas for revision, and often included some minor suggestions related to specific paragraphs or sentences in the manuscript (typically, asking for clarification). Although these patterns seem to be fairly typical in my field, as an editor, I found that reviews can be as short as a paragraph and as long as five single-spaced pages. A colleague recently told me he had received 15 single-spaced review comments, 10 of those pages coming from one reviewer!

I usually have three goals in mind when preparing my review: (1) communicating and supporting my evaluation clearly to the author and editor, (2) providing sufficient guidance for future revision, and (3) maintaining a respectful tone. It can be challenging to balance these
goals, ensuring that the reasons for a rejection not only are defensible but also do not deflate the author.

Although many reviews include an explicit recommendation regarding publication, reviewers may also be asked to share these separately in an online form or an email to the editor. Online forms typically also include a field for comments that will only be seen by the editor. As an editor, I found this field was typically used when reviewers were uncertain about their recommendation, especially if they were wavering between a reject and revise decision. It was helpful to have this information, though I often wished the author had been able to see it as well, as the comments at times conveyed a different message than the review itself. I also found that reviewers tended to submit language-related concerns to the editor but not include these in their actual review.

The First Decision and Resubmission

After a required number of reviews are submitted, editors must present the reviews and editorial decision to the author. At this point, many journals’ online management systems allow reviewers to access other (blinded) reviews completed for the manuscript. I am often intrigued to see what another reviewer noticed that I may have missed or interpreted differently, or to find that another reader reacted more kindly or harshly to the paper overall. In general, the opportunity to read other peer reviews has strengthened my own approach to the genre. I take note of particularly tactful critiques or reviews that are especially helpful in directing an author’s revisions, and I have tried to incorporate such strategies in my own reviews.

Comparing reviews for a single paper can highlight a lack of alignment among readers, but disagreements are not necessarily problematic. Reviewers bring unique perspectives to a manuscript, just as readers of published papers do. There are also so many elements to any one manuscript (the paper’s framing, the representation of related scholarship, the research questions, the research design, the analysis, the conclusions, the
writing) that it is nearly impossible for one reader to address everything. One great advantage of having multiple reviewers for a single paper is that the author and editor can see complementary perspectives and receive a broader set of comments overall.

If an editor invites the author to revise a paper, the reviewer may very well be asked to evaluate the revision. Editors may choose to send the revision to the initial group of peer reviewers, or to just some of them. At times, an editor may prefer a new set of eyes to read the paper. Depending on availability, however, revised papers can be sent to an entirely new group of reviewers.

Personally, I find revised manuscripts more challenging and time consuming to review. Reviewing a first-round manuscript involves just a close read of the paper, but a second-round review involves refamiliarizing oneself with the original manuscript and then determining what the author was asked to change, what they did (and did not) change, how they changed it, and how well the revisions address the original recommendations. Revisions can be relatively minor or can result in a substantially new paper. At times, the revisions reveal new weaknesses (or make visible existing weaknesses) that need to be addressed, an outcome that can be particularly frustrating to authors.

To detail their changes, authors are usually asked to prepare a response to reviewers, a document that lists each requested revision along with an explanation of how they addressed (or did not address) the concern. This document can be quite lengthy—sometimes up to 10 pages if the author is extremely detailed. The response gives reviewers a good sense of the author’s approach to the revision, including both substantial and minor changes. Sometimes, authors may indicate that they have not made certain recommended changes; they might have disagreed with the suggestion or were unable to revise in the suggested manner. In other cases, authors claim to have addressed a concern, but the reviewer may feel that the revision is inadequate. The author certainly has the choice to decide how and if to respond to suggestions, but decisions to not make requested revisions should be explained carefully to reviewers. As an editor, I often saw the frustration that reviewers felt when their recommendations were ignored.
The Final Decision

When an editor makes a final decision to either accept or reject a manuscript, participating peer reviewers are usually informed of the outcome, though the manuscript and the reviewers’ identities remain anonymous. It is not until a paper is published—if it is published—that a reviewer learns who the author is, and authors will only learn the reviewers’ identities if the reviewer reveals themselves to the published author. (That said, both authors and reviewers may at times have a strong sense of the other’s identities.) Of course, not all submission processes result in publication, and even established authors receive rejections. A rejection from one journal, however, is just the beginning of a second phase in which authors may revise the paper (or not) and send it to a new journal. Reviewers and editors may even suggest other appropriate venues for publication. Authors should be aware, though, that their paper may be sent to the same reviewers even at a new journal.

Common Challenges in Working with Peer Reviews

So far, I have described the publication process through the reviewer’s perspective, illustrating what might lie behind the peer review report itself. Drawing on this reviewer perspective, I attempt here to address some of the more common perplexities of scholarly peer review.

How Can I Anticipate Reviewers’ Perspectives?

It is impossible to fully anticipate how any given reviewer might respond to a paper, but there are strategies that authors can use to anticipate potential concerns. Most importantly, authors should be very familiar with the journal to which they are submitting. Each journal develops an evolving set of preferences or norms for the kinds of research published and the content and forms for papers. For example,
some journals expect very detailed methodology sections while others may not. Information about journal expectations can be found in the journal’s submission guidelines, mission, editorial board membership, and review criteria, but it is also necessary to be familiar with the journal’s published articles. Reviewers and editors both evaluate manuscripts with the particular journal audience in mind, so developing a strong understanding of the journal and its community of readers can be invaluable in anticipating what a reviewer might expect in a manuscript.

**Will I Be at a Disadvantage if English Is My Additional Language?**

Research has found that reviewers frequently do comment on language in their reviews (Belcher, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2015; Paltridge, 2017) and that EAL users may at the very least perceive themselves to be at a disadvantage in scholarly publication (Tardy, 2004; Uzuner, 2008). There is also evidence that authors’ socioacademic networks and geographic locations play an important role (Belcher, 2007; Hyland, 2016; Uzuner, 2008), and it can be difficult to disaggregate language background from these other factors.

As described earlier, language is generally low on my own priority list as a reviewer, especially for my reject or major revision recommendations. The language concerns that I do mention tend to relate to use of precise and consistent terminology rather than grammar or style. Scholarship suggests that language is a fairly common topic of critique in reviews, though the extent to which it influences the publication decision is unclear. Lillis and Curry (2015), for example, examined 95 text histories and found that in 58 of these, editors and/or reviewers emphasized language as a significant weakness in the manuscript. Of these 58, 47 linked language to assumptions of the author’s language background. Belcher’s (2007) study also identified language as a common area of critique in reviews, but she found no consistent differences in the feedback given to EAL and native English authors; differences seemed to be more related to “research writing expertise and availability of resources…than language issues” (p. 15). Examining reviews in the
journal *System*, Coniam (2012) found that less than half included comments on the quality of the paper’s language, though all of these were negative. However, overall, Coniam (2012) did not find a higher rejection rate for international EAL scholars. Drawing on similar research, Hyland (2016) has argued that language bias in publication is largely a myth. In the end, inequities in publication are surely numerous, and language bias should be viewed as one part of a complex ecosystem.

**How Can I Interpret My Reviews?**

It is not uncommon for authors new to publishing to misread the intentions of reviews, in part because they do not always explicitly state their publication recommendation. In fact, some journals ask reviewers to avoid including a recommendation in their review, likely to make it easier for editors to make a decision that contradicts reviewers. Additional confusion can occur because a reject review may look similar to one that recommends a revision—in fact, a revision review may be lengthier and include more suggestions, as I found in my own reviews.

Ultimately, an author really only needs to know the editor’s decision, as reviewers’ recommendations are advisory. Editorial letters should state clearly whether the paper has been rejected or whether the author is invited to revise and resubmit the manuscript for a new review. In rare cases, a paper may be accepted pending minor revisions. In general, the editorial letter should provide a clear statement of the decision; if a revised manuscript is invited, the letter should also detail the resubmission deadline and process as well as, in most cases, priorities for revision. If the decision and next steps are unclear, authors may always write to the editor for clarification.

**How Should I Deal with Harsh Criticism?**

Another challenge for authors—and especially newcomers—can be the critical nature of reviews, in which the content is often primarily negative (Paltridge, 2017). Publishing is not for the thin skinned! Although
I initially feared harsh peer reviews, over time I have learned to embrace them. Academic readers are critical, and I would much rather receive such critique before publication, when I have a chance to think it through and address it. Novice authors should know that critical reviews should not deter them but rather should be seen as a common (and challenging) part of publication.

When I received my first peer reviews as a doctoral student, a colleague suggested I initially just skim them and then put them away for a short while—maybe a few days, maybe a few weeks. Later, my colleague recommended, I could go back to them and read the editorial letter more carefully, identifying the editor’s main suggestions, followed by a close reading of all of the reviews. With this process, reviews that seem harsh at first usually feel more manageable and helpful after a bit of time.

When I first read reviews closely, I often highlight the key points—sometimes I put those in a bulleted list so that I can easily identify the suggestions. This also helps me to see which recommendations were made by multiple readers, which were emphasized by the editor, and which might be contradictory. After gaining a clear sense of the recommendations, I reread my manuscript. At this point, with a more objective approach to the reviews, I frequently find I agree with most of the comments and suggestions. Even when I disagree with a reviewer’s interpretations, I can usually see why they read it as they did, and I can then consider how I might revise so that reviewers read it differently. In the end, I believe all of my publications have been improved by peer review, even when I have chosen not to directly make changes that a reviewer has suggested.

How Can I Negotiate Reviewer Comments?

As I write this chapter, I am myself negotiating peer reviews for two papers. For each, my co-authors and I received three reviews ranging from negative (reject or major revisions) to very positive (accept with minor revisions). It can seem surprising as an author to see completely different impressions of your paper; how is it possible that one reviewer
can believe that your paper “effectively demonstrates the exigency for this work,” while another feels the “exigencies...did not provide enough catalyst for how this study could contribute to on-going conversations in the field”? It is the job of the editor to determine how to frame and mediate reviews for authors. Ideally, the editor identifies revision priorities and helps the author manage contradictory reviews. Given the heavy demands on editors’ time, however, this kind of work may not always happen, and authors often must determine themselves what is most important to attend to and how to resolve any contradictions. In these cases, seeking advice from more seasoned authors, including peers and supervisors, can be quite valuable.

Personally, I have found that a very systematic approach to revision helps me negotiate contradictory reviews or those that I disagree with. When I am ready to revise, I usually break down all of the gatekeepers’ recommendations into a response to reviewers document. As an editor, I saw many approaches to this task and especially liked authors’ uses of a two-column table, with editors’ and reviewers’ suggestions in the left column and the author’s response to each item in the right column. I now typically adopt this same format myself. Breaking down each suggestion creates a checklist of all items that need to be addressed, ranging from substantial revisions to minor edits. It typically takes me weeks to work through a revision, and the table helps me track my progress.

At some point, all authors encounter reviewer suggestions with which they disagree. Sometimes, reviewers may envision a different paper than the author intended, and their recommendations take the paper in a new direction. In other cases, reviewers may request a different approach to data analysis, perhaps one that the author feels is inappropriate. In one survey study of biomedical researchers, 62% of the 283 respondents felt that they had received incompetent peer reviews and 51% had received reviews they perceived to be biased (Resnik, Gutierrez-ford & Peddada, 2008), raising questions about the “fairness” of peer review. When disagreements occur, novice authors should know that they do not need to incorporate all suggestions. Instead, authors can explain that they have not made a requested change and detail the reasons why. In the end, authors should retain a sense of ownership over the paper, which may even mean withdrawing it and submitting it to a
new venue. Nearly every publication is ultimately a negotiation between
the author and gatekeepers, though I suspect authors become less will-
ing to sacrifice their authorial ownership with experience and time.

Reviewer as Peer

I hope the processes and practices that I have shared, however, idio-
syncratic, reduce some of the mystery surrounding peer review. I fully
acknowledge that the infamous peer reviewer (or “Reviewer #2”) may
never become an entirely benevolent figure for authors though. In a
recent conversation, a friend vehemently exclaimed to me, “I hate peer
reviewers! They take my ‘slow-food,’ that I have worked painstakingly
on for months or years, and they consume it like fast-food.” The irony,
perhaps, is that my friend is not only a hard-toiling author but also
himself a peer reviewer, serving on several editorial boards and review-
ing multiple manuscripts every year. He is just as aware of the com-
plexities of the system as anyone, yet he still feels a bit alienated by the
review process. Perhaps we cling to the mystique of the peer reviewer
partly as a way to distance ourselves from their (indeed, our) role as
evaluator. A nameless, faceless reviewer may be easier to vilify, easier to
attribute careless reading to, and easier to disagree with than our col-
league whose work we cite. But it may also be useful to remember that
the reviewer role is fluid, one that we learn to move in and out of with
increased experience in our scholarly communities. Indeed, one step in
our progression of professional participation comes when we review a
manuscript and realize that we are the dreaded Reviewer #2. The review
system, at that point, might still be something we fear but perhaps a
little less, as we experience the other side and consider its value as well.
Ultimately, the reviewers are us, trying to do our own small part in the
ecology of knowledge production. As Leo van Lier (2010) has fittingly
stated: “This is truly a selfless and pro bono task, one that carries no
benefits in terms of remuneration, prestige, or tenure but provides cru-
cial assistance to authors. How long this system can last in this rapidly
changing world is a question the field as a whole must worry about”
(p. 658).
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