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Abstract

Given global competitiveness for quality research articulated through scholarly publication, minimal research addresses the practices of Anglophone doctoral students in writing for scholarly publication. This study examines (1) the challenges faced by Canadian Anglophone doctoral students in writing for scholarly publication in international English-medium academic journals; and (2) the ways in which these novice scholars are supported by faculty supervisors and expert members of their academic community in communicating their work through scholarly publication. Two overarching questions frame the study: what are the challenges faced by Canadian Anglophone doctoral students in writing for scholarly publication? and how do they acquire the skills and knowledge necessary for scholarly publication?

The theoretical framework for this study draws on the social constructivist notions of Discourse Community (Swales, 1990) and Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). A qualitative case study approach frames the study methodologically. A questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis constitute the data collection methods. The participants include Anglophone doctoral students, faculty supervisors, and editors of academic journals from all across Canada. The theoretical framework for the study as well as the existing literature inform the data analysis and interpretation.

The findings indicate that although Anglophone doctoral students enjoy Native-English-Speaker status and presumably a linguistic advantage, they too face genre-specific, discipline-specific, and non-discursive challenges in the initiation phase of joining their target discourse community through writing for scholarly publication. They also struggle with the publication process. Moreover, the struggles they face in writing for scholarly publication are similar to their non-Anglophone peers. Furthermore, the findings also highlight a “sink or swim” model for acquiring academic literacy skills in Canadian Higher Education context. The findings underline that academia needs to be more accountable for emerging scholars’ legitimate peripheral participation and visibility in global scholarship. This study has important implications for policy making and instructional planning in Higher Education.
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Chapter 1

1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the issues under investigation and highlights the significance of the study and its objectives. It presents the research questions that the research seeks to answer and the theoretical lens that frames the research; highlights the contributions of the research to the field; provides definitions for key terms; and lays out the organization of the thesis.

1.1 Background / Overview

“Writing is to academia what sex was to nineteenth-century Vienna: everybody does it and nobody talks about it.” (W. L. Belcher, 2009, p.1)

Despite being contested two decades ago, the general assumption still exists that literacy in writing for scholarly publication comes with a higher or doctoral degree (Kapp, Albertyn, & Frick, 2011; Murray, Thow, Moore, & Murphy, 2008). The abundance of so-called “how to” manuals (i.e., materials focusing on structural and linguistic aspects of scholarly writing) has not adequately helped those writing for scholarly publication, particularly novice researchers (Driscoll & Driscoll, 2002; Keen, 2007; Moore, 2003). It seems that the inherent merits of scholarly publication, and the inclusionary (or exclusionary) forces behind it, have not been motivating enough to alleviate writing and publishing impotency common among many scholars in academia either (Belcher, 2009; Kapp et al., 2011; McGrail, Rickard & Jones, 2006; Murray et al., 2008). The fact remains
that writing for scholarly publication is still a mysterious practice and a considerable challenge for many established and emerging scholars, especially for doctoral students. Consequently, it is extremely important to know about the nature of the mysteries and challenges of writing for scholarly publication in order to be able to mitigate and overcome them (Kapp et al., 2011). This research aims at gaining insights into those issues. The following section will deal with the statement of the problem and purpose of the study.

1.2 Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

Just as it does for well-established members of academic discourse communities, writing for scholarly publication entails an interplay of benefits, motivations, risks, and pressures for doctoral students. Lei and Chuang (2009) highlight the necessity of scholarly publication as a requirement for graduation in many graduate programs:

In today's academic climate, the old adage "publish or perish" no longer applies solely to postdoctoral scholars, lecturers, visiting and tenure-track faculty members. Many masters and doctoral (graduate) students nationwide are expected to publish their research results before graduation. Many leading academic departments have required their respective master's and doctoral students to publish at least one and two to three research articles in scholarly journals, respectively, as part of their graduation requirements. (p. 1163)

The literature also underlines the significance of doctoral publishing for prospective academic positions and employment in the competitive context of academia (Kwan, 2010). The “publish or perish” ideology of academia has therefore more serious implications for
the academic recognition and career decisions of these emerging scholars. There is “no
doubt that [not only is] the competitive ‘bar’ for doctoral students rising in terms of both
quantity and quality”, but also writing dysfunction and publication impotency are rampant
in doctoral programs and among doctoral students (Jones, 2013, p. 89). Furthermore, “the
results of doctoral research are not widely or systematically disseminated through peer-
reviewed journal publication” (Kamler, 2008, p. 283; Lee & Kamler, 2008). Hyland
(2009a) argues for the importance of devoting extensive research to the academic literacy
education and practices of newcomers to academia. There has been a growing interest in
writing for scholarly publication practices of doctoral students over the past five years.
However, the research in this domain has mainly focused on experiences and challenges of
English as an additional language (EAL) doctoral students (Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 1999a,
1999b, 2000; Tardy, 2004), neglecting writing for scholarly publication practices of
Anglophone doctoral students in the Inner Circle where English is the dominant language
(Kachru, 1985). It seems as if

the literature tempts us to believe that international publication is more of a
challenge to multilingual scholars than it is to others who are endowed with
economic, cultural and symbolic capitals, and thus able to respond to the demands
of the core academic discursive practices with relative ease. (Uzuner, 2008, p. 261)

However, like their EAL peers, Anglophone doctoral students have a peripheral status in
their academic discourse communities as emerging scholars learning “the academic ropes”
(Swales, 2004, p. 56). Moreover, they “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, 2009a, p. 85). Therefore, their non-nativeness
in terms of academic English and academic literacy not only contests their so-called “geolinguistic advantage” (Lillis & Curry, 2010) or at least linguistic advantage to some extent, but also puts them at a double disadvantage. Consequently, it is of utmost significance to investigate the writing for scholarly publication practices of these novice scholars as one of the most pivotal yet extremely under-researched literacies required of them (Ferguson, Perez-Llantada, & Plo, 2011). The current research study aims to examine writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students in a Canadian higher education context. The following section will explain how my educational background, current status as a doctoral candidate, and my epistemological perspective inform my approach to the research.

1.3 Coming to the Research

In addition to the gap highlighted in research into writing for scholarly publication, a number of factors justify my interest in this area and inform the way I carry out this research. First, as a doctoral candidate at a Canadian higher education institution, I am dealing with the same “publish or perish” ideology. Therefore, this research is like a journey of self-exploration for me as studying the scholarly publication practices of my peers and colleagues provides me with invaluable insights into my own practices, challenges, and learning processes. Second, my current status and educational background in academic writing and research article genre both as a learner and teacher make me an insider and help me make more informed decisions about different aspects of my research. That is, I can choose a more appropriate design and more effective data collection methods, select appropriate informants, and design questions that can trigger more in-depth
discussions and elicit more insightful information. Third, situating my research within a social-constructivist epistemology raises my awareness about social aspects of knowledge construction and learning. Drawing on its underlying principles, I can contextualize the learning of academic literacies within social practices of academic communities and consider scholarly writing for publication as a manifestation of socially-constructed knowledge in such communities. Drawing on this awareness, I will explain the centrality and justification of the research in the following section.

1.4 Significance and Justification of the Study

Considering the potentially disadvantaged status of Anglophone doctoral students, I will draw upon a number of key rationales behind the bulk of research into writing for scholarly publication practices of EAL scholars in order to justify the significance of this study and focus on the writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone novice scholars:

- Like EAL scholars who “are a main pillar of global scholarship” (Uzuner, 2008, p. 251) and “help reform, expand, and enrich the knowledge base of core disciplinary communities” (Liu, 2004, p. 2), novice scholars (both Anglophone and non-Anglophone) are also key players in their academic communities, and their participation, legitimate yet peripheral, defines and changes disciplinary norms constantly and enriches disciplinary and global scholarship (Hyland, 2009a).

- Assuming the situated and personal nature of knowledge, Canagarajah (1996) points out that ‘periphery perspectives on different disciplines may provide
unique insights” (p. 463). Although the nature and extent of Anglophone novice scholars’ peripherality or “off-networkedness” (Swales, 2004) might not be analogous to those of their peripheral multilingual peers, their peripheral perspectives along with the personal and situated nature of their knowledge make their insights noteworthy, invaluable, and integral to academia.

- Like well-established members of their academic communities, novice scholars have to abide by the unquestioningly agreed-upon ‘publish or perish’ ideology as scholarly publication is one of the major determinants in their academic recognition and decisions about their academic and career lives (Hyland, 2015). Therefore, conducting research into the writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone novice scholars and gaining informed knowledge of related problems may alleviate the challenges they face and facilitate their participation and visibility in academia.

In light of these justifications, it is of paramount importance to devote extensive research focus to academic literacy education and practices of these newcomers to academia, especially their writing for scholarly publication (Hyland, 2009a). By the same token, this research aims to answer queries regarding writing for scholarly publication of Anglophone doctoral students which will follow in the next section.

1.5 Research Questions

This research study seeks answers to the following overarching questions:
a) Why do Canadian Anglophone doctoral students find writing for scholarly publication challenging?

b) How do they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals?

These questions will be dealt with in light of the theoretical framework which will follow in the next section.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study draws on the notions of Discourse Community (DC) (Swales, 1990) and Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The following is an explanation of these underlying concepts and the way these notions inform the necessary analytical framework for interpreting the data and seeking answers to the above-mentioned research questions.

1.6.1 Discourse Community (DC)

Swales (1990) defines a discourse community as people with shared social conventions “who link up in order to pursue objectives that are prior to those of socialization and solidarity, even if these latter should consequently occur.” (p. 24). Swales (1990) presents a set of criteria for identification of a discourse community: (a) common public goals; (b) intercommunication mechanism; (c) mechanism of participation for information exchange; (d) community-specific genres; (e) highly specific terminology; and (f) high level of content and discoursal expertise. A view of writing for scholarly publication as initiation into an academic discourse community frames the understanding of writing for scholarly
publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students. Based on such a view, “one’s entry into such communities rests upon his/her ability to meet the criteria set for them” (Uzuner, 2008, p. 258). In other words, as academic discourse communities determine access, inclusion/exclusion of newcomers, their entry, affiliation, and membership in such communities require that they learn and know the conventions (genres and rhetorical norms) and “the conversations of the discipline” (Bazerman, 1985, 1987; Hyland, 2009b; Swales, 1990). Consequently, exclusionary and inclusionary mechanisms of academic discourse communities and, more importantly, what Hyland (2009a, p. 89) refers to as “advanced literacy competencies and insider knowledge”, are concepts that can contribute to predicting, interpreting, and explaining the challenges and complexities that Anglophone doctoral students can encounter for initiation into such communities through writing for scholarly publication.

1.6.2 Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP)

LPP concerns the process through which newcomers join a community of practice (CoP). To view learning as LPP implies that “learning is not merely a condition for membership, but is itself an evolving form of membership” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 51); it implies that:

- learners acquire knowledge, tune their enterprise, and develop a unique identity, repertoire, style, and discourse through apprenticeship-like relations with experts.
- Viewed from this perspective, continuous engagement in the practices of social communities enables newcomers to move from peripheral to full participation and eventually allow them to replace the old-timers. (Uzuner, 2008, p. 258)
In this study, LPP provides the analytic lens for understanding the way Anglophone doctoral students learn writing for scholarly publication. The concepts of legitimacy and peripherality are used to interpret the status of Anglophone doctoral students and their participation in practices inherent to doctoral programs. The fact that they are doctoral students legitimizes their status as potential members of academic communities; however, their participation is considered peripheral due to their novice status, scaffolded practices, and limited engagement.

The concepts of CoP and expert members in such communities frame the academic context of the doctoral program, and the status and function of faculty members and academic supervisors respectively. The key notion of apprenticeship that is used as a springboard for this theory redefines learning as a collaborative process rather than an individualist cognitive one (Kirk & Kinchin, 2003). It highlights mechanisms of support for writing for scholarly publication, and raises awareness of the pivotal role of expert members in mentoring and scaffolding the induction, enculturation, and orientation of Anglophone doctoral students towards full participation in scholarly practices of their target academic communities. Drawing on the underlying notions of the theoretical framework, this research aims to make a number of contributions to the current scholarship on writing for scholarly publication which will follow next.

1.7 Contributions to the Advancement of Knowledge

Knowledge produced will: (a) provide insights into the writing for publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students; (b) contribute to deeper understanding of the nature of challenges presented by scholarly writing and publishing; (c) provide information for the
betterment of mentorship and support mechanisms for writing for scholarly publication; and (d) contribute to the knowledge base on best practices to strengthen doctoral students’ socialization in scholarly communities. The findings will add to foundational knowledge upon which Canadian universities can draw to adapt to the demands of scholarly publication, and to support research and talent development among Anglophone graduate students in general. Knowledge gained will help identify factors that ensure that Anglophone doctoral students thrive in the production of scholarly publications, which will in turn facilitate and advance their visibility in inter/national scholarship. The following section presents the definitions of the key terms that are used frequently throughout the thesis.

1.8 Definition of Key Terms

**Inner Circle:** Countries where English is the dominant language (e.g., Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom) (Kachru, 1985).

**Periphery:** Countries where English is used as a second or foreign language (e.g., Russia, China).

The following section presents a blueprint of the constituent chapters of the thesis and the issues that will be discussed in each chapter.

1.9 Thesis Organization

The following is a short description of the subjects presented in the following chapters of this thesis: Chapter two, Review of the Related Literature, provides an in-depth review of
the literature and research into writing for scholarly publication, and related trends, practices, and processes; Chapter three, Methodology, presents the methodological framework of the study, research design, participant recruitment criteria, data collection methods, and analytical framework; Chapter four, Findings, presents the findings of the research study; Chapter five, Discussion, discusses my interpretation of the findings in light of the theoretical framework, existing literature, and research questions; and Chapter six, Conclusion, summarizes key aspects of the study, presents the study’s implications for policy and practice, and suggests directions for further research.
Chapter 2

2 Review of the Related Literature

2.1 Overview

Academic productivity has become one of the inherent requirements of global scholarship, and scholarly publication has turned into “the major marker of productivity in academia”; it is also a significant determinant of the efficiency of both individual scholars and academic institutions (Belcher, 2009, p. 2). Traditionally, inspirations for scholarly publication mainly came from the classical mission of academia, as well as scholarly and ethical responsibilities of academics for knowledge production and dissemination (McGrail et al., 2006). However, in the current global context of scholarship, material rewards and instrumental motivations seem to justify writing and publishing practices of scholars to a greater extent.

Scholarly publication presents academics with a number of merits at both individual and social levels. From an individual perspective, it projects academic identity and status, and scholarly publications are “outputs to give self-worth and reputation, to achieve desired outcomes, and to have an impact” (Gevers, Mati, Mouton, Page-Shipp, Hammes & Pourid, 2006, p. 107; Kapp & Albertyn, 2008). It can also lead to rewards such as credits for continuing professional education, financial rewards, and peer and professional respect (Hodges, 2004). Lucas and Willinsky (2010) state that “scholarly publishing is a matter of public value and public good” (p. 352). From a social perspective, it promotes public discourse and disseminates research findings to the general public (Kapp, Albertyn, &
Frick, 2011). Peat, Elliott, Baur, and Keena (2002) refer to a number of reasons for writing and publishing research including: worthiness of the research results, progress of scientific thought, self-promotion and development, dissemination of knowledge to a broad audience, and ethical responsibility of the researcher to report the results.

Although this orientation to more instrumental and external motivations can be interpreted and analyzed differently (e.g., as the toll of globalization on academia, marketization of academia, etc.), neither pessimistic nor optimistic interpretation change the facts that (a) scholars all over the world are under extensive and ever-increasing pressure for scholarly publication and dissemination of knowledge, and more importantly; (b) in spite of inherent merits and instrumental benefits of scholarly publication (and the inclusionary or exclusionary forces behind it), writing dysfunction and publishing impotency are rampant in academia (Belcher, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Saracho, 2013). The following sections will deal with a short history of writing dysfunction in academia, research on writing for scholarly publication, publication practices of EAL scholars, the attitudes towards the status of Anglophone scholar in academia, doctoral writing for scholarly publication, and writing for scholarly publication pedagogy.

2.2 Chronic Dysfunction

“Writing dysfunction is common in academia” (Belcher, 2009, p. 1)

It could be argued that all academics with good first degrees and higher degrees will have developed the ability to write for scholarly publication. However, this assumption was questioned as long ago as 1987, when Boice established 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 et al., 2008, p. 119)

In his seminal work, 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) (i.e., only the “fittest” writers survive). However, he argues that the best answer to the above question “may be that we are only beginning to understand the reasons” (p. 8). He thinks that academia has been slow to help scholars, “especially to make writing for publication easier and more democratic” (p. 8). Boice’s (1990) account highlights the chronic nature of writing dysfunction in academia and the fact that academia could have played a more active and accountable role in dealing with such an important issue.

Reviewing the literature on writing for scholarly publication since then, it seems that some of Boice’s (1990) observations and the issues that he highlighted still hold true two and a half decades later. That is, (a) the general assumption that writing for scholarly publication is what academics can do, and do naturally and willingly, is still out there (Kapp et al., 2011); and (b) in spite of personal reasons and institutional forces behind writing for scholarly publication, and its inherent multidimensional benefits, “many researchers and
prospective authors approach writing with antipathy and fear”, and only a minority of academics are functioning normally in terms of writing for scholarly publication (Belcher, 2009; Brewer, Marmon, & McMahan-Landers, 2004, p. 16; Kapp et al., 2011). However, the growing research and literature on writing for scholarly publication over the past fifteen years definitely indicates that academia is no longer ignoring the key question that why only a minority of academics write for publication (Boice, 1990). More importantly, our knowledge on different aspects of writing for scholarly publication is not conjectural anymore but is based on empirical research which will be discussed in the following section.

2.3 Research on Writing for Scholarly Publication

Research articles on writing for scholarly publication can be categorized into three areas in the literature: (a) guidelines for novice authors; (b) writing for scholarly publication interventions; and (c) journal editors’ perspectives on scholarly publication (Kapp et al., 2011). The following subsections provide an overview of each area.

2.3.1 Guidelines for Novice Authors

The guidelines for novice authors address both writing and publishing aspects of scholarly publication. Henson (2001) presents a series of suggestions regarding writing for publication including: identifying specific goal(s), targeting similar journals, budgeting time efficiently, negotiating with journal gatekeepers, paying attention to style and format, and submission processes. Driscoll and Driscoll (2002) summarize four questions that novice writers need to address when writing for publication: “1. Can I write already? 2.
What should I write about? 3. Who is going to read it? 4. How should I write it?” (p. 146). Derntl (2003) outlines the publication process in journals and conference proceedings, and provides guidelines to novice scholars for writing, organizing, and publishing scholarly papers.

Brewer et al. (2004) provide basic advice for writing for publication for novice faculty members and graduate students. They advise that writing be considered as a process and be conceptualized in three stages: pre-writing, writing, and rewriting. Identifying topic, envisioning audience, articulating purpose, crafting thesis statement, outlining major points, and collecting information are the constituent steps of the pre-writing stage. The focus of the writing stage is to put words on paper and to convey the message. The re-writing stage consists of the revision of structure and correction of technical errors. Griffin-Sobel (2005) provides a series of guidelines about writing for publication for novice writers including: selecting a topic, organizing ideas, targeting a journal, gaining rapport with experienced writers, drafting, and editing. Drawing upon his surveys, personal experience, and academic writing for publication workshops, Henson (2007) offers a set of suggestions for novice writers on basic issues of publication such as the process of publication, manuscript organization, selection of the appropriate journal for publication, and negotiation with journal editors and gatekeepers. He also refers to two major mistakes in writing for publication practices of novice writers: (a) their efforts to impress editors rather than their readers; and (b) their unfamiliarity with target journals. Outlining the editorial process, Happell (2011) focuses on responding to reviewers’ comments and provides guidelines for negotiation with journal gatekeepers in the publication process. Brenninkmeijer, Eitner, and Floege (2012) enumerate the ten necessary aspects of writing
a paper for publication as research and data collection, authorship, journal selection, journal guidelines, presentation, ethical issues, paper organization, completion, submission and review process, and negotiation with journal gatekeepers. They elaborate on each of these steps and explain how attention to them facilitates writing and publication processes.

2.3.2 Writing for Publication Interventions and Support Strategies

Another body of literature addresses support mechanisms that facilitate induction and participation of emerging scholars in scholarly publication. Heinrich, Neese, Rogers, and Facente (2004) believe that most of their new Master’s students consider scholarly writing as number one on the list of their greatest fears; they also believe that these students lack the knowledge and skill needed for academic writing, and need support for scholarly publication. Heinrich, Neese, Rogers, and Facente (2004) developed “a writing for publication” workshop introducing students to the publishing process. They see writing for publication as a “learned skill that takes instruction, time, and practice” (p. 139). Gould, Katzmarek, and Shaw (2007) report on the experiences and challenges of three novice faculty members when writing for publication, and their strategies and shared efforts in dealing with those obstacles (e.g., forming a writing group as their community of practice). In their regular meetings, these junior scholars shared and discussed challenges regarding revision and resubmission processes, complexities of transition from creative writing to academic writing, and psychological barriers (e.g., fear of judgment, rejection, and comparison, as well as self-doubt). Murray and Newton (2008) describe a writing for publication course for allied health professionals, and evaluate the long-term outcomes of the course for participants. The findings indicated that the participants found the course
useful in improving their skills and confidence, and increasing their publications. They also highlighted the need for continuous support. Kapp et al. (2011) also describe a workshop in South Africa in which novice academic writers from different disciplinary backgrounds were provided with hands-on coaching in writing for publication. The participants reported personal, career, and institutional benefits, and found the workshop effective in improving writing for publication skills. These studies highlight that emerging scholars need ongoing institutional and peer support for learning and improving writing for publication and initiation into publication mainstream. The following section deals with the editors’ perspectives on academic publication.

2.3.3 Journal Editors’ Perspectives on Scholarly Publication

Literature also presents academic journal editors’ opinions on different aspects of writing for publication. In a survey study, Freda and Kearny (2005) describe the editorial responsibilities and experiences of editors, and seek their perspectives on efficient editorial strategies and practices. Editors in this study believed that they had an influential role in preserving academic excellence and integrity; however, many referred to challenges such as pressures to meet deadlines and journal contributors’ poor writing. Drawing on surveys with the editors of educational journals, Henson (2005) discusses a number of axioms for effective writing for publication. He highlights that: (a) writing for publication can be learned from various sources; (b) lack of “substance” can contribute to the manuscript not being accepted for publication; just as (c) the lack of a positive attitude towards writing for publication can be a debilitating factor for would-be writers; and (d) writers must be committed to serving readers rather than impressing editors. In a study in South Africa,
Kapp et al. (2011) seek journal editors’ experiences and perspectives on barriers to novice academic writers’ writing for publication. Journal editors highlighted style and language, lack of focus, poor contextualization, non-compliance with journal submission guidelines, research design, and inappropriate content for the journal as the most common errors made by novice writers and, consequently, as challenges for their gaining acceptance in target academic discourse communities. Novice academic writers highlighted their fears about the quality of their work (fear of rejection, of criticism, and of exposure of their weaknesses) and unfamiliarity with the peer review process as their most common challenges.

A review of the growing literature on writing for scholarly publication highlights the fact that the scholarly publication practices of EAL scholars have been the key concern and the central issue in this domain over the past two decades; it follows that this dimension constitutes the most considerable part of the existing literature on writing for scholarly publication. This imbalance can optimistically be interpreted as a gesture of good will on the part of academia to “help its own” and “to make writing for publication easier and more democratic” (Boice, 1990, p. 8). The following overview of the reason(s) for this extensive attention to peripheral EAL scholars and their writing and publishing practices not only clarifies why their participation in global scholarship has been in the centre of so much focus, but also justifies the rationale for the current inquiry and its related arguments.

#### 2.4 EAL Peripheral Scholars in Focus

Research into writing for scholarly publication is entangled with the status of English and its role as the medium of academic discourse, and as a result, the status of EAL scholars in
global scholarship. The “irresistible rise of English” (Uzuner, 2008, p. 254) in global scholarship and its pivotal role as “the default language of Science and academic research and dissemination” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 1) are often attributed to factors such as globalization, political and economic benefits, and the geopolitical status of the United States and Britain (Hyland, 2009a; Lillis & Curry, 2010). This may be true to some extent as “the reason a language becomes a global language has little to do with the number of people who speak it as a first language, but with who those speakers are” (Crystal, 2003, p. 7). However, issues of “prevalence” and “domination” need to be differentiated when talking about the dominance of English (Ammon, 2001).

Attitudes and interpretations towards the status of English in academia and academic publication are mainly split between those who see it as “self-interested pragmatism” (Hyland, 2015, p. 48) and acknowledge the communicatively unifying and facilitative merits of English as an academic lingua franca, and those that blame it as a source of unfair favouritism towards Anglophone scholars (i.e., “linguistic hegemony” or “cultural imperialism”) (Ferguson et al., 2011; Hyland, 2009a). Apart from any stance or attitude towards expansionary forces behind the spread of English, the fact remains that English has become the medium of access to academic discourse communities and dissemination of scholarly knowledge in academia, and publication in English has become the major marker of a scholar's productivity and academic achievement (Huang, 2010; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Uzuner, 2008). As Hyland (2015) puts it, “[i]ndeed, writing in English is now more than a choice of language; it has come to designate research of a high academic quality deemed worthy of a place in globally accessible peer-reviewed journals” (p. 45). This status of English in global scholarship has given rise to two major issues: (a) concerns over the
diminishing importance of other languages in academic and scholarly domains; and (b) concerns over the status and visibility of peripheral EAL scholars in global academic fora compared to their Anglophone peers (Ferguson et al., 2011). These points beg the question of why peripheral EAL scholars are so important to global scholarship.

In spite of the non-native status of EAL scholars, their pivotal role in global scholarship, and their unique insights and perspectives owing to their peripheral status and situated knowledge are undeniable (Canagarajah, 1996; Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 2001; Uzuner, 2008). Their participation and contributions expand and enrich the knowledge repertoire of mainstream academic communities, boosting knowledge production and dissemination processes; whereas, limiting their visibility impoverishes the global scholarly knowledge base (Liu, 2004; Uzuner, 2008). Consequently, the identification of hurdles, challenges, and mechanisms that influence and promote their participation and contributions to global scholarship is of paramount importance (Flowerdew, 2000). Therefore, the growing research into the writing for scholarly publication practices of EAL scholars is in reaction to the above-mentioned concerns and exigencies (Pérez-Llantada, Plo & Ferguson, 2011).

Uzuner (2008) provides a review of empirical research on the academic participation of EAL scholars in global scholarship through research and article publication. Empirical research into multilingual scholars’ academic writing and publishing in English dates back to St. John’s (1987) pioneering work on the practices of 30 Spanish scholars. Since then, interest in EAL academics’ publishing experiences and practices in global scholarship, especially in mainstream academic communities has grown (Uzuner, 2008). Studies in this domain highlight two major threads which will be discussed in the following subsections.
2.4.1 Attitudinal Perspectives

The attitudinal perspectives of established and emerging EAL scholars, and of journal editors, on the spread of English and its consequences on the status and academic writing for publication practices of EAL scholars have been explored and investigated in a number of studies. They have been conducted in different academic contexts, and used various methodological approaches, especially survey of attitudes (Braine, 2005; Casanave, 1998; Cho, 2004; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Ferguson et al., 2011; Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2001; Huang, 2010; Tardy, 2004). The following reflects the attitude of one of Hyland's (2015) Hong Kong informants on the issue:

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 where I can write in such a sophisticated way that the reviewers of prestigious journals would like to publish my manuscript. (p. 54)

Research in this area provides a mixed picture of EAL scholars’ attitudes. In other words, “while many academics complain that writing in English is time-consuming and laborious”; subjects them to extensive linguistic and non-linguistic constraints; and puts them at a disadvantage in terms of participating in global scholarship compared to Inner Circle Anglophone scholars, “substantial numbers feel no disadvantage at all.” (Hyland, 2015, p. 54; Huang, 2010). Moreover, EAL scholars consider English as the most prestigious and significant language for scholarly publication.
2.4.2 Challenges of Writing for Scholarly Publication

Research into the struggles that peripheral EAL scholars face in writing for scholarly purposes and identifying the nature of those challenges as the determinants of their attitudes constitutes another major thread in research and literature in this domain. The literature divides EAL scholars’ struggles for writing for publication into discursive (linguistic) and non-discursive (non-linguistic) categories (Ferguson, 2007) which follow respectively.

2.4.2.1 Discursive challenges

Hyland (2015) points out the “importance of linguistic skills” for scholarly publication and highlights that linguistic issues such as “lexis and syntax can certainly complicate the task for EAL authors” (p. 59). The following quotation from Canagarajah (2002) also indicates other aspects of the discursive challenges that EAL peripheral scholars face in scholarly publication.

[T]he academic community adopts strict gate-keeping practices in the publication of papers in the leading research journals. We know that reviewers and editors don’t show much tolerance towards divergence from standard discourses in the field. Even variations in dialect in English articles are treated as errors, leading to the rejection of submissions from periphery writers. Others who have attempted to publish critical perspectives on dominant constructs testify to facing considerable resistance from the academic community. Bazerman’s (1987) chronicling of the growth of the APA Publication Manual from six and a half pages in 1929 to 200
pages in 1983 indicates how the policies and requirements of journals have become tighter. (p. 39)

Other studies also indicate that discursive conventions of academic English and discipline-specific knowledge are major sources of struggle and source of disadvantage for EAL scholars. To his surprise as a researcher and academic paper reviewer, Flowerdew (1999a, p. 138) finds that the majority of participants rated technical problems with English as the major challenge. Abstract aspects of writing such as “organizational factors, innovative thinking, difficulty in incorporating the existing literature, and weighing the value of existing literature” (p. 138) were considered as a challenge only by a minority of the participants. Flowerdew (1999b) refers to a number of problems and challenges that EAL participants felt subjected them to a disadvantage compared to their Anglophone peers: they had limited ability to express themselves in a complex manner, needed a longer time to write, had less variety in their vocabulary and diction, had less ability to make strong claims for their arguments and findings, referred to the influence of their first language in the composition process, found writing qualitative articles more challenging compared to quantitative ones, felt they should restrict themselves to a simple style of writing, and found introduction and discussion sections as the most challenging parts of academic articles. In a comparative study, Braine (2005) investigates how Cantonese-speaking academics and expatriate Anglophone academics working alongside each other in Hong Kong compared and contrasted in terms of their academic publications when academic resources such as libraries, research funding, databases, and research assistants were equally accessible for both groups. He highlighted expatriate academics’ insights into the current issues and interests of their academic communities and their ability to persuade journal editors and
reviewers of the global significance of their local research as major factors for achieving publication. In other words, in addition to generic conventions of their disciplines, local academics’ awareness of “the conversations” of their disciplines affected their ability to establish the centrality of their research and consequently, constrained their visibility in the academic forum (Bazerman 1985; Swales, 1990).

The existent literature also documents tougher challenges for emerging EAL scholars who seek to publish their work in English-only journals (Belcher, 2007; Casanave, 1998; Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Tardy, 2004). Given both their unfamiliarity with genre-specific and discipline-specific expectations, and their novice peripheral status, these emerging scholars experience a double disadvantage compared to their established EAL peers.

Highlighting concepts such as "dialogue," "topic," and "voice", the Hong Kong non-Anglophone doctoral graduate in Flowerdew’s (2000) study described his scholarly publication challenges as stemming from linguistic difficulties and a lack of access to the mainstream discourse community. Cho’s (2004) findings also indicated that participants had linguistic difficulties in areas such as writing their research reports in English. They sought assistance from native speakers to revise their drafts. One participant was disappointed by his academic writing proficiency. Because of their linguistic difficulties and limitations, Cho’s (2004) participants preferred quantitative research to qualitative research. This finding supports the findings of Flowerdew (1999b) in which the participants found quantitative research less challenging than qualitative research. In her study of the perspectives of international graduate students in an American university, Tardy (2004) reports that the participants were frustrated with learning a second language and the
complexities of clear communication in English. That is, they thought that non-Anglophone scholars needed a long time for developing English literacy and faced more serious difficulties in expressing themselves in English.

In a qualitative case study, Li (2006b) investigates the writing for publication practices of a non-Anglophone doctoral student of physics. The findings highlighted challenges such as language barriers, unfamiliarity with current disciplinary discussions, and negotiating and communicating with journal gatekeepers. Li (2007) investigates the writing for publication experiences of a non-Anglophone doctoral student studying chemistry in mainland China. The challenges that this novice scholar encountered in writing in English for academic publication included unfamiliarity with the genre of research article and generic aspects of different parts of the journal article for example sorting out his data and claims. Li (2006a) analyzes the Chinese and English versions of a single paper written by a Chinese doctoral student in a science program. The student used a major reference as a template for language and rhetorical structure and modelled her writing accordingly. The findings indicated that the student had difficulties with the rhetorical structure and committed textual plagiarism. That is, she was not aware of generic variations between different kinds of academic papers and used long stretches of the major reference in her own writing.

2.4.2.2 Non-discursive challenges

The existent literature also highlights non-discursive challenges of established and emerging EAL scholars for writing for scholarly publication. Drawing on his own experience, Canagarajah (1996) highlights limited access to up-to-date literature as a
serious challenge for peripheral scholars which makes their contributions to disciplinary discussions out of date for core academic communities. The doctoral student in Lee and Norton (2003) highlighted her concerns including pressures and fear of scholarly publication, rejection, and exposure to larger discourse community as a newcomer to academia. A third of the participants in Flowerdew’s (1999a) study blamed biases by referees and editors as well as publishers’ roles in putting them at a disadvantage in writing for scholarly publication. The participant in Flowerdew (2000) also complained about the attitudes of journal editors toward his non-native status as a determining factor in rejecting the paper. However, all but one of Cho’s (2004) participants felt that reviewers and journals treated them fairly, and that their non-Anglophone status did not work against them. The international graduate students participating in Tardy’s (2004) study were also aware of non-linguistic factors affecting scholarly publication such as biases towards EAL research. Li (2006b) focuses on sociopolitical aspects of writing for scholarly publication and reports how power dynamics inherent in a non-Anglophone doctoral student’s relationships with his academic context, professor, and journal gatekeepers influenced his writing for academic publication process. The findings of Casanave (1998) indicated that novice Japanese scholars who completed graduate studies in the United States and returned to work at a university in Japan encountered the dilemma of needing to balance their academic writing for publication practices in both Japanese and English since they needed recognition, a reputation, and networking at both local and international levels. They adopted the strategy of translating their English publications into Japanese to manage this double pressure.
As noted earlier, a review of the literature in this domain leaves no doubt that EAL scholars are definitely the main focus in research into writing for scholarly publication. In that way, they are *advantaged* compared to their Anglophone peers. Moreover, studies indicate that EAL scholars’ participation in global scholarship is on the rise. However, the predominant sense is still that scholars from Kachru’s (1985) outer and expanding circles are the victims of geolinguistic injustices compared to “lucky Anglophone fellows” in the Inner Circle (English-dominant countries) (Benfield & Feak, 2006; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Swales, 2004). The following section will problematize the notion of linguistic advantage of Anglophone scholars with regards to writing for scholarly publication.

### 2.5 Lucky-Anglophone-Fellow Syndrome

The “*Lucky Anglophone Fellow*” syndrome framing the theoretical lens of researchers in this domain has given rise to a dominant discourse which has (a) portrayed the Inner Circle as a haven in which academic publication is taken for granted, guaranteed, and happens naturally and willingly; and consequently (b) led to an EAL-dominant approach to research in which the publication practices of Anglophone scholars in the Inner Circle have been overlooked, under-represented, and under-researched. Hyland (2009a) refers to this governing discourse, stating that “all newcomers feel challenged and intimidated by writing for publication”; however, “attention has largely focused on the obstacles faced by non-native English speaking researchers in getting into print” (p. 86). Amid such a dominant discourse, it is of utmost significance to take into account that (a) academic English has no native speakers, and academic literacy is not part of Anglophone scholars’ innate repertoire, but needs to be acquired and nurtured (Ferguson et al., 2011; Hyland,
2015; Kachru, 2009; Mauranen, Hynninen & Ranta, 2010); (b) “writing is not in every researcher's talent pool” (Derntl, 2003, p. 1) and as previously noted “native English speakers rarely receive help with academic writing during their university careers and are often less ‘academically bilingual’ than many NNESs [non-native English speakers]” (Hyland, 2009a, p. 85); and (c) Anglophone scholars have to cope with the same “publish or perish” policy in academia, especially novice scholars who are at the beginning of their academic careers.

Although part of the problems and challenges that peripheral EAL scholars experience, especially non-discursive ones (Canagarajah, 1996), may sound intangible or even overdramatized to Anglophone scholars in well-resourced institutions, scholarly publication cannot be taken for granted by virtue of native speaker status or membership in prestigious Inner Circle institutions of Higher Education (Belcher, 2007; Ferguson et al., 2011; Uzuner, 2008). This argument provides the first rationale for the current study and necessitates in-depth research into writing for scholarly publication practices and academic literacy education of Anglophone scholars in the Inner Circle countries, especially junior scholars. In addition to the significance of paying attention to the academic literacy education of novice scholars (Hyland, 2009a), the growing research interest in writing for scholarly publication practices of doctoral students over the past five years, and the scant literature on the writing for publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students in particular, provide the second rationale for the centrality of this inquiry which will be addressed in the following section.
2.6 Doctoral Students & Writing for Scholarly Publication

Although faculty and doctoral students have mixed opinions on whether doctoral students must publish during their doctoral candidature or from their dissertations before graduation, scholarly publication seems to have become a major expectation and requirement in doctoral education. 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). Just like well-established members of academic discourse communities, writing for scholarly publication includes a mixed bag of merits, motivations, risks, and pressures for doctoral students.

Kamler (2008) states 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). Kwan (2010) underlines the significance of doctoral publishing for prospective academic positions and employment in the competitive context of academia. Similarly, Casanave (2010) highlights that “[p]ublishing needs to start early if we are to compete in an increasingly tight job market” (p. 47). Watts (2012) discusses 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 as well. Enhancing one’s resume and profile, and achieving status and credibility in a research domain, are the extrinsic motivations. Boosting self-confidence, gaining self-satisfaction, and developing and organizing ideas are the intrinsic ones. Scholarly publication also contributes to shaping an established scholarly identity (Barnacle & Mewburn, 2010; Rugg & Petre, 2004).

Referring to 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). Watts (2012) refers to the “risk-laden” nature of writing for publication as well. 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 states that doctoral students need to be informed of the inherent risks of writing for publication. She also underlines that “guidance about rejection rates, review processes and the likely timeline from submission to publication is valuable” (p. 1105), and states that it is a significant, yet overlooked, responsibility of supervisors to inform students about relevant and target journals in their fields. There is also extensive pressure for publication in the course of and beyond doctoral candidature (Kwan, 2010; Lee & Kamler, 2008; Yates, 2010). Writing is a challenging aspect of doctoral work, and “many academics fear
will be judged inadequate because their writing fails to pass muster in the eyes of their peers; such feelings are even more acute for doctoral students” (Hunt, 2001; Kamler, 2008, p. 291). The graduate participants in Kamler’s (2008) study expressed anxiety when reflecting on doctoral writing and publication. They felt that “the whole process was one of tremendous effort and struggle” (p. 290). Casanave (2010) presented astonishment at “the packed and pressured lives” (p. 48) of most of her doctoral students. She enumerated heavy teaching loads, personal responsibilities, 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 Anglophone and non-Anglophone doctoral students were dealing with. Therefore, she is hesitant about “jumping on the publishing bandwagon” (p. 48) during the doctorate. Highlighting “an increase in publication-related anxiety among graduate students”, Paré (2010) believes that “the anxiety to publish” (p. 30) can be counterproductive for students rather than helpful.

In spite of the ever-increasing expectations and pressures on junior scholars, and considering possible writing for scholarly publication dysfunction in doctoral programs and among doctoral students (Jones, 2013; Kamler, 2008, p. 283; Lee & Kamler, 2008), a review of the literature on the writing for scholarly publication practices of doctoral students does not yield many findings. Moreover, the growing research in this domain has focused on practices and challenges of EAL doctoral students (Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Tardy, 2004). Therefore, just like their senior peers, novice EAL scholars have been definitely in the core and inner circle of research on writing for scholarly publication and, thus in a way advantaged, compared to their Anglophone peers.
It seems that academia has been slow to support and help Anglophone novice scholars in this respect. The following section will focus on the pedagogy of writing for scholarly publication in current academia.

2.7 Writing for Scholarly Publication & Pedagogy

Underlining the “unique and paradoxical” nature of learning at the doctoral level, Cotterall (2011) explains that doctoral education “typically includes formal and informal elements, proceeds through instruction and autonomous discovery, and can be intensely individual and quintessentially social. Nowhere are these paradoxes more apparent than in doctoral candidates’ experience of writing” (p. 413). Foregrounding the significance and stressful nature of writing in doctoral education, she stresses “the importance of good pedagogy in supporting the development of scholarly writing in the doctorate.” (p. 413). She highlights that “[m]ost doctoral candidates therefore require assistance if they are to become competent and confident scholarly writers” (p. 413). However, she argues the key issues involve where the help should come from, and what form it should take. The following subsections present different pedagogical approaches, practices, and strategies in the existent literature that can scaffold learning scholarly publication. Some of those practices such as writing for scholarly publication workshops are discussed in section 2.3.2. (Writing for Publication Interventions and Support Strategies, e.g., Heinrich et al., 2004; Gould et al., 2007; Murray & Newton, 2008; Kapp et al., 2011).
2.7.1 Mentorship

The key role of expert and peer support in the scholarly production of doctoral students is stressed in the literature. Lee and Norton (2003) presents a successful example of mentorship between a doctoral candidate and her supervisor where the supervisor demystifies different aspects and inherent challenges of scholarly publication including targeting an appropriate journal, (co)authorship, and the review process for her novice student. Delamont, Atkinson, and Parry (2004) believe that “graduate students and their supervisors have joint interests and responsibilities towards publication in the promotion of the research itself and sponsorship of the student” (p. 171). Kamler and Thomson (2006) discuss that mentorship creates:

a space in which both doctoral researchers and supervisors are learning selves in transition. This is a social and relational space in which performance (experience, dialogue, writing) allows the dynamic ‘smudge’ of learning, the movement from one knowing-beings to another. (p. 19)

In spite of the significance of mentorship in the induction of doctoral students into scholarly publication stream, Paré (2010) highlights two key issues that need to be taken into account in a publication-focused, apprenticeship-based pedagogy. First, “students who aspire to the scholarly life are already in [italics in the original] a version of their eventual workplace … [and] in a form of apprenticeship, working under the mentorship of (presumably) successful old-timers” (p. 36). However, such a 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” (p. 31). That is,

[a] pedagogy that supports the publication of doctoral work requires 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)

He also highlights “automaticity” as “a hallmark of expertise” (p. 37) and as a problematic issue in this case where people can do things without being able to explain them and consequently, opens the possibility of such pedagogy without knowledgeable teachers into question.

Perhaps this is not surprising, since we know that fluency in language does not require expressible knowledge of the linguistic system employed, and the same seems likely for rhetorical skill: one can make an effective argument without being able to explain how one is doing it. But can a pedagogy for publishing be developed without instructors who have the ability to articulate the rhetorical practices that students are being asked to master? (p. 37)

Second, Paré (2010) argues that writers go through “a gradual process of enculturation” to learn rhetorical norms and conventions of their target communities. It is “a form of osmosis that occurs over time as newcomers become situated in a community’s rhetorical action” (p. 37). However, a “pedagogy devoted to helping doctoral students publish during [italics in the original] their programme of study assumes that the process of learning to participate in a discipline’s discourse can be accelerated.” The key issue here is “how that might be
accomplished?” (p. 37). Drawing on a doctoral student’s account of his experience as an assistant editor, he exemplifies how the student’s level of engagement was “promoted and supported by his doctoral committee members” (p. 38) who were involved in writing and publishing themselves and could provide him with the necessary mentorship.

The literature highlights co-publication with faculty members as an important form of apprenticeship and mentorship. Investigating the inherent merits and costs of collaborative research and co-publication with faculty mentors from graduate students’ perspectives, Lei and Chuang (2009) highlight benefits such as valuable expert advice, learning negotiation strategies with journal gatekeepers, learning the politics of scholarly publication, and visibility enhancement for graduate students. They also refer to costs such as differences between graduate students and faculty mentors in terms of character and perspective on collaboration and co-publication, power dynamics in terms of workload and authorship, and lack of financial payment for research work. They believe that the merits of collaborative research and co-publication with faculty mentors exceed the costs. However, “research suggests that, unless they [doctoral students] are working with prominent advisors, they are less likely to publish early in their careers, especially in top tier journals” (Hyland, 2015, pp. 186-7). Moreover, “individual supervisors vary considerably in the support they give to writing for publication during and after the doctorate as do different disciplinary communities” (Kamler, 2008, p. 284). Kamler (2008) argues that in order to “scaffold doctoral publication” (p. 283), co-authorship with faculty supervisors needs to be reconceptualized as an important pedagogic practice within disciplinary structures.

Another literature discusses writing support groups as an important pedagogical framework for learning writing for scholarly publication. Aitchison (2010) describes writing groups as
“vibrant learning environments where pedagogical practices are based on a view of writing as socially situated practice” (p. 99). She argues that:

[ w]riting groups are paradoxical because, on the one hand, they are of themselves discrete communities of scholars, and at the same time they double as places for practising and communicating with other external scholarly communities. These external communities can include supervisors, academic peers, funding panels and the gatekeepers (editors and reviewers) of particular scholarly journals and networks of academic publishing. (p. 89)

Underlining that “writing group practices remain under-studied” (p. 83), Aitchison (2010) highlights the benefits of writing support groups in scaffolding learning and fostering peer critique and feedback exchange. She explains that “peer interaction in writing groups is doubly powerful because peers test and extend their conceptual knowledge as well as their capacity to communicate this knowledge through writing” (p. 87). Other literature also highlights the significant role of faculty and peer critique and feedback exchange in facilitating academic writing and improving scholarly output by doctoral students (Caffarella & Barnett, 2000; Thein & Beach, 2010).

The literature also highlights the key role of course instructors and the importance of coursework in mentoring doctoral students and orienting them towards scholarly publication. Drawing on her “Working Papers publication” project in a doctoral program at an American university in Japan, Casanave (2010) highlights “dovetailing” as a pedagogical framework in which “[r]eading, class work, thinking, and work on dissertations can be merged to some extent” and students’ coursework and writings can
feed into dissertation work and “be compiled into an ‘intermediate’ publication” (p. 55). She argues that professors can support and encourage interested students to connect their class work, dissertation, and publication practices “rather than see their work as fragmented and unrelated to dissertation and publication” (p. 55). She highlights faculty and peer feedback, low-risk revising, editing, and publishing opportunities, familiarity with discursive, social, and political aspects of writing and negotiation as advantages and valuable learning experiences of such intermediate practices. The literature also highlights the significance of institutional policies and practices in promoting scholarly publication.

2.7.2 Institutional Support

Academic institutions can play a key role in supporting doctoral students for learning scholarly publication (Kamler & Thomson, 2006). Keen (2007) believes that attention to the development of academic writing in general, and writing for scholarly publication in particular, may result in the improvement of students’ writing abilities and benefit faculty and academic institutions, and boost research and knowledge production and dissemination. McGrail et al., (2006) recommend “that universities support the development of structured interventions for their staff in order to increase their writing for publication” (p. 34). They thought that “a regular, ongoing arrangement seems to be most beneficial” (p. 34). Kapp et al. (2011) argue that promoting scholarship in academic institutions requires “capacity building/enhancing skills” at three levels: policy making for scholarly publishing, support provision such as writing for publication workshops, and writing for publication interventions. They highlight the role of intervention in teaching the required skills and its effectiveness for alleviating the challenges of writing for publication.
Hyland (2015) reports that because of the importance of scholarly productivity for academic ranking and government funding, many academic institutions have started offering interventions like writing for scholarly publication courses for their staff. He explains that such courses are informed by English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP), a newly developed branch within English for academic purposes (EAP), and are aimed to prepare novice scholars, especially doctoral students, for scholarly publication and “shortcut the painful and lengthy processes of learning by experience” (p. 186). He underlines that although the general assumption might be that such courses answer the needs of EAL scholars, “many scholars, irrespective of their ‘first language’ may find such instruction helpful” (p. 186). He adds that ERPP instruction is genre-based and the courses generally focus on publishable genres, especially the journal article genre, and the content is varied ranging from discipline-specific issues, formal and structural aspects of text, affective aspects of writing (e.g., raising confidence and authority) to negotiation and review process. ERPP courses need to be facilitated by an experienced English teacher “who does not share a professional relationship with the students. This allows the instructor to bring an informed but impartial perspective to the students’ texts” (Hyland 2015, p. 188). ERPP courses provide a peer-supportive environment where students exchange critical feedback and develop knowledge of socio-rhetorical aspects of scholarly writing and publishing through various consciousness-raising tasks.

### 2.8 Summary

There is no doubt that institutional policies and pedagogical practices play a key role in the promotion of writing for scholarly publication, and doctoral education is the right venue
for such policies and practices (Kamler, 2008; Kapp et al., 2011; Lei & Chuang, 2009; Murray et al., 2008). However, such policies and practices will only be helpful and fruitful if they are developed based on informed knowledge of the practices, needs, and challenges of doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication; not based on conjectural knowledge. By the same token, such informed knowledge emerges from systematic research and in-depth investigation into doctoral students’ writing for scholarly publication practices. This research aims to provide such informed knowledge into writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students in a Canadian higher education context. I will discuss the methodological aspects of the research including the design of the research, data collection, and data analysis in the following chapter.
3 Methodology

3.1 Overview

This chapter will discuss the methodological framework of the study, focusing on the rationales behind selecting the specific methodological approach, and the design. It will also discuss the preparatory measures I took into account when conducting the research, the methods that I used to collect the data, and the analytic and interpretive framework that I adopted to analyze the data.

3.2 Research Plan: Qualitative Research

The interdisciplinary focus of my research and the nature of my research questions required that I adopt an approach to research that (a) helped me explore issues that need to be explored; (b) provided an in-depth understanding of the issues raised and the contexts in which they occurred; (c) did not summarize the uniqueness of people and things in merely statistical measures and analyses; and (d) did not blind me to interactions among people (Creswell, 2007). That is, on the one hand, I needed a “complex [italics in the original], detailed understanding of the issue” that required collecting detailed data “in the field at the site where the participants experience the issue or problem under study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 37). On the other hand, the methodological framework of quantitative research and statistical analyses could not help capture individual perspectives and were not “sensitive” to individual differences, so “simply [did] not fit the problem” (Creswell, 2007,
Consequently, drawing on the guidelines presented in Creswell (2007) and Denzin and Lincoln (2005), I adopted the methodological framework of qualitative research. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) define qualitative research as:

a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (p. 3)

Creswell (2007) highlights that “qualitative research begins with assumptions, a worldview, the possible use of a theoretical lens, and the study of research problems inquiring into the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (p. 37). He explains that the characteristics of qualitative research include: (a) data collection is conducted “in a natural setting” instead of a laboratory and the researcher having direct interaction with participants; (b) the researcher is the instrument as they personally collect data; (c) the researcher uses several data sources such as documents, interviews, etc. to gather information; (d) data analysis is “inductive and establish[es] patterns or themes”; (e) the researcher focuses on “the meaning that the participants hold about the problem or issue, not the meaning that the researcher brings to the research or writes from the literature” (p. 39); (f) the researcher tries to “develop a complex picture of the problem or issue under the study. This involves reporting multiple perspectives, identifying the many
factors involved in a situation, and generally sketching the larger picture that emerges.” (p. 39); and (g) “the final written report or presentation include[s] the voices of participants, the reflexivity of the researcher, and a complex description and interpretation of the problem” (p. 37), contributes to the literature, and triggers action.

In light of these guidelines, the methodological framework of qualitative research connected best with my social constructivist epistemological and theoretical perspectives. Moreover, it allowed me to: (a) investigate the raised issues in a real world context; (b) construct reality through interaction with people in the real world and in the social context of my discourse community rather than looking for an external reality; (c) embrace the multiplicity and subjectivity of reality; (d) ignore “objective distance” and become an “insider” by putting myself in the research; (e) accept that my values, biases, and interpretations are part of my inquiry, and discuss them; and (f) adopt an inductive analytical framework (Creswell, 2007). Therefore, it was the right fit and a reliable point of departure for designing this inquiry and choosing appropriate research strategy which will be discussed in the next section.

3.3 Research Strategy: Case Study

Yin (1981) argues that in choosing the appropriate research strategy from the possible repertoire of empirical methods, the researcher should take a pluralistic approach, not a hierarchical one, and be aware that “each strategy is best suited to a different set of conditions, and each strategy is therefore likely to be favoured whenever such conditions prevail” (p. 98). Yin (2009) highlights that in selecting a research strategy “[a] common
misconception is that various research methods should be arrayed hierarchically” (p. 6). For example:

Many social scientists still deeply believe that case studies are only appropriate for the exploratory phase of an investigation, that surveys and histories are appropriate for the descriptive phase and that experiments are the only way of doing explanatory or causal inquiries. (p. 6)

However, he argues that “[d]istinguishing among the various research methods and their advantages and disadvantages may require going beyond the hierarchical stereotype” (p. 7). Therefore, all research methods can serve exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory purposes. Yin (2009) enumerates three conditions for identification of the best suited method for a research study: “(a) the type of research questions posed, (b) the extent of control an investigator has over behavioural events, and (c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events” (p. 8). Considering this inquiry in the light of these criteria and drawing on the methodological support of Creswell (2007), Denzin and Lincoln (2005), Patton (2002), Stake (2005), and Yin (1981, 1994, 2003, 2009), I decided that case study was the most advantageous method that could be chosen from the repertoire of empirical research strategies.

A case study is an exploration of a temporally and spatially “bounded system” (Merriam & Makower, 1988). Yin (2009) defines case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 18). He also argues that this method is advantageous when the nature of research questions are
explanatory (i.e., a “how” or a “why” question), and the investigator is researching “a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control” (p. 13). The methodological framework of case study research matched the conditions of this inquiry to a great extent. First, the focus of the research and nature of the questions were more explanatory; although exploration is an inherent characteristic of qualitative research in general (Creswell, 2007). Second, investigating writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students in a doctoral program was a contemporary event in a real-life context as opposed to a historical one. Third, although the influence of various sociocultural and institutional contexts experienced by participants in the case study was its focus, there was no control over the events or contextual conditions and variables in the doctoral program contexts (Stake, 2005).

Other characteristics of case study research contributed to data collection and data analysis phases of this inquiry as well. The fact that case study deals with situations “in which there will be many more variables than the data points” added an exploratory aspect to the inquiry and contributed to a thick description of the issues under investigation (Yin, 2009, p. 18). Case study also requires multiple sources of data and data convergence in a “triangulation fashion”, and the existence of previously developed theoretical propositions to inform the data collection and data analysis (Yin, 2009, p. 18). This allowed the adoption of various data collection methods and reliance on assorted sources of information. Data convergence and triangulation along with well-developed theoretical propositions contributed to the validation of this inquiry or what Lincoln and Guba (1985) call “credibility” as they believe that “the language of positivistic research is not congruent
with or adequate to qualitative work” (p. 95). That is, credibility is a more appropriate term than validity in qualitative research.

Yin (2009) has proposed a six-phase model for conducting a case study research. This model includes the: (a) plan; (b) design; (c) preparation; (d) data collection; (e) data analysis; and (f) presentation or report. A research design is a plan that “guides the investigator in the process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting observations. It is a logical model of proof [italics in the original] that allows the researchers to draw inferences concerning” relationships among different variables that they are investigating. (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1992, pp. 77-78). Every empirical study needs to have an explicit or implicit research design as it serves as a road map through which the researcher can track the transition of the study from research questions to the final report. Questions, propositions, unit(s) of analysis, the linkage of data to propositions, and interpretative criteria comprise the five constituent components of a research design (Yin, 2003).

Research questions provide the researcher with the necessary focus without which the researcher might not know what to cover about their case (Yin, 1994). This research study intended to look into writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students in a Canadian higher education context focusing on two overarching issues: (a) Why do Canadian Anglophone doctoral students find writing for scholarly publication challenging?; and (b) How do they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals? The two compatible theories of Discourse Community (Swales, 1990) and Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) provided the necessary propositional framework. This propositional framework guided the inquiry as to “where to look for relevant evidence” and informed data analysis and the interpretation of findings.
(Yin, 2009, p. 28). Writing for scholarly publication, the unit of analysis (case) in this case study, was also related to the way the research questions were defined (Yin, 2003).

Apart from the above-mentioned general characteristics of case study design, this research study needed to be framed within a specific design type. Stake (2005) categorizes case studies into intrinsic, instrumental, and collective case studies with an intrinsic case study focusing on investigating the particulars of a case, an instrumental case study investigating an issue about a case, and a collective case study addressing an issue in multiple case studies within a research study. Yin (2009) differentiates between single case and multiple case studies. “[A] single-case study is analogous to a single experiment” and this design is appropriate when the case (a)”represents the critical case [italics in the original] in testing a well-formed theory” where a single case “can confirm, challenge, or extend the theory”; (b) “represents an extreme or a unique [italics in the original] case” where a single case is “worth analyzing and documenting”; (c) is the representative or typical [italics in the original] case” where the purpose is to “capture the circumstances and conditions of an everyday or commonplace situation”; (d) is “the revelatory [italics in the original] case” when a researcher “has an opportunity to observe and analyze a phenomenon previously inaccessible to social science inquiry”; or (e) is “the longitudinal [italics in the original] case” where the same single case is studied “at two or more points in time” (pp. 47-49). Yin (2009) highlights that “a potential vulnerability of the single-case design is that a case may later turn out not to be the case it was thought to be at the outset” (pp. 49-50). When a study includes more than a single case, it has a multiple-case design. Compared with a single-case design, this design “can require extensive resources and time beyond the means of a single student or independent research investigator” (p. 53). Yin (2009) highlights that
in selecting multiple-case design “a major insight is to consider multiple cases as one would consider multiple experiments” [italics in the original]—that is, to follow a ‘replication’ design” (p. 53). In other words, “[e]ach case must be carefully selected so that it either (a) predicts similar results (a literal replication) [italics in the original] or (b) predicts contrasting results but for anticipateable reasons (a theoretical replication) [italics in the original]” (p. 54).

That is far different from a mistaken analogy in the past, which incorrectly considered multiple cases to be similar to the multiple respondents in a survey (or to the multiple subjects within an experiment)—that is, to follow a “sampling” design. (pp. 53-4)

Considering the current research in light of the above-mentioned guidelines, a single case design was adopted for the current research as it contributed to an in-depth understanding of the case (Creswell, 2007). The representative or typical rationale (c above) provided a reliable justification for this design as writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone novice scholars in a Canadian academic context could be representative or typical of scholarly publication practices of other emerging scholars and consequently “[t]he lessons learned from experiences of these cases [were] assumed to be informative about the experiences of the average person” (Yin, 2009, p. 48). Moreover, replication (literal or theoretical) as “the logic underlying the use of multiple case studies” (p. 54) did not simply justify the purpose of the current study. Therefore, multiple-case design was not the appropriate framework for the research study. Having decided on the most appropriate strategy for the research, I focused on a number of preparatory procedures for the data collection phase of the study which will be discussed in the following section.
3.3.1 Preparation for Data Collection

Before embarking on data collection, it was necessary to consider a set of preparatory steps or what Yin (2009) calls “the desired skills” (p. 67). Therefore, I took into account that it is imperative to: (a) ask good questions, interpret the answers well, keeping in mind that “research is about good questions and not necessarily about answers” (p. 70); (b) open my ears and not be misled by my own preconceptions; (c) be flexible and adapt to unexpected situations and consider them as opportunities instead of threats; (d) have a clear understanding of the issues that the research study intended to address; and (e) be open to contradictory evidence and not blinded by theoretical preconceptions. A review of the literature had helped me design good questions for both the questionnaire and the interviews. However, those questions defined the overall framework of the interviews and discussions with the informants. I was aware that because of the semi-structured nature of the interviews, the informants might stray away from the main focus of the questions. Therefore, I knew that I had to listen very closely to their arguments and comments, look for new information between the lines, pick up what was implied and inferred, and use those points to ask more focused and detailed questions. During a couple of interviews with faculty members and editors, I ran out of space on my audio recorder and had to stop the interview and delete some audio files in order to make more space. Although it was unexpected and embarrassing, I tried to stay calm and have a little chat with the participants to keep the conversation going and at the same time fix the problem. I also paid very close attention to every detail and minor issue. I was also aware that in my interviews with doctoral students, faculty supervisors, and editors, I might come across contradictory evidence or information, so I was prepared to interpret and make inferences about what
was going on in the course of data collection and use those points to cross-check opinions and answers just like a detective (Yin, 2009). Because of reviewing the literature and my own personal experience as a novice scholar and published writer, I had theoretical preconceptions and preconceived positions on the issues I was going to address in my interviews with the participants. However, I did my best to leave them behind the door when I was interviewing the participants and focus on contrary evidence and findings in order to enrich my data and final discussion of the findings.

3.3.1.1 Ethical issues

The second step at the preparation stage was attention to inherent ethical issues in the research and how to protect the human participants (Creswell, 2007). Bassey (1999) discusses ethical issues under the three headings of respect for democracy, respect for truth, and respect for persons. In light of these three forms of respect, I obtained approval from the ethics review board of the Faculty of Education at Western University for conducting this research study (Appendix A). The nature and aims of study were explained to the participants through the letters of information (Appendices B, C, D, E) and also in person. Written consent forms (Appendix F) were also signed and dated by all human participants in this inquiry. Moreover, I took extreme care to be honest about the inquiry, refrain from anything that might harm the participants, respect participants’ privacy, anonymity, and confidentiality, and refrain from intruding on their work (Yin, 2009).
3.3.1.2 Protocol development

A protocol is an instrument to guide data collection process and includes an overview of the project, field procedures, research questions, and guidelines for the case study report (Yin, 2003). This step was fulfilled through the ethics review process to a great extent as it was a prerequisite for it. The above-mentioned issues were explained in detail in the ethics review application and the reviewers’ advice and suggestions were incorporated in order to clarify any vague issues in the data collection process. Using the protocol kept me focused on the topic of the study, organized my thoughts in the course of interviews and document analyses, raised my awareness of issues such as the audience of the research report, and consequently contributed to the overall reliability of the inquiry (Bassey, 1999; Yin, 2009).

3.3.1.3 Screening of candidates

The fourth preparatory step was recruiting and selecting candidates for the inquiry. A set of operational criteria was considered for “purposeful sampling” of the informants (Yin, 2003). These criteria contributed to selecting the most appropriate informants: those who could “yield the best data” (Yin, 2009, p. 91), and could “purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem” (Creswell, 2007, p. 125). The goal was to recruit four doctoral candidates, two faculty supervisors, and two academic journal editors as the three groups of participants for the main study. The criteria for the most appropriate informants included that graduate students (a) be senior Ph.D. candidates (in their third year or beyond) in Education and related disciplines (e.g., applied linguistics); (b) have English as their native language; and (c) be in the publication process or have already
published at least one single-authored, empirical (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) study in an English-medium refereed journal in the course of their doctoral candidature. The faculty supervisors had to be tenured, have taught doctoral courses in Education and related disciplines, and have supervised at least three doctoral students. The journal editors had to have at least three years of editorial experience with an inter/national English-medium refereed journal. It was thought that Anglophone doctoral candidates in their senior years of study with prior publication experience and faculty supervisors from Education and related disciplines would have a better understanding of the nature of writing for scholarly publication, and the inner-workings of pre/post submission processes than Anglophone doctoral students and faculty supervisors in Science disciplines, for example.

3.3.1.4 Pilot study

After obtaining the required ethical approval for conducting this research study, I conducted a pilot case study as the preliminary stage of the inquiry. I initially approached a female Anglophone doctoral student, a female faculty supervisor, and a female scholarly journal editor at an international conference regarding their participating in the pilot study. Then, I followed up via email correspondence and they agreed to participate.

The senior doctoral student, Samantha, was studying second language education at a Canadian university, working as a sessional instructor teaching academic writing and speaking, and working as a research assistant. Samantha had done her Master’s following undergraduate studies, and then taught English as a second language for about ten years. She had decided to do her doctoral studies in order to gain a better understanding of her professional work. Samantha's educational background in language education, seventeen
years of experience as an English as a second language teacher and academic writing instructor, and record of (co)publications in scholarly journals made her a good participant for the pilot study. As someone with extensive experience in different aspects of academic life, she could provide insight into the writing for scholarly publication practices of a typical Anglophone novice scholar. The faculty supervisor selected for the pilot study was from a second language education background, had supervised several doctoral students, and had published on academic writing as well. The editor selected for the pilot study had the pre-requisite background in editing an international journal, and had also supervised several doctoral students. All three were able to provide insightful opinions on the writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students in a Canadian higher education context.

The data for the pilot study were collected through sixty-minute long semi-structured interviews at a time and place convenient to each of the participants. With their permission, the interviews were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim. I then shared the transcripts with the participants to ensure accuracy. I asked them about issues that needed more explanation and clarification via email. Inductive analysis of the transcripts using the qualitative data analysis software MAXQDA and my interpretation of the data resulted in the emergence of preliminary codes. I will explain this process more in data analysis section 4.2.

The pilot study informed my data collection plans for the main research study in terms of content and procedures, and shed light on issues and challenges that could arise (Yin, 2009). It confirmed that participants involved in language and higher education could provide useful insights as they were familiar with concepts and meta-language related to academic writing and writing for scholarly publication. Moreover, the preliminary codes
that emerged in the pilot study served as a blueprint for the codification of the main study data, and contributed to the coding system of the main research study which will be dealt with in the following sections.

3.4 Main Study

The current study was originally planned as a mixed-methods research study in a sequential design (quantitative preceding qualitative) where a questionnaire constituted the quantitative component and a qualitative case study constituted the qualitative component. The rationale behind the design, more specifically the quantitative component, was that it could provide “background knowledge on a large number of informants” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 172). However, the limited number of respondents in the quantitative phase required a change in the design and ultimately led to a qualitative case study research.

Originally, a recruitment of research participants advertisement (Appendix G) was emailed to Graduate Studies Student Coordinators in target faculties at universities across Canada. In choosing these research sites, factors such as access, obstacles to data collection, and whether they had Faculties of Education or Applied Linguistics programs were taken into account. I requested that the coordinators forward the advertisement to graduate students, and post it on bulletin boards in their departments as well. Due to ethical issues, the coordinators could not share graduate students’ contact information with me. Therefore, I had no idea how many potential Anglophone doctoral candidates received the advertisement via email or saw it on bulletin boards in their departments. However, ultimately, ten Anglophone doctoral students contacted me via email and expressed their interest in participating. Next, I emailed a letter of information (Appendix B) and a fillable
questionnaire (Appendix H) to would-be participants, and asked them to fill it out and return it as an email attachment. Due to the limited number of people who expressed willingness to participate in the study, the questionnaire merely served to identify and purposively sample the most appropriate doctoral candidates for the interview stage of the study. Those six respondents who were not selected for the next phase of the study did not meet at least one of the screening operational criteria. That is, they were either not in their senior years, had not published or were not in the process of publishing, or had published reviews and reports not empirical papers. The four selected doctoral candidates were from disciplines related to language and higher education. They had also experienced some sort of academic English instruction as a teacher or learner throughout their education or employment. All of them had attended courses or workshops related to academic English and writing in their institutions or elsewhere and three of the graduate students were teaching oral or written academic English in their departments or other institutes at the time they participated in the study. Therefore, in addition to content knowledge, they had good understanding and knowledge of the intricacies of academic writing, and related learning and pedagogical aspects and issues.

Focusing in on the faculty profiles on websites of several academic institutions in Canada in the above-mentioned disciplines, I emailed several faculty members who I believed to be outstanding scholars in the fields of language and higher education and applied linguistics. Two were selected based on their schedule and willingness to participate. They both had content knowledge and the meta-language needed to talk about writing for scholarly publication. Both of the faculty informants had editorial experience as well, and could comment from both the perspective of a faculty member and an editor.
In order to select the most qualified journal editors for this inquiry, I selected a pool of top-ranking journals in the fields of language and higher education and applied linguistics. I investigated their websites, focusing on their scope and aims, editorial boards, and more specifically their editors. Then I emailed key editors, and selected two based on their schedule and willingness to participate. They both had extensive editorial experience with national and international journals. Additionally, they were faculty supervisors as well so could also draw on their supervisory experiences. All the participants came from universities across Canada. The following section will deal with how the data for this inquiry were collected.

3.4.1 Data Collection

Data collection refers to a set of interrelated procedures that help researchers collect information in order to answer research questions (Creswell, 2007). Yin (2009) cautions that researchers need to pay attention to the fact that “there is no clear cut-off point” in case study data collection; however, enough confirmatory data needs to be collected for research issues (p. 100). Moreover, researchers have to be mindful of things such as inadequate data, or leaving the site prematurely, which Creswell (2007, p. 119) calls “field issues”. Yin (2009) underlines three major principles in data collection process and explains that these principles “are not intended to straitjacket the inventive and insightful investigator. They are intended to make the process as explicit as possible” (p. 124). First, use multiple sources of evidence. “[A] major strength of case study data collection is the opportunity to use many different sources of evidence” (Yin, 2009, pp. 114-5). Multiple sources of evidence develop an element of triangulation or “converging lines of inquiry” (p. 115) in research.
They also enable the researcher to address a broader range of issues, and strengthen the construct validity of an inquiry (Yin, 2003; Yin, 2009, p. 115). In light of this principle, I did not limit myself to a single source of data. My data collection sources included a questionnaire, interviews with Anglophone doctoral candidates, faculty supervisors, and academic journal editors, and an analysis of the websites of two Canadian universities and three international English-Medium academic journals. These methods supported data triangulation, helped present multiple perspectives on the raised issues, and ultimately contributed to building a more “in-depth picture of the case” (Creswell, 2007, p. 132; Patton, 2002). The specifics of each source of data collection will be discussed in the following sections.

Second, create a research study database. This principle involves organization and documentation of data. “[T]he lack of a formal database for most case studies is a major shortcoming of case study research” as “a case study database markedly increases the reliability [italics in the original] of the entire case study” (Yin, 2009, p. 119). Without such a database, “the raw data may not be available for independent inspection” (p. 119). Therefore, every investigator “should strive to develop a formal, presentable database, so that in principle, other investigators can review the evidence directly and not be limited to the written case study report” (Yin, 2009, p. 119). My computer skills and a qualitative data analysis software called MAXQDA helped me significantly in developing such a database and digitalizing my data collection. I developed two separate databases simultaneously throughout the data collection process. The first one included all the files and folders I had created to store, document, and organize the raw data on my laptop. Primarily, I created a folder called “doctoral research” and another folder within that folder
called “data”. Within “data”, I created questionnaire, interview, and documents as my subfolders.

When doctoral candidates returned the questionnaires, I exported them as pdf files and stored and organized them in a series of subfolders that were named after the participants within the questionnaire folder. Within the interview folder, I created three subfolders named doctoral students, faculty, and editors. In the interview phase of data collection process, I stored and organized audio files and voice memos I had created in the course of the interviews using my iPhone or audio recorder in a series of subfolders within each group and under each participant’s name. I also scanned the participants consent forms and stored and organized pdf files in relevant subfolders. I used the memo function of MAXQDA to turn my handwritten notes into stickies that could be posted within MAXQDA and appended to relevant pieces of information. MAXQDA automatically displayed if a note was appended to a questionnaire, interview, etc. and made them available for further analysis. Analyzing the websites of two Canadian universities and public domains of three scholarly journals, I used my Macintosh computer’s “Grab” application, an application which enables you to take pictures of your computer screen, to shoot and save the online information as documents that could inform my research. I also exported and saved webpages as pdf files or downloaded pdf files that I found useful for the document analysis phase. I stored and organized all the relevant data in the “documents” folder. All of the documents that I needed for the document analysis phase of my research were available online so the whole collection process was conducted using my laptop.
I developed the second database simultaneously with the first one within MAXQDA. That is, I imported all the raw data I needed for the analysis phase of my research (things that did not include data such as consent forms) into MAXQDA and stored and organized them as a smart database within MAXQDA. The difference between the two databases was actually the way the data were organized and the affordances that MAXQDA offered for data organization, access, and retrieval. In the first database, the data were stored in separate files and folders just the way things are stored in a filing cabinet. However, MAXQDA turned the imported bits and pieces of information into a smart interconnected web of data where everything and everyone were and could be connected to everything and everyone. It provided the opportunity to spot a tiny piece of information in a bulk of data and made easy fast data retrieval possible to an amazing extent. I had a scheduled backup plan for both my databases in order to prevent data loss.

Third, maintain a chain of evidence. A chain of evidence illuminates the process of inquiry from research questions to conclusions to an external observer and improves the reliability of the research (Yin, 2009). “Moreover, this external observer should be able to trace the steps in either direction (from conclusion back to initial research questions or from questions to conclusion)” (Yin, 2009, p. 122). As mentioned earlier, MAXQDA played a major role in creating such a chain of evidence in this research. I also did my best to allow an external observer to follow this chain of evidence in a number of ways: (a) in my final report, I have made clear and sufficient citation to relevant sections of the database for example I have cited specific interviews, websites, and documents; (b) my database indicates “the actual evidence” and “the circumstances under which the evidence was collected- for example, the time and the place of the interview” (Yin, 2009, p. 123); (c) I
have tried to keep those circumstances consistent with the case study protocol and the specific procedures outlined in it; and (d) I have made sure that the protocol indicates “the link between the content of the protocol and the initial study questions” (Yin, 2009, p. 123).

Although case study evidence can be collected from different sources, there are no specific data collection methods unique to case study; therefore, data collection in case study research is eclectic, and the researcher chooses any methods are appropriate and practical for their inquiry (Bassey, 1999; Yin, 2003). The following sections deal with the data collection methods adopted for this research.

3.4.1.1 Questionnaire

Questionnaires are “any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing answers” (Brown, 2001, p. 6). The questionnaire is “capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly” and “has become one of the most popular research instruments applied in social sciences” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 101). The questionnaire for this research study targeted only Anglophone doctoral students and involved a series of multiple choice and open-ended questions organized around three key topic areas: background and demographic information, attitudes towards scholarly publication, and experiences in academic publication. Demographic questions aimed at obtaining information on the respondents’ work and education background, gender, age, place of birth, field and year of study, languages they knew, and their willingness to participate in the next stage of the study. Questions regarding attitudes towards writing for scholarly publication sought their perspectives on whether they found writing for scholarly
publication challenging, felt linguistically advantaged compared to their EAL counterparts in terms of scholarly publishing, and thought writing for scholarly publication instruction needed to be included in the doctoral program. Questions regarding experiences in academic publication addressed their current or previous writing for scholarly publication practices and were meant to gain information on their target journals, number of publications, nature of their challenges for scholarly publication, as well as ways of learning scholarly writing and publishing. The rationale behind the questionnaire design was to develop a broad, general understanding of writing for scholarly publication practices and experiences of Anglophone doctoral student population. However, as mentioned earlier, due to the limited number of respondents who returned the questionnaire and expressed their willingness to participate in the study, the questionnaire merely served the purpose of purposive sampling of the most appropriate candidates for follow-up interviews and provided preliminary data about their writing for scholarly publication practices. My findings on these topics follow in the next chapter, section 4.2.

3.4.1.2 Interviews

A major source of case study information comes from conducting interviews (Yin, 2009). Talmy (2010) highlights that in applied linguistics “interview research has increased dramatically in recent years, particularly in qualitative studies that aim to investigate participants’ identities, experiences, beliefs, and orientations toward a range of phenomena” (p. 128). The objective of conducting interviews is to see things from an interviewee’s perspective as their perspectives are “meaningful”, “knowable”, “explicit”, and provide information that defies direct observation (Patton, 2002, p. 341). I interviewed
Anglophone doctoral students in order to seek their perspectives, perceptions, and experiences regarding writing for scholarly publication; moreover, I interviewed faculty supervisors and academic journal editors to gain a more comprehensive (yet possibly contrary) perspective on the above-mentioned issues, and to add more information to the data repertoire. Although journal editors were not part of this temporally and spatially “bounded system” per se, they were the members of doctoral students’ discourse communities who functioned as gatekeepers (Merriam & Makower, 1988). Therefore, their perspectives provided an outsider’s view that enriched the comprehensiveness of the data, served a confirmatory purpose, and contributed to data triangulation. Drawing upon the experiences of doctoral participants as both teachers and learners of academic writing as well as the mixed supervisory and editorial experiences of both faculty and editor participants made the interview data multifaceted as it activated the participants’ multiple identities and liberated their multiple voices (Talmy, 2010).

In order to minimize variation in the line of query, I conducted standardized semi-structured open-ended interviews (Patton, 2002). In light of the two overarching questions of this research, I developed the interview protocol (Appendices I, J, K) based on the review of the existent literature on writing for scholarly publication, more specifically EAL academics’ challenges for scholarly publication and the pedagogy of writing for scholarly publication discussed in sections 2.4.2 and 2.7. of the literature review chapter. I adapted a few of the interview questions about problematic parts of the journal article and challenges of scholarly publishing from Flowerdew (1999b) and modified them to fit the nature and purpose of my study. Hyland’s (2009) discussion of English for professional academic purposes (EPAP) informed developing the question regarding an EPAP course in the
context of the doctoral program. I designed the interview questions for doctoral students to elicit relevant information about their personal practices in writing for scholarly publication as well as their knowledge, inference, and understanding of other Anglophone novice scholars’ (their colleagues, friends, etc.) experiences and practices. Each informant was interviewed once for 60 minutes at a convenient time and place following a line of inquiry reflected in the protocol of the study (Yin, 2009). I then shared the transcripts with the participants to ensure accuracy and trustworthiness. In reporting interview data, I tried to reflect the participants’ perspectives and opinions genuinely. Taking up a supportive voice strategy, I drew on short and long stretches of quotations from the participants in order to avoid the researcher’s authoritative interpretive voice and push their authentic voices “into the limelight” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 665). Section 4.3 in the next chapter will present the findings of the interviews.

3.4.1.3 Document analysis

“All research projects involve, to a greater or lesser extent, the use and analysis of documents” (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 1996, p. 150). Documents provide what Patton (2002, p. 294) refers to as a “behind the scene look”. They were an invaluable source of information in addressing the educational aspect of my research and corroborated and triangulated data from other sources (Yin, 2009). Yin (2009) cautions that inferences from documents must be made cautiously and should be treated as leads for more in-depth investigation rather than as definite conclusions (Yin, 2009). In light of these guidelines, I analyzed www.elsevier.com, www.TESOL.org, and www.springer.com which are the publishers and public domains of the three following journals respectively: English for
Academic Purposes, TESOL Quarterly, and Higher Education. In my descriptive analysis, I focused on the submission guidelines of those journals and any relevant information regarding scholarly writing and publishing shared on their public domains. I also analyzed the websites of two Canadian leading universities. In my descriptive analysis, I focused on any relevant information regarding scholarly writing and publishing shared on their writing and support centre webpages. The analyses aimed at gaining further understanding of how Anglophone doctoral students learn writing for scholarly publication, the extent to which they are supported in their communities of practice for learning writing for scholarly publication, and the extent to which writing for scholarly publication is implicitly or explicitly addressed and promoted in policies and practices of academic institutions and scholarly journals. The findings on these topics will follow in the next chapter, section 4.4.

The data collected were analyzed in light of the theoretical framework of the study and the existent literature. The next section will deal with this aspect of the research.

3.4.2 Data Analysis

Data analysis is a complicated intellectual process of dealing with a huge amount of raw data in order to achieve reliable conclusions. It consists of preliminary preparation and organization of data for analysis, followed by the development of themes through codification and condensation of codes, and ultimately the representation of data in various forms such as tables, figures, or a discussion (Bassey, 1999; Creswell, 2007). Yin (2009) likens data analysis to telling a “story”. To tell the story from the beginning to the end, an “analytic strategy” is required (Yin, 2009, p. 130). Yin (2009) refers to four general strategies for case study data analysis: (a) theoretical propositions; (b) case description
development; (c) the use of qualitative and quantitative data; and (d) rival explanations. Given the qualitative nature of the inquiry and explanatory exploratory objectives of the research questions, I adopted the first strategy. The theoretical lens of the study and the existent literature provided a reliable analytic and interpretive framework to analyze the collected data.

Knowing that data analysis is a spiral process rather than a linear one, I analyzed the data iteratively as new data emerged (Creswell, 2007). My data analysis was completely computerized and conducted using the qualitative data analysis software MAXQDA. I imported the pilot study audio files into the software and used the transcript function of the software to transcribe pilot study interviews. Then I saved the transcripts in the software for further analysis. The data analysis consisted of three phases. The first phase started with analyzing the pilot study data. In the first phase, I moved from transcripts towards codes. That is, I narrowed down the content of the transcripts into a number of codes for each group of participants and developed the coding system for the whole study. I used my theoretical lens and the existent literature on writing for scholarly publication as my analytical framework. That is, they informed me in detecting emergent themes and codifying the data. However, they did not limit my analysis in any ways as I was open to any recurrent and emerging themes. Initially, I developed two overarching codes, “challenges” and “learning”. Then within each code, I developed sub-code such as “pressure”, “time”, “encouragement”, “feedback”, etc. Coding at this phase was very detailed and everything looked like a relevant issue and therefore a new code. After an initial detailed coding, I gave myself some time and returned to my data after a week as I wanted to have a fresh eye in my analysis. This time, I merged similar codes together and
I grouped minor codes under more overarching codes, and eliminated codes that did not look relevant any more. For example, I merged “pressure”, and “time” into “non-discursive challenges” as a more overarching code and “encouragement”, and “feedback” into “mentorship”. I kept refining my codes over a span of a month at weekly intervals. This helped me see things differently every time and look for more macro codes and patterns and ultimately a trimmed coding system.

In the second phase of the analysis, I moved from my pilot coding system towards the new data. I imported the audio files of the main study interviews into the software as I did the interviews, transcribed them, and then used the codes that I had developed in the previous phase as well as my coding system for the analysis of the new data. Again, I was in no way limited by the previous coding system as it just served as point of departure for this phase of analysis. The analysis at this phase led to the emergence of more new codes and the refinement of previous ones. I used the memo function of the software to jot down my notes and ideas and attached them to the interview transcripts or the codes themselves. Enjoying the affordances of MAXQDA, I could see the most frequent codes or words in my data and see who no matter in which group had spoken to a code or retrieve all the data under a single code irrespective of their group or participant. These affordances facilitated elimination of redundant material and refinement of the coding system all through the codification process.

In third phase of analysis, I looked at my codes across the three groups. This phase was actually more about trimming my coding system in terms of using more overarching codes and more catchy names for those codes. Enjoying the drag and drop affordance of MAXQDA, I could easily move codes and sub-codes around, trim my coding tree, and add
coherence across groups. Had I used “mentorship”, “support”, and “hand-holding” to code similar data in three separate groups, I replaced them with “mentorship & support” and used it as a single code for all of the groups. The fact that most of my research questions were similar across the three groups helped me a lot in that respect. At the end of this phase, I ended up with a trimmed coding system with very similar codes and minor differences in terms of their sub-codes across the three groups. After the data analysis phase, I had to choose an appropriate way to present my findings and report my research to other members of my academic community. The next section will deal with this topic.

3.4.3 Presentation

The last phase of my case study research was the compositional phase. One of the most significant elements in shaping the report and its compositional structure was the audience and their needs since the report serves as a “communication device” (Yin, 2009, p. 168). As the primary audience of my research was my dissertation committee, that included well-established members of my academic discourse community, I adopted structured reporting (Bassey, 1999) or what Yin (2009) refers to as linear-analytic structure in order to report and present this research. This structure follows the traditional introduction, method, results, and discussion (IMRD) sequence and is the most suitable when “a thesis or dissertation committee comprise the main audience for a case study” (Yin, 2009, p. 176). However, I divided the introduction and the discussion chapters into introduction and literature review and discussion and conclusion respectively. Just like every research study, this research had some limitations that will be discussed in the following section.
3.4.4 Limitations of the Study

As is typical of qualitative research, the findings of this study were not generalizable to larger populations, nor was that the goal; the goal was to gain insights into a context-specific, bounded case study that may inform researchers working on comparable topics and issues. Any attempts to extend or generalize the findings of this study to disciplines other than Education or related disciplines requires a great deal of caution. As we see next, chapter four will report the findings of the research.
Chapter 4

4 Findings

“My university is one of the only places probably that you can graduate and never have published anything” (Jack)

4.1 Overview

The findings of this research are presented in three major sections: 4.2 questionnaire, 4.3 interviews, and 4.4 document analysis. Section 4.2 presents information on backgrounds and scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students extracted from their questionnaires. Next, the constituent sub-sections of section 4.3 (i.e., 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3) present overarching codes emerged from the analysis of the interviews with Anglophone doctoral students, faculty supervisors, and academic journal editors respectively. Finally, section 4.4 presents the findings of the document analysis phase of the research and focus on the information gained through analyzing the websites and public domains of three international scholarly journals and two Canadian universities.

4.2 Questionnaire

This section aims to provide a preliminary picture of Anglophone doctoral participants and their writing for scholarly publication practices. More specifically, it deals with their demographic information as well as attitudes and experiences with regards to writing for
academic publication gained from analyzing their questionnaires. Table 4.1 presents mini portraits of the demographic information of the five Anglophone doctoral students participating in the research.

**Table 4.1 Demographic Information of Anglophone Doctoral Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>PhD Program &amp; Year</th>
<th>Languages other than English</th>
<th>No. of Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Samantha     | Education 6        | French, Korean              | 1 journal article in the process of publication  
11 Journal articles (as first or co-author)  
7 Book chapters |
| Rose         | Education 3        | French, Spanish, Portuguese, Mandarin | 1 journal article in the process of publication  
1 book chapter in press  
1 multi-authored journal article (as the second author)  
2 book chapters (one as first author & one as second author) |
| Faith        | Education 3        | None                        | 3 journal articles |
| Jack         | Education 6        | French, Spanish, Portuguese | 2 journal articles |
| Larry        | Education 3        | Italian, French             | 1 journal article in the process of publication  
1 multi-authored journal article (as the first author) |
All of the Anglophone doctoral student participants were completing PhDs in Education, but had various specializations in applied linguistics, language studies, and higher education. They had been in the doctoral program between 3-6 years. In addition to English as their native language, all of them except one had different levels of proficiency in other languages including French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Korean, and Mandarin. All of the participants had published or were in the process of publishing at least one single-authored journal article and their in-progress and published articles ranged from 1-11. They all also had work experiences in ESL and EAP instruction, and academic writing and speaking instruction. The following is a summary of their attitudes to and experiences in writing for academic publication.

Samantha thought that it was “challenging enough for [her], as a native English speaker, to write an academic paper for publication” as it entailed “learning a new genre and discourse.” It took her some time to acquire sufficient awareness of those aspects of writing for scholarly publication. She thought that Anglophone doctoral students were linguistically advantaged compared to their non-Anglophone peers in terms of writing for scholarly publication as “the greater students’ English language proficiency, the better.” At the time of the interview, she found non-discursive aspects of writing for scholarly publication such as finding time for it more challenging than discursive aspects. She was confident in her writing abilities, and enjoyed writing for publication. She considered scholarly writing as a “reflective learning process” in which she could further develop an understanding of her research from theoretical framing to methodology and interpretation of data. She learned writing for scholarly publication through a combination of trial and
error, instruction in her doctoral program, mentorship by faculty supervisors, how-to manuals, and academic journal guidelines. She developed a better and in-depth understanding of her discipline in her senior years, which helped her situate her work in a better way as well. She thought that writing for scholarly publication instruction needs to be included in the doctoral program curricula.

Rose highlighted that writing for scholarly publication is challenging for Anglophone doctoral students as it is “highly technical and structured.” Moreover, being an Anglophone doctoral student “does not mean you can understand and use academic language.” Novice Anglophone scholars need to “develop academic literacy” just like their non-Anglophone counterparts. However, developing this literacy is “a bit easier” for them than their non-Anglophone peers. Currently non-discursive aspects of writing for scholarly publication (e.g., time and opening oneself up to criticism) were more challenging for her than discursive ones. She learned writing for scholarly publication through trial and error mainly, and mentorship by faculty supervisors, peers, and senior students who had published and were “willing to provide support” to some extent. “[N]o one really teaches us how to do it. We learn by reading academic writing and then through trial and error, and error, and error.” She thought that writing for scholarly publication “should be formally taught” and a course on it “should be a requirement in any graduate program.”

Faith believed that writing for scholarly publication is challenging for Anglophone doctoral students as “[t]here is little support for editing and collaboration, [and] [t]here is little opportunity to have others look at your work”. She found both discursive and non-discursive aspects of writing for scholarly publication challenging. She enumerated her challenges as: originality (i.e., wanting to contribute something useful/profound),
understanding and communicating in more theoretical/abstract ways, publishing for more meaningful reasons than just publishing, knowing if the paper was “good enough” (i.e., she could never figure out what makes some papers get published, and different levels of quality between publications). She learned writing for scholarly publication through trial and error and mentorship by faulty supervisors. She thought that writing for scholarly publication instruction needed to be included in the doctoral program curricula, and “[i]t would be very helpful for students who [were] specifically aiming for an academic job.”

Jack underlined that writing for scholarly publication is challenging for Anglophone doctoral students as “they have not had extensive experience writing in this particular genre” as novice scholars. However, Anglophone doctoral students are advantaged compared to their non-Anglophone counterparts in terms of writing for scholarly publication, especially in the process of negotiation with gatekeepers. He found both discursive and non-discursive aspects of writing for scholarly publication challenging. The most challenging parts for him were “writing in a concise manner, navigating the establishment and maintenance of oneself as a credible author, and producing work that is up to a level [he] can be proud of.” He learned writing for scholarly publication through trial and error, minimal attention and mentorship by his MA and PhD supervisors, academic journal guidelines, and formatting and editing courses offered by the school of graduate studies and the writing centre. He believed that writing for scholarly publication instruction needed to be included in doctoral program curricula either as a specific mandatory course or as part of other courses.

Larry thought that writing for scholarly publication is challenging for Anglophone doctoral students as it is “likely a new endeavour for most graduate students, and like anything new,
it usually takes time to understand all of the nuances involved in the scholarly writing process, and for students to be able to produce according to the expectations of any given discipline.” However, Anglophone doctoral students are advantaged compared to their non-Anglophone counterparts in terms of writing for scholarly publication. He found discursive aspects of writing for scholarly publication more challenging than non-discursive ones. He learned writing for scholarly publication through trial and error, instruction in the doctoral program, mentorship by faculty supervisors, how-to manuals, and academic journal guidelines. He highlighted that writing for scholarly publication instruction needed to be included in the doctoral program curricula.

The Anglophone doctoral student participants unanimously agreed that they struggle with writing for scholarly publication and believed that the instruction of scholarly publication needs to be included in the doctoral program. However, they had conflicting opinions on their linguistic advantage in writing for scholarly publication compared to their EAL peers. Drawing on the perspectives of Anglophone doctoral students, faculty supervisors, and academic journal editors, following section presents the findings of the interview phase of the research. It aims to provide a more in-depth understanding of the nature of the challenges of these emerging scholars and their learning experiences within the context of the doctoral program.

4.3 Interviews

Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3 reflect Anglophone doctoral students, faculty supervisors, and academic journal editors’ perspectives on Anglophone doctoral students’ challenges for writing for scholarly publication and learning writing for scholarly publication
respectively. More specifically, they provide answers to the two overarching question of the research: (a) Why do Canadian Anglophone doctoral students find writing for scholarly publication challenging? and (b) How do they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals?

4.3.1 Anglophone Doctoral Students

From Anglophone doctoral students’ perspectives, their struggles regarding writing for scholarly publication were rooted in discipline-specific and genre-specific norms and conventions (e.g., disciplinary and stylistic requirements of the journal article genre and different academic journals), epistemological issues and content knowledge (e.g., theoretical conceptualization), publication process (e.g., targeting appropriate journals), and non-linguistic challenges (e.g., finding time for academic publication). These struggles were codified as “academic genre(s)”, “epistemology and (sub)disciplinary knowledge”, “publication process”, and “non-discursive” challenges respectively and follow below in sub-sections 4.2.1.1 through 4.2.1.4. Moreover, Anglophone doctoral students’ perspectives and experiences regarding learning writing for scholarly publication included personal as well as contextual aspects, and were codified as “personal academic engagement”, “mentorship and support”, and “doctoral program” respectively and follow below in sub-sections 4.2.1.5 through 4.2.1.7. It should be noted that “personal academic engagement” for the purposes of this research denotes the doctoral students’ self-developed strategies for learning scholarly publication and isolated involvement in academic activities that foster such learning, for example, extensive reading and modelling writing accordingly.
4.3.1.1 Academic genre(s)

The Anglophone doctoral participants believed that genre-specific challenges included developing an awareness of academic genre(s) (e.g., thesis, journal article, book review, etc.) and learning differences and variations across them. Focusing on the journal article genre, they explained that their challenges were related to: (a) “learning how to position yourself in your research, carving out a niche, saying what research has been done, where there is a gap, how [you’re] gonna fill that gap with [your] research” (Jack); (b) structuring the journal article and its constituent sections (i.e., introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, discussion, and conclusion); (c) the functional differences between those sections and framing and disaggregating them so that they do not get mixed up; and (d) being concise as opposed to being verbose. Rose, Jack, and Larry added that they and their doctoral colleagues usually struggle with the generic stylistic requirements of different academic journals (e.g., methodological preferences, structural organization of articles published in those journals, discipline-specific vocabulary (i.e., what vocabulary to use), and formatting conventions such APA, MLA, etc.). They also highlighted citing sources, punctuation, proper grammar skills (such as tense, articles, and prepositions), and limited spelling skills as the struggles of Anglophone doctoral students.

… there is a lot of different genres to master. You’ve gotta learn how to write an abstract, you’ve gotta learn how to write a conference proposal, you’ve gotta learn how to write literature review, you’ve gotta learn how to write a research paper, you’ve gotta understand the different sections of it. It is different sections of the research paper, the method section and the literature review and all of those sort of
things. And all of those have or many of them have different functions and they need to be presented differently … (Larry)

With regards to the introduction section of the journal article, Rose, Faith, and Samantha agreed that they struggle with getting “a hook” (Rose). That is, they spend a lot of time revising in order to have a clear idea about “how this whole paper is gonna flow” (Rose) and how to engage themselves and the reader in a “meaningful way right from the start” (Rose). Unlike others, Jack and Larry said that the introduction section was the least challenging section for them to write. Jack believed that it is because they get more practice in shorter “low-stakes” writing such as conference proposals and presentation abstracts within their doctoral program compared with “high-stakes” genres such as the journal article for which they get “next to no guidance” and instruction. They added that the only challenge within this section is to “keep it to a reasonable size” (Jack).

Rose, Jack, and Faith pointed out that literature review, either as a separate section in the journal article or as part of the introduction or background, is a showcase of one’s “breadth of knowledge” and “sort of establishing your credibility” (Jack). They highlighted uncertainties about the completeness and comprehensiveness of one’s review of the literature and consequent concerns about one’s credibility as a big challenge for novice scholars. Samantha’s challenge in this section was related to her lack of understanding or familiarity with disciplinary discussions, arguments, camps, etc., presenting and organizing disciplinary discussions coherently and, “trusting [her] own opinions about other people’s work.” However, Larry and Faith did not find literature review challenging as it is “saying what’s there and where [one] fit[s] in” (Faith).
With regards to adopting a critical stance in the review of the literature, Faith and Samantha agreed that they had developed a descriptive approach to the literature review instead of being critical and did not necessarily see literature review “as a critiquing exercise” (Samantha). However, Rose added that she likes adopting a critical stance and enjoys “when others really take the time to critique what [she is] saying and provide that kind of feedback.” She thought that it is a learning process for her as a novice scholar. Unlike Rose, Jack found “not being critical” even more challenging than “being critical.” The real challenge for him was distinguishing the perspectives of different scholars regarding disciplinary issues and discussions and then “grouping the criticism” or in other words “bunching research into different sub-areas and then being critical of an overall body of research” without making any misinterpretations. Larry initially found getting the right critical yet respectful academic tone challenging.

The participants agreed that the methods was the least challenging section as it is so linear, straightforward yet tedious, “like writing a recipe” (Rose). However, Jack found justifying and defending his methodological decisions and designs challenging as there are different ways to investigate and answers research questions. The participants also believed that writing the findings was not challenging as the same descriptive formula as the methodology applies to this section and one needs to be concise and decide which things are important to be reported to which audience. However, Larry believed that “it’s a very descriptive process and there is a lot of unspoken rules about the way things get described.” So, it was challenging to present the findings and results in a way that “meets the expectations of the readership” in terms of vocabulary, diction, verb choice, and verb tense.
The participants unanimously agreed that they struggle a lot with writing the discussion and conclusion sections. They thought that junior scholars including themselves struggle with indicating why their findings are significant “to the overall scope of the research” (Jack), “balancing the strength” (Samantha) of their claims about their findings and their generalizability and transferability. They stressed that emerging scholars need to appropriate or hedge their claims or make what Samantha called “qualifying claims”.

… I find a lot of doctoral students, they make claims with absolutely no qualification or the claim is too strong, they don’t weaken claims and there is a tendency not to want to point out the limits of particular thinking… so for instance a typical claim might be teachers in Ontario secondary classrooms don’t support or don’t understand how to support English language learners in teaching content area subject matter. That’s a very typical graduate student kind of claim, they don’t have any evidence of that, they could at least say some, or in my experience or based on the studies I have read … (Samantha)

The findings in this section indicate the importance of awareness of the expectations and requirements of academic genre(s) and academic journals in writing for scholarly practice of Anglophone doctoral students. They highlight that doctoral students’ struggles in writing discussion and conclusion, introduction, and literature review exceed their struggle in methods and findings sections. In addition to academic genre(s), Anglophone doctoral students also struggled with epistemological and content knowledge in their scholarly publication practices. The following section will address those challenges.
4.3.1.2 Epistemology & (sub)disciplinary knowledge

Rose, Faith, and Samantha highlighted conceptualization and articulation of the theoretical framework as a serious challenge. They explained that they struggle with understanding theoretical concepts and notions, “adding in a theoretical perspective or explaining the theoretical concepts and building on them and to make them original” (Faith), developing and situating an argument within and beyond a theoretical framework or theoretical concepts, and indicating the significance of their research to the existent body of knowledge. This challenge “does overlap with a discursive challenge in terms of how you describe that theoretical framework, and how you articulate your entry point into that, and how you then make the move to connect that with your own research” (Samantha). Samantha also highlighted understanding (sub)disciplinary knowledge or what she called “knowledge of the field” as one of the key issues and challenges in her writing for scholarly publication practices. She underlined the significance of disciplinary knowledge in improving her writing ability and determining her scholarly orientations as she could be “far more specific about the claims [she is] making” and the noteworthiness of those claims to other scholars in her field.

The findings indicate that Anglophone doctoral students’ challenges in this area are twofold: content and form. First, they struggle with understanding the content knowledge of their disciplines including paradigmatic, theoretical, and disciplinary discussions. The second struggle concerns articulation and presentation of that knowledge and framing one’s argument within epistemological and (sub)disciplinary notions in a coherent manner. Just
like the production phase, the dissemination phase of scholarly publication posed serious challenges to Anglophone doctoral students which will follow in the next section.

4.3.1.3 Publication process

The participants agreed that they struggled with the know-how of the publication process including (a) targeting the appropriate journal; (b) navigating submission and review processes including interpreting reviewers’ messages, attending to their comments and critical feedback, and implementing the recommended changes; (c) refashioning a rejected article in terms of “balancing the new guidelines with the recommendations that were made from the previous reviewers” (Jack); and (d) resubmitting it to a different journal with different genre-specific and stylistic expectations. They recounted a number of reasons for those challenges. First, considering that more and more academic journals are popping up every day, targeting the appropriate fit and avoiding fake predatory journals were a big challenge. Second, they did not know to what extent and in what ways they could or were allowed to agree or disagree with gatekeepers. Third, incorporating the suggested changes require that one shift their mindset to understand where reviewers are coming from, open up a gap in their original opinions in order to accommodate those changes, and rethink what they have done already. So it disrupts the flow of the original paper. Fourth, “striking the right diplomatic tone” (Larry) in responding to reviewers, especially when the author is not in agreement with their criticism.

Anglophone doctoral students’ lack of awareness of the inner-workings of the publication process as well as their novice status make them feel insecure in different stages of the
review process. The following section will deal with non-linguistic issues that pose a challenge to writing for scholarly publication practice of Anglophone doctoral students.

4.3.1.4 Non-discursive challenges

Although the main focus of this research was on discursive challenges of Anglophone novice scholars, non-discursive challenges and issues also came up in Anglophone doctoral students’ comments and opinions which are worth sharing. They included: (a) affective and mental aspect of seeking help as one puts oneself in a vulnerable position and opens oneself up to criticism and potentially loses credibility with peers and colleagues; (b) the affective aspect of getting critical and negative feedback from gatekeepers; (c) a lack of confidence in one’s writing abilities and the originality of one’s work; (d) finding people in one’s research area who would be willing to spend time and read one’s work and then provide critical feedback; (d) crushing pressure to participate in a mysterious process of scholarly publication in order to secure future job opportunities and visibility in academia; and (e) lack of time.

… I would say the biggest challenge for myself and people that I know is all the pressure. So it's this idea that you want the academic job, you have to be published. It's this mysterious thing where it's all or nothing. You either are in and you get published or you would put rejected and discouraged. And then you have to get it done, you have to get published, and the students talk about it and get stressed. And I think that's very difficult … (Faith)

Mental and affective factors as well as life conditions play a key role in initiation of Anglophone doctoral students into scholarly publication and dealing with the extensive
pressure for survival and visibility in academia. The following sections will deal with the elements that shape and affect learning experiences of Anglophone doctoral students.

4.3.1.5 Personal academic engagement

As mentioned earlier, personal academic engagement in the sense used in this research denotes doctoral students’ self-developed strategies for learning scholarly publication and isolated involvement in academic activities that foster such learning, for example, extensive reading and modelling writing accordingly. All the participants highlighted that “many parts of academia are based on the sink or swim model” where doctoral students “find things challenging because oftentimes they’re not explained” (Jack). So one is either supposed to know those things or “it’s just assumed that you will assimilate these behaviours and practices as you go along … which doesn’t always happen” (Jack). Professors and administrative people “just assume that you’ve been through an undergrad, you’ve been through a master’s, [so] you must be able to write” or acquire the necessary skills and “figure it out” by yourself (Rose). Therefore, as a doctoral student, one needs to be self-motivated, value scholarly publication, “take the risk” (Faith), practice a lot, and be persistent in order to learn writing for scholarly publication. “Unless [you] get the support of a senior student who’s published before or [are] connected with a supervisor or a faculty member that’s willing to write with [you]” (Rose) because “no one else is gonna push you” in this endeavour (Samantha).

The participants underlined the significance of extensive reading as a good personal strategy in developing a sense of what is a good and what is a bad paper, measuring the quality of other scholarly productions, developing an awareness of the expectations of
one’s academic discourse community, and ultimately learning writing for scholarly publication. They highlighted that in their readings, they pay attention to both content and style of writing and borrow discursive and rhetorical conventions and then assimilate and incorporate them into their own writing practices. They also use well-written articles and conference presentations as a template and adapt their structural organization in their own practices and style their writing based on those models.

… we read articles like crazy in classes. So typically what I do when I’m writing is I try and style it after article I like. If I find the article I think it’s well-written, I understand it, I want my writing to sound like that or I want my writing to have these components or this article has this section, that’s really cool so my best examples are articles that are already published … (Faith)

Larry and Samantha also added that teaching academic writing has contributed to their learning and developing academic writing skills and has helped them focus more on structural organization of the materials they read. Jack also underlined the significance of extensive writing for learning writing for scholarly publication. Referring to their experiences as a manuscript reviewer, a copyeditor, and a conference proposal reviewer, Rose and Samantha believed that involvement in evaluative practices such as reviewing and critiquing are beneficial for learning writing for scholarly publication. Through such activities, novice scholars “see the unpolished, unfinished kind of pieces” (Rose) and therefore develop a better sense of strengths and weaknesses of others’ works as well as their own writing practices and get initiated into disciplinary conversations and practices.

Rose and Samantha also referred to the significant role of conference sessions on academic
publication and journal editors’ presentations in informing doctoral students about scholarly writing and publishing and helping them strategize academic writing.

The findings highlight that academic literacy skills including writing for scholarly publication are taken for granted for Anglophone doctoral students. Moreover, the extent of their learning and success depends on their engagement in the practices of their academic communities and how motivated, strategic, and resilient they are. The key role of mentorship was also highlighted by the participants which will follow in the next section.

4.3.1.6 Mentorship & support

The participants unanimously believed that mentorship and support at faculty level (especially one’s supervisor) and at the peer level are pivotal in helping doctoral students to view writing for scholarly publication as a lovely and enjoyable activity rather than an academic chore, to succeed in this “scary and isolating process” (Rose), and to develop their writer/publisher identities. They highlighted that at early stages, very few people can publish on their own without faculty mentorship and support. However, all of them believed that access to expert support and mentorship opportunities are limited, relatively unstructured, and case by case in their doctoral programs and departments. Stressing that some of them were lucky to have a pleasant and supportive relationship with their supervisors, they added that a lot of their doctoral colleagues felt frustrated as they were deprived of such support and did not “have any connection with their supervisor beyond their own thesis” (Rose). They “would never have the opportunity to write or have the self-confidence to publish on their own and the extent of their academic writing [would be] predominantly course papers” (Rose).
… so if you have a professor like my now supervisor you have a lot of already mentorship, if you don’t, you need someone … not many people do … that’s not gonna always happen … I wish other people had the same thing I had where they could ask for help (Faith)

They argued that the fact that professors are overburdened and stretched time-wise on the one hand, and novice scholars’ concerns about losing their credibility and stature on the other hand have affected supervisory and mentorship practices and created a “a situation of don’t ask don’t tell” (Jack). Moreover, there is a “lack of coordination between departments, writing centres, and individual professors” in terms of the quality and quantity of support and mentorship (Jack). Furthermore, mentorship opportunities and quality learning experiences depend on “the luck of the draw” (Rose) as to who you are assigned or connected to as a graduate assistant or in a research project and the supervisor’s conceptions of their mentorship responsibilities and graduate assistantship. “Professors who take their job as mentor seriously provide an avenue for that [scholarly publication]. Others who just sort of take on their students as work-horses probably don’t put a lot of effort into that” (Larry). Unlike others, Samantha believed that although the supervisor “creates the relationship that you are going to have” to a great extent, mentorship is about reciprocal supportive “relationships” and collaboration opportunities depend on the nature of the relationship between supervisors and doctoral students. She enumerated flexibility and openness to advice and suggestions from the supervisor, collaboration, reciprocity, and mutual respect for each other’s opinions as the key elements for enjoyable mentorship the lack of which can lead to supervisor’s neutrality or withdrawal and consequently failure of mentorship.
… I come to research from the field that there is a system, there is a process, there’s hierarchies, … I kind of see my supervisor as my boss. I’m here to do what I’m told and so I do it and I don’t question it because I accept the idea that he has more knowledge and expertise and experience doing these things than me. So who am I to go and argue a point or a way of doing things at this stage in my career. I gain far more by listening and doing what I’m asked than by debating … and accepting that these people are here for a reason and they have my best interest in mind and I can follow what they have to say and it always has worked … (Samantha)

The participants believed that mentorship for writing for scholarly publication should be mandated, structured, and incorporated as a “required element” into graduate assistantship which is more research-driven, and be a criterion for faculty tenure and promotion. They highlighted encouragement, co-publication, feedback, peer support groups, and online resources as various forms of mentorship and support.

They believed that faculty supervisors have to genuinely encourage (i.e. encouragement plus handholding in writing and publishing processes) students to “take the risk and be persistent, demystify writing and publication processes for them, and prepare them for dealing with the affective aspect of rejections” (Faith). Faith and Samantha explained how their professors’ encouragement not only had helped them “realize that what [they were] working on in [their] courses could have a broader audience besides the professors for whom [they were] submitting it”, but also had helped them see themselves “as a writer or a scholar or a publisher of something” (Samantha).
Rose and Samantha described their co-publication experiences with their supervisors and peers as a transition stage where their peers and supervisors’ mentorship, support, and constructive feedback had scaffolded their learning and improved their self-confidence, fostered their writer-identity, and helped them advance from a second author to a first author and gain independence as researchers and publishers. However, Rose said that co-publication with supervisors was not a common practice in her doctoral program and she was an “anomaly” in that respect. Faith had never co-published so she thought that it was “a huge gap for her” and she was missing it.

The participants also agreed that course instructors, supervisors, peers, and journal gatekeepers’ constructive feedback and criticism on ideas and arguments as well as the actual writing itself (e.g., style, grammar, and structure) play a key role in (a) raising novice scholars’ confidence in their capabilities; (b) removing their “doubts and issues that prevent [them] from actual publishing” (Rose) and alleviating their challenges for writing for scholarly publication; (c) informing them of the expectations of the target audience; and (d) refashioning and resubmitting their manuscripts. However, they highlighted insufficient quality feedback from some of their course instructors and supervisors and added that sometimes faculty suffice to brief qualitative comments (e.g., good job, nice work) and surface-level features (e.g., grammatical mistakes) as their comfort zone or a strategy to avoid harsh criticism.

The participants underlined the significance of structured peer support groups for learning writing for scholarly publication. They believed that mentorship “doesn’t always have to be supervisor and graduate student. It can be peer mentoring [where] students come and take the reins” (Larry). They thought that such groups are the venues that provide “the
opportunity to let off some steam”, encourage yourself and others, do collaborative writing, and share feedback, “issues, problems, successes, and so on” (Larry). They highlighted the role of supervisors and institutional and departmental initiatives for availability of such support mechanisms.

Referring to the ever-increasing role of digital technology in and beyond academia, the participants underlined the role of online resources such as “how-to manuals”, and academic websites and blogs in raising novice scholars’ academic literacy awareness. They also highlighted the shift from traditional practices in scholarly publication to more digital and online presence and the pressure on scholars for such presence. However, they believed that most junior scholars “don’t have the skill set to communicate in that way” (Rose). They also added that “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” (Rose). They thought that doctoral students need to be informed, encouraged, and supported to try alternative ways for scholarly writing and publishing if they want to have their voices heard.

The findings stress the crucial role of faculty and peer mentorship for acquiring academic literacy competence, socialization into academic communities, and developing writer/publisher voice and identity. However, they highlight that such support mechanisms are limited, unstructured, random, and supervisor-dependent in the doctoral program. The role of the doctoral program in learning scholarly publication will be addressed in following section.
4.3.1.7 Doctoral program

The participants unanimously believed that the doctoral program is the ideal academic context for learning scholarly writing and publishing and initiation into the academic world. They enumerated graduate courses, professional development opportunities, and writing centres as the key elements that could shape and influence learning experiences of Anglophone doctoral students. Highlighting the constructive role of course assignments in their scholarly publication practices, they thought that it would be more useful if doctoral courses and course assignments were designed and structured in a way that prepared doctoral students for scholarly publication in the future. However, they pointed out the scarcity of such assignments in most of their doctoral courses or in the practices of their course professors.

… I have only actually had one course where they required that we go online, we find a journal that we are interested in, and that’s the journal we should write for their requirements. And that was a great idea because I actually got published in after that in that journal because I had a paper ready to go. So to me that was a very smart of the professor but out of the fifteen courses I’ve taken at [name of the institution] that only happened in one course. So I would say a lack of those sort of requirement. I think people are too busy and courses are the only place … (Faith)

Reporting that academic writing was not offered or addressed as a graduate course or a part of another graduate course in their academic institutions, the participants had conflicting opinions on having a specific course on writing for scholarly publication in the doctoral program. Larry and Samantha believed that “there is so much content knowledge out there
that coursework would be better reserved for that” (Larry) and such a course is “divorcing the content learning from the writing [whereas] they go together” (Samantha). Therefore, formal instruction on writing for scholarly publication should be part of a doctoral course such as the research methods course where information on both research and writing and publication is presented alongside. However, Rose, Jack, and Faith believed that a structured course where different aspects of academic writing and publishing are explicitly discussed is necessary “if you wanna have a PhD and you wanna work in the field of academia, in the field of research” (Rose). “Getting a PhD is a commitment to writing and we need to focus more on that” (Rose). They stressed that they would prefer to take something that is relevant and necessary for their future academic life rather than some of the doctoral courses that are not particularly informative, useful, or applicable.

… I understand the argument against coursework and frankly some of the coursework that I have is a little bit ridiculous including some of the research methods courses that I’ve had that are very introductory and below my personal level of expertise at this time. So for me I would rather have an opportunity to develop a skill that I know that I’m going to need to use through my career than be forced into a course to get a very introductory level lesson on something that I already know about that I still have to take anyway and not planning on using in my own research anyway. So I have to write, I don’t have to use this particular from of methods that I’m actually not interested and not planning on using anyway … (Rose)

The participants also thought that professional development workshops and seminar series offered in the doctoral program can potentially scaffold learning writing for scholarly
publication. However, based on their personal experiences, they believed that the way these occasional voluntary sessions are administered currently does not provide a successful learning experience for emerging scholars both quantity and quality-wise as: (a) writing for scholarly publication is only addressed once a year in academic socialization seminar series; (b) the focus is dominantly on publishing, leaving out “the physical act of writing itself” (Rose); (c) the information presented is very basic and useful for those with no knowledge of scholarly publication; and (d) the schedule and timing of the seminars do not match part-time doctoral students’ schedules.

… so once a year one of them would probably be on publishing … but it's nothing, it's all voluntary if you want to go, you can go to that stuff … publishing would be the topic. They wouldn't just have something on writing, because you can get that at the service [writing centre] … (Faith)

The participants believed that writing centres can help junior scholars with “how to become a better writer” (Faith) and facilitate especially the writing component of scholarly publication. However, they doubted the usefulness and quality of services offered by writing centres as: (a) their practices are more focused on genres such as thesis, grant, and scholarship applications; (b) their advice and feedback are more focused on editing and technical features of academic writing which “may not be as helpful as it could be” for journal publication (Jack); (c) Anglophone junior scholars face affective and mental barriers in seeking services offered in those centres. They also added that the way those centres are advertised and the fact that they are mostly used by EAL novice scholars have created this impression that they offer English as a second language (ESL) services rather than student support services.
… they do provide a lot more focused support for writing grant applications, for writing scholarship applications which often times is the same type of writing. But if we’re particularly looking at journal articles, there is not a lot of support, no …

(Jack)

Highlighting the random and unstructured nature of educational policies and practices with regards to scholarly publication in their doctoral programs, the participants believed that policies and practices of the doctoral program need to encourage and support learning academic literacy skills through: (a) making it a requirement for doctoral students and forcing them into publication stream; (b) promoting collaboration between writing support centres, professors, and doctoral students in terms of expectations for student writing; (c) helping novice scholars overcome the inhibitions that are stopping them from academic productivity; and (d) introducing novice scholars to all available as well as alternative on-site and online support resources and mechanisms. They stressed that doctoral programs and academic institutions need to “prepare their students for what’s coming” (Larry) and what is expected of them and value writing for scholarly publication.

Anglophone doctoral students’ perspectives indicate that the requirements of scholarly publication in terms of the expectations of academic genre(s), disciplinary knowledge, the know-how of the publication process, and non-discursive issues pose serious challenges to emerging academics’ scholarly publication practices irrespective of their linguistic or geographical backgrounds. Moreover, they highlight the unstructured nature of the education of academic literacy skills and the gaps between emerging scholars’ expectations and institutional policies and practice. The following section will present faculty
supervisors’ perspectives on Anglophone doctoral students’ writing for scholarly publication practices.

4.3.2 Faculty Supervisors

From faculty supervisors’ perspectives, Anglophone doctoral students’ struggles regarding writing for scholarly publication were rooted in discipline-specific and genre-specific norms and conventions, publication process, and non-linguistic issues. These struggles were codified as “academic genre(s)”, “publication process”, and “non-discursive” challenges respectively and will follow below in sub-sections 4.3.2.1 through 4.3.2.3. Moreover, faculty supervisors also highlighted that Anglophone doctoral students’ experiences in learning writing for scholarly publication included personal as well as contextual aspects. Those aspects were codified as “personal academic engagement”, “mentorship and support”, and “doctoral program” and will follow below in sub-sections 4.3.2.4 through 4.3.2.6. Table 4.2 presents mini-portraits of the disciplinary and research focus as well as supervisory experiences of the faculty supervisors participating in this research.

Table 4.2 Demographic Information of Faculty Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Supervisors</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>No. of Ph.D. Students Supervised</th>
<th>Editorial Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>L2 Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>Editorial / Advisory Board Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 indicates that the faculty participants were from disciplines related to language education. Therefore, they had both content knowledge and the meta-language needed to talk about writing for scholarly publication. Moreover, as established members of academia, they had extensive supervisory experience which made their comments richer and more insightful. Furthermore, all of them had editorial experience, and could comment from both a faculty member and an editor’s perspective. The following sections present faculty supervisors’ perspectives on Anglophone doctoral students’ struggles regarding writing for scholarly publication.

4.3.2.1 Academic genre(s)

The faculty participants highlighted socialization into academic genre(s) and figuring out genre-specific expectations of different readership and academic journals such as “particular organization of the articles” or “a particular way of coming to the point quickly” as a challenge for doctoral students (Kevin). Highlighting the interaction between writing skill and conceptual skill, they believed that “sometimes poor writing is actually a lack of
clear conceptualization in terms of what it is that I wanna say and then how do I wanna say it and making sure that there is a logic going through it” (Kevin). In this case, inter or intra-sentential issues (e.g. grammar or vocabulary) are less serious than the overall organization and coherence of that argument or paper. They also thought that some Anglophone doctoral students “tend to overwrite things” (Alex) and “try to over-complexify, be too sophisticated, and use all kinds of words and jargon that are kind of indicators of being a member of a particular club” (Kevin) or a specific discourse community. Kevin believed that doctoral students should not limit themselves to a particular discourse community and should be able to “de-centre and be agile in terms of their use of particular discourse patterns and terminology that suit their audience”. Otherwise, “they end up writing things that are opaque” to those who are not “members of the club”. He highlighted that it takes time for novice scholars to “develop that agility”. The participants pointed out varying degrees of familiarity or unfamiliarity with academic genre(s) and proficiency in academic literacy among Anglophone doctoral students.

Focusing on the journal article genre, they highlighted that some doctoral students have difficulty with writing coherently and separating “conventionally defined” (Alex) sections of the journal article or aggregating relevant information in those sections. For example, they usually mix the content of the literature review section with the method section or the results section with the discussion section. They highlighted that doctoral students usually struggle with turning the introduction chapter of their theses into a one or two-page of journal article introduction and framing the significance and objectives of their research. They thought that the method section is the easiest section for doctoral students to write as it is a “straightforward” documentation of one’s research steps and procedures and does
not require an “in-depth analysis” (Laura). However, the justification of the methods used might be a challenge. They also agreed that framing and presenting the findings or the results in a “coherent, focused, and conceptually succinct but also sufficiently detailed way” (Alex) and in relation to the purposes of the research is a big challenge for Anglophone doctoral students.

… you are producing something that has sections and those are conventionally defined sections and you have to separate out the different parts logically following the conventions and that's I think that's something that people do learn as a doctoral student and should learn … (Alex)

Faculty supervisor’s perspectives highlight a lack of awareness of the expectations of the journal article genre and target audience as a challenging area for Anglophone doctoral students. In addition to genre awareness, Anglophone doctoral students also struggled with the know-how of the publication process which will be dealt with in the next section.

4.3.2.2 Publication process

The faculty participants believed that unlike established scholars, novice scholars do not have the “the basic mind map” or “schema” (Laura) of the intricacies involved in publication process including: targeting an appropriate journal, submission, and negotiation with gatekeepers and attending to their critical feedback. They explained that although junior scholars probably might know the expectations of the target audience through the journal publication guidelines, they still find the process very challenging as they are novice and “don’t have the actual experience” (Laura). Non-discursive issues also came up in faculty supervisors’ comments which will follow next.
4.3.2.3 Non-discursive challenges

The faculty participants unanimously agreed that the emotional aspect of dealing with critical reviews or rejection is a big challenge for doctoral students. “New doctoral students can be quite upset and devastated at getting an insensitive feedback” as they have not developed “thick skins” in dealing with negative reviews (Kevin). They also pointed out that Anglophone emerging scholars struggle with time coordination and publishing pressure before conducting their doctoral research as they are not standing in a good position. The following sections reflect faculty supervisors’ perspectives on learning writing for scholarly publication.

4.3.2.4 Personal academic engagement

The faculty participants highlighted that doctoral students have to “take the major responsibility and to be motivated and have the career aspirations to try to learn from the opportunities that exist” (Alex). They believed that doctoral students learn writing for scholarly publication in an “indirect culture” (Alex) and through getting involved in it, practicing, and doing it. They highlighted extensive reading and modelling one’s work based on similar published materials as good strategies that can help doctoral students gain both disciplinary knowledge and awareness of the expectations of the target genre(s). The next section will present faculty participants’ opinions on the role of mentorship and support for learning writing for scholarly publication.
4.3.2.5 Mentorship & support

The faculty participants agreed that professors’ mentorship and support are crucial and integral for socialization of emerging scholars into the target academic community and learning writing for scholarly publication. However, they highlighted that mentorship opportunities are not the same for every doctoral student and “there is a lot of luck in it” (Kevin). They mainly depend on “where the doctoral student lands” (Kevin) and who their supervisor is. So “not every student can get that more intensive experience” and “in an equal extensive basis” (Alex). They also pointed out that faculty supervisors’ perceptions of mentorship and collaboration, their experience, and the nature of the student/supervisor relationship and their level of communication determine quality and effectiveness of mentorship.

… some faculty members are very open to working with doctoral students either in terms of joint publications from projects that they're involved in or helping doctoral student write up his or her research independently. Others are probably much less so … (Kevin)

The participants highlighted encouragement, co-publication, feedback, and support groups as various forms of mentorship and support. The faculty participants explained that they mention scholarly publication in their courses, have informal talks with students on the issues involved in academic publishing, draw their attention to scholarly journals in their disciplines, and encourage them to have a publication plan. They also motivate their students to get their publishable course papers, thesis research, and maybe preliminary work related to it into publication. The faculty participants highlighted co-publication as a
“stepping stone” for doctoral students (Kevin). It is a “learning process” (Kevin) and a way of providing them with “academic experience” (Laura). However, Kevin pointed out that it [co-publication] typically reflects “the faculty member’s perception of the doctoral student’s ability to contribute to it rather than being done as mentorship.” The participants also underlined the significance of “clueing into” (Kevin) the feedback doctoral students can get from professors, journal gatekeepers, and experienced published peers for learning writing for scholarly publication. Alex thought of the review process “more as an apprenticeship kind of process, more than a negotiation one”. It is “learning how to become a participating member of a discourse community and fulfilling the roles and responsibilities that are expected of that” (Alex). They referred to the significance of support groups as venues where doctoral students can share ideas on their research, theses, conference presentations, and academic writing and publishing.

Faculty supervisors’ perspectives foregrounded the critical role of mentorship for learning scholarly publication. However, they indicated that such a support mechanism is limited and unstructured in doctoral programs. The following section will deal with the role of the doctoral program in learning experiences of Anglophone doctoral students.

4.3.2.6 Doctoral program

The faculty participants enumerated graduate courses, professional development opportunities, and writing centres as the key elements that could shape and influence learning experiences of the Anglophone doctoral students. The participants believed that the doctoral program and professors have to structure opportunities and provide assignments and experiences that support learning writing for scholarly publication and
lead to publication of publishable genres. However, Kevin and Alex said that scholarly publication instruction or learning was not an explicit goal in their graduate courses. But, they had set it as an option and had let students know that the top level evaluation is a paper that is publishable.

Highlighting that there was no specific course on writing for scholarly publication in their doctoral programs, the faculty participants had conflicting opinions on a writing for scholarly publication course. Laura and Alex believed that such a course was not necessary, feasible and applicable as (a) “writing for publishing is more like icing on the cake, so that can be addressed with workshops” (Laura); (b), developing a separate course has its own bureaucratic complications and requires a justification as graduate courses are typically research courses, but this course is a support course rather than a core course; (c) “students always want to finish quickly and expeditiously” (Alex); (d) academic institutions tend to “strip graduate programs, PhD programs particularly, down to the most essential elements” (Alex). Drawing on his personal experience, Alex said that “those things [writing for scholarly publication course] weren’t structured as requirements in the programs” when he did his doctoral studies and was wondering if “people have learned to be scholars without that stuff” formulated into their doctoral programs. However, Kevin believed that a specific, non-credit supplementary course on writing for scholarly publication would be valuable, much appreciated, and more feasible. He added that if such a course were offered, “there would be a lot of take-up by doctoral students” as it provides “a lot more mentorship and demystifying what’s involved” rather than “just a one-shot two-hour seminar”. However, he believed that thanks to variation in academic literacy competencies of doctoral students, a separate course is not necessary for all of them.
… university administrators want to see their students complete in a short period of time in order to have a good reputation and attract more students to complete in a short period. So there is a real push to take a minimal number of courses, minimal basic number of courses and for economic reasons as well as time and human resources … (Alex)

The faculty participants explained that in their departments there are structured and ad hoc opportunities organized by students and faculty to talk about various topics including scholarly publication which is addressed at least once a year. Laura mentioned that doctoral students can also use the services of the writing centre for learning writing for scholarly publication. However, she thought that the writing centre only provides support for academic writing and not on writing for scholarly publication.

Kevin highlighted that there should be “explicit orientation” as to how to support doctoral students for learning writing for scholarly publication within the doctoral program. Alex argued that the doctoral program and professors have to engage students in collaborative research and create a “research-oriented discourse community” that “values research and puts it in the foreground” where doctoral students and professors can verbalize and share their research with each other and foster collegiality. He highlighted that in such verbalizations “oral dimensions interact with written dimensions” as well.

Faculty supervisors’ perspectives indicate that Anglophone doctoral students struggle with the expectations of academic genre(s), the inner-workings of the publication process, and non-discursive issues. Moreover, they also highlight that significance of the doctoral program and mentorship and support mechanisms offered within it for learning writing for
scholarly publication. However, they underline the random and ad hoc nature of those opportunities in the doctoral program. The following sections will present academic journal editors’ perspectives on Anglophone doctoral students’ writing for scholarly publication practices.

### 4.3.3 Academic Journal Editors

From academic journal editors’ perspectives, Anglophone doctoral students’ struggles regarding writing for scholarly publication were rooted in discipline-specific and genre-specific norms and conventions, epistemological issues and content knowledge, publication process, and non-linguistic issues. These struggles were codified as “academic genre(s)”, “epistemology and (sub)disciplinary knowledge”, “publication process”, and “non-discursive” challenges respectively and will follow in sub-sections 4.3.3.1 through 4.3.3.4. Moreover, academic journal editors also highlighted that Anglophone doctoral students’ experiences in learning writing for scholarly publication included personal as well as contextual aspects. Those aspects were codified as “personal academic engagement”, “mentorship and support”, and “doctoral program” respectively and will follow in sub-sections 4.3.3.5 through 4.3.3.7. Table 4.3 presents mini-portraits of the disciplinary and research focus as well as editorial experiences of the journal editors participating in this research.
Table 4.3 Demographic Information of Academic Journal Editors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Editors</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Editorial Experience</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>L2 Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial / Advisory Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial / Advisory Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 indicates that the editor participants were from disciplines related to language education, higher education, and applied linguistics. Therefore, they had both content knowledge and the meta-language needed to talk about writing for scholarly publication. Moreover, their extensive editorial experiences provided rich insights into Anglophone doctoral students’ writing for scholarly publication practices. Additionally, as established members of academia they could draw on their supervisory experiences and comment from both an editor’s and a faculty member’s perspective. The following section will deal with journal editors’ perspectives on Anglophone doctoral students’ challenges for writing for scholarly publication.

4.3.3.1 Academic genre(s)

The editor participants highlighted understanding the expectations of the academic genre(s), understanding the actual audience, and the discursive changes novice scholars need to make switching across different academic genres as the challenges of novice
scholars for writing for scholarly publication. They explained that the challenge concerns doctoral students’ unawareness of genre conventions and stylistic variations across different disciplines and academic journals. “[Doctoral students] are not “trained to do their own kind of genre analysis actually … all writers need to have some kind of level of genre awareness and it’s not something that’s actually taught” (Patrick). They underlined the significance of this awareness for writing for publication decisions of doctoral students as well as their initiation and socialization into target discourse communities or “fitting into the club” (Simon). The editor participants also referred to the use of informal and “not scholarly enough” language and “conjunctions when that’s not acceptable in the journal" as a challenging issue for some graduate students (Melanie).

… there are definite stylistic differences between journals and between disciplines and people have to be sensitive to those things. Some journals seem not to be particularly picky, many are and you can you really need to know the style that’s wanted. That’s gonna fit you into the club so to speak. They let you join the discourse community so to speak and I think that’s really a key issue… it’s very diverse you know, different journals are looking at different styles, students need to know what style is going to fly there … (Simon)

Focusing on the journal article genre, Patrick thought that first the title of the journal article and then the abstract are the most difficult and significant sections of the journal article as they give the reader the first impression and help the writer “get over the line” in the publication process because if you don’t get over the line “none of the rest matters.” He pointed out that “the reader that matters the most at the point of writing is not the readers of the article. It’s the editor and the reviewers.” Simon and Melanie believed that doctoral
students are usually “so apologetic” (Simon) in putting forward their research and its objectives. They struggle with getting to the point and “don’t understand that you don’t have any secrets and surprises, that you say at the beginning what you’re going to do” whether in the introduction or in the introductory moves of the literature review (Simon).

Regarding the literature review section, they agreed that novice scholars including Anglophone doctoral students struggle with understanding that “it’s not just the research you’re talking about, it’s the other scholarship that it is embedded in” (Patrick). They are not aware that they are not supposed to take a “show bag approach” (Patrick) or “just a catalogue of what’s out there” (Simon) in reviewing the literature where “there’s something on everything but actually that doesn’t show any sort of judgement” (Patrick). Moreover, Simon believed that doctoral students “don’t critique and they don’t establish as well as they could” in the literature review section. He surmised that it might be related to the writer’s relationship with their target audience and their knowledge of the presuppositions of that audience. He believed that the relationship and knowledge of presuppositions may lead to the writer’s (un)awareness or (un)willingness to take discursive moves they are supposed to take to “explain certain things” and to take certain stance.

… if you are a graduate student writing for your own supervisor, a whole lot of the presuppositions of your most obvious audience which is your supervisor are already known to you and it wouldn’t hardly even make sense for you to explain certain things because it just turns into a show question. He or she already knows the stuff and you are just demonstrating that aren’t you a good boy and so that’s like inappropriate discourse even. It’s pointless. When it comes to writing for an audience reading the journal, you don’t know what their presupposition are so it’s
a different audience right? And I think that it maybe they don’t feel comfortable doing it. It may simply be that they don’t realize that they need to do it. You may not get practice doing it when you are writing for a person who knows you and your project well right? … maybe to them it’s very obvious and the question is that they have to make it explicit for the reader … (Simon)

Patrick added that “what a lot of newer writers don’t realize is while you’re writing, actually it’s kind of a communication between people and in a literature review, you’re talking about somebody not just somebody’s work.” Therefore, “you don’t have to do it in a way which tears other research apart … [and] get[s] … someone very established offside with you.” Moreover, he pointed out that one of the struggles of novice scholars when paraphrasing others’ works is misrepresenting and changing what others have said. The editor participants believed that the methods section “shouldn’t be too hard because it should be technical” (Patrick) and straightforward as the researcher merely outlines the research procedures and the research instruments they applied. However, Patrick distinguished method from methodology and believed that novice scholars need to know the difference between the two concepts and understand methodology. He highlighted that methodology is more complicated for novice scholars as they are “not so aware of the sort of epistemological foundations of the work that they’re working with.” Therefore, the methods section is hard in that sense.

Highlighting the discussion as the most challenging section of the journal article for novice scholars, Patrick believed that a lot of novice scholars, both Anglophone and non-Anglophone, struggle with two issues in this section: (a) indicating the connection between their research and existing research “whether it agrees with it, whether it doesn’t agree
with it, and extends it”; and (b) framing and appropriating their report, even in case of disagreement, in a “non-confrontational,” “building-on-knowledge” way and without “making too strong claims.” Patrick and Simon also pointed out that doctoral students are not always clear on the implications of their study for further research and practice in the conclusion section and assume that conclusion is merely a summary of their work.

The editors’ perspectives also highlight a lack of awareness of generic and stylistic expectations of different discourse communities and academic journals as a challenging area for Anglophone doctoral students. The next section will deal with disciplinary knowledge as another challenge in Anglophone doctoral students’ scholarly publication practices.

4.3.3.2 Epistemology & (sub)disciplinary knowledge

Highlighting theoretical framework as the most challenging part of an empirical paper, only Melanie pointed out the absence of the theoretical analytical framework in manuscripts written by novice scholars including Anglophone doctoral students. “Either people don’t include it or they don’t think it’s important.” She also underlined that summarizing elaborate and complex theoretical frameworks poses a serious challenge for novice scholars as “it requires a lot of elaboration for the reader to understand” and junior scholars are limited by the word length in a journal publication. Apart from generic and epistemological challenges, Anglophone emerging scholars also face challenges in the publication process which will follow in the next section.
4.3.3.3 Publication process

The editor participants pointed out that Anglophone doctoral students struggle with different aspects of the publication process including targeting a journal and negotiation with gatekeepers. In terms of choosing an appropriate journal, they believed that “Anglophones won’t know that any better than non-Anglophones… [they] may not even know how the journals are ranked in the field” (Patrick). They also considered negotiation with gatekeepers as the hardest phase of publication process and underlined that novice scholars’ lack of awareness of the review process gives rise to two issues. First, novice scholars take a long time to respond back to the requested revisions and sometimes even take revision requests as a rejection and are not in the mindset to attend to suggested revisions. Second, they struggle with understanding reviewers’ expectations and attending to those expectations. They “think that they’re being given the option to do something but actually they’re not … they [aren’t] suggestions, they [are] directions” (Patrick). They do not understand the “take it or leave it” message behind those so-called “suggested revisions” or “clarification requests” (Patrick). They emphasized that failure to understand reviewers’ expectations and specific discourse of review process would lead to miscommunication between the novice scholar and gatekeepers, and ultimately rejection of the manuscript. The findings highlight the significance of awareness of different aspects of the publication process, especially the discourse that frames the review process, for successful interaction between novice scholars and gatekeepers. In addition to the above-mentioned struggles, non-discursive issues also affect Anglophone emerging academics’ scholarly publication practices. These issues will be discussed in the following section.
4.3.3.4 Non-discursive challenges

The editors referred to the affective aspect of dealing with reviewers’ critical comments as a challenge for doctoral students. They understood that reviews generally give rise to a sense of discouragement in novice scholars but advised that novice scholars “just have to put on [their] bullet proof vest” (Patrick), overcome negative feelings, stay motivated and persistent, and keep the dialogic channel with journal gatekeepers open. This approach contributes to the development of a positive, supportive relationship between gatekeepers and novice scholars and makes gatekeepers think of them as engaged and invested contributors. The following sections will reflect journal editors’ perspectives on learning writing for scholarly publication.

4.3.3.5 Personal academic engagement

Drawing on their personal experiences in learning writing for scholarly publication, the editors stressed that they went through the so-called “sink or swim” process to learn writing for scholarly publication and they “worked it out” for themselves rather than through instruction in their doctoral program. “It’s not that difficult … to me it’s a no-brainer, you want to work in a university setting in higher education you need publications … you need to figure out what you need to do to get those publications” (Melanie). Patrick and Simon thought that realistically Anglophone doctoral students learn writing for scholarly publication through personal engagement rather than training, and go through the same “sink or swim” process in current academia. “[I]f they’re lucky to have had some training, if you had been able to go to a course, it’s very helpful, but I think most people don’t unfortunately. So it’s learning by doing actually, it really is …” (Patrick). Simon and
Melanie pointed out that doctoral students need to be strategic in their writing and publishing decisions and have a “publishing plan” (Melanie), especially for targeting the appropriate journal(s). The participants highlighted extensive reading, resilience, motivation, and investment as the factors that help Anglophone novice scholars for leaning scholarly publication. The editor participants’ perspectives emphasized that learning academic literacy skills in current academia is based on the trial and error model and highlighted the significance of personal engagement and strategic planning in the acquisition of academic literacy skills. The following section will deal with the role of mentorship in Anglophone emerging scholars’ learning experiences.

4.3.3.6 Mentorship & support

The participants thought that “in general, all doctoral students need mentorship and they need somebody who is experienced with journal publication to walk them through the process and let them know what are the different stages and what to expect” (Melanie). They underlined that the supervisor as well as course teachers and advisors play a key role in learning writing for scholarly publication, especially facilitating the psychological aspect of the review process and junior scholars should take advantage of such support opportunities. However, they also underlined the random and case-by-case nature of supervisory mentorship in academia and believed that “some teachers don’t see that as part of their job, or don’t have the particular chemistry with that one individual student” (Simon). Moreover, Simon pointed out that a transition process is underway in academia where “ultimately people are not gonna have a mentor anymore.” Therefore, doctoral students need to look for alternative sources of support. The participants highlighted
encouragement, co-publication, feedback, clear guidelines on journal websites and public domains, editorial internship, novice scholar-friendly sections, journal editor symposiums, and writing support groups as various forms of mentorship and support.

The editor participants underlined the key role of the supervisor’s encouragement in initiating emerging scholars into scholarly publication, developing their self-efficacy, and consequently, boosting their resilience in the writing and publishing processes. They believed that supervisors can draw students’ attention to available resources and opportunities and encourage them even before the writing process. Drawing on their supervisory perspectives, the participants underlined co-publication as a significant mentorship practice if the student and the supervisor’s research interests are aligned.

The editor participants also thought that journal editors and reviewers should give explicit constructive feedback to novice scholars on their submissions. Even in case of rejection, they need to provide a clear reason and be willing to engage if they come back for clarification and “provide feedback that helps resolve conflicts in an academically serious responsible way that is not discouraging” (Simon). Patrick and Melanie mentioned that supervisors and advisors need to read papers that doctoral students have written and provide constructive feedback before submitting to academic journals. However, Patrick highlighted that supervisors and advisors are already overloaded. More importantly, they “often don’t have the metalanguage for knowing how to talk about writing … it doesn’t mean they’re not good writers. They just don’t know how to talk about it.” He believed that a combination of an academic writing expert who can provide doctoral students with advice on writing for scholarly publication and one’s supervisor or advisor who can provide advice on content areas would be more useful in the doctoral program.
The participants believed that academic journals should provide as much information as they can about their inner-workings on their websites and demystify different aspects of scholarly publication, especially the review process for novice scholars. The editor participants also thought that working as a book or manuscript reviewer or as an editorial assistant would be a useful learning experience for doctoral students as they gain “a lot of insights into this process that you would never get in any other way” (Simon). Simon pointed out that it is important that academic journals have refereed sections that are less demanding technically and time-wise, easier to revise, yet not intellectually inferior to full-length journal articles where doctoral students could learn scholarly publication through publishing in those sections. He added that quite a number of scholarly journals have those sections. They also underlined that journal editors’ symposiums within academic conferences are useful opportunities for encouraging doctoral students and informing them about the inner-workings of the scholarly writing and publishing processes. Drawing on his experience in a writing retreat, Patrick believed that a writing group is “really a valuable way of mentoring each other” and learning writing for scholarly publication as students write collaboratively and it “takes away this idea that you need an outside expert to give you feedback.” It also creates little communities of writers.

The editor participants’ perspectives indicated the significance of mentorship and support within and beyond the academic context for socialization of doctoral students into scholarly publication. However, they highlighted that current situation of academia limits access to quality and effective supervisory mentorship. Therefore, novice scholars need to take advantage of alternative support opportunities. The following section will address the role of the doctoral instruction in shaping Anglophone doctoral students’ learning experiences.
4.3.3.7  Doctoral program

The editor participants unanimously highlighted the key role of doctoral instruction in learning scholarly writing and publishing. However, they had conflicting opinions on the nature and quantity of instruction. Patrick emphasized that a writing for scholarly publication course needs to be included in the doctoral program curriculum. He thought that doctoral students need support as academic genres are mysterious and “a lot of students don’t know what’s involved” in them. Moreover, even across the divisions of a faculty, supervisors have “very individual” opinions on the nature and structure of academic genres and they never have “a common sense of what’s expected” from graduate students. Referring to writing and composition courses offered at some universities, he believed that such courses are mainly aimed at undergraduate writing and not at the journal article genre, “so people have very little training” in that respect. He preferred a year-long course to ad hoc workshops and emphasized that it needs to address both writing and publishing components as “they’re both essential [and] students don’t know either of those things.” He believed that such a systematic and continuous approach combined with student-formed writing groups where students practice peer review and peer feedback would be very useful for learning writing for scholarly publication. Moreover it unburdens faculty supervisors and contributes to their purposeful mentorship as it involves them “at crucial points rather than overwhelming [them].” However, he underlined that the success of a writing for scholarly publication course, or any other mentorship practices, depends on the level of engagement of the student.
Unlike Patrick, Melanie believed that scholarly publication has to be addressed in mentorship practices of faculty supervisors, graduate student seminar series, and in a very limited way “at very most in some kind of introductory first year doctoral course addressed in one class.” Above and beyond that, it is doctoral students who need to figure out “(a) the importance of publishing in those kinds of venues journals, books, etc.; and (b) how to go about doing it.” She argued that “you need to strike a balance between handholding and creating somebody who’s an independent thinker and somebody who can go ahead and negotiate within academia in order to be successful in that world.” She believed that having a whole separate course on writing for scholarly publication was not “feasible” for a number of reasons. First, “you are admitted to a doctoral program because you have spent many years taking courses and writing papers and at that point you need to have the skills associated with being a self-starter, being independent.” Second, the doctoral program curriculum is already overloaded with courses, and the primary objective for doctoral students is “to write a thesis, so they need not to be spending their time taking course after course after course. It’s not a good use of their time, it’s not what a doctoral program is about.” Third, “you need to have somebody who becomes a champion and decides that they would spearhead this course and submit a proposal to do it but there is reluctance to include more courses” and institutional bureaucracy is complicated.

Similarly, Simon highlighted that an extra course means extra financial issues for academic institutions and students. Plus “students are already overloaded.” He thought that the research methods course might be an appropriate venue for emphasis on writing for scholarly publication. However, he believed that the success of such an approach all depends on whether the research methods course merely stops at the analysis of
epistemological and methodological aspects of articles or goes beyond those issues and highlights the rhetorical considerations of the articles and analyzes the way methodological choices were framed through specific discursive moves and in specific generic frameworks.

The perspectives of Anglophone doctoral students, faculty supervisors, and academic journal editors converge on the fact that Anglophone doctoral students struggle with academic genre(s), epistemological and disciplinary knowledge, publication process, and non-discursive issues. However, a comparison of the perspectives highlights a number of discrepancies between the emerging (Anglophone doctoral students) and established (faculty supervisors and journal editors) participants’ approaches to the journal article genre. These note-worthy discrepancies concern the introductory (title, abstract, and introduction), literature review, methods, and discussion section of the journal article genre and epistemological issues and will be discussed in the next chapter.

Similarly, all of the participants’ perspectives unanimously point to the determining role of doctoral students’ personal engagement, mentorship, and the doctoral program in shaping Anglophone doctoral students’ experiences in learning writing for scholarly publication. Moreover, they highlight the unstructured and ad hoc nature of mentorship and support mechanisms in the context of the doctoral program. However, they indicate divergence in terms of the education and pedagogy of writing for scholarly publication and the responsibilities of those involved. These issues will be discussed in the next chapter. The following section will report the findings of the document analysis phase of the study.
4.4 Document Analysis

This section presents the findings of the document analysis phase of the research. It focuses on the information gained analyzing the websites and public domains of three international scholarly journals and two Canadian universities which will follow in sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2. The analysis aimed at gaining a further understanding about how Anglophone doctoral students are supported for learning writing for scholarly publication and how writing for scholarly publication is implicitly or explicitly addressed and supported in policies and practices of scholarly journals and academic institutions of higher education. Table 4.4 presents an overview of the three international English-medium refereed academic journals whose websites and public domains were analyzed for the sake of this research.

Table 4.4 International Academic Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Since</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English for Academic Purposes (EAP)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>“Provides a forum for the dissemination of information and views which enables practitioners of and researchers in EAP to keep current with developments in their field and to contribute to its continued updating” (journal website)</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL Quarterly (TQ)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>“Fosters inquiry into English language teaching and learning by providing a forum for TESOL professionals to share their research findings and explore ideas and relationships in the field” (journal website)</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>TESOL / US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>“Educational developments throughout the world in universities, polytechnics, colleges, and vocational and education institutions. It reports on developments in both public and private higher education sectors” (journal website)</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Springer / The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected journals (*English for Academic Purposes, TESOL Quarterly, and Higher Education*) were from the field of education with a focus on academic English education, language education, and higher education respectively. All of them had a hybrid publication model (i.e., online and hardcopy) and had been published since 2002, 1967, and 1972. Moreover, they were among reputed high-impact-factor journals in the field of academic language and higher education. Therefore, it was thought that the analysis of their public domains would provide more insightful information about education of writing for scholarly publication in higher education. The following section will present the findings of the analysis.

### 4.4.1 Academic Journals

The analysis of journal websites indicated that all of these scholarly venues highlighted their expectations and requirements on their public domain under “Aims & Scope” and “Author Guidelines”. “Aims and Scope” provided an overview of the content focus of scholarly productions that the journals thought would appeal to their readership. “Author Guidelines” focused on a number of policies and guidelines that the journal expected authors to follow or be aware of in order to be published in that particular journal including:
stylistic format, submission categories, review process and criteria, research guidelines, ethics guidelines, copyright, and open access. All three journals had online mechanisms for submission and review processes. They had presented detailed information as to how to create an online account for submissions, go through the online submission system (such as ScholarOne Manuscript Submission System) and upload one’s manuscript and attachments, track the progress of one’s submission, and online review and revision processes through their portal. In addition to the above-mentioned similar information shared on journal websites, Springer, the publisher of Higher Education, had a “Journal Author academy” link on its website. This link featured interactive online courses on two overarching areas: writing your manuscript and submitting and peer review. “Journal Author academy” offered complementary information on open access and how to review an article as well. It also included Springer English academy which focused on topics such as: why publish in English?, why is good writing important?, reader expectations, and overcoming language barriers. Interested authors could take a quiz before or after taking those courses. Each course consisted of a number of modules that focused on either writing or publishing components of scholarly publication, and offered detailed, useful information on various aspects of academic writing and publishing. At the end of each course, if the author took the quiz and answered 60 percent of the test correctly, Springer would award them a certificate that they could download and print out. Table 4.5 provides an overview of the key areas covered in “Author Academy” courses.
Table 4.5 Springer’s Journal Author Academy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing your manuscript</td>
<td>Identifying hot topics, Study design, Types of journal manuscripts, Reference managers, Overview of IMRaD structure, Title, Abstract, and Keywords, Introduction, Materials, Methods, and Results, Discussion &amp; Conclusions, Figures and Tables, Acknowledgments and References, Formatting your manuscript, Concise writing, punctuation, Spelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting and peer review</td>
<td>How to choose a target journal, What do journal editors want?, Cover letter, Common reasons for rejection and how to avoid them, Revising your paper and writing response letters, Publication ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Springer’s Journal Author Academy provided very useful information on both writing and publishing aspects of scholarly publication. In the writing component, it provided authors with information about choosing current disciplinary discussions, the journal article genre and its constituent sections as well as stylistic conventions such as punctuation and spelling. The submitting component addressed the know-how necessary in the publication process including targeting an appropriate journal and negotiating with gatekeepers.

Elsevier, the publisher of EAP journal, had an “Early Career Researchers” link on its website which featured training resources for scholarly writing and publishing. Table 4.6 provides an overview of the content of the training resources.
Table 4.6 Elsevier’s Early Career Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>“freely-available, bite-sized training webinars and a series of one hour live webinars all containing useful tips and tricks on getting published, peer review, journal and article metrics, grant-writing and getting your paper noticed” (Elsevier website)</td>
<td>Publishers: origins, roles, and contributions, The journal publishing cycle, Introduction to scholarly publishing, Proper manuscript language, Open access, figures and handling revisions, preparing your manuscript, structuring an article, How do reviewers look at your paper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>“[A] series of live workshops offering advice on everything from how the publishing process works to writing and submitting a manuscript” (Elsevier website)</td>
<td>• “Introduction to Scholarly Publishing • How to Get Published in Research Journals • Open access Publishing • Successful Grant Writing • How to Review a Manuscript • How to get your paper noticed • The Impact Factor and Other Bibliometrics • Authors’ Rights and Responsibilities (Elsevier website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing “Crib Sheets”</td>
<td>“[A] series of informative posters that are completely free for you to download and hang on your wall” (Elsevier website)</td>
<td>How to get published How to review manuscripts Research and publishing ethics Successful grant writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elsevier’s Early Career Researcher presented webinars, posters as well as information on live scholarly publication workshops that Elsevier had presented/will present in different countries. These resources provided novice researchers with invaluable information on academic writing and the inner-workings of the publication process focusing on a wide range of topics including academic writing, structural organization of the journal article...
genre, targeting appropriate journal, review process, negotiation with gatekeepers, ethical aspect of research, and open access.

TESOL Quarterly (TQ), had a “FOR NEW AUTHORS” section within “Author Guidelines”. The editors asked new authors to read (a) the second section of the (Dec, 2014) editorial; and (b) TQ Research Guidelines in order to make sure that their submission met the designated criteria. The second section of the editorial explained the two-stage review process a manuscript goes through at TQ. First, the “first in-house review” checklist and how the editors(s) dealt with a submission primarily before sending it to external reviewers. Second, criteria that external reviewers used to assess the quality of a submission. It also presented some information on the timeline of the review process, how conflicting reviews are dealt with, and a manuscript’s journey to final publication. Moreover, in its March, 2015 editorial, the editors of TQ presented a number of guidelines that doctoral students and emerging scholars needed to consider as they prepare their manuscripts for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. First, they highlighted the significance and benefits of scholarly publication for visibility and survival in current academia and advised that novice scholars pay attention to requirements, style, and focus of the target journal in order to increase their chance for getting published. Moreover, they provided a number of guidelines for novice scholars who wanted to convert their dissertations into journal articles. Encouraging new disciplinary voices and perspectives, they also highlighted rejection as part of the review process and advised that novice scholars be persistent, and use the feedback from rejection(s) to refashion and resubmit their papers.
The analysis of the public domains of the three academic journals indicates that the publishers of these scholarly journals, as novice scholars’ non-immediate community of practice, have stepped beyond the traditional prescriptive approach to scholarly publication where their inner-workings were implicit and limited to a set of guidelines that needed to be followed. In other words, they have started demystifying the know-how of different aspects of the scholarly publication process which required a lot of effort, time, and experience to decipher in the past. They have also implemented an online interactive support mechanism that not only directs more experienced contributors in their scholarly publication practices, but also instructs emerging scholars in a wide range of areas related to scholarly writing and publishing, mentors them in different aspects of scholarly publication, and helps them acquire the necessary academic literacy skills set in order to socialize into their target academic communities. The findings of the analysis highlight that the pedagogy of writing for scholarly publication is explicitly addressed in policies and practices of scholarly journals. Moreover, academic journals provide rich online resources beyond the context of the doctoral program that can scaffold academic literacy development of Anglophone doctoral students. The following section presents the findings of the analysis of the websites of two Canadian academic institutions.

4.4.2 Higher Education Institutions

In addition to the websites of the above-mentioned scholarly journals, I also analyzed the websites of two Canadian leading universities. The Writing Centre at one of those universities offered on-site and online academic, creative, and professional writing courses as well as tutorial services for adult and high school students. Table 4.7 presents information on the offered courses that addressed academic writing. The centre also offered
grammar, style, writing under pressure, writing your blog, and advanced composition courses as well.

Table 4.7 Writing Centre Courses at University A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Writing (AW110)</td>
<td>“University Writing introduces the tools essential to creating powerful and persuasive academic writing. Students practice key components of writing academic papers, including selecting meaningful topics, highlighting implications, supporting ideas with research, working effectively with arguments and counterarguments, and using academic citations to avoid plagiarism.” (university website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing for Graduate Students (AW107)</td>
<td>“Writing at the Master’s or PhD level presents distinct challenges. This course helps you with the specific requirements of graduate-level articles, reports and theses. Topics include problem areas in style and grammar, the development and organization of ideas, writing abstracts and literature reviews, and incorporating sources and quotations. As well as carefully designed assignments, the course provides opportunities for questions, discussion and exercises.” (university website)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The courses offered at this Writing Centre addressed genres that are expected of graduate students including reports, theses, and graduate-level articles. They aimed at helping students with the structural organization of journal article genre, developing arguments as well stylistic aspects of academic writing such as citation and quotation. However, a specific course on writing for scholarly publication was not part of the courses offered at the Writing Centre. The publishing component of scholarly publication was not a part of the academic writing courses offered either.

The Writing Centre at the other university provided developmental rather than remedial support in five areas throughout an academic year for both Anglophone and non-Anglophone scholars: “non-credit courses, single-session workshops, individual writing
consultations, writing intensives, and a list of additional resources for academic writing and speaking” (university website). The centre offered a wide range of workshops that supported graduate students for various aspects of academic writing. The workshops were suitable for students who had a busy schedule and could not attend the courses offered. Strategies for creating coherence and flow in academic writing, strategies for writing effective literature reviews, effective editing strategies, writing a research article, mastering punctuation, meta-discourse, plagiarism, paraphrasing, and quotation were among the areas that were focused upon in the workshops. The centre also provided individualized consultations for graduate students who needed support for their academic writing. In such sessions, expert consultants helped graduate students to develop their skills in planning, writing, editing, and revising their academic work. Writing Intensives provided graduate students with opportunities for an intensive “writing regimen in a distraction-free environment, as well as expert support and advice” (university website). These opportunities were to be presented in the form of “Thesis Writing Boot-Camp” and “Article Writing Boot-Camp”. Moreover, the centre also offered a wide range of on-campus and online resources that supported academic writing for scholarly publication practices of graduate students. Some of the resources focused on areas such as citation formats, grammar, plagiarism, publishing, academic writing, and thesis writing.

The short courses at this centre were in a modular design that met two hours a week for six weeks in addition to office hours and/or tutorials. Besides classroom instruction, one-on-one feedback on oral and written work was offered as well. Some of the courses were discipline-specific. Others addressed different needs of native and non-native speakers of English. Table 4.8 presents information on the courses offered at this centre. Moreover,
there were also three basic to more advanced courses designed specifically for non-native speakers of English which focused on essential, grammar, and style of academic writing. Other courses offered instruction on oral academic skills and writing different proposals.

### Table 4.8 Writing Centre Courses at University B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDIT 1/2 - Becoming a Better Editor of Your Own Work</td>
<td>“The course focuses on four aspects of editing: editing for correctness, clarity, cohesion, and concision. Using rules derived from the standard practices of educated writers, we will review the grammar errors most commonly made by graduate students. In the second and third weeks, we will focus on clarity and cohesion at the level of sentences and paragraphs.” (university website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 1/2 - Prewriting Strategies for Developing and Organizing Your Ideas</td>
<td>“Participants will be introduced to a range of strategies for developing and organizing their ideas – strategies such as organizing notes through key words, outlining, diagramming, use of Aristotle’s Topics, etc. – and will be encouraged to consider which strategies work best given their own learning styles.” (university website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA 1/2 - Understanding the Research Article: Reading towards Writing</td>
<td>“What are the typical “moves” made in the opening section of a Research Article? How do you use the words and work of others to support your arguments without losing your own voice? How do you introduce and incorporate a theoretical framework? Is speaking in the first person appropriate? What strategies are at play in an article’s conclusions? This course is designed to help graduate students write research articles by increasing their familiarity with the established forms of articles published in their own discipline. Through class discussion and close readings of articles drawn from representative fields of study, we will analyze discourse strategies in order to answer the above questions and more. The course will also consider technical writing issues, such as what verb tense works and strategically using the passive or active voice. Students will also receive feedback on the research papers that they themselves are writing.” (university website)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The courses offered at this centre focused on thesis and the journal article genres. Focusing on a wide range of topics regarding academic writing, this centre helped students strategize developing and organizing ideas, structure their theses or journal articles and learn rhetorical function and structure of different sections of their theses or articles, edit and shape their writing based on the expectations of their discourse community. However, just like the first writing centre, this one did not offer a specific course on writing for scholarly publication. The focus of the courses offered was merely on academic writing and did not address the publishing component.

The findings of the analysis highlight that the courses offered at the writing centres of both universities mainly addressed topics regarding genres that are expected of graduate students and in graduate programs, especially the thesis genre. If the content of the courses reflected what is advertised on the websites, those courses could facilitate academic writing literacy of Anglophone doctoral students and scaffold their initiation into the journal article genre. However, the fact that other aspects of scholarly publication (such as submission process, review process, negotiation with gatekeepers, etc.) were not part of the implicit or explicit focus of those courses calls into question their applicability.
as a pedagogic support mechanism for learning scholarly publication. The following chapter will present a discussion of the findings of the study.
Chapter 5

5 Discussion

5.1 Overview

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings of the research in light of the theoretical framework, the current literature, and the research questions. It includes a discussion of the participants’ conflicting perspectives regarding different sections of the journal article genre; the role of native-speakerhood in raising Anglophone doctoral students’ awareness of the expectations of their target discourse communities; Anglophone doctoral students’ linguistic advantage in writing for scholarly publication practices; the isolated nature of Anglophone doctoral students’ learning experiences within the context of the doctoral program and the inherent risks involved; the choice ahead of us to avoid those risks; and my personal stance as an insider researcher.

5.2 Novice Not Native: This is the Question

Writing for scholarly publication is not merely an academic practice for novice scholars, it provides them with an opportunity for initiation and socialization into discourses and practices of their target discourse communities. However, initiation and participation require that novice scholars not only be aware of the expectations of their discourse community including community-specific genres, highly specific terminology, and high level of content and discoursal expertise (Swales, 1990), but also meet those expectations in their practices. In other words, these community-specific expectations not only shape
the way newcomers can frame, develop, articulate, and support their discussions, but also
determine their inclusion or exclusion from target academic discourse communities and
challenge their participation. Considering that English is the default language of scholarly
publication and thus the lingua franca of global academic community, the native-English-
speaker status of Anglophone novice scholars must supposedly make them aware of the
expectations of their discourse communities and consequently, facilitate their initiation and
participation in the practices of those communities. To verify this supposition, first, one
needs to know what the expectations of a discourse community are. Then, they need to see
whether Anglophone emerging scholars’ practices or perceptions of the expectations of
their discourse community diverge from the real expectations or not.

The theoretical framework of Discourse Community highlights the expectations of a
discourse community as community-specific genres, highly specific terminology, and high
level of content and discoursal expertise (Swales, 1990). Moreover, the perspectives and
practices of the established members of a discourse community can reflect the expectations
of the community they represent. Therefore, in addition to the theoretical framework of the
Discourse Community, I can draw upon the perspectives of the faculty supervisors and
academic journal editors (as established members) to inform my understanding of the
expectations of the discourse community that all of my participants belong to. A
comparison of the participants’ perspectives in light of the first research question (i.e., Why
do Canadian Anglophone doctoral students find writing for scholarly publication
challenging?) provides me with the opportunity to establish Anglophone doctoral students’
diverging practices and perceptions from the expectations of their academic discourse
community. In what follows, I will discuss the participants’ perspectives regarding different sections of the journal article genre.

Anglophone doctoral students’ perspectives regarding the introductory section (introduction, title, and abstract) highlighted that they were more focused on the importance of the introduction compared to the title and the abstract in engaging the reader or what they called getting the “hook” (Rose). However, one of the editors (Patrick) underlined that title and abstract were more important to them than the introduction and editors looked at those sections in order to make their decisions on acceptance or rejection of submissions in the first place. Moreover, unlike Henson (2007) who believed that novice writers should not try to impress editors, he thought that contributors had to have editors and reviewers in mind at the time of writing rather than the general readership. There could be two underlying reasons for this case of divergence. First, the doctoral participants might mistakenly perceive of these sections, especially abstract, as “low stakes” writing whose only requirement is observing the word limit. This perception blinds the novice scholars to the rhetorically promotional function of the title and the abstract and the fact that these sections are not merely a name or a summary for a manuscript. They are as important as the whole journal article as they provide a discursive space to make the first impression and justify the worthiness of one’s research in the eyes of the gatekeepers who are the real readership of academic journals. Second, apart from the thesis, doctoral writing is usually limited to genres such as reaction papers, meta-analysis, research reports, or annotated bibliographies which do not require a catchy title or a real abstract. Therefore, doctoral students might not get enough practice in that respect. Moreover, novice scholars’ constant concern for targeting the appropriate readership clouds their judgement about the real
readers as they are more focused on second-hand consumers of academic productions (i.e., general readership).

This also stresses that as a strategy in targeting the appropriate readership, novice scholars not only have to do a quick research on past issues of their target journals (as recommended by faculty participants), but they also have to be aware of the preferences of the editorial team as well. Anglophone doctoral students’ “apologetic” approach (Simon & Melanie) and verbosity in putting forward their research and its objectives in the introductory section is another instance of novice scholars’ divergence from genre-specific expectations. This divergence may be related to the fact that doctoral publication in many cases is dependent on doctoral research where doctoral students turn their theses into journal articles. Therefore, their lack of understanding of differences and requirements of these genres and different expectations of their target readership does not let them make the necessary changes when switching across these genres.

The participants’ approaches to the literature review section also indicated instances of divergence. The student participants thought that they needed a very descriptive approach to the literature review in order to highlight their “breadth of knowledge” (Jack) and establish their credibility. However, the established members did not approve of it and thought that novice scholars’ insecurities in their writing underlined their “show bag approach” (Patrick) to literature review. They also underlined that doctoral students try to indicate their affiliation as a “member of a particular club” through overwriting and using heavily jargonistic language (Kevin). They believed that doctoral students should not limit themselves to a particular discourse community. Otherwise, “they end up writing things that are opaque” to those who are not “members of the club” (Kevin). Moreover, they
thought that novice scholars did not “critique as well as they could” (Simon). Having a different perception of the rhetorical function of the literature, Anglophone doctoral students are more concerned about the comprehensiveness of the literature review rather than its critical aspect, relevance, and currency. It seems that just like the introductory section, they do not see literature review as a discursive space where they are supposed to situate their research in the broader disciplinary scholarship and critique that scholarship in order to create a research space (Swales, 1990). To them, literature review is more of a parade of their knowledge and the quantity of the literature review matters more compared to the quality which is a bigger concern for the established members. Therefore, they draw on as many sources as they can, including those that might not be the most important or recent necessarily, in order to make their literature review look comprehensive and themselves look credible in the eyes of their target readers.

Using jargonistic language, or what Swales (1990) calls highly specific terminology, could be a conscious strategy on the part of novice scholars to highlight their legitimate status in disciplinary discussions and a form of introducing themselves as participants and contributors to those discourses. Disciplinary discourses are not static entities and doctoral students are not merely the consumers of them. The novice scholars are legitimate active participants in creating them and through their participation they refine, reshape, and contribute to disciplinary discourses (Hyland, 2009a). Therefore, they might interpret using jargonistic language as their “deep immersion” in authentic discourses which results in “valuable contributions” (Paré, 2010, p. 31). Moreover Anglophone doctoral students’ lack of understanding or familiarity with disciplinary discussions and perspectives, prior instruction in writing literature review, or perception of literature review as not necessarily
a “critiquing exercise” (Samantha) could justify their non-critical stance in the literature review section. They might also conceive of a critical approach as a risky strategy that could irritate their established peers who might be would-be decision-makers at different critical stages of their academic lives. Therefore, they might prefer to adopt a non-critical “he said, she said” (Faith) approach as an escape strategy to avoid any confrontation with their established peers.

All the doctoral participants except one (Jack), agreed that the methods section was the easiest part of the journal article genre and what they were required to do was simply describing the procedures they went through in conducting their research. However, the outlier and the established members highlighted the difference between method and methodology and believed that it was not merely a descriptive process because one needed to justify one’s methodological approaches and decisions. Therefore, it was hard in that sense. This convergence of Jack’s perceptions with the established members’ expectations regarding the methods section can be discussed in terms of genre and epistemological awareness. Compared to other doctoral participants, Jack might have had richer experiences in terms of exposure to academic genres including writing them or teaching them. This exposure plays a key role in his perception of the rhetorical function of different sections including the methods. Therefore, he is more aware that there is an important element of persuasion in the description of the methods section. That is, in this discursive space, one is supposed to take a number of discursive moves in order to describe one’s approach but at the same time justify to the reader the philosophy behind the approach. In other words, he knows that he needs to be “descriptively persuasive”, rather than just descriptive. Considering the specialist nature of the awareness, it seems that he has most
likely developed it through a research graduate course where the difference between method and methodology was explicitly highlighted and elaborated on. However, the fact that the difference was not articulated by other doctoral participants can also indicate that not all PhD students get those types of Methodology courses and it is not necessarily addressed or brought up in pedagogical practices of their professors.

It is noteworthy that genre awareness provides the context for articulation of methodological awareness. My personal experience speaks to this issue as well. Coming from a quantitative background, I had limited knowledge of ontology, epistemology, and qualitative research. I was aware of genre because my Master’s work dealt with the research article genre. Therefore, I had the necessary articulatory knowledge to frame my epistemological perception. However, what I did not have was the epistemological perception itself. Taking a research course on qualitative research shaped my epistemological perception as well and increased my methodological options. Therefore, I could be more persuasive about the choices that I made and more elaborate in articulating them.

Highlighting discussion as one of the most challenging sections in the journal article genre, the editor participants (and two of the doctoral participants) believed that Anglophone doctoral students struggle with balancing the strength of their claims. That is, they make too strong claims based on their findings and do not appropriate or hedge their claims. In this case of divergence, it seems that emerging scholars have difficulty striking a balance between their legitimacy and peripherality. That is, on the one hand, they are the legitimate participants in their disciplinary discourses. Therefore, they are supposed to make claims. On the other hand, they are peripheral compared to more established participants and are
still in the process of developing their understanding of disciplinary discussions. When their perception of their legitimacy overshadows their understanding about their peripherality, it clouds their judgement about the boundaries of their statements and claims and makes them think that their claims need to be as authoritative as possible. Consequently, they make claims that are very authoritative yet sometimes unqualified or broad. This issue could also be discursive. That is, they may not be necessarily aware of hedging as a discursive strategy to appropriate one’s stance in the discussion section. That is, to use modals (e.g., may, might, could, etc.) to control the extent of authority in one’s claims and navigate the discussion phase in a “non-confrontational”, “building-on-knowledge” way (Patrick).

Regarding epistemological or disciplinary knowledge, one of the editors explained that doctoral students either do not include a theoretical framework in their submissions or do not see its significance. It seems that novice scholars have a hard time making the connection between theory and practice. In other words, they are ill-equipped to appropriate a theoretical framework and then operationalize it from among the plethora of theories presented to them in their courses. Moreover, theoretical concepts and notions are basically too complex to explain and write about, especially for novice scholars. So when one wants to operationalize something abstract in a limited number of words things become conceptually and discursively much more complicated and overwhelming. Consequently, one either has to leave it out or consider it as a filler in the paper rather than the framework.

Although the perspectives of both emerging and established participants in the previous chapter agreed on Anglophone doctoral students’ unawareness of genre expectations of their target discourse communities, I specifically drew on these instances of divergence for
the sake of the discussion and the point I was trying to make. Moreover, genre-specific issues were only one aspect of Anglophone doctoral students’ challenges for scholarly publication. The findings also highlighted that Anglophone novice scholars were unaware of and consequently struggled with disciplinary content knowledge, the know-how of the publication process, and faced affective and non-linguistic issues in their writing for scholarly publication practices. Therefore, the native-English-speaker status of Anglophone doctoral students does not make them aware of the expectations of their target academic discourse communities. Nor does it raise their awareness of the know-how of the publication process or facilitate their affective and non-discursive barriers for initiation and socialization into scholarly publication. The findings support the argument that “academic English is no one’s first language” (Hyland, 2015, p. 57) and “academic writing, or academic literacy, is not part of the native speaker’s inheritance” (Ferguson et al., 2011, p. 42). As an extension to this discussion and in light of this understanding of Anglophone doctoral students’ writing for scholarly publication practices, it is significant to see whether the native-English-speaker status of Anglophone doctoral students puts them at an advantage compared to their EAL peers. The following section frames this discussion in the context of current literature on scholarly publication.

5.3 Lucky Anglophone Fellow Myth

The findings of this research highlight that Anglophone doctoral students are dealing with a lot of the same discursive and non-discursive challenges highlighted in the literature on EAL scholars’ writing for scholarly publication (Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b, 2000; Li, 2006b; Li, 2007). In terms of discursive challenges, the doctoral participants struggled with
generic conventions of academic English and discipline-specific knowledge. They echoed the views of both the majority of the participants in Flowerdew (1999a) who rated technical problems with English (e.g., grammar, lexis), as their major challenge and the minority who struggled with academic genre(s), structural organization of the journal article, and rhetorical function of different sections of the journal article. The findings also support those of Flowerdew (1999b) in that introduction and discussion are the most challenging parts of the journal article. Similarly, the findings agree with those of Braine (2005) in that unawareness of disciplinary knowledge and discussions poses a challenge for successful participation of both Anglophone and EAL scholars in global scholarship and their visibility. The findings also aligned with those of Li (2006a, 2006b & 2007) in that both her EAL doctoral participants and Anglophone doctoral students found unfamiliarity with the journal article genre and rhetorical functions of its constituent section, unfamiliarity with current disciplinary discussions, and negotiating and communicating with journal gatekeepers challenging. Moreover, the Anglophone doctoral participants’ struggles with stylistic requirements of academic journals such as APA disagrees with Canagarajah’s (2002) view that the tightening of the stylistic preferences of academic journals has only affected scholarly publication practices of EAL scholars.

In terms of non-discursive challenges, the findings highlight that just like their EAL peers, Anglophone doctoral students are dealing with pressure for publication in the course of and beyond their doctoral candidature, scholarly publication anxiety, the risk of premature publication, and affective and mental difficulties involved such as rejection or critical feedback, lack of confidence in their writing abilities and the originality of their work, and time for academic writing, doubled with family and personal responsibilities. (Casanave,
Moreover, the difficulty of finding people in their research area who would be willing to spend time and read their work and then provide them with critical feedback resonates with the experiences of EAL peripheral scholars in Canagarajah (1996) and Sahakyan (2006). More importantly, it seems that their Anglophone status complicates things for them and some of their challenges, especially the affective ones, can even be more serious compared to their EAL peers. That is, they have to deal with the double mental and affective pressure when seeking help with academic English literacy skills as they interpret it as putting themselves in a vulnerable position and losing credibility and stature with peers and professors.

The findings of this research support Hyland’s (2015) argument that “the native/non-native distinction breaks down entirely at advanced levels of academic writing” (p. 58). They also challenge claims about the geo-linguistic (or at least linguistic) advantage of Anglophone scholars in writing for scholarly publication which is adamantly advocated in some of the literature on scholarly publication (Curry & Lillis, 2004, 2010; Canagarajah, 1996). More importantly, they support this position that in the current research world, the difference is no longer between Anglophones and non-Anglophones, but between experienced and novice researchers (Hyland, 2015; Swales, 2004). In light of this understanding, it is clear that just like EAL scholars, Anglophone novice scholars need to develop academic literacy awareness and competency in order to navigate the same mysterious terrains and gain visibility. However, the key issue as highlighted by Cotterall (2011) is where the help should come from, and what form it should take. This issue will be discussed in the following section.
5.4 Legitimate Peripheral Isolation

The theoretical lens of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) frames writing for scholarly publication as a means of socialization into the practices of one’s community of practice and a form of learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The context of the doctoral program is one of the first venues for such socialization. As a community of practice, the doctoral program can support the initiation and enculturation of doctoral students into target academic disciplinary communities and their discourses and practices. The fact that they are doctoral students legitimizes their status as members of academic communities; however, their participation is considered peripheral due to their novice status, scaffolded practices, and limited engagement. In such a context, established members can serve as mentors and facilitate the transition of novice scholars from the periphery to the core. The theoretical framework of LPP highlights the context of the doctoral program and faculty mentorship as the sources and forms of support. The findings indicate that Anglophone doctoral students’ engagement, mentorship, and the doctoral program are the elements that can shape their learning experiences. However, the participants’ perspectives highlight that Anglophone doctoral students’ learning experiences within the context of the doctoral program are mainly individual. That is, isolated learning or what the participants called the “sink or swim” model is the dominant approach in learning scholarly publication in the doctoral program. In what follows in this section, I will draw on the findings regarding the second research question (i.e., How do they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals?) as well as the theoretical framework of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991), to discuss what makes Anglophone doctoral
students’ learning experience “intensely individual” rather than “quintessentially social” (Cotterall, 2011, p. 413) and what the risks are.

The reasons can be found in a number of (misleading) assumptions about Anglophone doctoral students, doctoral programs, and writing for scholarly publication, as well as what is overlooked about these elements. These assumptions were reflected more or less in the participants’ perspectives. To begin with, to many scholars an Anglophone doctoral student is a real mystery. When they disintegrate the qualities of this paradoxical being, they see a person who has English as their native language, is at the highest level of education, and reminds them of the time they were doing their doctoral studies. Therefore, it does not make any sense to them why they have to teach and support someone to learn writing for scholarly publication who (a) already knows English; (b) intends to write for publication in an English-medium journal and has already got the skills, supposedly because of their doctoral status; (c) is supposedly in academia to do research and graduate in the shortest amount of time possible. These misleading assumptions about who an Anglophone doctoral student is and what s/he knows have created a wrong image of Anglophone doctoral students. This situation is a reminder of the Oscar-winning movie, The Curious Case of Benjamin Button, in which Brad Pitt (Benjamin Button) was born old and died as a baby at the end of the movie. He looked old on the outside yet felt young and inexperienced on the inside. Similarly, Anglophone doctoral students although Anglophone and doctoral on the outside are still novice and inexperienced on the inside.

The “native-speakerhood” assumption reflected in the doctoral student participants’ perspectives (Samantha, Jack, and Larry) underlies the idea that native-Anglophones have
acquired writing competency naturally and are therefore advantaged in that respect. However, it overlooks the fact that:

[a]lthough 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 knowledge as a result of early childhood socialization and not the acquisition of writing, which requires prolonged formal education. (Hyland, 2015, p. 56)

Supporting Hyland’s (2015) opinion, the findings problematized this assumption and as a result, challenged the notion of linguistic advantage of Anglophone doctoral students with regards to writing for scholarly publication. Moreover, they also supported that “graduate students can turn out to have rather vague understandings of the whole process of academic publishing” and highlighted the necessity of writing for publication education for Anglophone doctoral student (Delamont et al., 2004, p. 174).

The doctoral student assumption was reflected in the faculty and editor participants’ perspectives (Alex, Melanie) who considered scholarly publication a “no-brainer” (Melanie) and thought that doctoral students either had already acquired the literacy skills in their undergraduate and Master’s studies or it was their responsibility to learn how to do it without much handholding. However, this assumption overlooks that (a) although doctoral studies indicates the highest level of education worldwide, every single academic can give a different definition of what a doctoral candidate should be and what their
abilities including academic writing literacy should be. Even if there was a single definition, the huge variation among doctoral candidates in terms of academic literacy competency in universities indicates that no academic institution goes by that definition; (b) despite the ever-increasing expectations for scholarly publishing, writing for publication is not part of the curriculum at undergraduate or postgraduate levels in many disciplines (Murray & Newton, 2008); (c) “doctoral publication is not a given. It flourishes 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); (d) academia is changing constantly and established members’ teaching and learning experiences might belong to two different times (their conception of teaching reflects how they learned things most of the time). Therefore, maybe scholarly publication was not a graduation requirement or even expected of doctoral students when they did their doctoral studies. Even if, they were smart enough to “figure it out” and strategize their learning, it does not mean that their students can or should have to do it on their own; most importantly, (e) doctoral education is a means not an end, it is the beginning of becoming a researcher, writer, and publisher not the end. Therefore, if it is the trajectory to becoming a scholar, the candidate needs to be supported to learn what a scholar is supposed to do and scholarly writing and publishing are definitely on the top of that list these days.

The writing-as-an-accessory assumption was reflected in the participants’ conflicting perspectives on a writing for scholarly publication course. Some of the participants (Kevin, Patrick), especially doctoral students (Rose, Jack), thought that writing for scholarly publication needed to be included in the doctoral program as a specific course. However,
Samantha and Larry believed that “there is so much content knowledge out there that course work would be better reserved for that” (Larry). Melanie, Laura, and Alex believed that it should be addressed in a series of workshops in a limited way as it was more like “the icing on the cake” (Laura). Simon also argued that it should be addressed as part of another course, for example research methods course. This assumption overlooks that writing for scholarly publication is not an extra-curricular activity in the doctoral education. It is an essential part of it. But it is either taken for granted or its importance is neglected under the pretext that research is the focal point of the doctoral program. However, it needs to be taken into account that research does not exist without writing and there is no point in doing research if the findings are not disseminated. Writing embodies research. One cannot separate a scholar’s writer and researcher identities. This assumption goes hand in hand with the doctoral student assumption in the sense that doctoral students are supposed to have learned academic writing in their earlier education and therefore, need to focus on learning content knowledge and doing research at the doctoral level. There is no doubt that students and academic institutions are under a lot of pressure and both sides want to finish with each other as soon as possible. Moreover, designing and justifying a course undoubtedly has its own bureaucratic complications. However, it needs to be taken into account that doctoral publication is a common expectation nowadays (Casanave, 2010). Therefore, time, money, and doctoral courses ought to be available in order to help novice scholars learn something that is expected of them and they need for their future survival and visibility. Otherwise, expectations, needs, and practices do not match.

Another misleading assumption concerns mentorship. The key role of mentorship has been highlighted in the literature (Lee & Kamler, 2008; Kamler & Thomson, 2006). It is a fact
that it can definitely make learning experiences of doctoral students more social and the lack of which can make the experience isolated. The findings also indicate that those who did not have access to adequate supervisory support felt frustrated and desperate. However, as the findings highlighted, it is misleading to assume such a support mechanism is structured and available for every Anglophone doctoral student. This assumption overlooks 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 of their hand-holding and support. That is why graduate assistantship experiences of doctoral students are also so diverse; (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); therefore students are not neutral elements in a mentoring relationship and the chemistry between them and their supervisors and their joint responsibilities and benefits complicate this complex equation (Delamont et al., 2004), and most importantly, (d) a lot of aspects of writing for scholarly publication, especially the writing component, require explicit specialist instruction by knowledgeable experts and cannot be picked up implicitly in an apprentice-like pedagogy unless the mentor is a writing specialist (Paré, 2010). These factors make mentorship subjective and as the findings highlighted good mentors a rare commodity in current academia. On the other hand, they also open apprenticeship-based pedagogy and the traditional approach to mentorship to question.
The other assumption is related to the doctoral program. The findings highlighted that although the context of the doctoral program and opportunities within it as a community of practice can potentially help emerging scholars’ initiation and socialization into writing for scholarly publication, those inherent capacities are not used to their full potential. That is, (a) not many faculty members explicitly or implicitly address writing for scholarly publication in doctoral courses or dovetail course assignments and coursework with what doctoral students do beyond the context of the class to scaffold their scholarly publication (Casanave, 2010); (b) academic socialization seminars and workshops are usually ad hoc and even the structured ones do not meet the expectations of doctoral students in terms of quality and quantity; (c) services offered at writing centres are more focused on graduate genres such as thesis and technical and stylistic aspects of academic writing and do not address publishing aspect of scholarly publication (presumably addressed in other ad hoc workshops). This has made doctoral students doubtful about the quality of their instruction and feedback. Plus, students’ accounts indicated that the services offered in those centres were not well-advertised and Anglophone doctoral students face affective and mental barriers to using the services; (d) there is also a lack of coordination between faculty members, departments and writing centres regarding the education of writing for scholarly publication, (e) alternative ways of writing and publishing, for example digital modes of scholarly publication are not generally promoted or supported by professors as they “are generally out of their depth when it comes to that kind of work… and in fact are looking for that kind of support and advice themselves” (Rose); and (f) doctoral students are not encouraged to participate in non-immediate communities of practice beyond the context of the doctoral program or to benefit from the alternative support mechanisms they offer. The
analysis of the websites of three academic journals highlighted the significance of those resources for acquiring academic literacy skills. These issues have negatively affected the doctoral program as a community of practice and made learning opportunities and support mechanisms offered within the doctoral program case by case and unreliable.

Consequently, a combination of these assumptions and realities of academia have marginalized the social aspect of learning writing for scholarly publication in current academia and forced Anglophone doctoral students to rely on their own initiatives and capabilities in order to strategize their learning and figure out ways to compensate for their lack of social support. The “lucky” ones may come across a caring mentor now and then or have access to alternative means of support. However, the unlucky ones who cannot figure things out on their own have no other choice but to perish. It seems like a self-regulating mechanism in which the fittest survive to become more and more visible and the weak get marginalized and automatically eliminated eventually. As discussed in chapter two, in his seminal work on scholarly publication, Boice (1990) cautions us about this kind of Social Darwinism. It seems that the issue facing us at this juncture is whether we want to subscribe to it or avoid it. I will address this issue in the following section.

5.5 Social Darwinism or Accountability: The Choice Is Yours

It seems that Social Darwinism (Boice, 1990) is a serious threat for emerging scholars in current academia. On the one hand, both universities and students have been relying far too much on supervisory mentorship and indirect culture for learning writing for scholarly publication. On the other hand, the findings highlight that the current policies and practices
of the doctoral program may not be optimally helpful in providing the necessary support for initiation of doctoral students into scholarly publication. Therefore, the findings support Kamler (2008) in 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.” (p. 292). They highlight that academic institutions have to avoid unstructured ad hoc approaches, adopt more informed, effective, and purposeful policies and practices, and take a more accountable role in the education of scholarly publication. More importantly, they need to promote and invest more in social pedagogies and explicit instruction including peer-based learning, publication-oriented coursework, non-immediate communities of practice, and ERPP courses. In the next section, I will draw on my personal experiences as a novice scholar to fulfill my role as an involved researcher.

5.6 An Insider

I see my research from a situated position. That is, I am myself a doctoral candidate who has written for scholarly publication and lived the experiences of my participants. Therefore, a lot of the things they said, a lot of the feelings they expressed resonated with mine. As a novice scholar who did his Master’s on the research article genre and is doing his PhD research on writing for scholarly publication, I feel lucky to have learned different aspects of this mysterious endeavour through formal education without going through a trial and error process. Listening to my participants, I thought about the assumptions that many novice and established scholars have about Anglophone doctoral students, their writing for
scholarly publication practices, and doctoral education. I thought how simple sometimes their challenges sounded to me and how advantaged sometimes EAL scholars are as their non-nativeness is a good justification for their mistakes, support-seeking efforts, and most importantly their instruction and formal education. Doing my doctoral studies, I completely agree with them that most of the doctoral program is based on a “sink or swim” model and sometimes even “sink or sink” model, and that mentorship is a case by case issue in the sense that you have limitations in terms of whom you can choose and who can choose you. Writing my research, I felt very satisfied with the fact that I could shed light on some aspects of Anglophone doctoral students’ academic lives, what they go through, and how right or wrong assumptions about them affect the course of their academic lives and scholarly publication practices. In the following concluding chapter, I present the implications of this research for policy and practice and offer a number of suggestions for further research in this domain.
Chapter 6

6 Conclusion

This chapter presents an overview of the research including its objectives, research questions, theoretical and methodological frameworks, key findings, and the significance of those findings. Next, it highlights the implications of the research for policy and practice, and offers a number of suggestions for further research.

6.1 Overview

This research examined writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students in a Canadian higher education context. It investigated challenges experienced by Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication in international English-medium academic journals and examined how they are supported and mentored by expert members of their academic communities in this scholarly endeavour. More specifically, it sought answers to two overarching issues: (a) Why do Canadian Anglophone doctoral students find writing for scholarly publication challenging? (b) How do they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals?

The notions of Discourse Community (Swales, 1990) and Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) constituted the theoretical framework of the research. Framing writing for scholarly publication as initiation into a discourse community meant that “one’s entry into such communities rests upon his/her ability to meet the criteria set for them” (Uzuner, 2008, p. 258). I adopted such a perspective to predict, interpret, and
explain the challenges that doctoral students encounter for initiation into academic communities through scholarly publication. LPP framed writing for scholarly publication as participation in the practices of one’s community of practice and learning those practices in an apprenticeship-like relationship with the expert members and through continuous engagement in those practices. The key notion of apprenticeship framed the role of expert members in scaffolding academic enculturation, and socialization of doctoral students.

Methodologically, this research adopted a qualitative case study framework. The participants included Anglophone doctoral students, faculty supervisors, and editors of academic journals from across Canada. Data were collected through a questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. The questionnaire served for the purposive sampling of the most appropriate participants for the interview phase of the study. Interviews with the three groups of participants provided various perspectives on the writing for publication practices of Anglophone scholars. The analysis of the websites of two Canadian leading universities and public domains of three academic journals also provided useful information on how Anglophone novice scholars were supported in their communities of practice. The theoretical framework of the study and the existing literature informed the analysis and interpretation of the collected data.

With regards to the first research question (Why do Canadian Anglophone doctoral students find writing for scholarly publication challenging?), the findings indicated that Anglophone doctoral students struggle with discursive and rhetorical conventions of the journal article genre and stylistic requirements of different academic journals. They also find the conceptualization and articulation of epistemological and disciplinary discussions challenging. Moreover, they struggle with different aspects of the publication process
including targeting the appropriate journal, navigating the review process, and negotiating with journal gatekeepers. Furthermore, they have to cope with non-discursive aspects of scholarly publication including affective and mental burden of seeking help, finding time for scholarly writing, and dealing with critical comments affectively. With regards to the second research question (How do they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals?), the findings indicated that Anglophone doctoral student’s personal strategies, mentorship, and the doctoral program context are the elements that can shape learning experiences of Anglophone doctoral students. However, the findings underlined that mentorship opportunities and institutional support mechanisms are either absent or very unstructured, and mainly depend on initiatives and practices of individual supervisors and faculty members.

The findings highlighted that writing for scholarly publication is challenging for Anglophone doctoral students and their struggles are rooted in their novice and peripheral status and therefore their unawareness and inexperience in practices of their academic discourse communities. More importantly, their native-English-speaking status does not put them at an advantage compared to their EAL scholars when writing for scholarly publication. Moreover, Anglophone doctoral students’ learning experiences are more isolated and individual-based than social-based and embedded within their communities of practice. Therefore, the findings underline that academic institutions need to take a more accountable role in promoting and supporting academic literacy education of emerging scholars and their socialization into the global scholarship.

The current scholarship on writing for scholarly publication is dominated by the “Lucky Anglophone Fellow” syndrome. EAL scholars both novice and established are depicted as
the victims of linguistic injustice, “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). On the other hand, Anglophone scholars are considered to be bestowed with a first language that provides them with social and cultural capitals and initiates them into target discourse communities easily. It should be noted that “[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). Providing a real-life account of the realities of academic lives and academic literacy practices of Anglophone doctoral students, this research highlighted that novice scholars face similar struggles in their writing for scholarly writing practices no matter what their first language is. Moreover, it indicated that “it is clearly absurd to claim that native English speakers are an undifferentiated group which shares the same competence in specialist literacy skills demanded by academic writing” (Hyland, 2015, p. 58). Furthermore, it underlined that the policies and practices of the doctoral program have to support Anglophone doctoral students in a more structured way in order to facilitate their visibility in global scholarship. This research helped address shortcomings that exist in understanding how the Canadian research system at the post-secondary level can provide effective support for scholarly publishing practices of Anglophone doctoral students. The following sections deal with the implications of the research for policy and practice and a number of suggestions for further research.
6.2 Implications

This research has important implications for policy-making and instructional planning in higher education and doctoral programs. The findings of the research add to the foundational knowledge upon which Canadian academic institutions, doctoral program policy makers, professors, doctoral students, writing centres, ERPP practitioners, and EAP material developers can draw upon to support emerging scholars’ visibility and participation in global scholarship.

Academic institutions and doctoral program policy makers have to adopt more informed policies and practices that can promote the value of scholarly publication, orient doctoral students towards scholarly publication and facilitate their practices, and involve both faculty and students in collaborative knowledge production and dissemination. As part of their ongoing and dominant discourse, academic institutions and doctoral program policy makers have to institutionalize the significance of the researcher’s commitment to knowledge mobilization and public engagement and the role of applied research for improving policy and practice. That way it becomes part of doctoral students’ dominant discourse and faculty members’ educational practices. As highlighted earlier, academic institutions and doctoral programs have to invest more in explicit instruction such as writing for scholarly publication courses. ERPP can inform such instruction theoretically and methodologically and scaffold designing and developing ERPP courses within the doctoral program.

The doctoral program and professors have to design courses and structured assignments that scaffold novice scholars’ scholarly publication practices. Structured
assignments help create a pedagogical framework where students’ course work, dissertation and publication practices “dovetail” and consequently, feed into, and scaffold each other rather than function as separate independent elements. This framework promotes peer feedback, low-risk revising, and familiarity with discursive, social, and political aspects of writing and negotiation (Casanave, 2010). My personal experience speaks to this pedagogical approach to some extent. In one of the courses in my first year of doctoral studies, we were supposed to choose a recent book, review it, and then submit the review for publication. That assignment helped me get familiar with the book review genre and learn that it is an easier (yet less credited) way to get published as a novice scholar. I not only did not waste my writing, but also shared it with a broader audience rather than only my professor and colleagues.

The doctoral program and professors need to have a better understanding of the real expectations of their students in terms of mentorship and deliver more structured, continuous, and focused mentorship within and beyond class. Professors and academic institutions also need to promote alternative forms of support such as peer-mentorship. Peer-mentorship can lessen professors’ workload, get novice scholars more involved in their learning process, and add more variety to their social learning experiences. These social spaces help students verbalize their research, write collaboratively, discuss their scholarly publications experiences, exchange feedback, and may lead to joint publications. They can also create a sense of care, trust, and responsibility among doctoral students, help them be encouraged and inspired by each other’s success stories and lower their affective filters in seeking help. However, as Patrick highlighted, unlike common academic socialization seminar series reported in the findings that address the publication process in
a single session and only focus on publishing process, these support mechanisms need to be organized and continuous and focus specifically on scholarly publication addressing both writing and publishing components. They should demystify the journal article genre and its constituent components, submission and review process, and help students with their ongoing writing and publishing projects. More importantly, they should be facilitated by someone, either a faculty or a student(s) who has a good understanding of academic genres and the meta-language to articulate the knowledge explicitly.

Moreover, the doctoral program and professors also have to raise doctoral students’ awareness of on-site and online support resources available within and beyond the immediate context of the doctoral program, as well as the mentorship that other members of students’ community of practice (e.g., editors, reviewers) can provide them with. Students also need to become aware of opportunities such as editorial assistantship, reviewing and editing positions that are offered within their programs or are available in their in-house publications.

Furthermore, the doctoral program and professors have to draw doctoral students’ attention to their online communities of practice and encourage them to exchange support and mentorship with other members of their communities of practice. This helps doctoral students learn how widely their academic contributions can reach and how broad their communities of practice are. They also learn that they have a personal space where they can write and publish their research without going through the formal gatekeeping procedures. This can help students gain more confidence and peer feedback without being afraid of getting rejected or mental and affective aspects of negative critical feedback.
Doctoral students have to look for alternative support mechanisms beyond the academic context of the doctoral program, adopt effective strategies that are developed by their published colleagues, participate actively in professional development opportunities offered in their doctoral programs, and take a more accountable role in supporting their peers. Writing centres need to have a better coordination with academic departments and faculty members, develop policies and practices informed by the state of the art research and knowledge on English for academic purposes pedagogy, and tailor their services based on the real needs of graduate students and requirements of the doctoral program. ERPP practitioners have to analyze the needs of the participants in ERPP courses in order to develop a more informed understanding of the struggles that doctoral students encounter in scholarly publication and design their course accordingly. Material developers need to design resources that go beyond common guidelines and dos and don’ts of scholarly publication and address the real challenges of doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication. The following section presents a number of recommendation for further research in this domain.

6.3 Suggestions for Further Research

The growing literature on writing for scholarly publication in general and doctoral writing in particular highlights the significance of this domain in current disciplinary discussions and requires further in-depth research in the following areas:

1. Writing for scholarly publication practices of novice scholars, especially Anglophone ones. More empirical research, especially case studies, is needed in order to gain further insights into different aspects of writing for scholarly publication practices of these
scholars including: their challenges for scholarly publication, strategies that help them learn scholarly publication, cognitive processes that they go through to create scholarly texts, their discursive interactions with gatekeepers, their mentorship experiences, and most importantly as Hyland (2015) highlights, specific needs of different group of students and what practices work for them.

2. Writing for scholarly publication pedagogy. The pedagogy of writing for scholarly publication is an under-researched area where more empirical research is needed in order to gain further understanding about pedagogical practices and strategies that can scaffold doctoral students’ learning and facilitate their socialization into academic genres and discourses.

3. Comparative studies. Researchers need to conduct comparative research into different Higher Education systems and doctoral programs in different countries in order to gain insights into region-specific and discipline-specific policies and practices regarding the pedagogy of writing for scholarly publication and the effectiveness of such policies and practices when applied in other academic contexts.

4. Researchers also need to compare cognitive and social processes that Anglophone novice scholars and non-Anglophone scholars go through in acquiring academic literacy competence.

5. More research is needed in order to assess the effectiveness of current and common policies and practices (writing centres, academic literacy seminars and workshops,
students support groups, ERPP courses) in facilitating the socialization of doctoral students into scholarly publication.

6. Further research is also required into mentorship practices of faculty members including their co-publication with doctoral students, supervisory strategies, and feedback on doctoral students’ writing.

7. Research also needs to focus on non-immediate communities of practice and investigate support mechanisms that exist beyond the context of the doctoral program and their role in initiation of novice scholars into writing for scholarly publication.

Research in these areas will enrich knowledge repertoire upon which academic institutions and professors can draw in order to improve academic literacy education of their emerging scholars and support collaborative production, dissemination, and mobilization of knowledge.

6.4 Conclusion

In the globalized academic context, research in this domain needs to adopt a more inclusive approach in focusing on scholarly publication practices of both Anglophone and EAL scholars, demonstrating the challenging nature of academic publication for all scholars, and presenting more comprehensive pedagogic approaches and strategies. Moreover, there is no doubt that the chronic scholarly writing and publishing dysfunction that many academics are dealing with is the result of their education and policies and practices of academia for preparing them as prospective scholars. So are the solutions.
In conclusion, this investigation into the writing for scholarly publication practices of Anglophone doctoral students has provided insights into an extremely under-researched population in an under-represented aspect of academic literacy. The insights gained regarding the challenges they face during their initiation and socialization into academic discourse communities, and how best to scaffold their legitimate peripheral participation in their communities of practice, are timely. They challenge the view that Anglophone scholars enjoy geolinguistic advantage in global scholarship, highlight shortcomings in current doctoral program policies and practices regarding writing for scholarly publication, and underscore the view held by PhD students, faculty members, and journal editors that academia should be held accountable for assisting emerging scholars in achieving greater visibility and voice in global scholarship, both of which can enable them to play a much needed role in the construction, dissemination, and mobilization of knowledge.
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Appendix B - Letter of Information to Anglophone Doctoral Students  
(Questionnaire)

An Investigation into Writing for Scholarly Publication by 
Novice Scholars: Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral 
Students

LETTER OF INFORMATION

(Doctoral Students)

Introduction

My name is Pejman Habibie and I am a Ph.D. candidate at the Faculty of Education at Western University. I am currently conducting research into Writing for Scholarly Publication Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students and would like to invite you to participate in this study.

Purpose of the study

The aim of this study is to seek the perspectives of Canadian doctoral students, faculty members, and scholarly journal editors on writing for scholarly publication practices of novice scholars. More specifically, this research aims to explore the challenges and complexities of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication and investigate how they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals.

If you agree to participate

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire about the above-mentioned issues. It will take 30 minutes of your time. This questionnaire will help me to identify and choose the most qualified doctoral students who are interested to participate in the main phase of this research. The main phase of the study will involve an individual interview that will take about 60 minutes. Those invited for interviews must: (a)
be senior Ph.D. candidates (in their third year or higher year) in Education or a related sub-discipline (e.g., applied linguistics), (b) have English as their native language, and (c) be in the publication process or have published at least one single-authored empirical (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) research paper in an English-medium refereed journal in the course of their doctoral candidature. Please complete and save the attached fillable questionnaire (pdf file) and return it as an email attachment to

**Confidentiality**

The information collected will be used for research purposes only, and neither your name nor information which could identify you will be used in any publication or presentation of the study results. All information collected for the study will be kept confidential. Any information that might disclose your identity will be removed or replaced with pseudonyms.

**Risks & Benefits**

There are no known risks to participating in this study. There are no direct benefits to you; however, this study might have implications for you in your own scholarly practices.

**Voluntary Participation**

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time with no effect on your academic status. Completion and return of the questionnaire to the researcher indicates your consent to participate in this part of the study.

**Questions**

If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant you may contact the Office of Research Ethics, Western University at. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Pejman Habibie at or my supervisor, Dr. Shelley Taylor at.

This letter is yours to keep for future reference.
Appendix C - Letter of Information to Anglophone Doctoral Students (Interview)

*An Investigation into Writing for Scholarly Publication by Novice Scholars: Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students*

*LETTER OF INFORMATION*

*(Doctoral Students)*

**Introduction**

My name is Pejman Habibie and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Faculty of Education at Western University. I am currently conducting research into *Writing for Scholarly Publication Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students* and would like to invite you to participate in this study.

**Purpose of the study**

The aim of this study is to seek the perspectives of Canadian doctoral students, faculty members, and scholarly journal editors on writing for scholarly publication practices of novice scholars. More specifically, this research aims to explore the challenges and complexities of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication and investigate how they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals.

**If you agree to participate**

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a 60-minute open-ended interview about the above-mentioned issues at a place and time that you and the researcher would agree upon. The interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed into written format. Moreover, in order to corroborate and enhance the evidence in the final report, interview transcripts and draft case study will be presented to you and your agreement on interpretations, inferences, and stories will be sought. This will take you approximately 45 minutes.
Confidentiality

The information collected will be used for research purposes only, and neither your name nor information which could identify you will be used in any publication or presentation of the study results. All information collected for the study will be kept confidential. Any information that might disclose your identity will be removed or replaced with pseudonyms.

Risks & Benefits

There are no known risks to participating in this study.

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time with no effect on your academic status.

Questions

If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant you may contact the Office of Research Ethics, Western University at. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Pejman Habibie at or my supervisor, Dr. Shelley Taylor at.

This letter is yours to keep for future reference.
Appendix D - Letter of Information to Faculty Supervisors (Interview)

An Investigation into Writing for Scholarly Publication by
Novice Scholars: Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students

LETTER OF INFORMATION

(Faculty Supervisors)

Introduction

My name is Pejman Habibie and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Faculty of Education at Western University. I am currently conducting research into Writing for Scholarly Publication Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students and would like to invite you to participate in this study.

Purpose of the study

The aim of this study is to seek the perspectives of Canadian doctoral students, faculty members, and scholarly journal editors on writing for scholarly publication practices of novice scholars. More specifically, this research aims to explore the challenges and complexities of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication and investigate how they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals.

If you agree to participate

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a 60-minute open-ended interview about the above-mentioned issues at a place and time that you and the researcher would agree upon. The interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed into written format. Moreover, in order to corroborate and enhance the evidence in the final report, interview transcripts and draft case study will be presented to you and your agreement on interpretations, inferences, and stories will be sought. This will take you approximately 45 minutes.
Confidentiality

The information collected will be used for research purposes only, and neither your name nor information which could identify you will be used in any publication or presentation of the study results. All information collected for the study will be kept confidential. Any information that might disclose your identity will be removed or replaced with pseudonyms.

Risks & Benefits

There are no known risks to participating in this study.

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time with no effect on your employment status.

Questions

If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant you may contact the Office of Research Ethics, Western University at. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Pejman Habibie at or my supervisor, Dr. Shelley Taylor at.

This letter is yours to keep for future reference.
Appendix E - Letter of Information to Academic Journal Editors (Interview)

An Investigation into Writing for Scholarly Publication by
Novice Scholars: Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students

LETTER OF INFORMATION

(Journal Editors)

Introduction

My name is Pejman Habibie and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Faculty of Education at Western University. I am currently conducting research into Writing for Scholarly Publication Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students and would like to invite you to participate in this study.

Purpose of the study

The aim of this study is to seek the perspectives of Canadian doctoral students, faculty members, and scholarly journal editors on writing for scholarly publication practices of novice scholars. More specifically, this research aims to explore the challenges and complexities of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication and investigate how they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals.

If you agree to participate

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a 60-minute Skype chat about the above-mentioned issues at a time that you and the researcher would agree upon. The Skype chats will be audio-recorded and transcribed into written format. Moreover, in order to corroborate and enhance the evidence in the final report, the transcripts and draft case study will be presented to you and your agreement on
interpretations, inferences, and stories will be sought. This will take you approximately 45 minutes.

Confidentiality

The information collected will be used for research purposes only, and neither your name nor information which could identify you will be used in any publication or presentation of the study results. All information collected for the study will be kept confidential. Any information that might disclose your identity will be removed or replaced with pseudonyms.

Risks & Benefits

There are no known risks to participating in this study.

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time.

Questions

If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant you may contact the Office of Research Ethics, Western University at. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Pejman Habibie at or my supervisor, Dr. Shelley Taylor at.

This letter is yours to keep for future reference.
Appendix F - Consent Form

An Investigation into Writing for Scholarly Publication by Novice Scholars: Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students

Pejman Habibie

The University of Western Ontario, London, Canada

CONSENT FORM

I have read the Letter of Information, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Name (please print):

Signature:

Date:

Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent:

Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent:

Date:
PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT AD

Research Study on

Writing for Scholarly Publication by Novice Scholars: Practices of Canadian Anglophone Doctoral Students

Pejman Habibie, The University of Western Ontario

If you
✦ are a senior Ph.D. candidate (in your third year or higher years) in Education or a related sub-discipline (e.g., applied linguistics),
✦ have English as your native language,
✦ are in the publication process of or have published at least one single-authored empirical (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) research paper in an English-medium refereed journal in the course of your doctoral candidature,

you are invited to participate in a research study.

Participation involves a 60-minute open-ended interview about the practices and perspectives of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students on writing for scholarly publication.

For more information regarding this study or to volunteer to participate, please email:
Appendix H - Questionnaire for Anglophone Doctoral Students

Writing for Scholarly Publication: Practices of Novice Scholars

Instructions

I would like to ask you to help me by answering the following questions concerning Writing for Scholarly Publication Practices of Novice Scholars. The purpose of this survey is to better understand the challenges and complexities that Canadian Anglophone doctoral students face when writing for scholarly publication and to investigate how they learn how to publish in scholarly refereed English-medium journals. I am interested in your personal opinion and experience.

SECTION A: Attitudes Towards Writing for Scholarly Publication

Please answer the following items by putting a checkmark (√) in the box.

1. Writing for scholarly publication is challenging for doctoral students.
   Strongly disagree □  Disagree □  Agree □  Strongly Agree □  No response □

   Please explain your choice(s) below
   ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

   ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Anglophone doctoral students are not linguistically advantaged compared to non-Anglophone doctoral students in terms of scholarly publication.
   Strongly disagree □  Disagree □  Agree □  Strongly Agree □  No response □
Please explain your choice(s) below

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. Teaching how to write for scholarly publication needs to be included in doctoral program curricula.
Strongly disagree □  Disagree □  Agree □  Strongly Agree □  No response □

Please explain your choice(s) below

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SECTION B: Experiences in Scholarly Publication

1. Are you in the process of publishing a single-authored empirical (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) research paper in an international English-medium refereed journal now? (International journals include journals with a home base in Canada like The Canadian Modern Language Review AND international journals like AILA Review)

   Yes □  No □

   *if Yes, What is your target journal(s)?

   ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

   ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Have you published at least one single-authored empirical (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) research paper in an international English-medium refereed journal in the course of your doctoral candidature?
Yes ☐ No ☐
*if Yes, 1. When was it published? 2. What journal did you publish it in?

3. How many research papers have you published in scholarly refereed journals in the course of your doctoral candidature so far?

4. Which aspects of writing for scholarly publication do you find challenging?
Linguistic aspects (e.g., meeting discipline-specific norms or genre conventions of your field such as academic writing on educational psychology or applied linguistics or mathematics education, etc.) ☐
Non-linguistic aspects (e.g. finding the time for academic writing; finding the motivation for academic writing; getting over writer’s block, etc.) ☐
Other ☐

Please explain your choice(s) below

5. How have you learned how to publish in scholarly refereed journals? (check as many boxes as you wish)
Trial & error □  Instruction in your doctoral program □  Mentoring by faculty supervisor □  “How to” manuals □  Academic journal guidelines □  Other □

*Please explain your choice(s) below*

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SECTION C: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Gender:-------------------------------  Age:-------------------------------

Studies or Occupation:---------------------------------------------------------------

Academic Institution:------------------  Program & Degree:------------------

Year of study (e.g. 1st/2nd):-----------------------------------------------------------

✦ What is your place of birth? ---------------------------------------------------------- (e.g. London, ON, Canada)

✦ What is your mother-tongue (first language)? English □  French □  Other (please specify)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

✦ What other languages or varieties of languages do you speak?
4. Are you interested in participating in a 60-minute follow-up interview?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, please provide your email address so that I may contact you if you are chosen to participate in the interview.

Email address:----------------------------------

Please complete and save this fillable questionnaire & return it as an email attachment to

Thank you for your time and contribution
Appendix I - Interview Questions for Anglophone Doctoral Students

Interview Questions

(Doctoral Students)

1. What are the discursive (linguistic) challenges of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication?

2. What are your discursive (linguistic) challenges for writing for scholarly publication?

3. When writing for scholarly publication, which parts of the academic paper do you find the most challenging and the least challenging and why?

4. Which part(s) of the publication process do you find challenging and why?

5. Which part(s) of your academic paper(s) need(s) most revisions based on editors/reviewers’ comments and why?

6. How do Canadian Anglophone doctoral students learn how to publish in scholarly refereed journals?

7. How have you learned how to publish in scholarly refereed journals?

8. What would be the best way for Canadian Anglophone doctoral students to learn scholarly publication?

9. How should doctoral programs and faculty supervisors support Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for learning scholarly publication?

10. Do you think that English for Professional Academic Purposes (EPAP) must be included in the doctoral program curricula? Why?

11. What practices does your program have in place to help doctoral students develop writing for scholarly publication skills?
Appendix J - Interview Questions for Faculty Supervisors

Interview Questions

(Faculty Supervisors)

1. What do you think are the discursive (linguistic) challenges of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication?

2. When writing for scholarly publication, which parts of the academic paper do you think are the most challenging and the least challenging for Canadian Anglophone doctoral students and why?

3. Which parts of the publication process do you think are challenging for Canadian Anglophone doctoral students and why?

4. How do you think Canadian Anglophone doctoral students learn how to publish in scholarly refereed journals?

5. What do you think would be the best way for Canadian Anglophone doctoral students to learn scholarly publication?

6. Have you ever co-published with your Canadian Anglophone doctoral students, why or why not?

7. How do you support your Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for learning scholarly publication?

8. How should doctoral programs and faculty supervisors support Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for learning scholarly publication?

9. Do you think that English for Professional Academic Purposes (EPAP) must be included in the doctoral program curricula? Why?
Appendix K - Interview Questions for Academic Journal Editors

Interview Questions

(Journal Editors)

1. What do you think are the discursive (linguistic) challenges of Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for writing for scholarly publication?

2. When writing for scholarly publication, which parts of the academic paper do you think are the most challenging and the least challenging for Canadian Anglophone doctoral students and why?

3. Which parts of the publication process do you think are challenging for Canadian Anglophone doctoral students and why?

4. How do you think Canadian Anglophone doctoral students learn how to publish in scholarly refereed journals?

5. What do you think would be the best way for Canadian Anglophone doctoral students to learn scholarly publication?

6. How should scholarly refereed journals support Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for learning scholarly publication?

7. How should editors and reviewers support Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for learning scholarly publication?

8. How should doctoral programs and faculty supervisors support Canadian Anglophone doctoral students for learning scholarly publication?

9. Do you think that English for Professional Academic Purposes (EPAP) must be included in the doctoral program curricula? Why?
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