CHAPTER 21.

PUBLICATION PRACTICES AND MULTILINGUAL PROFESSIONALS IN US UNIVERSITIES: TOWARDS CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON ADMINISTRATION AND PEDAGOGY

Missy Watson
Syracuse University

The stakes for publishing in English are high for scholars seeking advanced degrees, academic positions, tenure, promotion, or research funding within and beyond US borders.[1] The demands facing multilingual scholars[2] whose first language is other than English are no doubt comparable to those of native English speaking scholars. Multilingual writers, however, often negotiate cultural and linguistic divides in addition to navigating—as all publishing scholars must—the rhetorics of the text, topic, genre conventions, writing processes, and communication with gatekeepers. The literature that investigates publication practices and other high stakes writing processes of multilingual graduate students and faculty at US colleges and universities has been prolific, especially in the last ten years. Scholars, for example, have worked to demystify the manuscript writing and review process of publication for multilingual writers, noting the sociopolitical interactions that take place and the authorial identities formed (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Casanave & Vandrick, 2003; Flowerdew, 2000, 2001; Li, 2006). Others have inspected the numerous "literacy brokers" involved during the composing and submission processes—the various readers, editors, and reviewers that participate in the composing and revision processes (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2006). Further, the cultural, linguistic, and geopolitical challenges multilingual researchers face, reflections they provide, and coping strategies they use have also been studied (Belcher, 2007; Belcher & Connor, 2001; Canagarajah, 2002; Cho, 2004; Gosden, 1992, 1995).

This investigation extends conversations surrounding the sociopolitical networks occurring as multilingual professionals pursue academic publication in English-medium journals. I interview multilingual faculty about their experiences and reflections about their journey to published research-writer. While these participants' insights are many, my purpose in this chapter is to interpret their testimonies in hopes of imagining new systems of support to be initiated in US universities. Given the influx of international students and teachers, I argue, a new paradigm for literacy and rhetorical education in US universities for multilingual research-writers is long overdue. Thus, I begin with the following broad research questions:

> What insights might be gleaned from exploring the educational histories and reflections of multilingual scholars schooled outside of the US who have made the transition to published research-writer? How might such an analysis be useful for educators and administrators seeking innovative solutions for implementing literacy and rhetorical training for multilingual graduate students and faculty?

RESEARCH METHODS

This study is informed by theories that view learning and writing as socially constructed ideological events where individuals rhetorically negotiate their entrance into discourse communities (see, among many others, Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Casanave & Vandrick, 2003; Johns, 1997; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Ramanathan, 2002; Swales, 1988, 1990; Wenger, 2000). Results are based on interviews with multilingual faculty teaching at US universities who have experienced the transition from being an unpublished, novice researcher to a published research-writer. Data collected consists of semi-structured audio-recorded interviews, copies of email correspondence with journal reviewers, participants' curriculum vitae, and email communications with participants. I explore these interview-based case studies for salient trends in participants' literacy practices in order to reveal insights based on participants' ongoing experiences with academic writing and publication in English.

Of the six participants, three were chosen for this chapter because they offered unique perspectives while sharing the same field of research. All three are currently working as international faculty at large public universities in the US and are employed in linguistics departments as tenured or tenure-track professors.[3] The participants have each published at least six articles in international

journals and each received her undergraduate degree at a university located in her native country. However, participants come from varying native countries, have different native languages, and have had very different experiences learning and practicing academic English writing. The participants' linguistic and educational background, together with a limited summary of their academic writing background, can be viewed in Table 1.

Table 1. Participant backgrounds

	Dr. Huszár	Dr. Nakajima	Dr. Sanchez
Native Language	Hungarian	Japanese	Spanish
Country of origin	Hungary	Japan	Argentina
Grade School			
Location	Hungary	Japan	Argentina
Language	Hungarian	Japanese	Spanish
Undergraduate Studies			
Location	Hungary	Japan	Argentina
Language of instruction	English	Japanese	English
Explicit writing instruction	None	None	None
Course writing assignments	Some short answer essays in English	Some essays written in Japanese	Some short answer essays in English
Major writing assignments in English	Undergrad thesis in English	Undergrad thesis in English	None
Graduate Studies			
Location	England and United States	Japan and United States	United States
Language	English	English	English
Explicit writing instruction	None	None	None
Seminar writing assignments	Term papers	Term papers	Term papers
Major writing projects	1 M.A. thesis in English, 1 Ph.D. dissertation in English	2 M.A. theses in English, 1 Ph.D. dissertation in English	No M.A. thesis, 1 Ph.D. dissertation in English

CASE PROFILES AND ANALYSIS

Cultural, Educational, and Linguistic Backgrounds

Dr. Huszár,[4] the first participant, grew up in Budapest, Hungary, and it was there that she received her early education through her bachelor's degree—all of which was taught in Hungarian. When she attended a Budapest university as an English Language and Literature major, she was taught entirely in English. Although she had received biweekly English language training from her mother, an English as a Foreign Language teacher, when looking back she wonders how she was able to survive undergraduate courses, since she recalls not understanding a single word spoken by the professor in her very first lecture. Today it is quite clear that she communicates in English with ease—both in conversation and in writing.

Dr. Nakajima, the second participant, grew up in Japan and is a native speaker of Japanese. Like many students learning English as a foreign language in their native countries, Dr. Nakajima studied English in high school and college through courses taught by non-native English speaking instructors. Dr. Nakajima completed her schooling up until her first masters degree in Japan. Although instructed solely in Japanese through her first MA, she received both of her first degrees in American literature. Therefore, most of the texts she read were written in English, but class discussions and coursework were completed in Japanese. In fact, her coursework mostly consisted of translating and interpreting English texts into Japanese. Similar to Dr. Huszár, Dr. Nakajima was not given explicit instruction in writing in English. Essentially, the only writing in English she did before her PhD program was during the writing of her theses for her BA and first MA degrees.

The third participant, Dr. Sanchez, was born and raised in Buenos Aires, where she communicated in her native language of Spanish. She was instructed completely in Spanish all through her early education until college. Besides learning Spanish verbs by heart in high school, she did not receive any explicit instruction in writing in her native language. She went on to receive her BA as a Professor of English and Technical English also in Argentina, where her courses were primarily taught in English. Dr. Sanchez was not required to take any formal writing courses during her college years, although one class from her undergraduate studies included discussions of materials and methods for teaching English reading and writing as a foreign language.

On Major Influences towards the Transition to Emerging Scholar

Despite their scholarly interests falling under the broad discipline of linguistics, one of the most notable variations between participants are their graduate

experiences. Dr. Huszár explained that the culture at her graduate institution encouraged students to join writing circles, and she received support and feedback on writing from faculty. It was common knowledge in Dr. Huszár's graduate department that doctoral students should be striving to publish their work in academic journals. Some of her seminars included assignments where students were charged with writing with publication in mind, and faculty would then respond to seminar papers in similar ways as do reviewers of journals. Dr. Nakajima, on the other hand, reported that her graduate institutions did not prepare her for academic research and publication; the importance of publishing was never acknowledged or discussed, she explained, by any of her professors or fellow graduate students. Instead of introducing her to research, her degrees prepared her to teach language at various competency levels. In fact, it wasn't until she applied for a tenure-track position that she learned of the need to publish research studies in her field in order to advance professionally within her department.

In Dr. Sanchez's case, she was able to get some explicit support on advanced academic writing during her graduate career, but this came out of her own discoveries, not from her graduate program. Dr. Sanchez explained how puzzled she was when she discovered (accidentally) the explicit analyses of the conventions for academic writing (such as Swales, 1990; Swales and Feak, 1994). She could not understand, for example, why her program did not explicitly address conventions of academic discourse or why they did not refer students to the vast literature investigating academic discourse communities. When rereading her old papers now, she notices strong research questions in her studies, but feels like the "moves" (Swales and Feak, 1994) of her texts were not in line with the academic writing conventions of her discipline. Her case illuminates a different kind of instruction, since writing mentorship for her happened textually, not socially. Unlike the previous cases where social mentorship either occurred or didn't in graduate studies, Dr. Sanchez succeeded through explicit instruction, but the instruction was happenstance and self-sponsored.

Participants also pointed to the transition from graduate student to faculty member as greatly impacting their development as writers. Drs. Nakajima and Sanchez both regret not having been more practiced in academic writing and publication during their graduate studies and are still wanting support in writing as faculty. Even Dr. Huszár, who received the most intense mentorship, struggles as a faculty member seeking publication. There are no networks in place within her department, and she worries about overburdening her already busy colleagues by asking them to discuss or review her manuscripts. She now relies solely on feedback from journal reviewers and editors. According to Dr. Huszár, writing without the support of mentors and peers often results in her

publishing fewer manuscripts or doing so at the expense of her administration and teaching duties.

On the Use of Rhetorically-Informed Coping Strategies

In addition to the practices occurring in graduate studies and as new faculty, another theme that emerged from the participants' experiences and reflections are the coping strategies often called upon by multilingual writers when seeking scholarly publication in English. That Dr. Sanchez found explicit examination of academic genre conventions the most useful in her transition from novice researcher to published research-writer, for instance, is representative of the kinds of coping strategies each of the participants drew on, especially as they became more experienced writers. That is, participants relied on text-based rhetorical analysis and imitation practices. Besides receiving mentorship from her faculty advisor, Dr. Huszár recalls in graduate school how she relied on articles she read as models, and she noticed with the help of her instructor some characteristics of the IMRD format (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion). While her work now often varies from the IMRD format, it has been a significant organizational strategy for her throughout her academic career. Like the other two participants, upon determining her topic, literature review, and argument, Dr. Nakajima will similarly seek out models written in her research area for organizing and presenting her studies, usually articles addressing similar topics within the journal in which she seeks publication.

The use of models, however, was not found to be limited to structural features. To explain how her writing processes have altered and advanced as she entered the professoriate, Dr. Sanchez divulged that before her first publication her only use of models was for *external organization,* while today she looks to models as guides to *internal moves* in addition to external structure. For example, when writing her dissertation, she referenced a previously published dissertation as a model for format and chapter organization, but today when she refers to models she will look more closely at an article's organization scheme for the moves within each section. Thus, for Dr. Sanchez, when attempting to gain a more critical understanding of the rhetorical organization and moves of research writing in one's discipline, it is crucial to analyze the more nuanced rhetorical features than the overarching placement and order of sections. Similar to Dr. Sanchez, Dr. Huszár finds importance in building this kind of rhetorical knowledge.

Using previously published articles as models for argumentative tone and style is also a practice of Dr. Nakajima. Dr. Nakajima recalled being uncomfortable when she first started writing for publication when reviewers suggested that

she adopt a more assertive tone and pushed her to criticize previous scholarship. Dr. Nakajima named this particular quality of English academic writing as conflicting with how she might write arguments in Japanese. Because she experienced some difficulty revising her tone to meet reviewers' demands, she began analyzing models closely for the kinds of writerly moves that accomplish this goal. She looked at the tones and grammatical structures of claims and also paid attention to where in research articles claims were being made. Her experiences, as well as those of the other participants, demonstrate how important models can be for scholars transitioning as published academics in their disciplines, especially when writers do not prefer to adopt an assertive tone or are not familiar with claim-making strategies in their fields. More than merely noting the overall structures, the kind of analysis participants were engaging in had to do with observing and imitating the rhetorical qualities of argument-making.

THE PROSPECT OF EXPLICIT RHETORICAL TRAINING

The case profiles of Drs. Huszár, Nakajima, and Sanchez suggest a number of trends in the literacy practices occurring in graduate education, including the use of coping strategies and the kinds of "literacy brokers" and brokering available to multilingual international graduate students. First, the differences in graduate education among the three participants indicate the benefits of fostering a culture of publication where students are informed about the social, political, and cultural aspects of publishing in their discipline, encouraged to write towards publication, provided support and feedback for publication, and are explicitly instructed on the rhetorical features and genre conventions of scholarly articles in English. Second, a coping strategy often utilized among this group of scholars suggests the desire for explicit instruction in recognizing and applying the rhetorical genre features recurring and privileged in research writing in their field. That is, participants' testimonies make clear the importance of looking closely at how arguments and evidence are rhetorically presented. For participants, it is not only mentorship and instruction on the politics of publishing or feedback on their writing that worked for them; it was explicit instruction on and analysis of the nuanced rhetorical features occurring in the kinds of genres in which they would be required to perform mastery.

It is important to recognize that while some of the interview questions asked participants to reflect on the kinds of writing completed at the graduate level, each participant was drawn towards discussing the *quality* of her graduate education. It is not surprising that graduate studies act as a major contributor when analyzing individuals' early experiences engaging in the research writing practices of their discipline. Still, the fact that each participant honed in on this

context as having such a significant effect on their future practices for publication indicates the need for graduate education and administration to further recognize and investigate the teaching of advanced research-writing.

Of course, many researchers have acknowledged the powers of graduate programs, especially the politics of professors mentoring native English speaking and non-native English speaking students during dissertation and manuscript writing (Belcher & Braine, 1995; Belcher & Connor, 2001; Blakeslee, 1997; Cho, 2004; Li, 2006; Ramanathan, 2002; Reid, 1994; Spack, 1988). Li (2006), for example, argues that professors should bring more conversation within graduate classrooms regarding the sociopolitical interactions facing them as novices, such as when they work on research projects or manuscripts with mentors, professors, and journal gatekeepers in their discipline. What is noteworthy is that Dr. Huszár's effective professionalization experiences in her graduate studies suggest that some US university graduate departments are ensuring their students gain critical awareness about publishing practices in their discipline. Colleges and universities which are currently providing support to multilingual graduate writers ought to be investigated and assessed in hopes of making public innovative solutions for acquiring literacy and rhetorical strategies.

While the current study did not investigate such model programs, the case profiles provide insight into future directions that writing teachers, graduate directors, and university officials might consider when designing educational programs that address literacy brokering. One such issue to consider is the approach to teaching academic genres. Whether or not it is more effective to gain genre awareness *explicitly* through the teaching of genres, or by learning *implicitly* through the ongoing practice of academic writing, has been debated in genre studies (Freedman, 1993; Williams & Colomb, 1993). Questioning whether explicit or implicit genre-based teaching should be enacted in literacy education, Freedman (1993) argues individuals acquire genre knowledge implicitly, and so explicit instruction is not necessary or effective in transferring genre knowledge. For Freedman, explicit teaching is no more transferable to new contexts than implicit learning of genre conventions. However, while the participants of the current study did not receive explicit *instruction,* they did go on to learn genres explicitly *on their own.* Since they studied the rhetorical features of genres and sought reading material which addresses explicit strategies for analyzing genres, their experiences support the argument for the explicit teaching of academic genre conventions, a process whereby writers work to identify, analyze, and practice recurring communicative moves. It was precisely the participants' experiences with analyzing texts explicitly for their features and their review of books which suggest explicit strategies for rhetorical reading and writing in academia are most useful. Their testimonies, furthermore, reveal

that multilingual writers are eager to receive explicit instruction at the graduate level.

Approaches to remediating the lack of explicit teaching have been documented by many. Belcher (1995) suggests we teach critical reading so that graduate students can begin to recognize features in articles within disciplines across the curriculum. She believes that if students learn about these features, they will in turn begin to use them in their own writing. Ramanathan (2002) comments that university departments should genre-sensitize students and teachers so that they can develop metaknowledge about the socialization processes in disciplines, including academic publication. She adds that part of this sensitization should include making students aware of the relative power associated with mastery of these genres. Similarly, Canagarajah and Jerskey (2009) conclude that

> We [as educators] should help students demystify the dominant conventions behind a specific genre of writing, relate their writing activity to the social context in which it takes place, and shape writing to achieve a favourable voice and representation of themselves (483).

Using textual models is a coping strategy that has been cited before by multilingual writers (Belcher & Connor, 2001), so it is also not surprising that each of the participants promotes the practice of drawing on models as a significant strategy for writing for publication. It is surprising, however, that studies in this specific area of inquiry have not investigated the ways that models help to shape the language and structure of a multilingual writer's text. Most of these studies aim at analyzing how individuals—such as multilingual and native-English-speaking colleagues, language experts and journal reviewers and editors—shape multilingual writers' texts (Belcher & Connor, 2001; Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2001; Lillis & Curry, 2006). The contributions of "literacy brokers" (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2006) have been rhetorically analyzed in order to assess how significant these changes are to a multilingual writer's draft. Still, studies that investigate the ways texts and the modeling of texts help to shape scholars' manuscripts during the writing process may provide significant insight concerning the extent to which these models influence the intertextuality of research writing—the textual interactions between content, structure, or language found within and between these texts and their contexts.

More than pedagogical strategies, however, teachers and administrators would need to think critically about how to institutionalize literacy and rhetori-

cal instruction for multilingual graduate students and junior faculty. Flowerdew (2000) asserts that in addition to more formal training in graduate studies, graduate programs should create centers where students meet to reflect and share resources or information about publishing in their disciplines. Braine (2005) suggests that Hong Kong universities should have departmental mentoring services across disciplines, similar to those existing in engineering. He also suggests that Hong Kong journals "establish a mentoring service between the author and a more experienced writer" (p. 714). Again, Dr. Huszár indicated that she relies on reviewers as her only source of feedback since she does not feel comfortable seeking help from her already busy colleagues when drafting and revising manuscripts. She lamented not having alternative outlets for reviewing her texts, and ultimately concluded that she would be very interested in participating in other forums dedicated to manuscript review. These types of programs mentioned by Flowerdew and Braine where colleagues get together to share experiences and review works in progress are precisely what Dr. Huszár would be interested in participating in. Research assessing the need or apparent positive results of programs like these for university faculty in the US might lead to more university departments considering the inclusion of such programs. Studies like Kwan's (2010)—where a Hong Kong graduate program is investigated for its instruction of academic publication—could be replicated in and outside of the US to determine the practices and outcomes of departmental attempts to implement explicit instruction to graduate students on publication conventions in English.

CONCLUSION

Becoming "fluent" in the subtle discourse practices of one's discipline may very well mean garnering a better conceptualization of the more intricate communicative moves in research writing. Such a nuanced understanding of discourse practices fits well within the theories and practices that inform the advancing field of Rhetorical Genre Studies. Bawarshi and Reiff (2010), in their review of the growing field of genre studies, explain that

> The emphasis within RGS [Rhetorical Genre Studies] has been to show that genres are not only communicative tools. Genres are also socially derived, typified ways of knowing and acting; they embody and help us enact social motives, which we negotiate in relation to our individual motives; they are dynamically tied to the situations of their use; and they help

> coordinate the performance of social realities, interactions and identities. To study and teach genres in the context of this socio-rhetorical understanding requires both a knowledge of a genre's structural and lexico-grammatical features as well as a knowledge of the social action(s) a genre produces and the social typifications that inform that action: the social motives, relations, values, and assumptions embodied within a genre that frame how, why, and when to act. (77)

The conceptualization of genres as social actions in RGS provides a helpful framework for understanding and interpreting the stories and strategies shared by participants of this study. Participants pointed to the benefit of explicit genre-based instruction, especially on the social, rhetorical, and lexico-grammatical levels. It was not efficient for participants to merely understand the structural features of the genres they were expected to engage in; instead, they remarked on the importance of recognizing the nuanced rhetorical features occurring and communicative tasks achieved when writing in their disciplines. Understanding how one crafts effective claims in one's field, for example, suggests an understanding of the social motives behind a given topic of inquiry. Analyzing and practicing the nuanced rhetorical moves in research writing that are privileged in certain scholarly circles suggests an understanding of the kinds of assumptions and values held by the intended audience. Seeing genres as typified responses utilized for socially engaging a discourse community may permit writers and educators to treat the learning of genre conventions in ways that more effectively initiate individuals as research-writers. It is crucial, in other words, that the explicit teaching of genres be accomplished critically—so that the varying and nuanced rhetorical contexts that guide research writing are considered—rather than being taught mechanically as if learning genre conventions could successfully be treated as a stagnant checklist of moves to complete.

Furthermore, that none of the participants received formal training or were given any referrals to the literature on this topic, suggests an existing discrepancy between the knowledge produced in academia and the knowledge and resources that are actually passed on to graduate students. Even graduate students in language-based disciplines such as Dr. Huszár, Dr. Nakajima, and Dr. Sanchez are apparently not engaged in this literature, at least at the time they were enrolled. Studies exploring the information gap between research and practice in graduate writing education could potentially illuminate the possible resources geared toward demystifying disciplinary writing conventions which administrators might implement in their programs and curricula. Based on the

trends illuminated by this limited set of examples, it may serve them well to begin questioning how we might better translate our knowledge about literacy practices and the learning of advanced genres into more effective pedagogical, institutional, and administrative practices aimed at better preparing multilingual graduate students and junior faculty for academic publication.

As a final note, while the scope of the current study was to explore graduate experiences and administration within US borders, it is crucial to acknowledge that despite participants questioning the effectiveness of their graduate programs in preparing them for writing for publication, each case presented here is representative of practices in the English-dominant center. Being schooled in English-medium institutions within the US provided participants with access to technology, published work, and writing resources including centers, editors, and native-English-speaking colleagues. Further, participants of the current study were in language programs where issues like sociolinguisitics, discourse conventions, and English grammar are fundamental to the curriculum. Some have even gone on to teach writing for publication courses and have reflected on the politics of their writing processes and of publication practices. Despite all these advantages, the participants still reported facing numerous challenges in learning the conventions for publishing in their field and ultimately pointed to the need for additional support. Research is far from complete which investigates institutions both inside and outside US borders for the writing resources available (or not available) to multilingual graduate students and faculty. The exigence for more research on (and more implementation of) these resources has perhaps never been more apparent as it is now, especially considering the influx of international students and faculty in the US and the continued dominance of English in academia. The extent to which new resources are informed by research findings in rhetoric, linguistics, and composition studies—especially regarding the specific needs and experiences of multilingual graduate students and faculty—will play a significant role the effectiveness of such institutional implementations.

NOTES

1. The research presented in this chapter comes out of the study completed for my master's thesis published in 2010. I'd like to thank Ann M. Johns, my Thesis Chair, for her feedback on the early stages of this research.

2. The terms "multilingual writers" or "multilingual scholars/researchers" will be used in this chapter to refer to those writers in US contexts whose first language is other than English.

3. Prior to the interview, each participant signed or verbally agreed to the informed consent form as part of the Human Subjects research approval process through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) in 2009 at my previous institution.

4. According to IRB policy, the names used in this study are pseudonyms and measures were taken to protect the identities of the participants involved, including not disclosing their current universities, the universities they have previously attended, and the titles of the articles they have published.

REFERENCES

Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: Introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse.

Belcher, D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(1), 1-22.

Belcher, D., & Braine, G. (Eds.). (1995). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Belcher, D., & Connor, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Reflections on multiliterate Lives.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Blakeslee, A. M. (1997). Activity, context, interaction, and authority: Learning to write scientific papers in situ. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 11*(2), 125-169.

Braine, G. (2005). The challenge of academic publishing: A Hong Kong perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(4), 707-716.

Burrough-Boenisch, J. (2003). Shapers of published NNS research articles. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 223-243.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Canagarajah, A. S., & Jerskey, M. (2009). Meeting the needs of advanced multilingual writers. In R. Beard et al. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of writing development.* (pp. 472-488). London: Sage.

Casanave, C. P., & Vandrick, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cho, S. (2004). Challenges of entering discourse communities through publishing in English: Perspectives of non-native-speaking doctoral students in the United States of America. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 3*(1), 47-72.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 663-688.

Gosden, H. (1992). Research writing and NNSs: From the editors. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1,* 123-139.

Gosden, H. (1995). Success in research article writing and revision: A social-constructionist perspective. *English for Specific Purposes, 14*(1), 37-57.

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the non-native English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(1), 127-150.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to non-native speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 121-150.

Freedman, A. (1993). Show and tell? The role of explicit teaching in the learning of new genres. *Research in the Teaching of English, 27*(3), 222-51.

Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, role and context: Developing academic literacies.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kwan, M. S. C. (2010). An investigation of instruction in research publishing offered in doctoral programs: The Hong Kong case. *Higher Education, 50*(1), 55-68.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Li, Y. (2006). A doctoral student of physics writing for publication: A sociopolitically-oriented case study. *English for Specific Purposes, 25,* 456-478.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication, 23*(1), 3-35.

Ramanathan, V. (2002). *The politics of TESOL education: Writing, knowledge, critical pedagogy*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly, 28,* 273-292.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22,* 28-51.

Swales, J. (1988). Discourse communities, genres and English as an international language. *World Englishes, 7*(2), 211-220.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J., & Feak, C. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills: A course for non-native speakers of English.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Wenger, E. (2000). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, J., & Colomb, G. (1993). The case for explicit teaching: Why what you don't know won't help you. *Research in the Teaching of English, 27*(3), 252-64.