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Abstract

This thesis examines knowledge production practices within higher education by exploring the experiences of Japan-based language teachers writing for academic publication. Global practices of knowledge production as encoded in high-prestige published academic texts are of ongoing research interest. However, the exploration of author practices of writing for academic publication is a relatively new area of interest which I pursue in this thesis. The investigation of the writing for academic publication practices of Japan-based language teachers presented here helps to further expand the empirical research base and facilitates critical examination of the processes underlying writing for academic publication more broadly.

This thesis is primarily based on research into the writing for publication practices of seven Japan-based authors, exploring why they write for academic publication and the practices that underlie their writing. The study employs an ethnographically informed methodology, incorporating multiple sources of data, including interviews, different versions of manuscripts submitted for publication, and the correspondence surrounding those manuscripts. These multiple sources facilitate exploring the complex processes behind writing for academic publication.
Methodological tools from academic literacies and critical discourse analysis are applied to examine the authors’ writing for academic publication practices and the processes their manuscripts go through during submission, review, and revision along their trajectories toward publication. This thesis illustrates the hidden complexities underlying academic knowledge production and examines the processes that shape what can be and is published.

Key findings include the heterogeneity of writing for publication practices among the authors, the complexity of the trajectories of published manuscripts, and how the ideologies expressed in the authors’ published manuscripts have been shaped by the review and revision process. A key contribution of the thesis is the methodology developed to investigate writing for academic publication practices, specifically regarding analysis of text publication trajectories.
Contents

Declaration.......................................................................................................................... ii

Dedication........................................................................................................................... iii

Acknowledgments.............................................................................................................. iv

Abstract............................................................................................................................. vii

Contents .............................................................................................................................. ix

List of Tables....................................................................................................................... xviii

List of Figures ...................................................................................................................... xx

Publications arising from the research................................................................................xxii

1. Introduction to the investigation of Japan-based English language teachers writing for academic publication ........................................................................................................... 1

   1.1 Motivation for this research....................................................................................... 1
1.2 Key terminology in this thesis ................................................................. 3

1.2.1 Japan-based authors writing for publication: Referencing author language background .................................................................................................................. 4

1.2.2 HE and global knowledge production ....................................................... 6

1.2.3 The language of journal evaluation: Editors, Reviewers, and peer review 10

1.3 Framing the research: Writing for publication from within HE in Japan ........ 11

1.4 The objectives of the investigation presented in this thesis ......................... 21

1.5 The structure of this thesis ........................................................................ 22

2. Literature review of writing for academic publication research .................. 24

2.1 Introduction .................................................................................................. 24

2.2 Research on writing for publication: Focus on texts ................................ 25

2.3 Research on writing for publication: Focus on practices ........................... 31

2.4 Research on revision practices: Changes to manuscripts .......................... 50

2.5 Research on the correspondence of writing for publication ...................... 58

2.6 Research into Japan-based writing for academic publication ................... 69
2.7 Summary of writing for publication practices research: What this thesis aims to contribute .......................................................... 76

2.7.1 Contribution to writing practices research: How, why and where Japan-based language teacher authors write for publication ........................................ 76

2.7.2 Contribution to revision practices research: How authors’ manuscripts change through brokering ........................................................................ 77

2.7.3 Contribution to correspondence practices research: The negotiated interaction between authors and brokers ............................................................... 78

3. Research methodology for investigating Japan-based English language teachers writing for academic publication ........................................... 80

3.1 Introduction ................................................................................. 80

3.2 Orientation to knowledge making .............................................. 81

3.3 Research design ......................................................................... 85

3.3.1 Research questions ................................................................. 85

3.3.2 The author participants ............................................................ 88

3.3.3 Data collection ....................................................................... 92

3.4 Data analysis and selection decisions ......................................... 100

3.4.1 Semi-structured interviews and transcription ....................... 112
5.3.5 Japan conference proceedings: Kathy’s text history analysis............207

5.3.6 Outside-Japan book chapter: John’s text history analysis..............210

5.4 Analysis and synthesis of the text histories........................................213

5.4.1 Volume of revision and evaluation work.................................214

5.4.2 Importance of networks to writing for publication.....................222

5.4.3 Examining how the manuscripts changed.................................229

5.5 Summary ...................................................................................246

6. Patterns of exchange in author-broker interaction: Communication and expectation
   247

6.1 Introduction .............................................................................247

6.2 Patterns of exchange in the sets of correspondence ....................249

6.2.1 Author responsibility for revision: The ‘preferred’ exchange structure..250

6.2.2 Questioning revision work responsibility: ‘Dispreferred’ exchange options
   260

6.2.3 (Not) communicating publication decisions in the exchanges ........266

6.2.4 Author difficulty in understanding and implementing changes........271

6.2.5 The significance of turnaround times in the exchanges.................274
6.3 Summary .................................................................................................................................277

7. Discussion of Japan-based authors’ experiences of writing for academic publication: Revisiting the research questions ...........................................................................................................279

7.1 Introduction .....................................................................................................................................279

7.2 Why do early career Japan-based language teachers write for academic publication and what academic publication practices do they engage in? .................................................................279

7.2.1 The significance of authors tending to view their writing as pedagogically oriented while brokers tended toward a research orientation .................................................................280

7.2.2 Authors write for multiple communities ..................................................................................285

7.2.3 Author difficulty in selecting journals to submit manuscripts to .............................................291

7.3 What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions? .................................................................................................................................296

7.3.1 Uncertainty in evaluative brokering practices .........................................................................296

7.3.2 Variability in broker expectations for authors to account for teaching ‘context’ .....................300

7.3.3 Evaluating texts, evaluating authors in broker discourse .......................................................304
7.4  What does the correspondence surrounding the authors’ writing for academic publication reveal regarding text brokering processes and relationships between authors and brokers? ................................................................. 309

7.4.1  The importance of discoursal construction of identity in the sets of correspondence .................................................................................................................................................. 310

7.4.2  Evidence of risk in writing for academic publication ........................................ 315

7.4.3  Invisibilizing the process of text production in published manuscripts .. 321

7.5  Summary ................................................................................................................................. 324

8.  Conclusion to the investigation of Japan-based authors writing for academic publication.................................................................................................................................................. 327

8.1  Introduction .................................................................................................................................... 327

8.2  Contributions to the writing for academic publication literature .................. 327

8.2.1  The importance of broker-author correspondence in shaping academic knowledge production ......................................................................................................................... 328

8.2.2  Representations of authors that transcend straightforward binaries..... 331

8.2.3  Japan-based writing for academic publication ......................................................... 334

8.3  Methodological contributions ................................................................................................. 337

8.3.1  Developing a graphical representation of manuscript trajectories ...... 338
8.3.2 Evaluating the Change Heuristic as a research tool .............................. 340
8.3.3 Analysis of revisions to manuscripts across their trajectories ............... 344
8.3.4 Analysis of sets of correspondence ............................................................... 347
8.4 Critical reflection on the research ................................................................. 348
8.4.1 Implications of incomplete version and correspondence histories ...... 348
8.4.2 Implications of restricted focus on writing for publication .................. 349
8.4.3 Critical reflection on author interviews and issues of researcher interpretation of data ................................................................. 352
8.5 Summary ......................................................................................................... 354
9. References ........................................................................................................ 357
10. Appendices ..................................................................................................... 382
    Appendix A. Ethical approval notice ................................................................. 382
    Appendix B. Letter soliciting author volunteers ............................................. 383
    Appendix C. Author consent form ................................................................. 384
    Appendix D. Complete list of author participants ...................................... 385
    Appendix E. Semi-structured interview questions for authors .................... 387
    Appendix F. Sample initial interview transcript extract, with Aya ............. 389
    Appendix G. Sample follow-up second interview transcript extract, with David ................................................................. 395
    Appendix H. Raw change code counts for the six text history analyses ........ 413
    Appendix I. Examining where manuscripts change: Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper’s changes by section ................................. 414
    Appendix J. Examining words added and deleted: Two-way keyword comparison of Junpei’s Japan journal paper ................................................................. 414
List of Tables

Table 1-1. Japanese faculty three-year publication data for the humanities and social sciences.................................................................13

Table 3-1. Preliminary research questions.................................................................85

Table 3-2. Summary of the seven core author participants and their interview data available for analysis.................................................................92

Table 3-3. List of collected text history manuscripts and the data available for them.99

Table 3-4. Summary of manuscripts selected for text history analysis......................104

Table 3-5. Transcription coding scheme .................................................................114

Table 3-6. Criteria for classifying publications.......................................................119

Table 3-8. Selected extracts from a Change Heuristic ...................................................... 128

Table 4-1. Summary of authors’ publications ........................................................................ 139

Table 4-2. Summary of author presentations ....................................................................... 179

Table 5-1. Summary of the evaluations of three manuscripts ........................................... 220

Table 5-2. Brokers who interacted with the manuscripts during their trajectories ........ 222

Table 5-3. Change codes and instances per manuscript section ........................................ 232

Table 5-4. The manuscripts’ changing word counts by section ....................................... 233

Table 6-1. Reviewer comments on Junpei’s English ......................................................... 251

Table 7-1. An example of the identity of authority in David’s set of correspondence ........ 311

Table 7-2. Prestige of process versus publication type in Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings paper correspondence ......................................................... 313
List of Figures

Figure 3-1. Example Result of Document Comparison Summary of Insertions, Deletions, and Moves in Microsoft Word’s Reviewing Pane ........................................121

Figure 3-2. Example publication trajectory graphical representation .....................121

Figure 5-1. Weller’s (2001) “Path of a manuscript through the editorial review process” (p. 2).........................................................................................................................187

Figure 5-2. Burrough-Boenisch’s (2003) “Representation of the path taken by an NNS research article” (p. 226)..................................................................................................188

Figure 5-3. Lillis and Curry’s (2006) “Representation of brokers involved in academic text production” (p. 15).....................................................................................................189

Figure 5-4. Sample text history analysis graphic: Junpei’s Japan journal manuscript .................................................................................................................................191
Figure 5-5. Publication trajectory of Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal manuscript .......................................................... 196

Figure 5-6. Publication trajectory of David’s outside-Japan journal manuscript ...... 199

Figure 5-7. Publication trajectory of Junpei’s Japan journal manuscript .............. 203

Figure 5-8. Publication trajectory of Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings .......................................................................................................................... 206

Figure 5-9. Publication trajectory of Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings manuscript .......................................................................................................................... 209

Figure 5-10. Publication trajectory of John’s outside-Japan book chapter ............ 212

Figure 5-11. Change Codes per 100 words for the six text history analyses ............ 216

Figure 6-1. Examples of Reviewer margin questions and comments in Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper (Kathy MS23 V5) ................................................................. 254
Publications arising from the research


1. Introduction to the investigation of Japan-based English language teachers writing for academic publication

1.1 Motivation for this research

The importance of writing for academic publication for those working within higher education (HE) is well-established (Hyland, 2016; Lillis & Curry, 2010), as are the various subfields of applied linguistics that seek to examine the characteristics of successfully published academic manuscripts, such as English for specific purposes (ESP) (Swales, 1990). Less well developed, but gaining increasing interest, are investigations into author practices of writing for academic publication, such as those described in Lillis and Curry (2010). This thesis seeks to contribute to this emerging body of research by examining the writing for academic publication practices of Japan-based authors working within the broad field of English language teaching. How it seeks to contribute to this conversation is outlined further below. However, first it is necessary to address the question of why an investigation of the writing for academic publication practices of Japan-based authors working within English language teaching is of interest.
The motivations underlying this study arise from my experience of writing for academic publication from Japan as an English language teacher and the contribution I feel a study into this demographic of authors could make to writing for publication practices research more broadly. With respect to my own experience, while I originate from a country within the Anglophone center of HE (discussed in 1.2.2), the USA, I have been resident in Japan since 2000, and have been authoring and brokering (editing, reviewing, copyediting and proofreading; further explained in 1.2.3) texts for publication since 2004. My geographical positioning is on the periphery of global knowledge production, in what is generally described as a marginalized field, language teaching (Turner, 2011). I interact with and broker a variety of texts across a variety of fields, as a Reviewer and Editor for language teaching and learning themed publications and as what Willey and Tanimoto (2015) refer to as a “convenience editor” (p. 64), (generally) informally assisting colleagues with their writing for academic publication in other fields, including medical and pharmaceutical sciences. These experiences have fostered my interest in the processes of writing for academic publication and a desire to explore them through the project described in this thesis.

Regarding what this study of Japan-based authors working within the field of English language teaching can contribute to writing for publication practices research, I feel there are three aspects of this demographic of potential interest. First, as language work has been described as a marginalized part of the broader academy (Turner, 2011), examining knowledge production within language teaching can offer interesting insights into writing for publication practices. This is particularly true as English language teaching is described as exhibiting a “gap” (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014, p. xi) between teaching and research, characterized by “ambivalence toward
the application of [second language acquisition] research to classroom practice” (p. 2). Examining how authors experience and navigate this gap can help to illustrate wider processes that underlie writing for academic publication practice (see 4.4.3 and 7.2.1). Second, Japanese HE has been described as “closed” (Hall, 1998, p. 92), suggesting it has somehow maintained alternatives to what are described as “centripetal” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 271; Lillis, 2013, p. 133) pulls toward standards reflective of those valued by institutions in the global center of knowledge production. There is considerable interest in articulating and developing “centrifugal” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 272; Lillis, 2013, p. 133) forces to resist this global pull toward the center. Investigating Japan-based writing for publication practices may elucidate possible alternative discourses from those originating in the globally dominant center (see 8.2.3). Finally, there has been debate about the “slippage” (Lillis & Curry, 2015, p. 130) between conceptualizations of ‘native’ vs. ‘non-native speakers’ of English (problematic in 1.2.1), novice vs. expert, and center- vs. periphery-based authors (discussed in 1.2.2) in research into writing for academic publication. By investigating authors based in Japan with Japanese, English, and other languages as a first language, it is hoped that the research described in this thesis can unpack and more closely examine the issues raised above (this is returned to in 8.2.2).

1.2 **Key terminology in this thesis**

The research presented here seeks to take a critical stance (discussed in 3.2) toward the investigation of writing for academic publication practices. As such, it is necessary to both define and problematize some of the key terms and concepts referenced by earlier investigations and employed throughout this thesis. Specifically, this section addresses notions of ‘non-native’-ness and other terms...
used to refer to author language background, classification of published manuscripts into categories such as ‘international’, and the labels used to refer to ‘publication brokers’, such as journal Editors, Reviewers, and Copyeditors. Explicitly addressing issues of the labels used to refer to different roles and practices within writing for academic publication contributes to “making the strange familiar and the familiar […] strange” (Lillis, 2008, p. 382), the importance of which for the investigation reported in this thesis is outlined in 3.2.

1.2.1 Japan-based authors writing for publication: Referencing author language background

In this thesis I have chosen to refer to the authors who contributed to the research as either ‘Japanese’, meaning Japanese nationals, or ‘foreign residents of Japan’, meaning authors originating from outside Japan. While this is an oversimplification of the demographics of Japanese society (see Lie, 2001), it accurately represents the authors whose experiences are analyzed here and facilitates sidestepping some of the “implicit slippage” (Lillis & Curry, 2015, p. 130) alluded to in 1.1 and elaborated on below.

A variety of terms have been used to refer to authors whose first language is not English, with the most common being “non-native” (such as in Flowerdew, 2001, p. 121). As this term has been problematized as representing “a coarse Native vs. non-Native dichotomy” (Hyland, 2016, p. 66), terms such as “English as an international language (EIL) and English language (EL)” have been used “to distinguish users of English as an additional language from those who use it as their primary language” (Belcher, 2007, p. 2). Lillis and Curry (2010) employ the term “multilingual scholars” (p. 42) toward similar ends. Hyland (2016) problematizes what he describes as a
dichotomy in the literature between the difficulties “English as an Additional Language” (EAL) (p. 58) scholars face and those faced by English as a first language authors. In this thesis EIL and EL are used to refer to scholars more generally, such as when dealing with the research literature, while Japanese and foreign residents of Japan are used to refer to the specific authors whose experiences are examined here.

While recently the focus of investigations has tended to be on EIL scholars writing in English for publication (see Chapter 2), within globalized HE various backgrounds are increasingly represented. This is particularly true in countries seeking to internationalize their HE institutions, such as Japan. Thus, in Japan, in the field of language education, there are Japanese and foreign residents of Japan, and it is unclear how their experiences are similar and/or different. It is also unclear what issues authors from Anglophone countries based in Japan face in seeking publication, and the extent to which the issues they experience resemble those of their Japanese counterparts. The research presented in this thesis seeks to interrogate and address some of these questions.

Other aspects of author backgrounds subject to ‘slippage’ include treating authors whose first language is not English as relatively new to writing for academic publication and their English as a first language author counterparts as experts (Lillis & Curry, 2015). In the investigation described in this thesis, an active effort was made to recruit writers ‘new’ to publishing their academic writing, that is publishing their first academic texts. Although as the research progressed, author experience of writing for publication came to be viewed as relative (returned to in 3.3.2), and so in this thesis rather than characterizing authors as ‘new’ or ‘experienced’, the
relevant publication is described, such as “first writing for academic publication” (see 4.3.6) and “first outside-Japan indexed journal article” (see 4.3.1). The authors’ publications are analyzed by type in 4.2.

In taking a critical stance in this thesis, I have sought to avoid easy labeling through providing rich contextual details to signal the complexity of the authors and their backgrounds, such as originating from Africa and having learned English in school rather than at home (see Jordan’s profile, 4.3.7). This allows for some critical distance between the language used to describe the authors who contributed to the research and some of the more loaded conceptualizations of authors in the literature, such as ‘English as a second language’ writers. While author demographics are a variable considered and discussed in this thesis, there is also an effort to not “essentialize” (Appadurai, 1988, p. 41) authors by demographic category, which can problematically mask diversity (this is returned to in 3.3.2).

1.2.2 HE and global knowledge production

The Japan-based authors who contributed to the research presented in this thesis are described as writing for both ‘within-Japan’ and ‘outside-Japan’ publications. This framing enables examining notions of the “periphery” (Canagarajah, 1996, p. 441) and “semiperiphery” (Bennett, 2014, p. 2) (both are returned to in 2.3) in global knowledge production. It facilitates a critical distance from notions of “international” (Lee & Lee, 2013, p. 216) publication of manuscripts, as the term is used in the literature and by Japanese institutions to characterize authors’ published ‘output’. This critical distance allows for examination and evaluation of how such notions are referenced and signaled, and toward what ends.
Canagarajah (1996) distinguishes between “periphery” (p. 435), “Third World” (p. 438) journals and “Western/mainstream journals” (p. 438), while writing primarily from the perspective of “the academic community [he is] ‘native’ to—that based in the University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka” (p. 438). Belcher (2007) uses the term “off-network” (p. 2) scholars, drawn from Swales (1987, p. 43), to describe scholars residing outside “mainstream Anglophone” (Belcher, 2007, p. 1) contexts. Lillis and Curry (2006) refer to their research informants as “multilingual scholars” (p. 4) who are “working outside of Anglophone center contexts” (p. 5). These different terms and descriptions are generally utilized to highlight a contrast between center, “inner circle” countries such as the US and the UK and “outer circle” and “expanding circle” countries (Kachru, 1992, p. 3). However, as Nunn (2015) has observed, authors writing outside of the Anglophone ‘center’ may view labels of themselves as peripheral as problematic, particularly when they are rather active in their local professional communities.

The literature also contrasts “local” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p.6) representations and evaluations of knowledge production with the “global” (p. 6). ‘Local’ has been used to indicate contextual information relevant to the scholars being investigated, while ‘global’ or ‘international’ signal the standards of high-prestige, center Anglophone journals and the people that represent those journals, such as Editors and Reviewers (see 1.2.3 for an explanation of the capitalization conventions used for official brokers in this thesis). As Canagarajah (1996) and Lillis and Curry (2006) note, such labels tend to underplay variation within categories and can bring with them evaluative connotations. For example, ‘local’ can be taken to signal arbitrary or parochial “local knowledge’ or ‘folk wisdom’” (Canagarajah, 1996, p. 460), while ‘global/international’ may imply established standards. However, as Casanave
(1998) and Lillis and Curry (2010) explain, specific national contexts have expectations for scholars that, while different from other ‘international’ standards, are hardly arbitrary but instead carry with them their own traditions, reward systems, and evaluative frameworks that are not less legitimate than the expectations of the ‘global’ academy. Furthermore, Weller (2001) illustrates how many now-contemporary international publishing standards were historically adopted by center journals in haphazard and arbitrary ways. Additionally, the labeling of the Anglophone academy as international and other academies as local carries problematic connotations of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). Lillis and Curry (2010) and Bennett (2014) problematize the dichotomy between center and periphery using Sousa Santos’s (1990) term “semiperiphery” (p. 6) to reference (primarily) Western European contexts. Sousa-Santos (1990) draws on Wallerstein’s (1984) world systems theory, specifically the label “semiperipheral states” to refer to countries that “have a near even mix of core-like and peripheral products” (Wallerstein, 2004, p. 28), meaning these countries tend to have more access to material and knowledge resources, but are nevertheless not part of the center of global knowledge production (world systems theory is returned to in 2.3).

When referring to debates in the literature, the terms from individual sources are cited in quotation marks where possible, with ‘international’ generally signaling center publication and ‘standards’, while acknowledging the shortcomings of such arbitrary distinctions (see also 2.3). In examining Japan-based, ‘local’ expectations for writing for publication, “within Japan” is used to set the topic of investigation, Japan-based writing for publication, apart from other possible ‘local’ expectations. When referring to the published manuscripts of author participants and classifying them by type, the distinctions “within-Japan” and “outside-Japan” are used. These
framings facilitate critical examination of some of the implicit assumptions embedded in the labels used in the literature discussed above (see also 2.4). They are based on both terminology used in studies of Japanese academic publishing, or ‘output’ (discussed in 1.3), and also on the empirical data gathered for the investigation described in this thesis (see 4.3). Using terms for the investigation described in this thesis that are distinct from the terms used in the literature more broadly facilitates a critical stance toward the subject of the investigation, authors’ writing for academic publication (see 3.2).

The empirical focus of this thesis is writing for academic publication, a particularly high prestige aspect of academic knowledge production. Thus, the terms academic writing and writing for publication are largely treated as synonymous in the discussion that follows, although I do acknowledge that others treat these two terms as signaling different practices. I also acknowledge that there are a variety of different writing practices within HE in addition to writing for academic publication that are of potential interest to writing researchers, and that the narrow focus of this thesis excludes those other writing practices from the investigation. This is returned to in the discussion of the limitations of the study in 8.4.2.

As the investigation described in this thesis was interested in author publishing practices, the documents the authors supplied were analyzed as representative of their academic writing for publication, including a variety of different publication types (summarized in detail in 4.2) rather than concentrating on one specific type of publication, such as the journal article. How this contrasts with earlier research is discussed in Chapter 2. Data collection is returned to in 3.3.3, and the labeling of authors’ published manuscripts is addressed in 4.2.
1.2.3 The language of journal evaluation: Editors, Reviewers, and peer review

The research described in this thesis uses the terms ‘authors’ and ‘brokers’ to distinguish between the named authors who contributed to the research and the brokers they interacted with in their manuscripts’ trajectories. The term “broker” (Lillis & Curry, 2006, p. 4), refers to the authors’ interactants during their texts’ trajectories, such as the Editors, Reviewers, and Copyeditors who shape the texts. Using broker allows for critical distance between the terms used in the correspondence and the terms used when discussing the correspondence, thereby facilitating interrogation of the labels used (see 7.4.1). Furthermore, throughout this thesis capitalization is used to reference the different roles official brokers are indicated as filling in the correspondence (such as Editor), except when they are used in quotation, in which case the source capitalization conventions are maintained. Capitalizing the labels used for official brokers’ roles helps to indicate these are their ‘official’ capacity in which they are interacting with the authors and facilitates critical examination of the extent to which that work is similar and different across brokers working in similar capacities.

Interrogating the roles official brokers fill in the texts’ trajectories is important because the roles as reported in the correspondence are not necessarily predictive of the role individual brokers play in a manuscript’s trajectory, particularly with respect to how Editors interact with authors and shape their texts (see Chapter 6). Thus, the label ‘broker’ facilitates interrogating the processes manuscripts go through and who shapes them. Furthermore, as is explained in 2.5, the trajectories of manuscripts tend to be considered standard across fields and journals in the literature reviewed. However, the research presented in this thesis shows that text
trajectories can be quite variable (see Chapter 5). Where labels such as Editor are used in the correspondence, they are presented inside quotations.

It is important to acknowledge that the term broker to refer to shapers of published texts is not without controversy. Luo and Hyland (2016), investigating “English teachers who have worked on scientific research article manuscripts” (p. 44), claim the broker “metaphor fails to capture the collaborative and typically collegial nature of our teacher-academics dyads” and “overlooks the ethical dimensions of the relationship altogether, particularly the publishing credit which might be given to the mediator” (p. 44). They use the term “mediators” (p. 44) as an alternative. However, they do not explore the kind of official brokering by Editors and Reviewers primarily analyzed in this thesis. Considering the power dynamics at play in authors seeking publication in academic journals, with Editors and Reviewers “gatekeeping” (Swales, 1988, p. 151) access to publication, the less collegial broker seems a more appropriate label to use in this thesis.

1.3 Framing the research: Writing for publication from within HE in Japan

As the investigation described in this thesis explores the writing for academic publication practices of Japan-based language teachers, some explanation of the Japanese HE context, particularly with respect to English language teaching, is necessary. The writing for academic publication of the Japanese academy tends to be treated as synonymous with ‘research’ in the available literature on the topic, which is briefly summarized here. For example, Daizen (2015) refers to “scholarly contributions” as “research achievements” (p. 150), quantified by number of publications and conference presentations. However, it should be noted that some
of the author contributors to this thesis problematized characterizing them as ‘scholars’ and their writing for academic publication as ‘research’ (see Kathy’s profile, 4.3.6). Therefore, in the discussion of the author contributors’ writing for publication outside of this section, they are referred to as authors (rather than scholars), and their published writing as their published papers (rather than their research).

Regarding writing for publication and research evaluation, Boyer, Altbach, and Whitelaw (1994) found more than 90% of faculty in Japan reported their “research” being “regularly evaluated” (p. 47) while less than 50% reported their teaching being “regularly evaluated” (p. 47). Becher and Trowler (2001), discussing the global academy more generally, note the issue of the primacy of research over teaching in HE is prevalent, so this situation is not unique to Japan. However, the phenomenon is described as more marked in Japan. For example, Fukudome (2015) reported about 32 percent of Japan’s professoriate were “teaching-oriented” (p. 173), compared to the US at about 49 percent and the UK at about 44 percent (Ehara, 1996, cited in Fukudome, 2015, p. 172).

Examining the research output of Japanese university faculty, Daizen (2015) analyzes the publication output of the Japanese faculty while Huang (2015) analyzes Japanese faculty publishing “abroad” (p. 199) and “in foreign languages” (p. 199), both over a three-year period. Summary information for the humanities and social sciences fields, the two fields they reported on closest to language teaching, are presented separately for each author in Table 1-1.
Table 1-1. Japanese faculty three-year publication data for the humanities and social sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication category</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly book authored</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly book edited</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article published in a book or journal</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research report or monograph</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper presented at a conference</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Published abroad”</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Written in foreign languages”</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Daizen, 2015, p. 152 & Huang, 2015, p. 199)

Daizen analyzes manuscripts in each publication category. Huang analyzes manuscripts ‘published abroad’ and ‘written in foreign languages’.

Daizen (2015) and Huang’s (2015) analysis (Table 1-1) indicates Humanities and Social Sciences faculty in Japan publish on average between 1.5 (Humanities) and 2.1 (Social Sciences) manuscripts per year in journals or books. They also publish non-academic work, such as a “professional article for a magazine” (Daizen 2015, p. 152) at about the same frequency as their more academic work and papers presented at conferences about once a year. For the Humanities, about 3 percent of all publications are “published abroad” and 5 percent “written in foreign languages” while for the Social Sciences the rate is 14 percent and 47 percent, respectively. However, regarding the manuscripts “published abroad” and “written in foreign languages” (Huang, 2015, p. 199), there is little information regarding which publication category they are written for (see Table 1-1 for example publication categories), where, or in what language. By way of comparison, Larsen and Magnussen (1984) found that among Scandinavian psychologists, between 10 percent (Denmark) and 40 percent (Sweden) of manuscripts were written in non-Scandinavian languages, 80 to 90 percent of which were written in English (p. 4). The papers published by the authors whose experiences are analyzed in this thesis are discussed in 4.2.
Regarding institutional evaluation of faculty publications in Japan, Amano & Poole (2005) describe a system where the majority of faculty are appointed to permanent positions when they are initially hired (also see McVeigh, 2002), leading to less pressure to meet the expectations of faculty review boards, a point Casanave (1998) and Poole (2010) both also acknowledge. There are also reports of pressure on faculty returning from completing degree work outside of Japan to first establish themselves by publishing in Japanese before pursuing English language publication (Casanave, 1998). Yonezawa (2004) observes there is heterogeneity across Japanese institutions in how they evaluate faculty publications.

Related to the tendency for Japanese faculty to be hired into permanent positions, the Japanese faculty has been described as exhibiting a high degree of academic “inbreeding” (Yamanoi, 2006, p. 25), defined as “the share of alma mater graduates to all staff. Inbreeding is the practice by universities of hring [sic] their own students” (p. 25). Yamanoi (2006) describes an inbreeding percentage for 13 “main research universities” (p. 27) from a high of 78 percent for the University of Tokyo, considered Japan’s preeminent public university, to a low of 32 percent for Hitotsubashi University, a prestigious private university in Tokyo. Yamanoi (2006) also analyzes the extent to which positions at these 13 universities are open to graduates from outside of the 13, showing 100 percent of faculty positions above lecturer rank were held by graduates from the 13 universities. This leads Yamanoi to conclude “the Japanese research universities market was not open but substantially closed to graduates of the other research universities” (p. 27). McVeigh (2002), citing Sugiyama and Yamagishi (1996), notes, “some estimate that about half of all instructors work at their alma maters” (p. 135). Poole (2010), in describing the power politics of a private Japanese university, used the terms “inside” (p. 127) to describe
“commitment to lifelong employment at [one university]” (p. 127) and “outside” (p. 127) to describe faculty “actively preparing for work after [the university], or, in a more passive sense, not ruling out the possibility of advancing their careers outside [the university]” (p. 128). The themes of university faculty insider and outsider trajectories have also been taken up in discussions of language teacher identity (Hawley-Nagatomo, 2012). Thus, one aspect of the heterogeneity with respect to Japanese faculty evaluations noted by Yonezawa (2004) may be differences in faculty positioning as ‘insiders’ or ‘outsiders’ in their institutions. This positioning could in turn influence how important writing for publication is to them, as faculty who are on an inside trajectory may not feel it important to seek high prestige publication, while faculty on an outside trajectory may feel publication important to their future career prospects (see, for example, Poole, 2010). This theme is returned to below.

Examining Japanese faculty access to research funding, Daizen and Yamanoi (2008) noted nearly 95 percent of faculty reported receiving funding. Of those who received funding, 85 percent reported receiving funds from their institutions, 64 percent from government institutional funding, 38 percent from business, 29 percent from private not for profits, and 22 percent from other sources (p. 313). They also note that among full-time faculty, 78 percent hold doctorates, 18 percent master’s degrees and 3 percent bachelor’s degrees (p. 303).

Regarding the demographics of the Japanese HE faculty, despite the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)’s efforts to promote internationalization in the sector (Tsuruta, 2013), as of 2001 the Japanese faculty was made up of 97 percent Japanese nationals and 3 percent foreign faculty
(Yamanoi, 2006, p. 29). Of the foreign faculty, those from China and Korea were almost 56 percent of the total, with all other countries represented by the remaining 44 percent (Yamanoi, 2006, p. 29). Those from traditionally labeled ‘center’ countries, including the US, UK, Canada, and Australia, represented about 26 percent of the foreign faculty in Japan. Yamanoi also reported that about 94 percent of the Japanese faculty with doctoral degrees earned them in Japan, and of the about 6 percent who earned doctoral degrees abroad, 4 percent of all doctoral degrees were from US universities, 0.6 percent from UK universities, with France and Germany together representing an additional 0.6 percent (p. 28). With respect to gender, the Japanese faculty is predominantly male, with only 13 percent of the faculty female as of 2009 compared to 34 percent in the US and 26 percent in the UK (Kimoto, 2015, p. 91).

One way the numbers of foreign faculty in the Japanese academy are limited is through universities offering limited term contracts for positions intended for faculty from outside Japan (Hall, 1998). This is partly reflected in statistics showing that the percentage of part-time “non-Japanese” working in HE is nearly double, 5.8 percent, than of those working full-time, 3.5 percent (McVeigh, 2002, p. 267). Unfortunately, MEXT does not track statistics for full-time faculty on limited term contract positions versus those entitled to indefinite employment.

When the information presented here is viewed from a global HE perspective, Japan’s HE sector is distinct in some ways and reflects some of the trends reported for the global academy more broadly. Japanese HE appears distinct from US and UK HE with respect to the low levels of participation of foreign scholars or scholars educated outside Japan, with respect to its higher levels of gender inequality, and
because of its prevalence of private universities. Japanese HE resembles US and UK HE with respect to issues of adjunct status; the increased reliance on adjunct faculty in the US is widely reported, including its adverse consequences for career progression (Gaillet & Guglielmo, 2014). Thus, Japanese HE should not be viewed independently from larger international trends, but as existing alongside and within ongoing policy debates within global HE.

Turning to English language work within global HE, Turner (2011) describes language work in the academy generally as marginalized. The teaching of English within Japanese HE is also presented as marginalized (Hall, 1998; McVeigh, 2002; Poole, 2005). Discussions of the English language teaching faculty in Japan tend to conceptualize it as consisting of two groups. One is the ‘native English speaking’ ‘non-Japanese’ faculty, who are generally described as working in part-time, adjunct, limited term contract positions, generally employed primarily to teach ‘English communication’ undergraduate classes (and who are much less numerous than their Japanese counterparts). The other is Japanese nationals, who are considered to hold full-time, permanent positions, generally employed to teach topics such as ‘English literature’ (and who are part of the majority demographic of Japanese HE faculty) (Hall, 1998; McVeigh, 2002; Poole, 2005).

While research into English language teachers writing for academic publication within Japan is relatively sparse (what is available is reviewed in 2.6), investigations of English language teacher identity are relatively better represented, and some have indicated stances toward writing for academic publication. What these studies have found is briefly summarized below.
Hawley Nagatomo (2012) interviewed two part-time and six full-time Japanese teachers of English. One of her eight participants, Miwa, was working in a full-time limited term contract position where she had only teaching and no committee responsibilities. Hawley Nagatomo (2012) explains that in this situation “inexperienced academics can gain valuable job experience while having sufficient time for writing and publishing papers to build a resume” and that “everyone, including Miwa, believes she will find a good job soon” (p. 106). While Hawley Nagatomo (2012) does not explore her participants’ writing for academic publication practices in detail, she does note that they:

[...] engage with like-minded scholars by attending and presenting at conferences, publishing research and taking part in study groups. Engaging in such activities contributes to a sense of professional identity that is apart from teaching and apart from the workplace. (p. 107)

Hawley Nagatomo (2012) observes that for two of her participants, engagement with academics outside their workplaces was important because they “often do not share similar academic interests with their colleagues” (p. 107). For example, one teacher, Kumiko, worked in an economics faculty “where the majority of the professors specialize in business-related areas” (p. 108). She also explains how Kumiko was asked to end her enrollment in a PhD program when she took her full-time position to comply with university employment policy. Kumiko agreed but ultimately decided to maintain her enrollment as having a PhD would “enhance her standing in the wider academic community” (p. 101) and helped her “to envision a future beyond her current workplace” (p. 102) even though “she is somewhat fearful of being discovered and consequently being fired for breaking the rules” (p. 101). Kumiko
also edited “a bilingual pedagogical journal that focuses upon teaching in the Japanese context” (p. 108).

Stewart (2005) also focuses on teacher identity, drawing on debates regarding the degree to which language teaching is a profession (Johnston, 1997) and considering teachers’ careers and identities in Japan. One of Stewart’s participants, John, an American, was fluent in Japanese and held a PhD. Stewart writes of him, “John derives some satisfaction in having succeeded in comparison with many Japanese colleagues, who have never published or done research in their fields” (p. 241). Stewart also notes that in a previous position, when he sought to study for a master’s, his “allegiance was questioned” as he was working for one institution but attending classes at another.

Poole (2010) describes his investigation as “an ethnography of a university faculty” that explores the internal politics of one private university in Japan, largely discussing developments concerning the English language teaching faculty. One aspect of his analysis considers whether individual professors at the university are on an inside or outside track within the institution, with inside meaning they are internally oriented toward a lifetime career at their current institution and outside meaning they are externally oriented toward finding employment at a different, hopefully more prestigious university in the future (see discussion in 1.2.2). He discusses, drawing on Bourdieu (1975), the procurement and manipulation of “capital” (Poole, p. 34; Bourdieu, p. 25) in these two separate tracks. Bourdieu describes a scientist’s capital as, making “a name for oneself” (p. 26, italics in original) through “the distinctive value of his products and the collectively recognized originality (in the information-theory sense) of his contribution to the scientific
resources already accumulated” (p. 25, italics in original; see also 2.3). In Poole’s terms, inside capital is represented by committee and other work that has an internal institutional value, but which would likely not translate well to an external search for a new position at a different university. Conversely, Poole describes outside capital, such as writing for publication, as less valued internally, but more valued by external institutions in the case of, for example, a job search. He notes how faculty exhibit different degrees of attention to inside and outside capital, and how these differing orientations suggest different intended career trajectories. Poole (2005; 2010) also notes how a change in focus toward teaching quality at the university influenced the perceived importance of inside and outside capital among the faculty, and how one faculty member, who apparently felt writing for publication was more important than internal responsibilities, ultimately chose to leave the university partly because of those reforms.

The picture here of Japanese English language teaching faculty writing for publication is relatively incomplete but suggests considerable complexity. There is limited mention of it as part of language teachers’ identities (specifically Stewart, 2005 and Hawley Nagatomo, 2012). There are potentially ambiguous ramifications for employment; professors on inside tracks at some universities may not be as interested in or motivated to write for publication (Poole, 2005), while faculty on outside tracks may be publishing in anticipation of looking for future employment at new institutions (Poole, 2005). However, the discussion of writing for publication in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 presents the situation as much more straightforward; it tends to describe a universal necessity for faculty to write for publication in prestigious journals to secure tenure and promotion. One potential contribution this research can make is to clarify the extent to which writing for
publication is important to the authors who contributed to the investigation described in this thesis, and what goals and interests their writing for publication serve.

Finally, Japan, along with other Asian countries, has been seeking to increase the number of foreign residents employed in HE in the country, which may lead to what Geertz (1983) describes as an “exile from Eden syndrome” (p. 159), where scholars educated at high prestige center institutions graduate then move to less well equipped and connected institutions. While Geertz (1983) was referring to this as an internal US phenomenon, with graduates moving from studying at more prestigious institutions to working at less prestigious ones, Flowerdew (2000) notes this ‘exile’ may be even more marked when scholars move from one national context to another, particularly considering different ‘local/international’ expectations for scholars and scholarship, as raised by Canagarajah (1996), Casanave (1998) and Lillis and Curry (2010). This is another phenomenon examined in this thesis: what resources the authors (don’t) have access to, how that (lack) of access may facilitate or impede their writing for publication, and how their writing for publication may facilitate or impede their efforts to build capital in light of such mobility.

1.4 The objectives of the investigation presented in this thesis

The research questions addressed in this thesis are:

- Why do early career Japan-based English language teachers write for academic publication and what academic publication practices do they engage in?
- What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for
submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions?

- What do the interactions the authors have in their correspondence surrounding their writing for academic publication reveal regarding text brokering processes and the relationships between authors and brokers?

These questions are returned to and elaborated on in 3.3.1, including discussion of how they were refined from the initial research questions that guided the investigation.

1.5 The structure of this thesis

Chapter 2 presents a literature review of research into writing for academic publication production and practices, along with a separate discussion of Japan-based writing for academic publication. Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology, including the orientation toward knowledge making taken, considerations of research design, data analysis, ethics, and issues of researching knowledge making in the academy.

Three thematically interlinked data analysis chapters follow. Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the seven author profiles generated from the interview and other data, followed by an analysis of what the author profiles reveal with respect to the authors’ writing for academic publication practices. This chapter is primarily concerned with answering the first research question (see 1.4) of why the authors write for academic publication and what academic publication practices they engage in. Next, in Chapter 5, the detailed text history analyses of six manuscript trajectories are presented, followed by a discussion of what the text history analyses reveal with
respect to the authors’ writing for academic publication experiences. This chapter is primarily concerned with answering the second research question (see 1.4) of how the manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing. The final data chapter, Chapter 6, explores the sets of correspondence surrounding the published manuscripts whose text trajectories are analyzed in the previous chapter. This chapter primarily addresses the third research question (see 1.4) about the nature of the interactions between authors and brokers and what their correspondence reveals regarding text brokering processes.

The discussion chapter, Chapter 7, integrates the analysis from the three data chapters, returning to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. It addresses each of the three research questions in turn, discussing the findings this thesis offers with respect to the questions posed. The conclusion, Chapter 8, turns to the contributions this thesis can make to the literature reviewed and to methodologies of examining author writing for publication practices. It also critically reflects on the research undertaken, considering some of the limitations of the study from the perspective of the data analyzed, the research questions posed, and issues of researcher interpretations of data.
2. Literature review of writing for academic publication research

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature relevant to the examination of the writing for academic publication practices and experiences of Japan-based authors reported in this thesis. Research into writing for publication is characterized here as taking two broad focuses: a text focus, as in genre analysis (Swales, 1987, 1990), and a practices focus, such as in academic literacies-based explorations of authors writing for academic publication (Lillis & Curry, 2010). The literature focused around investigating texts is briefly summarized before discussing the literature focused around writing for publication practices and revision practices. This is followed by a discussion of research into the correspondence of writing for publication then a review of the limited existing work specifically focused around Japan-based writing for publication research.

Since the work reviewed here tends not to explicitly divide itself along the lines demarcated above, some studies are cited across multiple subsections throughout the chapter. This is reflective of the overlap in the literature, and the tendency for
studies to mutually inform one another. Nevertheless, the broad distinctions between a texts and a practices focus is useful in framing the study presented in this thesis with respect to the literacy practices and Japan-based writing for publication literature.

2.2 Research on writing for publication: Focus on texts

Explorations of author experiences of writing for academic publication from outside of the global academic center (defined in 1.2.2) have recently enjoyed greater academic interest (Lillis & Curry, 2010). This is due in part to the prominence of English as an academic lingua franca, the profusion of academic journals, and more and more specialized fields of inquiry, along with academics outside the traditional Anglophone center increasingly seeking to publish in prestigious English language journals (Lillis & Curry, 2010). As this thesis contributes to this growing body of scholarship, exploring the writing for academic publication practices of Japan-based authors, this section briefly reviews two important text analysis traditions used to research writing for publication: Genre analysis (Swales, 1987, 1990), a popular applied linguistics tool for examining the rhetorical structures of published articles; and rhetoric of science investigations describing how genre conventions came to prominence historically through exploration of the development of the genre of science writing over time (Bazerman, 1998).

Genre analysis is the basis for many investigations analyzing published texts in applied linguistics. In genre analysis, Swales (1990) conceptualizes those involved in producing and consuming a specific genre of text as constituting a “discourse community” (p. 21), with such communities sharing common goals achieved through shared generic textual conventions. He defines genre as “a class of communicative
events [...] which share some set of communicative purposes” along with “patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content, and intended audience” (p. 58). Genre analysis facilitates discovery of implicit textual patterns that are potentially difficult for experts to explicitly describe because expert discourse community members tend not to be consciously aware of them (Swales, 1990). The analytical methods of genre analysis include gathering representative texts from a common source, such as a specific journal, and analyzing them for common discursive features. Such an investigation led Swales to propose an important model for understanding the rhetorical features of research article introductions, “create a research space (CARS)” (p. 140).

Swales’ work has been expanded and elaborated on by many researchers. It has been used to examine the structural characteristics of different genres within writing for academic publication, such as research articles (Gledhill, 2000; Lim, 2010; Swales, 1987) and to interrogate the functions that use of personal pronouns in academic research articles serve (Harwood, 2005b, 2005c). Additionally, differences between “research paradigms” (Kwan, Chan, & Lam, 2012, p. 188), between different languages (Loi, 2010; Martín Martín, 2003; Martín & León Pérez, 2014; Soler, 2011), and between author language backgrounds (Jaroongkhongdach, Watson Todd, Keyuravong, & Hall, 2012; Qanbari, Nemati, & Tohidian, 2014) have been studied. As one of the issues the research presented in this thesis explores is Japan-based authors writing for publication, including Japanese and foreign nationals, genre analysis studies that explore the influence author language background appears to have on academic writing are particularly relevant. Two such studies include an investigation into how RAs written in...
languages other than English exhibit move structures different from English RAs (Loi, 2010) and how authors with language backgrounds other than English may employ move conventions based on the expectations of languages other than English when writing in English (Sheldon, 2011).

Examining how RAs written in languages other than English exhibit move structures different from English RAs, Loi (2010) compared the structures of 20 English and 20 Chinese RA introductions in the field of education. Loi found 80% of the English research articles included “indicating a gap” (p. 274), while only 50% of the Chinese RAs included it. Examining how author language background potentially influences the move conventions used based on the expectations of languages other than English when writing in English, Sheldon (2011) analyzed move structure differences in applied linguistics RAs between English L1 (18 articles), Spanish L1 (18 articles), and English L2 texts written by Spanish authors (18 articles). Sheldon observed differences between the English L1 authored texts and the texts produced by Spanish speakers, both in Spanish L1 and English L2. She found cyclical move patterns in 10 of the 18 English L1 texts, in only 4 of the 18 Spanish L1 texts, and in 9 of the 18 English L2 texts written by Spanish speakers.

Genre analysis has led to extensive description of the structure and characteristics of various texts. However, questions have been raised regarding academic text production which the methods of genre analysis are not well equipped to answer, and which the writing practices research reviewed in 2.3 partly address. Here four of these questions regarding the processes behind academic knowledge production are raised.
The first question relates to community and how this is constituted, including issues regarding who decides such matters and the uneven distribution of power in discourse communities, which tends to be backgrounded in genre analysis. For example, Sheldon (2011) uses the affiliations of authors to divide their RAs into different groups for analysis, and concludes Spanish writers follow “English academic rhetorical patterns but simultaneously remain faithful to their Spanish cultural written norms” (p. 247). However, where the authors of those texts position themselves relative to the respective discourse communities they are writing for, and whether they are seeking to be ‘faithful’ to one or another discourse tradition, is difficult to capture through analysis of published texts alone, as is a detailed understanding of their language backgrounds. How the question of discourse community membership has been addressed in academic practices research is reviewed in 2.3.

The second question concerns how concentration on prominent textual features may underplay the changeable and relative nature of the norms of academic writing and may obscure genre variability. For example, Loi (2010), comparing Chinese and English language RAs, found English RAs indicated the gap they were seeking to fill 80 percent of the time while Chinese RAs indicated a gap only 50 percent of the time, concluding “Chinese writers do not place as much emphasis on indicating the gaps of past studies” (p. 274). However, such emphasis on trends may underplay the importance of less common discourse features. For example, in Loi’s analysis, 4 English RAs did not indicate the gap they were trying to fill, and 10 Chinese RAs did indicate a gap. How writing practices research has explored this question is reviewed in 2.3.
The third question is whether exclusive attention to final, published manuscripts may obscure the processes of writing and revision underlying their production (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Analysis of the discourse of manuscript evaluation and review, discussed in 2.5, has shown that in many fields it is rare to accept manuscripts following review without changes (Belcher, 2007; Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002), particularly in the social sciences (Hargens, 1990). Therefore, which features of published texts are products of the review and revision process and which were originally written by named authors are questions that cannot be explored through the exclusive analysis of published manuscripts (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Significantly, Swales (1990) acknowledges the importance of such processes. Section 2.4 reviews how practices-based research has addressed this question.

The fourth question arising out of text-based genre analysis concerns the co-constructed nature of published academic texts, and the negotiated brokering behind such co-construction. In addition to the journal RA, Swales (1993) notes that the “cycles of inquiry, submission, review, revision, editing and so forth” (p. 693) that accompany writing for publication are of interest to genre analysis. Genre analysis investigations have examined the discourse of author letters to Editors (Swales, 1996), Editor letters to authors (Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002), and Reviewer evaluations of manuscripts (Kourilova, 1998; Fortanet, 2008), studies reviewed in 2.5. However, how these evaluations lead to changes in manuscripts, and the co-constructed nature of the changes, or the relationship between evaluation and revision, are difficult to interpret based on analysis of published texts alone. This is in part because in genre analysis Reviewer evaluations tend to be de-coupled from the manuscripts they are evaluating for the purposes of analyzing their textual features (such as in Kourilova, 1998). Yet reviews are presumably written with the
intention of evaluating and effecting specific changes to specific manuscripts. Research into how reviews effect such changes requires analyzing not only their textual characteristics, but also how manuscripts are changed in response to reviews, or “uptake” in Lillis & Curry’s (2015, p. 132) terms. How the practices-based research literature has sought to answer this question is reviewed in 2.5.

While genre analysis has successfully described the rhetorical structure of modern texts, rhetoric of science (Bazerman, 1988) and scientific exposition (Turner, 2011) investigations have explored how these modern genre conventions came into widespread use. The techniques used in terms of analysis of published texts are often the same as those used in genre analysis, although the questions asked are concerned with the social construction of scientific genres over time. Bazerman and Turner also include in their analysis co-texts, or the correspondence surrounding texts, such as laboratory notebooks. Bazerman (1988) describes the evolution of the experimental research article along with the scientific research enterprise, what he terms in an early article writing “in disciplines” (1980, p. 657). Bazerman (1988) links rhetorical developments within the research article genre to historically contemporary debates and discussions. He argues the epistemological view of science that prefers certain argumentation and evidence over others is socially constructed and codified throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Through analysis of a physics manuscript published early in the 20th century, Bazerman further demonstrates how conventions conceived early in the history of scientific writing are codified in more modern journal article writing. Bazerman is returned to in discussion of how the authors’ manuscripts were revised in 7.2.1.
Turner (2011), also analyzing historical documents, demonstrates how the epistemologies of rational thought and clarity of language are perpetuated throughout the Anglo-European colonial period. Turner describes how scientific discourse comes to be dominated by the belief that its language should be transparent and invisible. Turner notes how this belief makes it difficult to critique the language of scientific communication, as “language is only marked when it is perceived as being faulty, and unmarked when the message is apparently clearly delivered” (p. 6). Turner links developments in ideals of language use in the academy to how language is dealt with in contemporary HE, problematizing the uncritical perpetuation of dominant paradigms of language use.

In summary, this section reviewed genre analysis (Swales, 1990, 2000) descriptions of published academic texts and how historical analysis of the rhetoric of science (Bazerman, 1988) illustrates the processes that brought the genre features identified in genre analysis to prominence. This review provides important context for the review of research into writing for academic publication practices, which this chapter turns to next.

2.3 Research on writing for publication: Focus on practices

Parallel to and intertwined with genre analysis studies of writing for publication, there has been considerable research into the publishing practices of scholars since early studies into the sociology of science (Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Latour & Woolgar, 1979). Such research has explored issues of global publishing practices in HE and is particularly relevant to the first two research questions, which ask why the Japan-based authors write for publication and what their writing for publication practices are (Table 3-1).
This review of research into writing for publication practices characterizes studies into three different types. The first includes (generally) earlier studies, largely from the sociology of science literature, conducted primarily in English speaking countries. These studies are concerned with the practice of writing for publication in academia generally, meaning issues of what language to publish in and geographical location tend not to be explicitly foregrounded. The remaining two types of studies reviewed tend to come after the earlier studies and take a more global perspective on how author language background and geopolitical location influence choices of language and place of publication (Lillis & Curry, 2010). The second type of study reviewed is primarily first-person accounts of author-researchers' individual experiences, while the third type is researchers' accounts of author experiences, where researchers (tend to) investigate authors other than themselves. This distinction between authors researching their own practice and researchers researching authors’ practices is somewhat problematic, as some researchers, such as Canagarajah (1996) refer to their own autobiographical experiences as authors in addition to discussing the practices of other authors. However, it is useful to help place the study described in this thesis among the third type of study. The first two types are reviewed more briefly as the third and final type is the most relevant to the research presented in this thesis.

In the first type of study, Knorr-Cetina (1981, 1982) and Myers (1985) represent early sociology of science investigations into the social processes underlying academic knowledge production. Also relevant are Becher and Trowler (1989, 2001). Observing author practices, Knorr-Cetina (1981, 1982) analyzes how lab notes were transformed into a published manuscript and Myers (1985) follows two
authors’ manuscripts on their trajectories toward publication. The focus of the review here is author practice, while their analysis of how manuscripts change is discussed in 2.4.

Knorr-Cetina describes how social relationships between scientists play a significant role in knowledge production, asserting science as “socially situated” (1981, p. 68). Myers (1985) illustrates how the authors’ social positioning within their respective communities limited the knowledge claims it was possible for them to make and the journals in which it was possible for them to publish. Specifically, Myers documents journals resisting author knowledge claims in their manuscripts, and how the authors are urged to soften initially strong claims during the review and revision process. Myers describes how the authors chose journals for publication based on what was possible regarding the claims they were seeking to make, and how rejected claims were reused in other academic work, including conference presentations and proceedings papers.

The desire of the scientists Knorr-Cetina (1981) and Myers (1985) investigated to make relatively stronger knowledge claims is explained by Knorr-Cetina (1982) through Bourdieu’s (1975) conception of the influence of market capital on social systems, observing “two distinct forms of economic reasoning” (Knorr-Cetina, 1982, p. 111). One involves scientists seeing their research efforts as investment of a kind of capital, where they seek to maximize on potential returns (for example, in terms of publishable results). The other involves developing a personal value, or sense of worth, where scientists seek to be challenged and engaged by the research work they do and see themselves as providing value to the institutions where they work through their contribution to and affiliation with them. Regarding publishing
practices, author concerns included which journals to publish in (Knorr-Cetina, 1982; Myers, 1985), the order of authors’ names (Knorr-Cetina, 1982), and how publishing could facilitate access to additional resources, such as grants to further develop their work (Myers, 1985).

Becher and Trowler (1989, 2001) explored how academics were socialized into their disciplines and the implications of disciplinary ‘territories’ for academic ‘tribes’ in global HE, analyzing interview data from 221 academics based in the USA and England from 12 disciplines (2001, p. 25). In the second edition of their book, Becher and Trowler (2001) added to their original study data from one more university and additional interviews with 24 “newly appointed academics in England and Canada” (p. 25). Of relevance to the study of writing for publication practices, Becher and Trowler note that among the “junior academics” (p. 77) in their study, some “were unclear whether a good [academic] reputation was more strongly determined by quantity than by quality of published writing” (p. 77).

The studies reviewed above successfully make visible author research practices. They tend to focus on critiquing the larger scientific enterprise and not on the implicit value assumptions of those being researched. For example, how authors evaluate journal quality and issues of choice of publication language medium tend not to be examined explicitly. These issues rose to prominence in later work which is reviewed next, beginning with Canagarajah (1996).

An early example of an applied linguist seeking to explore issues of writing for academic publication among multilingual scholars based outside of the traditional Anglophone center is Canagarajah (1996). Formerly affiliated with the University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka, Canagarajah had recently moved into US HE work. He outlines
issues he and his colleagues faced when seeking to write for publication from Sri Lanka that center academic journals did not consider problematic, referred to as “nondiscursive” (p. 436) requirements of writing for academic publication, as distinct from the discursive interests of genre analysis. Canagarajah defines nondiscursive requirements as, “the supposedly commonplace or practical requirements of academic publishing that are not treated as having implications for the language, content, or style of the writing” (p. 436). These include formatting and bibliography requirements, paper quality, submission expectations and procedures, and “the nature of interaction between authors and editorial boards” (p. 436). Canagarajah notes, “These conventions assume the availability of certain material resources – technological, communicational, and economic – which cannot be taken for granted [...]” (p. 436). Examples are prepaid postage, providing multiple copies of drafts of manuscripts for review, and multiple rounds of mail correspondence concerning manuscript revisions, which were difficult or impossible for Canagarajah and his colleagues to accommodate because of circumstances beyond their control.

Regarding the problem of access to material resources, Canagarajah (1996) draws on the concept of “core-periphery” (Wallerstein, 2004, p. 12) from world-systems analysis (Wallerstein, 1974, 1991, 2004), which observes there is “unequal exchange” (2004, p. 12) between economically stronger countries and weaker countries, with the flow of capital going from the weaker to the stronger. Canagarajah (1996) describes “periphery” (p. 441) communities as generally disadvantaged relative to the “developed’ center” (p. 441), with the periphery dependent on the center, and the center’s dominance representing a self-perpetuating system where its exercise of power leads to the consolidation of even more power in the center.
One of the ways the core disadvantages the periphery that Canagarajah (1996) points out is through center HE exports of materials and expertise to the periphery in the form of training, which in turn reinforces the clout and expertise of center scholarship. Canagarajah argues that this positions periphery scholars as consumers of center scholarship rather than producers of scholarship. Furthermore, he argues center scholars writing about the periphery come to establish expertise in those contexts (from the perspective of center scholarship), and that when periphery scholars seek to write about their own contexts, they are forced to reference those center scholars in their own work, further perpetuating this imbalance of power. Canagarajah describes capital in the form of knowledge and expertise flowing from the periphery (Sri Lanka) to the center (Anglophone countries), with that knowledge controlled by the center, requiring periphery scholars to perpetuate the imbalance as they must then purchase access to it.

Canagarajah (1996) argues that lack of access to center scholarship by periphery scholars means these scholars have come to devalue center publication and develop alternative values from center norms. For example, he explains how in the periphery the oral tradition of knowledge transfer is valued, while in center academia the written medium is more valued. This means locally speeches and presentations are used as part of the currency of academic knowledge production, even as they are not recognized or valued by the center (see 1.3, specifically Table 1-1, for how this is reported in Japan-based research into writing for publication).

Following Canagarajah (1996), Casanave and Vandrick’s (2003) edited book includes several firsthand accounts of authors writing for academic publication and the issues they face, similarly written from first person perspectives in separate
chapters. Those narratives of relevance to the study of Japan-based authors writing for academic publication are reviewed in 2.6.

Next the third type of research is reviewed; researcher accounts of author experiences, generally multilingual scholars writing from outside the Anglophone center of scholarship. One of the most comprehensive investigations in this set of literature is Lillis and Curry’s (2010) exploration of the writing for academic publication practices of 50 European scholars, 47 PhD holders and 3 graduate students (p. 33). Their investigation, reported on across a variety of journal publications and in their 2010 book, involved 60 visits to 12 institutions across four sites in Hungary, Slovakia, Spain, and Portugal (Curry & Lillis, 2014, p. 7), the collection of “a wide range of ethnographic data” (2014, p. 7) including field notes, “approximately 1,200 texts written by scholars” (p. 7-8), “500 pieces of correspondence” (p. 8), and “250 text-based individual interviews” (p. 8). They found the scholars published “… in the three most prestigious categories of publication – books (85), book chapters (469) and journal articles (1,008) – and in a number of linguistic media” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 35). While acknowledging “any set of labels will oversimplify the intended audience for specific texts, and that the descriptors used, such as ‘local’ and ‘international’ are highly contested” (p. 42), based on the scholars’ publishing records, texts, and documentary data, Lillis and Curry identify seven different communities the scholars write for. In explaining their concept of communities, Lillis and Curry draw on communities of practice (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002), discourse community (Swales, 1990), and speech community (Hymes, 1974) literature, the significance of which is returned to below. The seven communities they identify the scholars writing for include:
• The “national academic community in the local national language” (p. 42),
• The “national applied community in the local national language” (p. 42),
• The “national academic community in English medium” (p. 44),
• The “International’ academic community in the local national language” (p. 44),
• The “intranational academic community in English medium” (p. 45),
• “Other national academic community in national languages” (p. 45), and
• The “international’ academic community in English” (p. 46).

Lillis and Curry (2010) observe that in the contexts the authors in their study work in, English publication is increasingly preferred to scholarly output in local languages. They furthermore document local strategies for resisting these trends, enacted by scholars who have complex motivations regarding the purposes behind publication and language medium choices. An important insight from their research is that of the seven communities they identify, only writing for the international academic community in English tends to be discussed in the research literature investigating academic writing practices (such as that reviewed in this section). However, the scholars they spoke with identified several different reasons for addressing a multitude of audiences in their written work.

Since Lillis and Curry’s critique of the narrow focus of writing for publication research on international publication in English, there has been some effort to examine the additional communities scholars write within and for, notably Bennett’s (2014) description of “semiperiphery” (p. 2) scholars writing for academic publication in Europe, drawing, like Canagarajah (1996), on Wallerstein’s (1984, 2004) world-
systems theory. The contested nature of the ‘international’ English academic community is also raised by Canagarajah, who notes,

It is not without irony that many of these journals based in North American and West European academic institutions with editorial boards of predominantly Western scholars [...] and publishing mostly the work of their colleagues label themselves ‘an international journal’ (p. 441).

This theme is returned to below, where the labels used to describe different groups of authors writing for academic publication are reviewed.

Semi-structured interviewing is one way that scholars’ experiences of writing for publication have been explored and is one of the research tools employed in the research described in this thesis (see Chapter 4). Li (2014) examines the publishing “perspectives and practices” (p. 41) of 14 “management academics” (p. 43) from seven business schools in four cities in China with “a live track record in English-medium publication” (p. 43). She observes how all the academics mentioned lists “of tiered English journals, usually internally circulated in their schools” (p. 45) as one reason for pursuing English language publication. Publishing in such journals was considered “persuasive for tenure and promotion” (p. 45) with one example given of “promotion from assistant professor to associate professor” (p. 45) requiring authorship “of one A-level paper and two A minus-level papers [...] in addition to other [...] publications” (p. 45). More senior academics were skeptical of the “game” (p. 46) of writing for publication for prestigious journals, and felt it was more important to address an “academic community” (p. 46). Additional reasons for publishing in English included “establishing a reputation in the field” (p. 46) and that publishing in Chinese would require additional background research, as Chinese
medium journal publication is also competitive and requires engaging in different academic conversations from those the authors could access via English.

Exploring the choice Chinese “humanities and social sciences” (p. 2) academics face of publishing in Chinese or English, Flowerdew and Li (2009) conducted “in-depth semi-structured interviews” (p. 1) with 20 scholars at a Chinese “comprehensive research-based elite university” (p. 4). They found the scholars resistant to publishing in English for three primary reasons: An interest in contributing to Chinese language conversations and communities; the obstacle writing in English for publication presents (particularly the amount of time required to publish in English); and skepticism of Orientalizing trends in Western English publication of work from China. All the scholars reported reading literature in English, even if they did not publish in English. Flowerdew and Li also note the younger scholars in their study seemed more interested in and eager to publish in English than the older scholars. They suggest scholars returning to China from abroad may bring back with them values different from those held by scholars educated in China, potentially contributing to shifting attitudes and practices within the country over time.

Scholars’ experiences of writing for publication have also been investigated through questionnaire survey research. Flowerdew (1999) examined the language medium writing practices of 585 Cantonese as a first language academics based in Hong Kong across a wide range of academic disciplines. Flowerdew found that among the scholars, refereed (94%) journal articles (86%) aimed at an international audience (84%) were the “most important types of publications” (p. 136), whether single authored (55%) or involving more than one author (45%) (p. 135). 92 percent
of respondents identified English as the most important language for publishing and 7 percent Chinese (p. 136). The contrast between the scholars’ responses in Flowerdew and Li (2009), who preferred Chinese publication, and those in Flowerdew (1999) and Li (2014), who preferred English publication, suggests the importance of local contextual factors and disciplinary specialism to authors’ writing for publication practices. This theme is taken up with respect to writing for publication in Japan in 2.6. Flowerdew (2000) also examined changes made to manuscripts as part of journal submission and evaluation (reviewed in 2.4) and conducted genre analysis of editorial decision letters sent to authors (Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002, reviewed in 2.5).

Surveying scholars across fields about their publishing practices at the University of Santiago de Compostela in Spain, Polo and Varela (2009) analyzed 213 questionnaire answers. They found choice of publication language depended on field of specialty, with “Experimental Sciences” researchers “more likely to publish in English” (p. 155) and those in Humanities seldom using English, further illustrating the potentially complex relationship between writing for publication and language medium choice within specific local contexts (see also Huang & Chang, 2008). Also investigating Spanish scholars, López-Navarro Moreno, Burgess, Sachdev & Rey-Rocha (2015), examined the results of 1,454 responses to a survey of “researchers’ motivations for publishing either in English as an additional language or their first language” (p. 1). They found motivation for publishing in English was

[…] mainly related to utilitarian aspects such as communicating the results of research to the international scientific community […] as well as to the maximization of non-economic benefits such as having research work
recognized [...] and meeting the requirements for professional promotion [...] (p. 12)

On the other hand, motivations for publishing in Spanish were described as

[...] somewhat fragmented and are linked mainly with ideological (defence of local issues, desire for the continued existence of scientific journals in Spanish) and social reasoning (to respond to a request or invitation from an institution, association or publisher) [...] (p. 12)

López-Navarro et al. (2015) also note publishing in Spanish was associated with a desire to communicate “to the local scientific audience” (p. 12), a category that resembles Lillis and Curry’s (2010) “national academic community in the local national language” (p. 44).

Harwood (2006, 2007) is a notable exception to the literature focusing on multilingual scholars reviewed above, as he investigated five British political science academics, examining their personal pronoun use in writing, specifically “the frequency with which the informants used I and/or we” (2006, p. 431, italics in original) and “the functions of personal pronouns” (2007, p. 27) in their writing. Harwood uses a combined text analytical and semistructured “discourse-based interview” (2008b, p. 254; Odell, Goswami, & Herrington, 1983, p. 221) methodology, also referred to as ‘talk around texts’ (Lillis & Curry, 2010, see 2.4). Harwood identified “seven textual effects” (2007, p. 32) of the use of personal pronouns in the informants’ writing. Using a similar methodology, Harwood (2008a, 2008b, 2009) also examined citation behavior, including “why academic writers in computer science and sociology sometimes supply the reader with more details of
citees’ names than they need to” (2008a, p. 1007) and the influence “the publication outlet in which an academic writer’s text appears” (2008b, p. 253) has on authors’ use of citations. Harwood (2008b) found that publication outlet influenced textual citation behaviors in a variety of ways and that scholars cited authors’ names for a variety of different stylistic and communicative reasons (2008a).

Three key themes are explored in the literature reviewed above. The first concerns where scholars are writing from and who they are writing for, including how community is conceptualized. The second is the competing publishing priorities authors face and why they write for academic publication. The third relates to access to resources in global academic knowledge production and its influence on writing practice.

On the topic of where scholars write from, the literature reviewed above uses several terms to reference this, including “‘center’/‘periphery’” (Canagarajah, 1996, p. 441; Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 5), based on world-systems theory’s “core”/“periphery” (Wallerstein, 2004, p. 12) differentiation of global production systems, and “semiperiphery” (Bennett, 2014, p. 2), also a term based on world-systems theory (Wallerstein, 1984; see also 1.2.2). Additionally, Kachru’s (1992) division of the world with respect to the spread of English into “inner”, “outer”, and “expanding” (p. 3) linguistic circles is referenced. According to Kachru, the inner circle is represented by countries such as the US and the UK, where English is the first language. The outer circle is represented by countries such as India and the Philippines, former colonial countries where English is a second or official language. The expanding circle includes countries such as China and Japan, where English is a foreign
language, albeit one with considerable socioeconomic importance (Kachru, 1992; Lillis & Curry, 2010).

With respect to how community is conceptualized and addressed in the literature, several metaphors of community have been drawn on in characterizing who authors write with and for. Hymes’ (1974) concept of “speech community” (p. 47) envisions groups of people socially organized through the languages they speak. Importantly, Hymes sees individuals as not belonging to one speech community, but as moving between different communities, with their changing language use signaling community membership as a dynamic expression of identity and intentionality. With respect to writing for publication, this can manifest as an author writing in English for an ‘international’ audience, signaling membership in the global HE community of their specialty in one instance, and in another instance writing an article explaining potential practical applications of scientific research in their national language, signaling a different kind of speech community membership.

The concept of communities of practice (Wenger et al., 2002) has its origins in research into how expertise and information is communicated in business settings, with senior core members of a community socializing new, periphery members into the community, and as those new members learn, they move closer to and eventually into the core of membership. An important idea for the writing for publication literature from this metaphor is “legitimate peripheral participation” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 35), when members outside the core, on the periphery of a community, nevertheless contribute value to that community and learn through their participation in it. Scholars based outside the global center of HE have tended to be characterized as peripheral members of the global academic HE community who,
through their writing for publication, can nevertheless ‘legitimately’ participate (for example in Flowerdew, 2000). Although partly because of their geographical distance from the core, they tend not to be depicted as capable of moving into the ‘center’ of global HE knowledge production (for example in Flowerdew, 2000).

The concept of discourse community as outlined by Swales (1990) is explained in 2.2. What is important to the discussion here from that metaphor of community is the idea that different groups of scholars use common generic structures and forms in their writing. This facilitates, for example, Loi (2010) examining the differences between Chinese writers writing in Chinese and Chinese and Anglophone English writers writing in English (see 2.2), as the assumption is that there are unique generic conventions followed by those producing discourse in Chinese RAs and Anglophone English RAs. It also facilitates Li (2014) conceiving of “management academics who are actively engaged in publishing in English” (p. 42) from China representing a cohesive group to investigate.

Lillis and Curry (2010) use these different concepts to suggest seven communities the authors in their research write for (see discussion above), the most complex model of academic writing communities proposed to date. Lillis and Curry observe, though, that 90 percent of the brokers identified in their study “are involved in English-medium international journal articles” (2006, p. 17). Most of the other studies reviewed above tend to consider authors writing for one of two communities: a center/inner circle ‘international’ audience in English or for their respective local periphery/expanding circle national audiences in the local language (for example, Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Polo & Varela, 2009; López-Navarro et al., 2015).
While Lillis and Curry (2010) identify a distinction between academic and applied local audiences (see discussion above), it is not clear whether this is due to the fields the authors in their study work in, education and psychology, or whether this is a cross-discipline phenomenon. In this regard it is worth pointing out that Polo and Varela (2009) and López-Navarro et al. (2015), investigating authors based in Spain, do not find they are writing for the same range of audiences identified by Lillis and Curry. This suggests the potential for considerable local variation in writing for publication practice, a theme taken up with respect to writing for publication in Japan in 2.6.

Lillis and Curry (2010) also take up the topic of writing networks, or social groups in which the authors in their study produce their academic work. They note that strong local support groups appeared instrumental in allowing authors to gain access to and take advantage of international publication and research collaboration opportunities (Curry & Lillis, 2010), although their work remains one of the few to investigate this topic.

However, it is important to acknowledge Canagarajah’s (1996) caution “that the center-periphery relation should not be dichotomized too much” (p. 447). He notes there are disenfranchised institutions within center countries that exhibit difficulty accessing the resources necessary for academic knowledge production, the “periphery within the center” (p. 447), just as there are countries ostensibly in the periphery “that have attained a technological and economic advancement comparable to many of the center states” (p. 447). According to Canagarajah, these countries include Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, although he notes that in these countries “linguicism effects the additional forms of hegemony exerted by Anglo-
centric communities” (p. 447), or that these countries do not have equal access to international venues for writing for publication, partly due to the limitations of having to write in English. This suggests that using national boundaries to characterize an individual author’s experiences of access to resources for academic knowledge production may represent an oversimplification of the variety that exists within HE in even relatively smaller countries, a theme Lillis and Curry (2010) raise with respect to the authors in their research. This topic is returned to with respect to Japan in 2.6.

Turning to the second theme, that of competing publishing priorities authors face and why they write for academic publication, Canagarajah (1996) observes different reasons for scholars located outside of the global center to write for publication which differ significantly from center HE expectations. One example is publications not typically valued by center HE norms being counted as such by his university in Sri Lanka, including newspaper articles and presentations to local civic groups. Describing the different forces acting on scholars’ writing, Lillis (2013) labels the pull of centering institutions “centripetal” (Lillis, 2013, p. 133) and the forces acting against such pulls “centrifugal” (p. 133).

Lillis and Curry (2010) note that for a given author there can be multiple competing pressures to publish in specific language mediums for specific journals. In many cases, authors seek to respond to this multiplicity of forces through their selection of what to publish where and in what language medium, with different specific choices aimed at responding to different specific pressures. Furthermore, they also note that authors’ experiences of seeking publication can shape their priorities, with authors who have experience of difficulty in publishing in English choosing to
concentrate on publication in their local national language, and those with experience of success in publishing in English seeking to pursue further English language medium publication.

In this sense, there is not a single center to which authors respond or resist, but rather there is what Lillis (2012) refers to as “polycentricity” (p. 703), signaling

a) The way in which there are many (rather than one) centres/systems and

b) That there are evident challenges to dominant or centripetal pulls and orientations.

(p. 703)

Despite such polycentricity, much of the research on writing for publication has tended to build on Knorr-Cetina’s (1982) conceptualization of the academic author writing for and within a market capital social system (see discussion above). Authors are depicted as seeking “professional promotion” (López-Navarro et al., 2015, p. 8) and “pursuing extra remuneration” (p. 8), although this may be an oversimplification of authors’ intentions when writing for publication. As Lillis and Curry (2010) have observed, the authors in their research write for a variety of different audiences and for a variety of different reasons.

The third theme from the literature raised here concerns access to the resources necessary for academic knowledge production. Canagarajah (1996) offers a compelling description of many of the material resources necessary for successful English international journal publication (see discussion above). In addition to the scholars in their research having difficulty accessing material resources, Lillis and Curry (2010) observe access to language resources is also an issue for authors
seeking publication in English, regarding both the expense involved in professional translation and the scholars’ relatively negative experiences of using hired translation to prepare English language manuscripts for publication. However, Hyland (2016) in a discussion and review article suggests that the difficulties faced by scholars from outside the global center writing in English are not different and distinct from the difficulties faced by center scholars, referring to a “myth of linguistic injustice” (p. 58). Politzer-Ahles, Holliday, Girolamo, Spychalska, and Berkson (2016), responding to Hyland, argue that Hyland’s view “underestimates the role that linguistic privilege (and its converse, linguistic disadvantage or linguistic injustice) plays in academia” (p. 4). That the issue of access to resources among scholars writing for publication remains a topic of debate suggests more empirical evidence of the difficulties authors face (or, from Hyland’s perspective, don’t uniquely face) would help to further clarify the experiences of non-center scholars publishing their academic texts.

To summarize, this section has reviewed key literature examining the practices of authors writing for academic publication, beginning with literature on the sociology of science that examines some of the assumptions underlying HE knowledge production (Knorr-Cetina, 1981). It also reviewed work describing difficulties scholars from outside the global center of HE scholarship faced when seeking to write for publication for an international English language audience (Canagarajah, 1996). Finally, studies examining the writing practices of groups of authors based outside the global center, in the periphery and/or semiperiphery, were reviewed (Flowerdew, 1999; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Bennett, 2014; Li, 2014). Three themes that clearly emerge from the literature as meriting further empirical attention, which this thesis seeks to address, were discussed:
• Where authors are envisioned as writing from and who authors are envisioned as writing for, including conceptualizations of community in the literature.
• The different, competing priorities acting on authors and their writing for publication practice.
• Author access to the resources necessary for writing for publication.

Section 2.7 discusses how this thesis seeks to contribute to these themes.

2.4 Research on revision practices: Changes to manuscripts

A key dimension of work across texts and practices centered research has involved investigating article review and revision. The literature exploring this topic has tended to ‘focus on the text’ by analyzing textual changes across different manuscript versions (Gosden, 1995; Daly, 2016) or to ‘focus on the process’ by examining both text and practice, including the different steps (submission, review, and revision) manuscripts go through (Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Myers, 1985; Flowerdew, 2000; Englander, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010).

Gosden (1995) uses what he describes as text analytical methods based on Halliday (1985) to examine how the results and discussion sections of seven research article manuscripts written by Japanese scientists were changed between their “FIRST available drafts in English and FINAL versions accepted for publication” (p. 45, caps in original). Gosden analyzes how the manuscripts changed together with interview data from the students and their PhD supervisors as “specialist informants” (p. 45). Gosden uses summary statistical information to describe the changes made and examines the communicative importance of specific textual changes through
integrating interview data with analysis of the manuscript changes. Gosden notes more than 60 percent of the manuscripts’ T-units changed, with about 60 percent of these changes representing “rhetorical machining” (p. 42; Swales, 1990, p. 125), which Gosden broadly explains as “the polishing of language” (p. 43).

Of the rhetorical machining changes Gosden identified, 27 percent related to “discourse structure” (p. 47), 22 percent to “researchers’ claims” (p. 47), and 24 percent to “technical detail” (p. 47). In his analysis of the changes made to one manuscript, Gosden describes how the first draft “showed evidence of recognized features of ‘immature’ writing […] which, by means of redrafting, were emended towards recognized more ‘mature’ features” “now acceptable to the ‘expert’ readers who function as the gatekeepers of the academic community” (p. 53). Gosden’s portrayal of the authors of the manuscripts he analyzed as ‘immature’ novices who, through the revision process, develop into more ‘mature’ writers is revisited as a theme in the analysis of textual changes literature below.

Daly (2016) examined the changes a language editor made to 52 manuscripts written primarily by Taiwanese medical researchers. Daly used corpus analysis techniques, comparing frequency wordlists between the original texts and the final, published texts “to compile a list of words representing the most significant differences in frequencies” (p. 34), combined with “a qualitative analysis to determine the functions of these words” (p. 34). He found that regarding word frequency, the largest number of additions were of articles (a/the), followed by preposition markers (of), and finally “lists of nouns without using and before the last noun” (p. 38, italics in original). He also found that “the most significantly frequent edited words in terms of discourse function” (p. 39) included register markers, such
as *that*-clauses, stance markers, such as *can, has/have been*, and discourse organizers, such as *although, this, as* (p. 40).

Studies focusing on the process manuscripts go through in their publication trajectories include sociology of science (Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Myers, 1985) and applied linguistics research, both studies of single authors and manuscripts (Flowerdew, 2000) and studies of multiple authors and manuscripts (Englander, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010, 2015). These studies do not exclude analysis of textual changes to manuscripts, but when change analysis is used, it tends to be to illuminate the processes the manuscripts went through in their publication trajectories.

An early example of research into the process of transforming laboratory notes and data into a manuscript submitted for publication is Knorr-Cetina (1981), who examines manuscript drafting and redrafting leading up to and through review and revision. Knorr-Cetina examines the manuscript’s first version and final prepublication, 16th version, referring to intermediate versions commented on and revised by a variety of intermediaries. Knorr-Cetina describes the published manuscript as “a multilayered hybrid co-produced by the authors and by members of the audience to which it is directed” (p. 106) where “technical critique and social control are inseparably intertwined” (p. 106). For example, the head of the research institute insisted the authors hedge the knowledge claims in their work, resulting in initially strong knowledge claims becoming more tentative. Knorr-Cetina connects these changes to local social power dynamics between the researchers and the shapers of the manuscript, demonstrating how the different parties cooperated with and opposed one another depending on their relationship to and position in the
research project. Another insight Knorr-Cetina offers is how the motivations and objectives of the research as presented in the article introduction are post-hoc rhetorical constructions quite different from the motivations, relationships, and power structures that inspired the investigation in the first place.

Myers (1985) uses Pinch’s (1985) framework for assessing the degree of externality of claims, or the degree of specificity of the “evidential context” (Pinch, p. 11), to examine how the knowledge claims made in two RAs are transformed during journal submission and review. Describing Pinch’s model, Myers writes, “higher-level claims are likely to be profound but risky, while lower-level claims are likely to be taken as correct, but are also likely to be trivial” (p. 602). With respect to the two RAs Myers analyzed, he observes:

In general, the authors start by making high-level claims for the importance of their findings, while the reviewers demand that they stick to the low-level claims that take their findings as part of the existing structure of knowledge. (p. 596)

Myers illustrates how statements evaluated as too strong by journal brokers end up published in the authors’ other works which are not subject to the same evaluative process as peer-reviewed journal publication, such as conference proceedings and transcripts of invited lectures. Myers’ work is also an early empirical description of scientists pursuing publication of the same manuscript at multiple journals, as the two authors start with prestigious journals that reject their manuscripts, leading them to submit to incrementally less prestigious publications (as evaluated by the authors) until their manuscripts are ultimately published.
Flowerdew (2000) is an early applied linguistics investigation of a manuscript changing through submission and review. Flowerdew documents the experience of a “nonnative-English-speaking scholar” (p. 127) using a case study methodology. Flowerdew investigates a Hong Kong-based academic who moved back to his place of birth after completing a PhD in the US as he seeks to publish in a US-based journal from Hong Kong. Flowerdew uses interviews, analysis of different versions of the manuscript, and interactions between the author and different brokers to examine how the manuscript changes from submission to publication. Flowerdew illustrates the importance of author personal narratives, or literacy histories, in informing how they approach the writing and production of texts. Flowerdew also tracks how the conversation around a research article, the reviews and editorial correspondence, influence how the article is shaped and changed during submission and revision. Flowerdew hints at the globally dominant forces that can act on manuscripts such as opposing sociopolitical viewpoints shaping what is published, which connects with the issues Canagarajah (1996) raises (discussed in 2.3). Specifically, the theme of the adverse influence of mainland China’s governmental policies on Hong Kong’s development was added to the article at the behest of brokers residing in the US, a theme the manuscript’s author was ambivalent toward. Flowerdew (2000) speculates this change may be in part due to the author not initially valuing “the rhetorical dimension of his work; he was more interested in the ideas than in the format for their expression” (p. 147), which may have left space for the US-based brokers to add their interpretations of the manuscript’s significance or “news value” (p. 142). Flowerdew’s account of how the ‘news value’ of the manuscript is strengthened during the review process contrasts with what Knorr-Cetina (1981) and Myers (1985) observed with the manuscripts they
analyzed (see 2.3), where they found authors’ initially strong knowledge claims were weakened through the review and revision process. Determining whether this is because Flowerdew was investigating an author writing in the social sciences rather than in the ‘hard’ sciences, the fields Knorr-Cetina and Myers investigated, or if the strengthening of knowledge claims in manuscripts is possible in any number of fields, would require a deeper empirical base of research into how manuscripts change during the publication process.

Exploring how the rhetorical identities of four “native Spanish speaker” (p. 40) authors were transformed through manuscript review and revision, Englander (2009) uses “retrospective semistructured interviews” (p. 40) in “a collective case study” (p. 39). Englander was primarily interested in instances of “problems with the language in the originally submitted manuscript” (p. 40) being made explicit in the review and evaluation correspondence. Englander observes two of the scientists preferred their original manuscripts to the final, published versions, as they felt they were more persuasive, perhaps echoing Myers’ (1985) observations regarding authors’ desire to make stronger knowledge claims than brokers will allow.

Lillis and Curry (2010) explore the complexity of the process of drafting and revising texts as they go through submission, review, and editing on the way to (or away from) publication (their research into author practices is discussed in 2.3). They focus on how manuscripts change, who made changes when, and gather information about the changes through cyclical “talk around text” (p. 43) interviews, including author responses to changes and comments on “rhetorical/knowledge significance” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 89). Like Flowerdew (2000) and Canagarajah (1996), they critique the forces at play in global knowledge production, bringing to
light how sociocultural and historical processes influence and transform what it is possible for authors to publish. They demonstrate how, for example, authors from outside the Anglophone center are permitted by journal brokers to validate theories originating from the center but are not allowed to suggest theories of their own in their published manuscripts, documenting how one manuscript was changed from a stance of contrasting to a stance of confirming a theory. The main author in this case observed, “Saying something from Central Europe which is new is not good, not allowed. Of course it’s absolutely their perspective to see Central Europeans as, I don’t know, a tribe trying to do something scientific” (p. 107).

Lillis and Curry (2010) also consider the influences academic brokers have on texts (reviewed in more depth in 2.5). They describe brokers revising texts in particular ways, through refocusing articles around “the most attractive point” (p. 102), reformulating conclusions “from contrast to confirmation” (p. 105; also see example above), handling “conflicting reviews” (p. 107), and authors “resisting the call to simplify” (p. 110) the language of manuscripts.

Further analyzing manuscripts and reviews from the same dataset as their earlier research, Lillis and Curry (2015) identify how English is raised as an issue in the evaluations of 95 manuscripts for which they constructed “text histories” (p. 132; discussed in 3.4.3). They identify “three key orientations” (p. 138) brokers took toward the language work required:

- “Concerned-deficit (It’s your problem)” (p. 138): The authors are responsible for producing English to a “‘native speaker’” (p. 138, quoting a Reviewer of a manuscript) standard.
• “Concerned-resigned (I’m sorry it’s your problem)” (p. 138): Here evaluators are more sympathetic to the challenges authors are facing “but insist that the standards must be upheld” (p. 139).

• “Concerned-interventionist (It’s our problem)” (p. 139): Here evaluators see the language work required of manuscripts “as a shared responsibility” (p. 139) and therefore make some of the necessary revisions themselves.

Lillis and Curry (2015) use three text histories to illustrate how each of these different orientations are realized through review and revision correspondence.

Two key themes emerge from the research reviewed in this section: stances toward English and stances toward authors and author experience. Regarding stances toward English in the literature, Lillis and Curry (2015) observe research examining reviewing practices “overwhelmingly works with a boundaried notion of English and invokes a clear dichotomy between ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ users of English in classifying” (p. 130) authors and journal brokers. Flowerdew (2000) is illustrative of this, as despite the author whose manuscript he analyzes, ‘Oliver’, considering “both Chinese and English as his mother tongue” (p. 133), Flowerdew nevertheless characterizes Oliver as a “nonnative-English-speaking scholar” (p. 127) in the title of and throughout his article (see discussion above).

With respect to stances taken toward authors, Lillis and Curry (2015) critique approaches or framings evident in the literature:

There is often implicit slippage between ‘non-native’ English users and novice writers/scholars, reflecting a common positioning of multilingual scholar-authors as ‘apprentices’, and thus positioned as more junior in text production practices. (pp. 130-1)
This is illustrated by Gosden’s (1995) characterization of the authors in his research as novice writers learning the expectations of their field (see discussion above) and Flowerdew’s (2000) description of Oliver as disadvantaged because “he lacked the nativelike language proficiency that full membership of his target discourse community” (p. 146) required. In Oliver’s case, at least, Flowerdew’s characterization comes despite Oliver having successfully completed PhD work in the US.

To summarize, this section has reviewed revision practices research, including studies investigating changes to manuscripts across distinct versions (Gosden, 1995; Daly, 2016) and investigations of processes of manuscript revision during their publication trajectories (Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Lillis & Curry, 2010, 2015). Two themes that clearly emerge from the literature as meriting further empirical attention, which this thesis seeks to address, were also discussed:

- Stances taken toward English in the literature.
- Stances taken toward authors and author experience.

How this thesis hopes to contribute to this literature is discussed in 2.7.

2.5 Research on the correspondence of writing for publication

Another way in which the literature has sought to investigate journal publication processes is through examining the correspondence of submission, evaluation, and revision, what Swales (1993) refers to as “cycles of inquiry, submission, review, revision, editing and so forth” (p. 693). Swales (1996) has characterized these as “occluded genres” that “support the research publication process but are not
themselves part of the research record” (p. 45). This relates to the research question focusing on “the interactions the authors have in their correspondence surrounding their writing for academic publication” (see 1.4). The literature reviewed here can be characterized as investigating the correspondence of brokering in two ways: through examining discreet genres, such as manuscript reviews, generally using genre analysis techniques, or through exploration of the process of interaction between authors and brokers. The focus of the research presented in this thesis is on the latter, although the former is important to review as both kinds of research inform one another, and the empirical research base of studies of sets of interaction between authors and brokers remains relatively limited. The focus of discussion in this section is examining correspondence around writing for academic publication, and so research such as questionnaire surveys of Editors (Flowerdew, 2001) and Reviewers (Tardy & Matsuda, 2009), while potentially relevant, are not the focus of attention.

As noted in 2.2, genre analysis has characterized the structure of a variety of different kinds of evaluation correspondence. The most notable of these is the journal review, although I’ve organized this discussion according to the order in which different texts are presumed to be produced and used during the publication and evaluation process. It starts with the author’s letter to the Editor (Swales, 1996), followed by Reviewer evaluations of manuscripts (Kourilova, 1998; Fortanet, 2008), and finishes with the Editor’s decision letter to authors (Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002; Farley, 2016).

Examining the structure and characteristics of author submission letters sent with manuscripts to English for Specific Purposes, Swales (1996) compared the
“components” (p. 50) of 30 “NNS letters” (p. 50) and 35 “NS letters” (p. 50). Swales concludes the NNS authors’ letters were nontypical relative to the NS letters. Swales argues these deviations from expected norms are problematic and describes normative structures for author letters. If followed, Swales feels these should help authors to appear as legitimate members of the discourse community, but if flouted they are potential markers of authors as new to or unfamiliar with (assumed to be) widely accepted conventions.

Genre analysis of peer review has been the focus of considerable attention. Kourilova (1998) examined reviews of 80 manuscripts “written by Slovak medical doctors and submitted to British and American biomedical journals” (p. 107), only two of which were ultimately rejected, with the rest eventually published. Fortanet (2008) examined referee reports from “two broad disciplines”, 25 from “Business Organization” and 25 from “Applied Linguistics”. 5 in each group were written by “Spanish researchers and non-native users of English” (p. 30) and the other 20 in each group were reviews of those researchers’ submitted written work. Mungra and Webber (2010) examined the “content comments and language-use comments” (p. 45) of “17 manuscripts submitted to English language medico-scientific journals by [non-native speakers of English] researchers working in Italy” (p. 45), including 366 comments from 33 reviews (p. 46). Mungra and Webber observed 15 manuscripts “were returned for revision and resubmission” (p. 46), one was “accepted immediately” (p. 46), and the final one was rejected. Reviews were generally negative: Kourilova found reviews contained on average more than eight negative criticisms and only one and a half compliments. Mungra and Webber found only 5 percent of the comments “expressed praise” (p. 47). “Omission of data was the most
frequent target of criticism” (Kourilova, p. 112) and “unjustified conclusions appeared to be the most severe” (Kourilova, p. 112) which Kourilova attributed to a “feature of Slovak expository prose, i.e. insufficient justifying support” (p. 112). Mungra and Webber found 56 percent of the comments concerned content while 44 percent concerned language use (p. 48). Fortanet found applied linguistics reviews tended to be longer and business organization reviews tended to include more evaluative language. Fortanet described the reviews’ move structures and examined typical structures for three types of evaluative patterns: criticism, recommendation, and questions. Paltridge (2017) includes a relatively recent analysis of a corpus of 97 peer review reports from the journal *English for Specific Purposes*. He analyzes their different characteristics according to the recommendation they made, whether “Accept” (9 reviews), “Minor revisions” (22 reviews), “Major revisions” (39 reviews), or “Reject” (27 reviews) (p. 27). Paltridge concludes “there were typical moves in the texts that were related to the recommendation being made on the submission” (p. 184) with respect to “what ‘counts’ as research, how it should be framed, theorized, investigated as well as how it should be reported on” (p. 185).

Examining the move structures of editorial letters to authors, Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002) analyzed 53 letters written by one Editor and sent to authors accompanying finished reviews of manuscripts. They observed some examples of “vagueness” (p. 476) where, “[i]t is not clear to the contributor what course of action is expected” (p. 476), which they partially attributed to efforts by the Editor to mitigate potentially face threatening criticisms. They also outline the process of manuscript evaluation at the journal, noting manuscripts initially go through editorial screening, where the Editor decides whether a manuscript would “merit the asking of reviewers
to spend valuable time reviewing the article” (Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans, 2002, p. 467). They explain “review” (p. 467) as the process of peer review whereby the manuscript is evaluated and ostensibly one of five decisions are made with respect to it: “accepting” (p. 467), “accept subject to revisions” (p. 480), “inviting the authors to resubmit the article” (p. 467), “accepting/inviting the authors to resubmit the article as a Research Note” (p. 468), or “rejecting the article” (p. 468). They also mention a journal review practice that may not be visible to authors, explaining how a “co-editor” (p. 464) at the journal prepared submitted manuscripts for review by making them anonymous in preparation for blind review (this theme is returned to with respect to the authors examined in this thesis in 6.2.3). Farley (2016) examined 59 decision letters written by 48 Editors “of a wide range of scientific journals” (p. 896) following review of nearly identical manuscripts. He found these letters used a distinctly different structure from that described by Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans.

In addition to analyzing decision letters, researchers have examined review and evaluation correspondence processes. Gosden (2001, 2003) investigated reviews and author responses to reviews associated with manuscripts submitted to a chemical physics “international Letters journal” (2001, p. 6). Gosden analyzed the rhetorical structure of 40 Reviewers’ comments on 21 research articles and the authors’ “point-by-point replies” (p. 8) regarding how they changed (or resisted changing) their manuscripts in response to the evaluations. Gosden discusses the implications of the reviews for the trajectories of the texts towards or away from publication, specifically examining the trajectory of one manuscript evaluated as “accept with revisions” (p. 13), the only one of six such manuscripts with that initial evaluation to be published. Gosden notes how the authors, in their replies to the
Reviewers, constructed the Reviewers as non-experts in the subject matter of their manuscript, and he examines the consequences this had for the subsequent review correspondence. Gosden (2003) shows that the comments in reviews of manuscripts evaluated as “accept with revisions” (p. 98) included mostly (about 90 percent) comments intended “to help authors make revisions” (p. 98), while for manuscripts evaluated as “unacceptable” (p. 98), the proportion of these comments fell to less than half.

Examining nine manuscripts’ “submission history documents for accepted and rejected manuscripts submitted to an applied linguistics journal” (Belcher, 2007, p. 1), Belcher sought “to investigate the role that peer reviewers play” (p. 5). Belcher chose manuscripts “with off-network provenance, i.e., originating outside the so-called English-speaking center, e.g., Australia, the UK and US, and written by both EIL [English as an international language] and EL [English language] speakers” (p. 5). These manuscripts originated from three regions: Near/Middle East, Far East, and Latin America/Europe. For each region “one rejected EIL paper, one accepted EIL paper, and one rejected EL paper” (p. 6) was analyzed. Belcher identifies a tendency for reviews to use a good news—bad news structure, corroborating Kourilova’s (1998) observations. Belcher also explains how the manuscripts accepted for publication exhibit longer trajectories, with more cycles of review, noting in one case a paper being reviewed seven times. Belcher includes the authors’ commentary on the reviews and cases of resistance to requested changes in her analysis of the manuscripts’ trajectories. Belcher also describes how in one case, even after acceptance of a manuscript by Reviewers, the editorial negotiation of the final version of the manuscript for publication “took months” (p. 14), partly due to the kinds of non-discursive difficulties raised by Canagarajah (1996; see
discussion above). Belcher notes the reviews of the EIL and EL authored manuscripts were “remarkably similar” (p. 14). Belcher documents one Reviewer characterizing an EL author as a non-native speaker, with the Reviewer writing, “It might be useful for a **NS of English** to read the text just to disentangle some of the sentences” (p. 15, boldface in original). With respect to this review, Belcher observed, “the reviewer […] assumed, quite mistakenly, that the writing style revealed the EIL speaker status of the author” (p. 15).

Specific roles and practices within correspondence processes have also been discussed, with different categories of brokers identified with respect to writing for academic publication. These include “literacy brokers,” encompassing “language brokers” and “academic brokers” (Lillis and Curry, 2010, p. 93), and “network brokers” (Curry & Lillis, 2010, p. 283). Language brokers accounted for 17 percent of the literacy brokers in Lillis and Curry’s data (p. 93), including translators (who were dispreferred), friends and family members, and “English language professionals” (p. 96), who tended to be preferred. Friends and family members and English language professionals have also been referred to as “convenience editors” (Willey & Tanimoto, 2012, p. 250; 2015, p. 64). Lillis and Curry found academic brokers had three different levels of familiarity and expertise with author subspecialties: “a general academic” (p. 93) from outside the specialty of the author, “a disciplinary expert” (p. 93) with similar background and interests to the author, and “a subdisciplinary specialist” (p. 93) of the same subspecialist field as the author. 72 percent of the brokers were involved with international journal publications, 86 percent of whom were academic brokers, with 88 percent of journal article brokering concerning international journals, and only 12 percent “English-medium national
journals” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 100). They attribute this discrepancy in brokering of text types to “a hierarchy of brokering according to type of publications” (p. 100) with “a ‘native English speaking’ academic literacy broker” (p. 100) being utilized only for texts aimed “at an ‘international’ journal publication” (p. 100). They explain that literacy brokers “have considerable experience in academia and success in writing for academic publication” (p. 102). They also found broker influence is not limited to changing manuscript texts. Network brokers facilitate access to publication opportunities and other resources. They “may or may not intervene directly in text production but are important in providing access to resources and opportunities for publishing” (Curry & Lillis, 2010, p. 283).

In addition to the studies reviewed above, which examined multiple manuscript trajectories, a limited number of studies have explored the trajectories of individual manuscripts. These include Li’s (2006) examination of a Chinese doctoral student of physics successfully publishing a paper in Physical Review Letters and Canagarajah and Lee’s (2014) description of an unsuccessful effort to facilitate a postgraduate student’s publication in TESOL Quarterly. Li (2006) tracks a manuscript from early drafting through to submission to and rejection by Science, followed by three rounds of review by five Reviewers after submission to Physical Review Letters before a reject decision which is followed by a formal appeal process that leads to acceptance, pending “improvement of English” (p. 461), and ultimately publication. While Li (2006) uncovers some of the issues engaged and addressed through the reviews and revisions, her research largely focuses on interviews with named authors surrounding “the social constructionist nature of knowledge and production” (p. 474; also see discussion of Knorr-Cetina and Myers in 2.3 and 2.4). Li does not examine in detail how the authors rhetorically navigated the submission,
revision, and rejection appeal process. Canagarajah and Lee (2014) describe the review process an ultimately unsuccessful “non-conventional research” (p. 67) manuscript went through, from the perspectives of a postgraduate author self-described as new to the field (Lee) and the Editor of *TESOL Quarterly* at the time (Canagarajah). They consider the competing priorities of author, Editor, and Reviewers, including whether to publish the manuscript in the “Forum section” where “articles don’t get institutional credit” (Lee’s preference) or as a “full-length” (p. 74) article (Canagarajah’s preference). Following two rounds of review and revision with three different Reviewers, Canagarajah reaches a decision of “accept pending changes” (p. 84). He forwards a marked-up version of the manuscript modified by a Reviewer to Lee, who observes, “I’ve just been asked to revise one third of my paper” (italics in original), which the Reviewer refers to as, “relatively minor changes” (p. 85). Lee concludes the review feedback asked her to “take the submission in a direction that was contrary to why I had chosen to write it in the first place” (p. 86). Canagarajah and Lee discuss how the different competing priorities of author and brokers ultimately lead to the manuscript not being published. Lee as author is interested in reducing the visibility of her manuscript, as she sees it as potentially controversial because of the stances taken and her self-representation in it. However, she is encouraged by her dissertation supervisor, the Editor of the journal, and two Reviewers to seek publication as a full-length article. As a relatively young researcher, Lee sees this as a precarious position to be put in, and ultimately the rhetorical demands of publishing the manuscript in that form could not be reconciled with her own personal values and preferences as the author of the work.
Two themes of importance emerge from the literature reviewed in this section. One concerns the interpretation of reviews/evaluations. Some of the literature assumes that author understanding of the requests for changes in Reviewer evaluations is straightforward (Kourilova, 1998) while others acknowledge potential ambiguity in the messages being conveyed to authors (Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002). Furthermore, research into correspondence practices shows authors can have difficulty understanding and interpreting evaluations of their manuscripts, and the process of revision does, at least in some cases, include negotiation of which requested changes are mandatory, and which the authors have more latitude in choosing whether (and how) to enact (Canagarajah & Lee, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010). Lillis and Curry (2015) refer to the enacting of requested changes in manuscripts as “uptake” (p. 130), which distinguishes between the text of reviews and evaluations and the actual changes that result from them in authors’ manuscripts.

The second theme raised in the literature concerns patterns of correspondence and a tendency to assume their homogeneity across author experience. The description of the genres of writing for publication and their related conventions gives some insight into how the correspondence is structured. However, with the important exceptions of Lillis and Curry (2006, 2010), Curry and Lillis (2004, 2010, 2014), and Canagarajah and Lee (2014), the interpersonal, interactional nature of correspondence is generally not examined in depth in the literature reviewed here. For example, Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002) point out potential ambiguity in a letter from an Editor. Such ambiguity may influence subsequent correspondence in a text’s history, which may be identifiable through examining that correspondence. Investigating this involves using sets of correspondence surrounding specific
manuscripts, rather than correspondence collected to represent multiple examples of one genre type, or what Lillis and Curry (2015) refer to as “analysing sets or clusters of reviews relating to each paper and the consequences of these clusters in uptake” (p. 130), such as the manuscript history explored by Canagarajah and Lee (2014).

For example, Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002), examining letters to authors from one Editor, while acknowledging their data may not be generalizable to other journals, nevertheless state “the review of manuscripts [at English for Specific Purposes Journal], we believe, is fairly consistent with journals we ourselves and colleagues have dealt with” (p. 468). Furthermore, while Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002) describe English for Specific Purposes Journal as blind reviewed, Gosden (2001) explains regarding the journal he analyzed, “as is common practice in many scientific fields, referees would know the identities of the authors and their affiliations from the submitted manuscripts and covering letter” (p. 7). Additionally, one of Gosden’s (2001) key points of analysis, the author response to the Reviewers’ letter, is “not used in any of the letters” Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002, p. 469) examine. Such differences demonstrate some of the potential variability in publication practice that authors may encounter and how in some cases, such as with Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002), where the Co-Editor makes manuscripts anonymous before review, the actual review practices of some journals may remain opaque to the authors submitting work to them.

This section has reviewed research investigating author practices of publication, starting with genre analysis investigations of the correspondence surrounding manuscript submission, review, and evaluation. Next research that examined sets
of correspondence surrounding manuscripts, and how that correspondence shapes manuscripts, was reviewed. Finally, two themes that clearly emerge from the literature as meriting further empirical attention, which this thesis seeks to address, were discussed:

- Author interpretation of Reviewer and Editor feedback and evaluations.
- The processes individual manuscripts go through as they are prepared, submitted, reviewed, and revised on their trajectories toward (or away from) publication.

Section 2.7 discusses how this thesis seeks to contribute to these themes.

2.6 Research into Japan-based writing for academic publication

This section turns to reviewing the limited research base of investigations into the practices of Japanese authors writing for academic publication. It begins by reviewing three first-hand author accounts of writing for publication then reviews research into Japan-based (mainly Japanese) author experiences of writing for academic publication.

Three first-person accounts of Japanese writing for academic publication were published as chapters in Casanave and Vandrick (2003). Sasaki (2003), based in Japan, writes about balancing the requirements of being a mother, teacher, and scholar. She describes how she limited the time for her research to ensure she could meet family obligations while still successfully publishing her work, demonstrating the potential complexity of variables at play among authors writing for academic publication. Kubota (2003), a Japan-born scholar who completed her undergraduate education at a Japanese University and her postgraduate work at a Canadian
University, while primarily concerned with issues of academic voice, describes herself as having “acquired academic writing skills in English as a second language (ESL) during adulthood” (p. 61). She notes her “earliest attempt to publish an article in an American peer-reviewed journal was unsuccessful” (p. 61), writing:

I was not experienced enough to write for publication from scratch without help, as opposed to publishing from a dissertation that had already been reviewed by experts. Furthermore, I had not established credibility as a researcher in the field. After receiving a rejection letter, I simply gave up ...

(p. 61)

When she moved to “a major research university in 1995” (p. 61) in Canada, she was told “to obtain tenure, I would need to publish 12 to 15 articles in peer-reviewed journals in 5 years” (p. 61). She describes a strategy of revisiting her PhD thesis to “turn it into several journal articles” (p. 61) to help meet this requirement. Matsuda (2003) is a US-based Japanese national who writes about his experience of trying to publish while in graduate school. He notes facing issues of legitimacy in some circumstances because he was “still a graduate student” (p. 50), but that through publishing while a student, he came “to stop thinking like a graduate student and to start thinking like a professional” (p. 49). He also mentions going from wanting, “to publish because that was what scholars were supposed to do” to a desire to “contribute my voice to the profession” (p. 40) later in his PhD studies, offering more evidence of the role experience plays in authors' ability to interpret the relative importance of publishing.

Another study within the limited research base of investigations into Japan-based authors writing for publication is Casanave’s (1998) early investigation of four
Japanese scholars working in a Japanese private university who had studied (or were studying) for their PhDs with US universities. Through a series of semi-structured interviews, Casanave gathered literacy histories from the authors, discussed ongoing writing projects, and the reasons they engaged in those projects. Casanave found the two relatively new scholars she spoke with wanted to continue to participate in US networks formed during their doctoral studies, which conflicted with advice from their Japanese university colleagues who valued Japanese language publication over English publication outside of Japan, especially for early career scholars.

Another researcher who included interviews in his methodology is Gosden (1995, 1996), who investigated the writing for publication practices of sixteen Japanese postgraduate students from “the fields of applied physics, chemistry, and cell biology” (p. 112) at the Tokyo Institute of Technology. The authors were required to publish their manuscripts in English as part of their degree graduation requirements. Gosden (1996) explores their writing for publication practices, English education histories, how they write and rewrite their English work, and issues of audience when they write. He notes the majority first write research articles intended for English publication in Japanese then translate their Japanese original into English. He observed that ten authors did not “think about [their] audience” (p. 118) while “a small number of doctoral students in the group” with “relatively more experience as researchers through conference presentations or […] short papers written in Japanese” (p. 119) acknowledged the importance of Reviewers and Editors as gatekeepers and evaluators of their written work. Gosden also notes how some authors felt their English medium writing was primarily intended for consumption by Japanese readers, observing “‘If they [as fellow Japanese] can read it, then it’s OK’”
This suggests they may not have been writing with ‘native English speaker’ standards in mind.

Comparing Japanese and British scientists, Okamura (2004; 2006) used semi-structured interviews to examine the strategies thirteen scholars in the physical science and medical fields employed when writing for publication, seeking to “examine differences among researchers in a linguistically less advantageous environment, such as Japanese where English is taught as a foreign language” (2006, p. 70). Okamura sought “to understand the problems of writing research articles” (p. 69) that Japanese face when writing in English and the strategies they use to overcome them. Okamura observes that the less experienced academics tended to “not have specific readers in mind” (p. 73) for their work, while more experienced researchers appeared “to have a specific audience in mind when writing research articles” (p. 73).

Examining five Japanese teachers of English who had published in English, Talandis (2010) asked why they chose to write in English and what difficulties they faced in doing so. Talandis observes that three responded they wrote in English because it “came naturally to them” (p. 263) as they were English teachers and were trained in English. This has some resonance with Cárdenas and Rainey’s (2017) reasoning behind the choice of English medium for an English language teaching-focused journal in Columbia. Two of the three authors in Talandis’ study noted they were educated in English outside of Japan. Talandis also observes that two authors sought to improve their English skills through writing in English. Another reason the authors identified for writing in English was the potential to address a larger audience, which Lillis (2012) noted was a motivation behind the creation of some
English medium national journals in Europe. One teacher, who mentioned writing three articles in English for a within-Japan English medium journal, explained:

Right now, my English articles have only been published in a Japanese organization. Maybe, I hope if I'm more confident about my research area, maybe in the future I could introduce it to people abroad so more people could read it. I'm now only focused on Japanese research areas, Japanese teachers (Prof. Okazaki). (Talandis, 2010, p. 265)

Of interest to the investigation discussed in this thesis, only one of the five authors Talandis (2010) interviewed explicitly mentioned the perceived prestige of journals as a motivation for choosing where to publish his work:

If you publish in English, a lot more people can read it. And if I can publish a paper in a prestigious journal, then it’s an honor. I always try to publish my papers in prestigious journals. Up to now I have been very busy, and I needed to sort of establish my credentials, so I wrote a lot of papers in Japanese also. But from now on, I’m really planning to submit my papers to more prestigious academic journals (Prof. Hayashi). (p. 265)

The quotation above appears to show some resonance with observations that Japanese scholars are expected to first ‘establish’ themselves through writing in Japanese before seeking English language publication, an observation Casanave (1998) also makes. However, this contrasts with the accounts from the PhD students Gosden (1996) investigated, who needed to publish in English to graduate from their programs, suggesting such expectations may be discipline and/or university/department specific.
The literature reviewed in this section has shown considerable variability within Japan with respect to writing for academic publication practice in terms of who authors write for and where they seek to publish their work. Despite the limited research base of investigations into this topic, four implicit assumptions can be identified with respect to how the literature frames Japan-based authors writing for publication. One is the tendency to assume that the ‘problems’ authors face arise because they are Japanese. Yet whether the difficulties the authors face are due to their language backgrounds, their geographical positioning outside of the global HE center in Japan, a “less advantageous environment” according to Okumura (2006, p. 70), or due to the research reviewed tending to concentrate on relatively less experienced authors, is difficult to determine. Another implicit assumption in the literature reviewed above is that Japan-based authors writing for publication are Japanese, with very little information regarding foreign nationals based in Japan writing for academic publication, although Gosden (1995, 1996) and Talandis (2010) are themselves foreign nationals researching and writing from within Japan. Third, there appears to be a conflation of writing in English with writing for international English publication, particularly in the cases of Gosden and Okamura (2004, 2006). However, research into European authors writing for publication has shown the communities they write for are more varied than this, so it remains unclear whether this assumption in the Japan-centered literature is due to Japanese writing for fewer audiences, or if it is the result of researcher assumptions regarding the writing of Japanese authors.

Finally, there is a tendency to problematize writing in English, rather than writing for academic publication more generally. The research reviewed here, by starting with
the stance of investigating the ‘problem’ of writing in English for academic publication, may be describing a picture of author practice that is more simplistic than the reality. This is because the ‘problems’ authors encounter in their writing practice may extend beyond issues of writing in English, to the “nondiscursive” practices Canagarajah (1996, p. 436) highlights. More broadly, there may be aspects of authors’ writing for publication practice that are obscured through research framed as investigating ‘problems’ of writing for publication, such as the benefits and advantages authors experience through their writing for publication practices.

This section has reviewed investigations of author writing for academic publication practices in Japan followed by a description of four implicit assumptions the literature reviewed here tends to make, which this thesis seeks to empirically explore:

- Problems tend to be attributed to authors’ Japaneseness, potentially obscuring issues of language background, geographical location, and relative experience in writing for publication.
- The tendency to concentrate on Japanese authors to the exclusion of foreign nationals resident in Japan may obscure additional variability in Japan-based author practices.
- Writing in English for publication and writing in English for international publication tend to be conflated.
- The research tends to view writing in English for publication as a ‘problem’ to be investigated, which may distort depictions of author experience.
2.7 Summary of writing for publication practices research: What this thesis aims to contribute

This section turns to a discussion of how the research described in this thesis contributes to the literature reviewed in this chapter.

2.7.1 Contribution to writing practices research: How, why and where Japan-based language teacher authors write for publication

One of the ways this thesis contributes to the literature reviewed is by broadening the empirical research base of author practice through investigation of Japan-based English language teachers’ experiences of writing for academic publication. In doing so, assumptions from the literature reviewed above can be unpacked and examined. These include considering Japan-based authors to be exclusively Japanese and that writing in English represents a ‘problem’ for authors. For example, while Okamura (2004; 2006) characterizes publishing in English as a ‘problem’, some of the authors profiled in Talandis (2010) noted “writing academically in English was something that came naturally to them” (p. 263), which resonates with the difficulty the scholars in Li’s (2014) study perceived regarding publishing in Chinese. The experiences and reasons for writing for academic publication of the authors profiled in this thesis are the focus of analysis in Chapter 4. The issues these experiences and practices implicate are discussed in 7.2, and the contribution this thesis makes to the literature reviewed in this chapter is elaborated on in 8.2.
2.7.2 Contribution to revision practices research: How authors’ manuscripts change through brokering

Considering the limited empirical base investigating how the review and evaluation process results in revisions to manuscripts, this is another contribution the research described in this thesis can make. While Lillis and Curry (2010, 2015) have constructed and analyzed close to 100 text histories, representing one of the most extensive investigations of changes made to manuscripts to date, this still represents a small fraction of the total manuscripts published annually. Furthermore, their research encompasses two fields, education and psychology, and involves authors based in four countries in Europe. Gosden (1995) investigated Japanese authors writing in the natural sciences, while Daly (2016) examined Taiwanese medical researchers’ manuscript changes. This suggests there are a wide range of fields and geographical contexts that remain open to further empirical investigation.

With respect to the publication type investigated, there has tended to be an emphasis on analysis of journal publication in the literature reviewed, as opposed to other types of publication, such as conference proceedings and/or book chapters. Thus, only part of academic knowledge production is represented in much of the literature reviewed in this chapter (with Lillis & Curry, 2010 a notable exception). The different publication types of the authors profiled in this thesis are discussed in 3.4.3 and 4.2.

Finally, regarding the focus of analysis, some research has tended to limit what aspects of the research article are investigated, such as Gosden (1995) concentrating on the results and discussion sections of the manuscripts he analyzes (see 2.4). In some cases, assumptions are made about how different parts of
manuscripts change that should perhaps be subject to empirical investigation before they are used to underpin decisions regarding what part of the research article is of interest. For example, Gosden justifies his interest in results and discussion sections as they “are more typically the focus of revision and rhetorical manipulation since they are the crux of a scientific RA’s potential contribution to the state of current knowledge” (p. 46). This kind of assertion would likely benefit from empirical scrutiny and additional research evidence. Finally, while Myers (1985) observed knowledge claims being tempered through the review and revision process, framing this as a general trend in scientific writing, Flowerdew (2000) found the knowledge claims in Oliver’s manuscript were broadened, suggesting there is further room for clarifying just how authors’ manuscripts are transformed during their trajectories (see 2.4). Such an analysis is the focus of Chapter 5. The findings of this analysis as they relate to the literature reviewed here are discussed in 7.3, and the contribution this thesis makes to methodology in this area is discussed in 8.3.

2.7.3 Contribution to correspondence practices research: The negotiated interaction between authors and brokers

Analysis of sets of correspondence surrounding specific manuscripts helps to highlight the networks authors engage in when writing for publication, revealing the complex process of academic publishing from the perspective of authors interacting in a community to broker access and resources. For example, in Li (2006) the exchanges appear to involve the main author submitting a version of the manuscript to the journal, then the journal replying with an evaluation of the manuscript. In four cases these include the return of reviews. In one case the author sends a letter of appeal regarding the decision to reject the manuscript, which is ultimately
successful, although the number of turns taken, or emails exchanged, is not examined in detail, suggesting authors generally submit manuscripts (or appeals) to Editors and Editors return evaluations, with or without Reviewer reports (Li, 2006). In addition to Li (2006), Lillis and Curry (2015) describe instances where Editors return revised manuscripts to authors as part of the correspondence, although their focus is on orientations in the correspondence toward English and language rather than an exploration of the patterns of exchange.

This suggests that an examination of the patterns of exchange and the trajectories of texts would contribute to understanding review and revision processes, an analysis that is the focus of Chapter 5. Furthermore, an investigation of sets of correspondence would help to reveal how broker assessments lead to uptake in manuscript revisions, analysis that is the focus of Chapter 6. The methodological contributions of this analysis are described in 8.3.4.
3. Research methodology for investigating Japan-based English language teachers writing for academic publication

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the research traditions engaged and the methodological instruments used for the investigation of Japan-based authors’ experiences of writing for academic publication presented in this thesis. It begins with a discussion of the interpretivist stance taken toward knowledge in this thesis, explaining the two complimentary paradigms of new literacies studies and critical discourse analysis that underpin the investigation presented here. Next, the research design is explained, including the research questions, information about the author participants, and how data was collected. This is followed by discussion of data analysis, including transcription of interview data, creation of author profiles, analysis of text histories, and investigation of the sets of correspondence between authors and brokers surrounding their publications. Following discussion of
research ethics, this chapter finishes by considering issues of researching knowledge making raised by the investigation.

3.2 Orientation to knowledge making

As the research questions asked in this thesis concern “the meanings and experiences of human beings” (Williamson, 2006, p. 84), in this thesis I take an interpretivist stance. Interpretivism holds that “people are constantly involved in interpreting their ever-changing world” which results in a “social world” “constructed by people” (p. 84). The investigation seeks to explore the underlying complexities embedded in processes of knowledge production and evaluation through examining the constructed worlds of the social, or “what people do and say within local contexts” (Freeman, de Marrais, Preissle, Roulston, & St. Pierre, 2007, p. 29). The investigative paradigms of new literacies studies (Lea & Street, 1998; Rampton, Tusting, Maybin, & Barwell, 2004; Street, 1984, 1995; 2003) and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; Rampton, et al., 2004) are employed, which offer complementary perspectives on the study of texts and processes of text production.

New literacies research explores insider perspectives regarding how texts are produced, viewing “literacy as a social practice” (Street, 2003, p. 77; 1984). In doing so, new literacies questions paradigms that view literacy as a neutral, universally transferrable skill, seeking to demonstrate the importance of context in how individuals both learn about and engage with literacy practices (Street, 2003). New literacies studies research has examined writing for academic publication in HE through attention to the processes underlying textual production and negotiation of textual changes as part of the review and revision process involved in academic publication (Lillis, 2013). The stance taken in such studies is that it is important to
understand the perspectives of authors writing for publication, the meaning(s) they inscribe into and ascribe to the texts they produce, and to examine how knowledge making is mediated in textual production (Lillis, 2013). One objective of such research is to question the representation of academic writing as a universalist language, to explore how it is used to represent a kind of reality valued and perpetuated by the academy (Turner, 2010), and to critically propose alternative avenues of representation of research experience (Agger, 1991). In new literacies studies an ethnographically informed perspective is seen as important to understanding how authors’ “uses of literacy derive meaning and power through their embeddedness within social practice” (Rampton, et al., 2004, p. 9; Street, 1984, 1995). Ethnographically informed refers to taking time to research and seeking insider perspectives, with the challenge for researchers to make the familiar more distant or different (Rampton, et al., 2004). Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) refer to this as making the topic of research “anthropologically strange” (p. 8) by acknowledging taken for granted assumptions, thereby revealing the phenomenon for study. Lillis (2008) refers to this as, “making the strange familiar and the familiar made strange” (p. 382). Geertz (1974) describes this as “a continuous dialectical tacking between the most local of local detail and the most global of global structure in such a way as to bring both into view simultaneously” (p. 43). The principles involved include repeated exposure, attention to insider and outsider perspectives, and an unbounded stance toward data collection, seeking to gather as much as possible of potential relevance, rather than carefully restricting what is included as data in the research.
The new literacies focus taken in this thesis is complemented by a critical discourse analysis lens. Critical discourse analysis, also part of the linguistic ethnographic tradition (Rampton, et al., 2004), is text-focused. Here the orientation to knowledge making taken in critical discourse analysis is discussed. The role critical discourse analysis played in analysis of data is discussed in 3.4.4.

The ‘critical’ dimension of critical discourse analysis involves critical theory, which questions assumptions about the reducibility of scientific problems within the social sciences to questions of methods of research (Agger, 1991). Agger explains that critical theory seeks to interrogate the frames used to investigate phenomena, arguing this makes it possible to question dominant paradigms of understanding within social science research and the larger structures governing how society is organized. A consequence of the questioning of categories of investigation and classification by critical theory is that researchers’ descriptions of phenomena become interpretive rather than universal, also a characteristic of ethnographically inspired inquiry (Agger, 1991). Thus, the researcher must acknowledge the relative nature of the categories they employ, the phenomena they identify, and the possibility for equally valid alternative interpretations and descriptions, including the positivist descriptions critical theory seeks to critique (Agger, 1991).

While critical theory calls for questioning the assumptions researchers make, it also acknowledges researchers inevitably need to make assumptions regarding researched phenomena (Agger, 1991). Thus, critical theory calls for making such assumptions explicit rather than implicit, and for researchers to interrogate them to justify their appropriacy, with readers evaluating the perspective(s) taken (Agger,
1991; Freeman, et al., 2007). This is returned to regarding the research presented in this thesis in 3.6.

Critical discourse analysis seeks to interrogate and question issues of power in discourse to examine assumptions in the production of texts and to reveal how the language used perpetuates imbalances in power in society (Fairclough, 1995; Rampton, et al., 2004; see also 6.1). Gee (1999) describes four “tools of inquiry” (p. 12) that help to accomplish this:

1. Examining peoples’ situation dependent identities or social positions, see 6.2.1;
2. Analyzing language used “to enact and recognize different identities in different settings” (p. 12), see 7.3.3;
3. Considering situated discourses, or the language people use and how they act at specific places and times “to enact and recognize different identities and activities” (p. 13), see 7.4.1; and
4. Reviewing the “long-running and important” conversations that encompass “a variety of different texts and interactions” (p. 13), see 6.2.

While the application of new literacies studies and critical discourse analysis are seen as complementary in this thesis, new literacies studies primarily informs the analysis of the author profiles in Chapter 4 and the text history analyses in Chapter 5. Critical discourse analysis primarily informs the analysis of exchange structures in the sets of correspondence in Chapter 6, while the discussion in Chapter 7 integrates findings from across the three data chapters in this thesis. Critical discourse analysis as it is applied in analysis is returned to in 3.4.4.
3.3 Research design

This section outlines the design of the study on which this thesis is based.

3.3.1 Research questions

To illustrate how the investigation evolved from its initial stages into the research presented in this thesis, the preliminary research questions and sub-questions that informed the study on which this thesis is based are presented in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. Preliminary research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Why do early career Japan-based English language teachers write for academic publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>What reasons do they give for writing for academic publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>What relationship is there between the reasons they offer and evidence of the importance of publication for employment in HE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>What differences are there between them in why they write for academic publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>What similarities and differences are there between the Japanese and foreign residents of Japan in terms of why they write for publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What academic publication practices do the authors engage in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>What academic practices do they engage in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>What influences their choices of where and how to engage in such practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>What publication types do they submit writing to for publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>What influences their choice of publication and to what extent do they appear to have a choice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>What issues do they identify, including choice of language (e.g., Japanese or English)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>How does this influence their choice of publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>What similarities and differences are there between the authors with respect to the above questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Who do the authors interact with in pursuing academic publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>How can these interactions be graphically represented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>What does examining the correspondence between authors and brokers surrounding writing for academic publication reveal about the texts' trajectories and regarding author-broker relationships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What are the experiences of authors in writing for academic publication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>How are their manuscripts evaluated? How do they respond to these evaluations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>How are their manuscripts changed during preparation for submission, review and editing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questions in 1 examine why the authors write for publication, exploring commonalities and variation in addition to juxtaposing their perspectives with framings from existing research on trends in writing for publication (see 2.3). The questions in 2 examine writing practice, publication choice, and issues authors face. The term ‘academic practices’ is used to widen the focus of this investigation from the relatively narrow focus on authoring academic texts in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 to other HE work potentially related to writing for academic publication, such as conference presentations. As Fry, Ketteridge, and Marshall (2009) define the term, “academic practices” (p. 3) refers to “contractual obligations [of those working in HE] to pursue excellence in several directions, most notably in teaching, research and scholarship, supervision, academic administration and management and, for many, maintenance of standing and provision of service in a profession (such as teaching or nursing)” (p. 3). The intention in this thesis is not to assume particular ‘academic practices’ are or are not important to the authors’ writing for academic publication, but rather to take a broad view toward the kind of activities the authors may see as important to their academic writing practice, and to use their explanations of their practices as the basis for the analysis presented in this thesis, consistent with an academic literacies approach and the ethnographically informed methodology outlined in 3.2. Examining academic practices more widely helps to contextualize the writing practices of the authors investigated.

Importantly, specific problems were not solicited from the authors, but instead their responses to more general questions were examined to identify issues that emerged through their talk about their experiences. This was to avoid problematizing author experience, which is an issue in how some literature approaches the topic,
addressing the ‘problem’ English poses for authors writing for academic publication (Okamura, 2006; Talandis, 2010; Englander, 2009; also see discussion in 2.6). What is not as clear from such literature is to what extent English poses a problem to authors and to what extent the questions the researchers ask frame author experiences. For example, some authors disagreed with Talandis’ (2010) framing of writing for publication in English as problematic. Therefore, in the investigation presented in this thesis the focus is on exploring authors’ experiences of writing for publication without explicitly problematizing those experiences.

The questions in 3 examine author interactions in pursuing writing for publication, which have received some attention (see 2.5), but which would benefit from a broader base of empirical data. The interest in 3.1 in ‘graphically representing’ the interactions authors have in pursuing academic publication refers to graphical representations of textual trajectories, which is an aspect of the empirical base of the literature that has been given some attention (Weller, 2001; Burrough-Boenisch, 2003), but which warrants further work, as the current graphical representations available tend to be of ideal text trajectories rather than based on empirical analysis of the trajectories of specific texts (see 5.2 for further explanation). Finally, the questions in 4 ask about texts and how they change in their trajectories toward publication, a topic that remains underexplored in the literature on authors’ practices of writing for publication (see 2.4). How these preliminary questions were refined into the final questions addressed in the three data chapters that follow (Chapters 4, 5, and 6) is explained in 3.4, where the three final research questions are presented.
3.3.2 The author participants

This section describes the process of selecting and recruiting authors to participate in the study. With one purpose of the investigation to compare author experiences, it was necessary to recruit authors with some commonalities for comparison. At the same time, labels such as ‘beginner’, ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ should be used cautiously as they can “essentialize” (Appadurai, 1988, p. 41) authors by demographic category, problematically masking diversity.

Japan-based author volunteers working in the broad field of English language teaching and learning were solicited. Japanese and foreign residents of Japan were included to expand the diversity of backgrounds explored. Including these two demographics of Japan-based authors adds additional perspective, potentially revealing interesting within-country variation, variation generally downplayed in investigations of the globalization and Anglicization of scholarly writing for publication to date (discussed in 2.3).

As a resident of Japan since 2000 and an English language teacher myself this author demographic is easily accessible to me. I am relatively familiar with in-country events and professional organizations, which facilitated access to and initial solicitation of author participants through attendance and presentation of preliminary results at regional conferences. Authors relatively new to writing for publication were preferred to facilitate exploring early academic authoring experiences. However, as the research progressed the phenomena of ‘writing for academic publication’ came to be viewed as an increasingly complex construct, and therefore some authors who could be construed as experienced in certain writing practices were included because of their relative inexperience with other writing practices. Specifically,
including authors writing for publication in international English journals, the main type of journal publication discussed in the literature on writing for academic publication (see 2.3), required approaching authors with considerable experience of writing for publication in Japan-based journals (specifically Jason and Alan, Table 3-2).

Recruitment of authors included two phases following approval by the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee (Appendix A; see also 3.5). The first sought to enlist as many interested authors as possible during the first year of the project through email solicitations of personal contacts and requests for author participants at conferences. Potential author participants were supplied with an invitation in print or via emailed PDF (Appendix B) and asked to contact me if interested. After this initial contact, if authors agreed to an interview, they were sent a research consent form to sign, complete, and return (Appendix C). Once consent was obtained an initial interview was scheduled. At the start of initial interviews consent was reconfirmed orally and authors were given the opportunity to ask questions about the investigation before the research portion of the interview began.

While efforts were made to meet authors for interviews in person where possible, in many cases, the cost of travel and the geographically distributed nature of the authors meant most interviews were scheduled via Skype. To simulate some of the advantages of face to contact, as interviewer I used the video call feature where possible, although in some instances, due to issues of call quality being compromised, only audio calls were used. Interviews were recorded using either the built in IR recorder feature on my personal cell phone for face-to-face interviews or Skype Call Recorder (Herren, 2010), a free software for recording Skype calls.
Participants were assured anonymity and data security. Data security was achieved through keeping all relevant files on secure devices and using password protected storage media. Anonymity has been maintained through using pseudonyms and by removing identifying information from the data extracts used in this thesis.

Interviews were transcribed and analyzed as the research progressed and additional data necessary to answer the research questions was sought to fill gaps in author demographics, including a second phase of author recruiting. Regarding this second phase of recruiting, as the research progressed, it became evident some important aspects of writing for publication were going to be absent unless additional authors were included. Specifically, while some Japanese authors had submitted manuscripts to outside-Japan indexed English journal publications, among the foreign resident authors there were not any willing and able to provide examples of publications submitted to such journals. Furthermore, while there was one female foreign resident author contributing large amounts of data (Kathy), the Japanese female author participants were reluctant to provide manuscripts and writing for publication correspondence. Additional authors were solicited to address these gaps, leading to the inclusion of Jason and Alan, foreign residents of Japan (Table 3-2), and A.N., a female Japanese author (Appendix D).

This thesis analyzes and presents the experiences of a core of seven (Table 3-2) of the 23 authors (Appendix D) who agreed to participate in at least one interview. The seven core authors discussed and analyzed in this thesis provided multiple versions of manuscripts and correspondence, which allowed for analysis of their experiences, changes to their manuscripts across different versions, and chains of correspondence concerning their manuscripts. In addition to the seven core authors,
in key places in the thesis discussion of authors from the larger dataset of 23 authors is also included. This is particularly true for Chapter 6, where it was felt that to fully address the research question relating to patterns of exchange in author-broker interaction (see 3.4), ‘dispreferred’ exchange structures needed to be analyzed in addition to ‘preferred’ exchange structures (see 6.1). This led to analyzing sets of correspondence from three additional manuscripts whose text histories are not analyzed in Chapter 5. This includes a set of correspondence from one additional author from outside the core seven authors, and analysis of sets of correspondence data from two additional manuscripts provided by two core authors (Kathy & John). The discussion and conclusion chapters (7 and 8) also include some reference to the larger dataset of 23 authors, although the focus of analysis is the seven core authors’ experiences.

Some basic information about the seven core authors is included in Table 3-2. Six of the authors were foreign residents of Japan and one was Japanese. All were from the broad field of English language teaching, although the Japanese author, Junpei, also taught Japanese in addition to English. The original intention of this investigation was to include equal numbers of Japanese authors and foreign residents of Japan, but partly due to issues of data collection (outlined in 3.3.3), this was ultimately not possible. Further, part of the discrepancy in number of author participants between Japanese and foreign residents is perhaps because as a researcher I myself am a foreign resident of Japan, and so have easier access to and familiarity with English dominant organizations and institutions within the country. This also comes through in the demographics of the Japanese author participants. Most were contacted through English language dominant conferences, connections, and organizations (as opposed to Japanese dominant English
language teaching organizations), which may account for why many have experience of postgraduate study outside of Japan. How the core of seven authors was chosen from the larger dataset of 23 authors is discussed in 3.4. While this convenience sample is not representative of all authors writing for publication in English language education in Japan, the authors present rich insights into their experiences, which can inform discussions of writing for publication within Japan and larger debates about writing for publication practice more generally.

Table 3-2. Summary of the seven core author participants and their interview data available for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author participant (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Japanese or foreign resident of Japan</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th># of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junpei</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT PhD English education student</td>
<td>3 (1 Skype, 2 email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
<td>11 (2 Skype, 9 email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
<td>4 (1 in-person, 3 email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
<td>10 (4 Skype, 6 email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>PT university English teacher, left Japan</td>
<td>35 (4 Skype, 31 email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
<td>4 (2 in-person, 2 email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
<td>3 (2 Skype, 1 email)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 Data collection

This section outlines the data collected for the research presented in this thesis, starting with the semi-structured interviews, followed by the texts collected, and finally the documentary data (such as resumes, job advertisements, and internal HE
documents relating to hiring and promotion). One of the purposes of the discussion here and in 3.4 is to explain the process of narrowing the focus of the research from the larger dataset of 23 authors to the core seven authors whose experiences are the primary focus of the investigation presented in this thesis.

All 23 authors’ first formal research participation was the semi-structured interview. The original plan was to have a series of interviews, starting with detailed “literacy histories” roughly following Casanave’s (1998) investigation into the writing for publication practices of Japanese scholars, followed by interviews centering on ‘text histories’. However, not all authors were willing or able to offer the kind of detailed texts required for construction of text histories (the texts available for analysis are summarized in Table 3-4). Text histories involve collection of “as much information as possible about the history of a text, including the drafts produced, the different people involved – including authors, reviewers, translators, editors and academic colleagues – the chronology of involvement and the nature of their impact on the text and its trajectory” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 4). Also, the time horizons involved in writing for publication varied considerably, with some authors having regular updates regarding their writing while others went long stretches with little new information, such as while waiting for reviews. Furthermore, the time commitment required for multiple, ongoing conversations with all the authors quickly outstripped the time and resources available for transcription of interview data and analysis. This led to a strategy of concentrating time and attention on authors who were more willing to contribute more information. These authors were followed up more frequently to develop a fuller picture of the complexity of their experience, while authors who seemed reluctant to speak frankly were limited to one research interview, although the possibility of following up with them was left open.
The initial interview gathered general information about authors' work histories and experiences of having written for publication. This initial information was included in the interview rather than as a questionnaire to allow for creating a space for open and frank dialog about authors' writing for publication practices (Miller & Crabtree, 2004). Once the authors had finished answering these general questions, the discussion turned to more specific and personal questions about their literacy histories and writing for academic publication practices. The interviews were semi-structured (Drever, 1995) to allow room for following up on issues of interest and concern that were raised, consistent with the goals of taking an emic, participant-experience focused view of their writing for publication histories and practices. The questions used as starting points for the semi-structured interview discussions are reproduced in Appendix E. These were initially piloted with four authors early in the research process to ensure they were soliciting information that would help to answer the research questions (the sample interview transcript in Appendix F is from one of these pilot interviews).

Several questioning strategies were used to facilitate author expression of their perspectives and to avoid leading questions. These included open-ended questions, asking for more details or to expand on answers (probe and follow-up questions), returning to previous topics which authors did not appear willing to address earlier, and reflecting back what authors said to confirm understanding (Gillham, 2000). In most cases, I determined the direction the interviews took, setting the topic for discussion and the questions asked, although this depended on my positioning as researcher. At some times I was positioned/positioned myself as a “knowledgeable insider” (Harris, 1992, p. 379; see also Lillis, 1997, p. 195) with experience of the
publications authors were interacting with and the specific issues they were facing. In other cases, I was positioned as an outside researcher, unfamiliar with the authors’ world of writing and research practice, particularly in the case of Japanese authors who were initially contacted through second or third parties. Positioning as it relates to the investigation is returned to in 3.6.1.

After the initial interviews, further interviews were scheduled on an ongoing basis. These follow-up interactions explored themes from earlier interviews and asked questions about specific changes made to texts during their trajectories. This was one space where as researcher I could consciously transition from an emic perspective as a conversant in our initial interviews to a more etic researcher perspective, as I could share tentative analytical insights and welcome author reactions as we exchanged new information. What these follow-up conversations could accomplish depended on the circumstances of the authors’ writing practices and the contributions they could make to the investigation. At times the semi-structured interview questions listed in Appendix E were not all covered in the initial interview and so were returned to. For example, the initial interview with Aya (Appendix F) mainly covered the questions in part A of Appendix E. Because Aya declined to provide samples of manuscript versions for text history analysis, I did not interview her a second time, although in that second interview we likely would have covered the questions in part B of Appendix E. At other times, authors’ ongoing projects were followed-up on, such as in Appendix G, where I ask David about the status of a paper that was “in peer review” during our initial interview. The questions asked did not follow a standard ‘schedule’. They were instead shaped by the research questions respondents appeared to have the most potential to contribute to. For example, David had an employment contract finish during the research
period, and so went from stable employment, to looking for a new position, to stable employment once again. Speaking to him about his changing motivations for writing for publication as he went through this process added important insights about why he writes for publication and how this changed according to his immediate circumstances (see Appendix G). The research decisions made in such situations were largely dependent on the individual author and their circumstances and were guided by the perceived potential for individual authors to further explain the complexity of their writing for publication practice within the time limitations for conducting the research. For example, in a follow-up interview with David (Appendix G), we focused on updates on his ongoing projects discussed in our initial interview, the collaborators he was coauthoring with, and his concerns about representing himself to prospective employers as actively (and adequately) engaged in writing for publication.

While all initial interviews were oral, follow-up contacts also included email ‘interviews’. These were usually intended to clarify some portion of the oral interview or to ask authors to expand on a topic of interest not followed up on in the initial interview(s). While this kind of data collection was not initially planned for, scheduling a time when author and researcher were both available was sometimes problematic, and the Japanese core author (Junpei) appeared to prefer the time for reflection and composing of his thoughts that email allows (Meho, 2006; Ratislavová & Ratislav, 2017). These email interviews are tracked in Table 3-2. In the chapters that follow email interviews are counted chronologically together with recorded oral interviews, and in the text of this thesis the verbs ‘said’ and ‘wrote’ are used to distinguish between the oral and email interviews. Interviews were counted
separately from the manuscript correspondence provided (discussed in 3.4.3), and
are referenced in the analysis as follows:

Author pseudonym Interview #

Example: Jordan Interview 5

Regarding collecting texts from authors, as not all authors were willing to provide
manuscripts and correspondence histories, the authors who provided them, along
with the corresponding manuscript number assigned for the purposes of this
research, are listed in Table 3-3. As the texts available for analysis significantly
influenced which of the 23 authors to include as core authors, Table 3-3 includes
data for all the texts collected from all 23 authors. The discussion that follows in 3.4
describes how as researcher I selected the seven core authors and six core texts
from the larger dataset. The core manuscripts selected for analysis are in bold
typeface in Table 3-3. The table also tracks:

- Whether an author is Japanese or a foreign resident of Japan,
- The language the manuscripts were written in,
- Whether the publications the manuscripts were submitted to were Japan-
based,
- The number of publications involved in the manuscripts’ histories,
- Whether the manuscripts were published at the time of data collection, and
- The relative completeness of the text histories (using Lillis and Curry’s (2006)
categories of “minimal”, “medium”, and “maximal” (p. 8) text histories with the
addition of a fourth category of “very minimal”, indicating a manuscript that
doesn’t meet the requirements of the minimal category but for which some correspondence or a draft is available).
Table 3-3. List of collected text history manuscripts and the data available for them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Language medium</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>MS #</th>
<th>Language medium</th>
<th>MS submitted to</th>
<th>Published?</th>
<th>Completeness of TH</th>
<th>MS Versions</th>
<th>Broker feedback</th>
<th>Additional documents</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Follow-up emails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign national living in Japan</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Japan, 6 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 Japan, 1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very minimal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very minimal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very minimal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jason &amp; Alan</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (2 each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Junpei</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Japan, 1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aoi</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 Japan, 1 outside-Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenta</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eri</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the documentary data collected, in addition to email interviews and versions of texts, authors included commentary when forwarding emails, and additional information such as faculty review evaluation schedules and resumes. These are also counted as ‘documents’ in Table 3-4 and were supplemented with additional information such as journal calls for papers, public editorial policies, and publicly available author profiles, resumes, and lists of publications. What the authors said, such as in interviews, was included as author talk in the coding stage, addressed in 3.4. The documentary data was stored and referenced where appropriate in analysis. For example, if an author mentioned a journal's editorial policy regarding the kinds of manuscripts they accept, and how a broker from the journal appeared to contradict that policy, then the journal’s policy was consulted. In such cases, the documentary data helped to add context to the authors’ accounts, as journal policy could be contrasted with broker statements, with the main unit of analysis remaining author experience.

3.4 Data analysis and selection decisions

This section outlines the data selection and analysis process for the research presented in this thesis. While the preliminary research questions in Table 3-1 guided the investigation, as the research progressed, it became apparent that the data available for analysis facilitated answering certain questions more than others, which informed which questions are explored in the three chapters that follow, the text histories analyzed (see Table 3-4), and the seven core authors whose experiences are explored (see Table 3-2). How the preliminary research questions were refined into the final questions posed here and addressed in this thesis is the focus of the discussion that follows.
One of the objectives of the investigation was to work with as rich of a data set as possible, as this would facilitate interlacing discussion of the authors’ experiences (Chapter 4) with analysis of their text histories (Chapter 5) and analysis of exchange structures in the sets of correspondence (Chapter 6). Ensuring that the author experiences examined in Chapter 4 connected to their text histories analyzed in Chapter 5 required concentrating on authors who provided what Lillis and Curry (2006) refer to as “maximal text history” data, with “multiple drafts of text plus more than one piece of related data (e.g., interview discussion, communication or feedback from broker)” (p. 8). This facilitated coherence across the author profiles in Chapter 4, the text history analyses in Chapter 5, and the discussion of the sets of correspondence in Chapter 6, as the authors discussed in Chapter 4 authored the manuscripts whose text histories are analyzed in Chapter 5, and whose correspondence is discussed in Chapter 6, and so informed the key decision to focus on the seven core authors who had provided maximal text history information.

In addition to the investigation being restricted to what manuscripts were available to analyze (see Table 3-3), deciding what manuscripts to analyze (and by extension which core authors to investigate) involved considering the kinds of manuscripts authors were writing, what was important to them in terms of writing for publication, which manuscripts had sufficient versions available for analysis (see Table 3-3), and the time available to analyze text-level manuscript changes.

Lillis and Curry (2010) describe text histories as “a key unit of data collection and analysis” (p. 4) that facilitate “exploring the trajectories of texts towards publication” (p. 4) which can be used to construct a picture of a text’s trajectory and the changes made to it over time during the manuscript preparation, submission and revision.
process. Regarding how the six manuscripts were chosen for the text history analysis, of the 23 authors, 11 (48%) provided 29 manuscripts (see Table 3-3). From these, 6 manuscripts (21%) were selected for a detailed text history analysis using the following criteria:

- Completeness and coverage of the different types of publication the authors were writing (summarized in Table 4-1),
- The emphasis in the literature on the importance of journal publications to academic knowledge production (see 2.7.2), and
- What writing the authors signaled as important (see 4.4).

Completeness of manuscript histories was evaluated using Lillis and Curry’s (2006) concept of “maximal text histories” (p. 8), although Lillis and Curry point out, “scholars vary enormously in their practices of keeping drafts and correspondence about specific texts” and “in the extent to which they report the involvement of others in their text production”, conceding “no text history is ever fully complete, in that frequently, drafts are discarded and written exchanges destroyed” (p. 8). As authors tended to provide electronic versions of manuscripts sent to brokers for evaluation, for the purposes of this investigation, the decision was made to analyze these. For the text histories analyzed in Chapter 5, all the available versions of the manuscripts were included in the analysis.

Regarding completeness of coverage of publication types, the original plan was to gather equal numbers of texts from Japanese and foreign resident authors, but unfortunately the Japanese authors, while willing to be interviewed, tended to not provide manuscript versions and correspondence for text history analysis. Three of the nine (33%) Japanese authors provided 5 manuscripts with ‘maximal’ histories
(see Table 3-3), covering only 2 publication ‘types’ (see Table 4-1), while 5 of the
14 foreign resident authors (36%) provided 16 manuscripts with ‘maximal’ histories
(see Table 3-3), covering 7 publication ‘types’ (see Table 4-1). Because of this imbalance in available manuscript histories between the Japanese and the foreign resident authors, the decision was made to instead cover the different types of publications the authors were producing, along with as many of the authors as possible. This was accomplished by examining the types of manuscripts the authors published most (summarized in Table 4-1), which manuscripts had the most complete record of revision and correspondence (Table 3-4), and weighing this against which publication types appeared to be more important to examine based on the authors’ perceptions of importance and the literature review. The manuscripts chosen for text history analysis in turn determined the authors whose experiences are explored in Chapter 4.

Kiyo, in-house university journals, were a frequent type of publication mentioned by some authors (see Chapter 4). They represent 19 (17%) of the authors’ publications counted in Table 4-1. However, the university kiyo journal manuscripts available for analysis did not include more than one version, with many authors noting that these tended to be published as-is with very little or no post-submission changes (see discussion in 4.2, specifically Alan in 4.2.2 and David in 4.2.3). Despite authors reporting university kiyo journal manuscripts being published without changes, it was felt that a text history analysis required at least one prepublication and one published manuscript version. Thus, while internal university kiyo journal publication was a common type of publication for some authors and was noted to be particularly important by David (4.2.3) and Jordan (4.2.6), since none of the university kiyo
journal manuscripts provided included multiple versions, this publication category was not included in the text history analysis.

Table 3-4 summarizes the six manuscripts selected for text history analysis, authored by the seven core authors (see Table 3-2; MS28 is coauthored by two core authors).

Table 3-4. Summary of manuscripts selected for text history analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS#</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Summary of author information and the manuscript selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS28</td>
<td>outside-Japan English indexed journal article</td>
<td>Co-authored by Jason (4.2.1) and Alan (4.2.2), foreign residents of Japan, project began intended for indexed, outside-Japan English medium journal publication, trajectory also includes presentation at a Japan conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS22</td>
<td>outside-Japan journal article</td>
<td>Authored by David (4.2.3), a foreign resident of Japan, paper based on conference presentation given at an Asian country’s TESOL association’s national conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>Japan journal article</td>
<td>Authored by Junpei (see 4.2.4), Japanese, submitted to three journals before publication, based on undergraduate thesis, trajectory includes Japan conference presentation and outside-Japan indexed journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS23</td>
<td>Japan conference proceedings</td>
<td>Authored by Kathy (4.2.5), a foreign resident of Japan, paper submitted following a Japan conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS16</td>
<td>outside-Japan conference proceedings</td>
<td>Co-authored by Jordan (4.2.6), a foreign resident of Japan, and a former colleague, paper trajectory includes outside-Japan conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS19</td>
<td>Outside-Japan book chapter</td>
<td>Authored by John (4.2.7), a foreign resident of Japan, paper based on conference presentation, initially proceedings paper, but Editors later notified contributors of book project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the manuscripts available for analysis, 25 of the 29 were journal articles. 44 of the authors’ 114 publications are journal articles (39%), with 13 (30%) of those published with an outside-Japan journal (Table 4-1). Only 4 of the 44 journal articles (9%) are published in indexed journals outside of Japan (Table 4-1), but this
manuscript type (MS28, Table 3-4) was included because of its prominence in the literature reviewed and because its authors, Jason and Alan, indicated this publication as particularly important to them (see 4.3.1 & 4.3.2). Thus, three journal articles were chosen for text history analysis, representing publication in an outside-Japan indexed journal (Jason & Alan’s MS28) in 5.3.1, an outside-Japan journal (David’s MS22) in 5.3.2, and a Japan journal (Junpei’s MS1) in 5.3.3. Conference proceedings papers were also quite prominent among the manuscripts authors published: 26 of the 114 publications (23%), with 6 of those (23%) outside-Japan conference proceedings papers. Therefore, one Japan conference proceedings paper (Kathy’s MS23, 5.3.5) and one outside-Japan conference proceedings paper (Jordan’s MS16, 5.3.4) were analyzed. Chapters in books were relatively uncommon, representing only 8 of the 114 publications (7%). However, while the other publication types showed Japan publication to be more common than outside-Japan publication, this was the only publication type where more outside-Japan manuscripts were published (6, 75%) than Japan manuscripts (2, 25%). Additionally, one author, John, signaled this type of publication as particularly important to him (see 4.2.7). Therefore, the sixth text history analyzes an outside-Japan book chapter (John’s MS19) in 5.3.6. Jordan provided all the ‘other’ publication types available for analysis (see Table 3-3). Since available data was limited to only one author and these were not signaled to be as important, they were not selected for text history analysis. Regarding Japanese language medium publication, only one author, Junpei, provided a Japanese language manuscript (MS2), meaning it would not have been possible to compare it across authors or publication type, and so it was dispreferred to the English medium manuscript and correspondence data Junpei contributed (MS1, Table 3-4).
As there were several, often overlapping analyses of author interviews, text histories, and the correspondence associated with the authors’ published manuscripts, it was important to track and interlink related themes across the different cycles of analysis, summary, and reanalysis. One way I managed this tracing was through the maintenance of a research journal, where I tracked and returned to different insights and questions from the various ongoing analyses. This allowed, for example, following up on themes from interviews that appeared to come up in the authors’ correspondence, from my own every day experience, and coordinating the structure of the author profiles across the seven authors profiled in 4.3. One specific example is the authors’ focus on writing for publication as intended to improve their classroom teaching practice (see discussion 7.2.1). This theme was raised early on in the journal with respect to a conversation I had with a senior colleague following presentation of preliminary data from the research at a conference in Japan, in an entry dated 23 September 2013:

After [conference name], [a senior colleague] said that my presentation was very interesting, but that the purpose of TEFL/TESL research is to improve classroom practice, and so wanted to know what my research had to do with the improvement of teaching practice. (edited for anonymity)

My senior colleague’s stated expectation that English language teaching research should yield practical teaching implications partly helped to inform my investigation of the authors’ experiences presented in this thesis, encouraging me to examine how they viewed the purpose of their writing for academic publication.

The decisions discussed above helped to refine the preliminary research questions into the final research questions focused on in this thesis. These and the
corresponding chapters in which they are discussed are outlined below, followed by a brief discussion and explanation of the preliminary research questions that are not addressed.

Chapter 4 is primarily concerned with analyzing the authors’ experiences, and so specifically examines the following preliminary research questions (see Table 3-1):

1. Why do early career Japan-based English language teachers write for academic publication?
   1.1. What reasons do they give for writing for academic publication?
2. What academic publication practices do the authors engage in?
   2.1. What academic practices do they engage in?
3. What are the experiences of authors in writing for academic publication?

The overarching analytical lens used in Chapter 4 is based around preliminary research question 4’s concern with author experience, which is used to examine why they write for publication and their academic publication practices. Thus, the above questions were consolidated into the following research question addressed in Chapter 4:

1. Why do early career Japan-based language teachers write for academic publication and what academic publication practices do they engage in?

In this chapter the methodological tool of author profiles, based on Lillis and Curry’s (2010) “scholar profile” (p. 20), is used to summarize seven authors’ experiences and publications. The focus is on why they write for publication (question 1 in Table 3-1) and their academic practices related to their writing for academic publication (question 2 in Table 3-1).
Chapter 5 is primarily concerned with the following preliminary research questions (see Table 3-1):

3. Who do the authors interact with in pursuing academic publication?

3.1. How can these interactions be graphically represented?

3.2. What does examining the correspondence between authors and brokers surrounding writing for academic publication reveal about the texts' trajectories?

4.1. How are their manuscripts evaluated? How do they respond to these evaluations?

4.2. How are their manuscripts changed during preparation for submission, review and editing?

The text history graphics (see 3.4.3 and 5.2) developed for each of the six manuscripts help to answer preliminary research questions 3, 3.1, 3.2 and 4.1. The discussion in 5.4 addresses preliminary research question 4.2, discussing how the manuscripts are changed during their trajectories. These research questions were consolidated into the following questions addressed in Chapter 5:

2. What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions? (Chapter 5)

In this chapter the text history analyses of six manuscripts authored by the seven authors profiled in Chapter 4 (one manuscript is coauthored by two of the authors profiled) are presented. Attention is given to the evaluations of the manuscripts (question 4.1 in Table 3-1), how the manuscripts changed during their trajectories
toward publication (question 4.2 in Table 3-1) and the significance of these changes (an extension of question 4.2 in Table 3-1), along with who the authors interact with and the significance of these interactions (question 3 in Table 3-1).

Chapter 6 is primarily concerned with the following preliminary research question (see Table 3-1):

3.2 What does examining the correspondence between authors and brokers surrounding writing for academic publication reveal about the texts’ trajectories and regarding author-broker relationships?

While preliminary research question 3.2 was initially a sub-question of preliminary research question 3 “Who do the authors interact with in pursuing academic publication?”, as analysis of the text histories in Chapter 5 progressed, it became increasingly apparent that the correspondence around writing for academic publication considerably influenced the authors’ experiences and published manuscripts, and so the decision was made to examine that correspondence, and the brokering embedded within it, in more depth and detail, beyond the text history analysis presented in Chapter 5. This analysis of the correspondence of writing for academic publication is presented in Chapter 6, which addresses the following research question, where the phrase “about the texts’ trajectories” (addressed in the trajectories in Chapter 5) has been changed to “regarding text brokering processes”:

3. What does the correspondence surrounding the authors’ writing for academic publication reveal regarding text brokering processes and relationships between authors and official brokers? (Chapter 6)
In this chapter, chains of correspondence between authors and brokers are examined, focusing on their interactions to examine how manuscript changes and relationships are negotiated (questions 3.1 & 3.2 in Table 3-1).

In refining and focusing the research questions, the decision was made not to pursue several of the preliminary research questions (see Table 3-1). Specifically, this research was primarily interested in author experiences, and so while some evidence from historical artifacts such as job listings are included in Chapter 4, systematically analyzing such historical artifacts would have led to less of a focus on author experience. This resulted in a decision to prioritize analysis of author experiences over analysis of the historical documents collected. This meant that preliminary research questions 1.2 “What relationship is there between the reasons they offer and evidence of the importance of publication for employment in higher education?” and 2.2 “What influences their choices of where and how to engage in such practices?” were not pursued. Similarly, implicit in preliminary questions 1.3 “What differences are there between them in why they write for academic publication?”, 1.4 “What similarities and differences are there between the Japanese and foreign residents of Japan in terms of why they write for publication?”, 2.5 “What issues do they identify, including choice of language (e.g., Japanese or English)?”, 2.6, “How does this influence their choice of publication?”, and 2.7 “What similarities and differences are there between the authors with respect to the above questions?” was the assumption that relatively equal numbers of Japanese and foreign resident authors were going to be ‘profiled’ (see 3.4.2). However, as only one Japanese author was ultimately included in the author profiles, the analysis of differences between the authors according to demographic or language background
characteristics became problematic. Therefore, the decision was made to emphasize the authors’ individual profiles in Chapter 4 (see 4.3). The chapter’s discussion section, 4.4, primarily concerns similarities between the seven authors (rather than differences), and so is more oriented toward answering preliminary research questions 1 and 1.1 than questions 1.2 to 1.4. Preliminary research question 2.3 “What publication types do they submit writing to for publication?” is addressed in part in 4.2, although the discussion there centers around the authors’ publications rather than submissions for publication, as where they had published was generally better documented in the data than where they had tried to publish.

To summarize, author profiles for the seven core authors are included in Chapter 4 which addresses the question: Why do early career Japan-based language teachers write for academic publication and what academic publication practices do they engage in? They are the authors of the six text history analyses in Chapter 5, which addresses the questions: What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions? The sets of correspondence from those text history analyses are the primary sets of correspondence between the authors and official brokers examined in Chapter 6, which addresses the question: What does the correspondence surrounding the authors’ writing for academic publication reveal regarding text brokering processes and relationships between authors and official brokers? (with the addition of one more author and three more manuscripts’ sets of correspondence; see 3.3.2).
3.4.1 Semi-structured interviews and transcription

This subsection first discusses methodology in semi-structured interviewing then interview transcription.

The paradigm of semi-structured interviewing adopted for this research has its origins in ethnographic investigations that call for the researcher to be a participant observer in the context of those studied (Geertz, 1973; see also 3.2). In such investigations, the researcher placing themselves in the context of the researched is often referred to as the “fieldwork” (Hammersley, 2006, p. 5) stage of the investigation. While this research does not incorporate an explicit fieldwork stage, the roles researcher and researched play in interviews significantly impacts what knowledge is constructed during them. How such roles influenced this investigation and, to the extent possible, how I worked to manage these roles is discussed next.

In the interviews, talk about professional practice tended to be interwoven with identity work, which was sometimes explicit in the interview talk and other times implicit in terms of how much detail was offered in answer to questions. It was evident from early in the investigation that how the authors and I as researcher came to be positioned in the talk influenced what was said.

How this positioning was handled in interviews includes consciously using rhetoric, implicitly and explicitly, to move myself away from my accustomed role as ‘expert’ teacher to that of naïve researcher. This is manifest in comparing my early interview responses to authors’ answers to questions, where I explicitly attempt to inform authors about publication practices as I understand them, and later interviews, where these ‘information moves’ are absent from my responses.
Furthermore, there were also instances of authors positioning themselves and me in different roles. Occasionally, authors familiar with my work on writing for publication would ask for advice about how to proceed regarding a specific dilemma, and in such cases I would offer an informed opinion based on my experience. When this was the case, in analysis I’ve tried to acknowledge where I may have influenced authors’ actions with the intention of making my role as explicit as possible (this is particularly relevant for Jason and Alan’s text history analysis in 5.3.1). At other times, authors unfamiliar with who I was and what I was trying to accomplish with my research were reluctant to offer details regarding their practice, particularly in interviews with some Japanese authors.

While the interviews were conducted primarily in English because of my own limitations with respect to conversational Japanese, Japanese authors were invited to reply in Japanese if they preferred, and in several instances, they did. The Japanese language was handled to the best of my ability during the interview then help was sought with translation at the transcription stage while retaining author anonymity.

All interviews with the core authors were transcribed. One important aspect of transcription is the coding scheme used, which shapes the amount of detail available to the analyst (Bucholtz, 2007). Interviews were transcribed using the coding scheme outlined in Table 3-5. I began with a much more detailed scheme, but the conclusion I reached was that in most cases the information of interest could be extracted without attending to every detail of the interview speech. Nevertheless, attention was paid to ensuring that the questions asked were included along with their answers in transcription and in presentation of data extracts in this thesis, with
the knowledge that how questions are framed can influence what is said (Diefenbach, 2009). Initially interviews were transcribed in full, and as the research progressed, more strategic transcription was employed, concentrating on talk that appeared more relevant to the research questions. As researcher I transcribed five approximately one-hour interviews myself. A commercial transcription service was used to transcribe an additional ten approximately one-hour interviews, although in analysis I consulted the original voice recordings when transcripts were unclear or there was a question. That said, it is important to note that “the interpretation of a recording cannot be neutral; it always has a point of view” (Bucholtz, 2000, p. 1441). Bucholtz (2007) also notes that transcription and translation of languages other than English requires additional analytical decision making and interpretation. Initially Japanese interview data was transcribed phonetically then it was rewritten into Japanese. When used in this thesis it has also been translated into English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription notations</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: word [word B: word]</td>
<td>Square brackets across adjacent lines denote overlapping talk. &quot;]]&quot; shows where the overlap stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wor-</td>
<td>A dash shows a sharp cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>Colons show that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>Indicates elision of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[text]</td>
<td>Indicates insertion of text to improve comprehensibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Generating author profiles

This subsection deals with the analytical and research tools drawn on in generating the author profiles presented in Chapter 4. While Chapter 4 draws heavily on interview data, historical artifacts such as author resumes were also consulted.
Short author profiles of the seven core participants of between one and two A4 pages were produced using Lillis and Curry’s (2010) “scholar profiles” to give a “sense” of the authors “and their priorities, interests and experiences in writing for academic publication” (p. 28). These were distributed to the authors for comment, or “member checks” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 314), which are a way to ‘test’ “data, analytic categories, interpretations, and conclusions” “with members of those stakeholding groups from whom the data were originally collected,” a “most crucial technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314). Asking authors for their perspectives on the developing analysis is consistent with a research approach seeking to explore lived human experience, and part of the strategy of attending to both emic, author-oriented perspectives and etic, researcher-oriented interpretations (see 3.2).

Where authors had requests for changes or corrections these were considered, although consistent with an interpretivist approach I have sought to exercise caution in not idealizing the authors as ‘experts’ regarding the phenomena studied (Bazerman, 1988; Williamson, 2006). Rather, I have tried to be conscious of the fact that the version of events authors present is representative of their understanding of their experience and is only one of several possible interpretations (Merriam, 1988; Patton, 2002). That said, as the research presented in this thesis is interested in the authors’ lived experience of writing for publication, soliciting author perspectives and interpreting those perspectives in a way the authors feel is accurate and authentic to their experience is important (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The requests for changes received through member checking tended to be related to corrections of factual errors, misunderstandings, and revisions intended to protect author anonymity rather than questions regarding the interpretations made in authors’ profiles. There was also an instance of one author, Jordan, correcting my
characterization of his publication types in Table 4-1, asking for a manuscript classified as ‘other’ to be moved to the ‘journal article’ category. As I am interested in authors’ experiences and perspectives, I made this requested change. I have also taken up some of the potential issues surrounding the categorization of author manuscripts by type in 4.2.

At this stage there were some interpretive challenges, as how the authors framed their experience of writing for publication and how experiences of authors writing for publication are presented in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 diverged. Specifically, authors tended to discuss conference presentations together with their writing for publication, while the literature tends to concentrate on writing for publication. In fact, all the text histories constructed and analyzed in Chapter 5 included a conference presentation at some point in their trajectories. Consultation of documentary evidence showed that in Japan these two tend to be discussed together (see, for example, Daizen, 2015), which led to including conference presentations in the analysis. I’ve tried to explicitly segregate discussion of writing for publication and conference presentation ‘output’ throughout this thesis to remain consistent with how writing for publication tends to be addressed in the literature.

3.4.3 Generating text histories

This section discusses how the text histories (see definition in 3.4) analyzed in Chapter 5 were developed to answer the question of how author manuscripts are changed in their publication trajectories. The construction of text histories involved analysis of multiple manuscript versions and the correspondence between authors and brokers to develop a picture of how the texts changed and who initiated the
changes. The analysis seeks to make visible who interacts with the authors and their manuscripts when and what the implications of these interactions are for the manuscripts, in terms of the changes made to them between the initial submitted version and the final published version, or what Lillis and Curry (2015) refer to as “uptake” (p. 132). Analysis of manuscripts followed two simultaneous but conceptually distinct tracts. One sought to reveal the overall process manuscripts went through over time on their trajectories toward publication. The other investigated the text-level changes made between the first available and final published manuscript versions, along with documentation of what changed and why through consultation of intermediate versions of the manuscripts and correspondence such as reviews.

Generally, the manuscripts used for the text history analyses discussed in this thesis were published by the time data collection began, and so the data supplied tended to be archival in the sense that authors forwarded on the correspondence and manuscript versions they had available. Therefore, I generally was not involved with the authors as a researcher at the time they were seeking to publish their manuscripts, and so did not influence what was said or done during the interaction. This is consistent with the objective of the research presented in this thesis as seeking to represent insider, emic perspectives (Agger, 1991; Rampton, et al., 2004). Analyzing correspondence following publication also facilitated analytical distance, which I could leverage to develop etic representations of author experiences (Geertz, 1974). There are two exceptions where the text histories involved authors providing correspondence and manuscripts from projects that were ongoing at the time of data collection. In both cases, the authors solicited my advice and feedback: Jason and Alan’s text history (5.3.1) and Kathy’s text history (5.3.5).
Regarding analysis of the overall process manuscripts went through on their trajectories, I developed a ‘text history’ graphic to represent the changes to the different versions of the manuscripts over time. Figure 3-1 is one such example for one of the manuscripts analyzed in Chapter 6. While the change analysis, discussed below, examined manuscripts for changes across the first available and final published manuscript versions, this overall analysis sought to catalog all the available manuscript versions. The basic unit used for different stages or steps in the publication process was individual versions of manuscripts and the correspondence surrounding them. In the case of the manuscript represented in Figure 3-1, this included four stages, representing submissions to three different journals. For the manuscript represented in Figure 3-1, intermediate versions, meaning presubmission versions or versions produced between rounds of submission to journals, were not available. In cases where they were available for other text histories, they are counted as unique manuscript versions (see, for example, Kathy’s text history, Figure 5-9).

This part of the analysis sought to create an overall picture of the trajectory of manuscripts and so required balancing information necessary to include against ethical requirements for participant anonymity. Given the ubiquitousness of information available today, the decision was made not to use journal titles but rather to label publications according to the dimensions outlined in Table 3-6. One dimension includes ‘Regional Nature’, whether Japan or outside-Japan. The contested nature of such distinctions has already been discussed in 1.2.2, but it is important to reiterate here that they are acknowledged to be problematic. While the ‘international’ nature of publications is a contested topic, the decision to distinguish
between inside Japan and outside-Japan publication in this thesis reflects that this is a distinction used by the authors, the publications they submit their work to, and Japanese HE evaluation schemes (see 1.3). Using these labels is not intended to bypass or undermine debates about the terminology used for describing writing for publication practice. Rather, it facilitates creating a critical distance between the terms used in this thesis and discussions in the literature more generally, facilitating critical examination of the topic of analysis, which is one of the objectives of the research (see 3.2). The three other dimensions encoded by the criteria include Language of publication, Type of publication, whether Journal, Book Chapter, Conference Proceedings, or Other (see also Table 4-1), and international indexing status.

**Table 3-6. Criteria for classifying publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>General examples</th>
<th>Example from Junpei’s MS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional nature</td>
<td>inside-Japan regional, Regional outside-Japan (‘Asian’), outside-Japan national</td>
<td>inside-Japan national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of publication</td>
<td>Japanese only, English and Japanese, English only</td>
<td>English and Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of publication</td>
<td>Journal (and frequency of publication), Book chapter, Proceedings</td>
<td>Annual academic journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International indexing status</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters SSCI Indexed</td>
<td>Indexed journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nature of the evaluations individual versions of manuscripts underwent was also labeled. Any time a complete manuscript version was sent to a publication, this was counted as a submission, and the nature of the submission was classified according to how the publication handled the manuscript, such as whether it was peer reviewed. The typical version of peer review in this research appeared to be blind,
anonymous peer review, where the Reviewers do not know who the authors are, and the identity of the Reviewers is not revealed to the authors (although this wasn’t always explicitly stated as policy). While this appears to be a standard form of peer review in the social sciences, it is by no means the only kind of peer review described in the literature (see Hargens, 1990 & Benos, Bashari, Chaves, Gaggar, Kapoor, LaFrance, et al., 2006 for more extensive discussions of varieties of peer review). Therefore, in this thesis blind anonymous peer review is considered the unmarked version of peer review and when other forms of peer review are employed, these are explicitly labeled. Sometimes information has been gathered about review practices at specific journals that authors did not raise as explicit knowledge in my interactions with them. Where this is the case, effort has been made to distinguish between explicit author knowledge and researcher knowledge to highlight emic and etic perspectives.

The graphical representation developed for illustrating manuscript trajectories exemplified in Figure 3-1 tracks a variety of summary information regarding a given manuscript and its publication trajectory. For example, the number of publications involved, the number of times a paper was evaluated or reviewed, the number of reviews, the number of Reviewers, and the number and nature of brokers known to have been involved are documented. It also offers a frame onto which additional information about changes made to the manuscript can be added.

One type of change information included is the number of changes made from version to version. This was calculated using Microsoft Word’s compare changes function, which performs an automated analysis listing the number of insertions, deletions, and moves (text moved from one location to another) between two
documents. The results of such a document comparison are displayed in the software’s “Reviewing Pane”, as illustrated in Figure 3-1.

Insertions: 249  Deletions: 235  Moves: 6

Figure 3-1. Example Result of Document Comparison Summary of Insertions, Deletions, and Moves in Microsoft Word’s Reviewing Pane

As the analysis is automated it has several shortcomings. Adding a paragraph is counted as one addition, as is adding a comma (and vice versa with respect to deletions). This is partially mitigated by the speed with which individual comparisons can be made, making it possible to analyze many versions quickly, and allowing for coverage of more manuscript versions overall. This change information helps add some context to the amount of work texts underwent, information that supplements the more detailed textual change analysis described next.

Figure 3-2. Example publication trajectory graphical representation
Investigation of text level changes began with comparing the first available full manuscript version to the final prepublication version. In the case of the manuscript represented in Figure 3-1, the first available version was the first version sent to a publication for review, but in other cases prereview versions were available and these were used (Kathy’s text history, Figure 5-9, is one such example). The variability in availability of texts is due to differences in version archiving and data storage habits among the different authors, an issue also noted by Lillis and Curry (2010). The issues this raises in terms of variability of the data available for analysis and the implications for the research presented in this thesis are discussed in 8.4.1.

In comparing the first available manuscript version with the final version, Lillis and Curry’s (2006, 2010) Change Heuristic was employed to classify the nature of the changes made to the manuscripts. While their heuristic isn’t the only one available, it was the latest iteration of the heuristics available at the time of writing to analyze different versions of texts. Its advantage is that it synthesizes several different change categories discussed separately by different authors, including Gosden (1995) and Knorr-Cetina (1981), facilitating answering the question of how manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing. The Lillis and Curry (2006, 2010) heuristic includes eleven categories of changes, summarized in Table 3-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>word/ sentence/ section added</td>
<td>This study investigates how task complexity influences EFL learners’ performance and amount of noticing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Example*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>word/ sentence/ section deleted</td>
<td>This study investigates how task complexity (±few elements) influences EFL learners’ performance and amount of noticing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>words/ phrase/ sentences reworded</td>
<td>This paper study investigates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reshuffling</td>
<td>reorganization of sentences/ paragraphs/ sections</td>
<td>Original: Recently there has been much discussion about what kind of tasks can promote second language acquisition. → Final: Since the mid-1980s, task-based language teaching (TBLT) has been the focus of great interest in both second language pedagogy and research. [Tasks moved to subject position in sentence.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>claims, evidence, warrants, what is foregrounded, backgrounded</td>
<td>This study investigates how task complexity (±few elements) influences EFL learners’ performance and amount of noticing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Positioning</td>
<td>explicit reference to position of paper/ research in relation to field/ discipline/ journal</td>
<td>The present study compared the effects of complex and simple tasks on learners’ speech production and the amount of noticing measured through “Reading and Underlining” (Izumi &amp; Bigelow, 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lexical/ register</td>
<td>levels of formality, discipline, field specific vocabulary</td>
<td>The present study compared the effects of complex and simple tasks on learners’ speech production and the amount of noticing measured through “Reading and Underlining” (Izumi &amp; Bigelow, 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sentence-level changes/ corrections</td>
<td>to sentence level syntax, vocabulary, grammar, spelling, punctuation</td>
<td>a great mount of → providing extensive amounts of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cohesion markers</td>
<td>ways in which sentences/ sections linked through for example conjunctions, lexical items</td>
<td>In this study,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Example*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Publishing conventions</td>
<td>scientific journal or organizational conventions (such as APA)</td>
<td>TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication, developed by Educational Testing Service) [spelling out the TOEIC acronym]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Visuals/ Representation of text</td>
<td>Formatting, diagrams, bullets</td>
<td>18pt → 14pt font for title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All the examples are from Junpei’s MS1 Change Heuristic; highlighted text represents the modified manuscript text corresponding to the change code

As Lillis and Curry (2006) explain, “Inevitably, the categories [...] overlap or may be subordinate to another category in a specific instance; for instance, cohesion markers may also be additions, and additions may relate specifically to argument and the nature of the claims made, such as the addition or deletion of hedges (e.g., possibly) and boosters (e.g., always)” (pp. 9-12). In the data examined for this investigation, such overlap was handled by using multiple labels. For example, in Table 3-8 the deletion of a specific variable used (Change Code 2) in the investigation also represents a change in the argument made (Change Code 5; hence both Categories 2&5 are marked in the Change Heuristic).

There are two significant differences between Lillis and Curry’s (2006, 2010) analysis and that used here which should be explained. One is that the text-level changes were first listed in the text reference/extract column and then the changes coded. In Lillis and Curry’s (2006) data, the Change Codes are listed and text extracts from different manuscript versions included by Change Code category (p. 10-11). For the analysis presented in this thesis the heuristic was organized by text extract and then coded because in many cases there were several different kinds of changes made within a single sample of text. For example, in applying the heuristic to Junpei’s manuscript, out of 124 text extracts with changes, only 29 changes...
received a single Change Code number, so it made more analytical sense to organize the heuristic by text extract than by Change Code.

A second difference between Lillis and Curry’s (2006, 2010) analysis and this investigation is that rather than trying to track all the changes made to the manuscripts they examined, they were interested in characterizing, “the most salient type of changes” with salience defined as “a relational notion, related to specific trajectories and publication text histories” (2006, p. 9). In contrast, in this analysis, the objective was to characterize as many changes as possible because this served as a first step before subsequent analysis, and so which changes would end up being salient was not clear when the changes were classified, although the classifications made were revisited as new data was added. Also, tracking as many changes as possible allowed for examination of hypotheses from the literature, such as Gosden’s (1995) statement that results and discussion “sections are more typically the focus of revision and rhetorical manipulation” (p. 46). Tracking changes in this way allows for counting and comparing Change Code frequencies between the different sections of a manuscript to build a picture of where in the text changes were made, and when in a given manuscript’s trajectory. The usefulness of the Change Heuristic is evaluated and discussed along with its limitations in 8.3.2.

The next step after documenting and labeling the changes was to visit the reviews and other feedback provided to authors to search for the origins of the changes in the text trajectories. When referenced in this thesis, manuscript correspondence is labeled according to which manuscript version it was associated with and the medium of interaction, as follows:

Author pseudonym MS# Medium#
Example: Kathy MS23 Email1

The example above indicates correspondence from Kathy’s manuscript number 25 (see Table 3-3), the first email available between her and the manuscript’s official brokers (see Table 5-2).

This further context was added to the Change Heuristic, along with reference to interviews and correspondence with authors. Comments based on my perspective as researcher and relevant background information were also added where appropriate, leading to a gradually fuller picture of how the final text was shaped during its trajectory and some of the implications of the changes made. Extracts from a completed Change Heuristic are included in Table 3-8 to demonstrate the result of this process. When extracts from the correspondence data are included in this thesis, [sic] is used to denote an error in the original text that has been retained in quotation and [...] is used to denote deleted text.

The qualitative analysis described above yielded several themes of interest. Consistent with a desire to engage in both close-up and larger holistic analysis, corpus software was also employed to examine changes in keywords across different manuscript versions using AntConc (Anthony, 2018). The final version of the manuscript was compared to the original, with keywords representing vocabulary that were significantly more frequent in the published version. A similar comparison was made from the original to the final, revealing vocabulary which were used considerably less frequently in the published version, further informing my examination of the changes to the manuscripts. For example, in Junpei’s case the appeared to have been added in several places in the change analysis document. Furthermore, it was listed as the second most significant keyword in terms of
keyness in the final manuscript version compared to the original, confirming it had been added during revision. Considering the problems users of English as an additional language have with English article use, this may suggest different brokers in the trajectory of the manuscript identified the as missing in different places, a hypothesis that was further checked against the correspondence collected from Junpei and directly with Junpei.

After what changes had been made where in the manuscript was tracked, the author perspective column of the heuristic was used to relate specific instances of interview talk with specific examples of changes to author texts. Furthermore, where there were instances of interest, such as a Reviewer comment that appeared to have not been taken up, or a change made that didn’t appear to be addressed in Reviewer comments, this was followed-up with the authors. Where their responses helped to better elucidate the changes that had been made to their texts, these were added to the Change Heuristic. This recursive process helped to add depth to the author profiles and allowed for cross-referencing and cross-validation of author interviews with their experiences of writing for publication as represented by their writing, furthering the ethnographic aims of this research for repeated researcher exposure and attention to insider and outsider perspectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Change Code</th>
<th>Text reference/extract</th>
<th>Suggested/made by?</th>
<th>Response by author</th>
<th>Rhetorical/knowledge significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(highlight color corresponds to Text Reference/Extract)</td>
<td>(Original → Final version, followed by markup of changed text with highlight color corresponding to Change Code(s))</td>
<td>When?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 3, 3, 285, 1, 3, 11</td>
<td>Abstract This paper investigates the influences of manipulating task complexity (±few elements) on noticing. [Original] → This study investigates how task complexity influences EFL learners' performance and amount of noticing. [Final] This paper study investigates the influences of manipulating how task complexity (±few elements) influences EFL learners' performance and on amount of noticing. [Colors indicate change codes in column 2]</td>
<td>Same as for 1. 3. 体裁の面で （1）1 頁目の abstract の部分が均等割になっていない。 3 In terms of appearance (1) The abstract on the first page is not justified.</td>
<td>Abstract justified</td>
<td>Reduction of experimental detail. Manipulating removed, as per Reviewer comment on 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Change Code (highlight color corresponds to Text Reference/Extract)</td>
<td>Text reference/extract (Original → Final version, followed by markup of changed text with highlight color corresponding to Change Code(s))</td>
<td>Suggested/made by? When?</td>
<td>Response by author</td>
<td>Rhetorical/knowledge significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>1&amp;5&amp;6&amp;7</td>
<td>Forty-two Japanese university students participated in the study. The participants engaged in each of the complex tasks (n = 14) and the simple tasks (n = 14) as experimental groups and reading task as a control group (n = 12). Their performance (in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency) and the results of reading and underlining (e.g., Izumi &amp; Bigelow, 2000) were analyzed as an index of the amount of noticing. Each performance score was submitted to a Mann-Whitney U test, and the underlining scores were submitted to a two-way ANOVA (before/after the task engagement and complex/simple task). [Text inserted in Final; not present in Original]</td>
<td>Version 3 Reviewer A feedback: First, details of the participants (e.g., Japanese, university, etc.), groups (number and type of groups and n -size of each group), and statistical tests should be added to the abstract.</td>
<td>details of study/procedure added</td>
<td>Intentional focus on quantitative aspects of a mixed methods study; see author email comments 2012-12-16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.4 Analyzing how broker interaction shaped authors’ texts

This subsection explains the methods of analysis of author-‘broker’ (defined in 1.2.3) sets of correspondence analyzed in Chapter 6, which asks what such interactions reveal regarding text brokering processes and relationships between authors and brokers. Sets of correspondence from the authors’ text histories were used to generate a picture of how the interaction between authors and brokers developed over time.

One lens for examining sets of correspondence is Fairclough’s (1995) critical discourse analysis, which addresses how inequality in power relationships in society shape what can be said in discourse, revealing embedded social power relationships (see also 3.2). Fairclough’s (1995) methods facilitate examining how differences in distribution of power influence who can say what when, allowing the analyst to comment on the larger social milieu in which texts are produced. As Fairclough (1995) explains, “language use is always simultaneously constitutive of (i) social identities, (ii) social relations, and (iii) systems of knowledge and belief” (p. 131) and is “constitutive in both conventional, socially reproductive ways, and creative, socially transformative ways” (p. 131) “depending upon [...] social circumstances” (p. 131). Fairclough (1995) brings into focus the perspective of the author, the social context as it acts on the author producing a text, the reader, and the social context in which the reader consumes a given text.

Fairclough (1992) refers to the structure of correspondence as an “exchange structure” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 153), meaning “a recurrent patterning of the turns of different participants” (p. 153; see also 6.1). Analyzing sets of correspondence can make visible
threads or topics of discussion. Examining such sets facilitates “close textual analysis” and “social analysis of organizational routines for producing and consuming texts” through examining “discoursal processes [...] of production and consumption” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 9). This includes “critical discourse analysis of discursive events with ethnographic analysis of social structures and settings” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 9-10), which facilitates paying “attention to the process of text production” (p. 7), the need for which in writing for academic publication research has been pointed out by Lillis and Curry (2010, 2015).

The sets of correspondence were examined to determine what was important in terms of ‘uptake’ both in the manuscripts themselves and in subsequent correspondence between the authors and brokers. Austin’s (1962) conception of “uptake” (p. 116) is used to identify such themes, which refers to linking within sets of correspondence. One form of uptake is potentially represented in how the correspondence leads to changes in the authors’ manuscripts (Lillis & Curry, 2015; see 6.2.4) and the other ‘uptake’ of themes in the author-broker correspondence itself, even if these do not lead to revisions to the published manuscripts (see 6.2.3 for an example).

3.5 Ethics

This research followed the guidelines of the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee (2014) and the British Sociological Association’s Statement of Ethical Practice (2002) to shape decisions regarding the research presented here. The notice of ethical approval for this research is included in Appendix A. Ensuring author anonymity is an important part of conducting ethical research. This was achieved
through removing identifying information from transcripts and data included in this thesis, along with the use of passwords for all relevant electronic devices and by storing the devices in safe, secure locations. Furthermore, pseudonyms are used for each of the author participants (Table 3-2), although participant anonymity does not free me as researcher from accountability regarding how I represent my author participants (Tusting & Maybin, 2007). One means of verifying that interpretations of author talk and actions were accurate was through member checking, or inviting the authors at key stages during transcription and analysis to comment on the interpretations made (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rager, 2005; see also 3.4.1). Such consultation had itself to be ethical, in that the amount of time required for authors to review the parts of this research relevant to them had to be reasonable. This was accomplished through informing authors when key segments of data were available, such as when an interview had been transcribed, and when analyses had been completed, such as a draft of their author profile or a text history analysis. Authors were invited to review and comment on the data or analysis. Most author comments served primarily to verify the accuracy of details presented, such as number of current publications, or elaboration of issues of interest to them. There were no instances of authors requesting reinterpretations or changes to how they were represented, and in many cases, authors did not reply to these invitations to comment. When authors did not reply they were contacted and invited to comment again as additional analytical and interpretive milestones were reached. Authors were also invited to review and comment on sections of this thesis relevant to them if they liked, although as researcher I retain responsibility for the knowledge claims made. A summary of the research was also produced
thanking the authors for their contribution and presenting an overview of the main findings from the investigation it was thought would be of interest to them (Muller, 2018).

Another ethical issue presented itself with respect to defining who the participants in this research were. In many cases, there were several people involved in the writing, editing, and review of the manuscripts. Authors frequently had coauthors who did not agree to be included as author participants. Authors provided correspondence with journals and reviews, so who was a research participant, and the ethics of dealing with non-participant data required consideration. The decision made was that authors were seen to be the ‘owners’ of the texts produced in the process of writing and review of their manuscripts, and therefore had the right to consent to this data being used for the purposes of this research. Where coauthors were involved, authors were asked to get the consent of their coauthors before providing any manuscript versions or correspondence related to their manuscripts. It was impossible to solicit the consent of journal Editors and Reviewers because Reviewers in most cases were anonymous. Furthermore, in the Editor-author relationship, the author is in the position of having relatively less power, and therefore as researcher it was deemed most important to protect the anonymity and rights of the relatively less powerful author participants (Grave & Walsh, 1998). Requesting Editor permission to use correspondence would undermine the authors’ right to anonymity, and so asking for such permission was deemed inappropriate. Instead, all Editor, Reviewer, and journal information has been made anonymous, referring to publication type (see Table 3-6) rather than to publications by title, a decision which serves to further protect author identities and addresses ethical problems surrounding Editors and journals having not given their
permission to have their correspondence with authors used in this investigation. A further ethical concerns involved consulting with authors to ensure the extracts used here sufficiently preserve their anonymity, a technique also employed by Lillis and Curry (2010).

3.6 Researching knowledge making in the academy

This section discusses the investigation of the processes of knowledge making within the Japanese academy presented in this thesis, and the importance of acknowledging this in a discussion of the methods of the research presented here.

3.6.1 Researcher positioning

As a member of Japanese HE myself, my positioning as a researcher with respect to the investigation presented in this thesis should be acknowledged, over and above my positioning already discussed with respect to the author interviews I conducted (in 3.4.2). The challenge of making the familiar strange, raised in 3.2, is relevant here, in terms of trying to put critical distance between my experiences of working in Japanese HE and trying not to read too much of my own autobiographical experience into the experiences related to me by the authors. Additionally, as someone who has presented, published, and taught courses on writing for academic publication since 2006, it was also important to try to place critical distance between the knowledge of the topic I have developed and the authors’ understanding of terminology common to such research. For example, when an author referred to choosing journals “based on the impact of the journal” (A.K. interview 1), I needed to be careful to query what the author meant by
'impact’ rather than to infer they were referring to the ‘impact factor’ generated through Thompson’s Science Citation Index. Similarly, I potentially worked as an Editor on or authored with some of the publications the authors submitted their work to, so I needed to be conscious to check their understandings and impressions of the processes their manuscripts went through, rather than assuming my prior knowledge would accurately represent their experiences. At the same time, being a knowledgeable insider with experience of Japan and knowledge of Japanese also allowed me to understand more of the authors’ stories than would have been possible had I not had such knowledge. For example, Japanese terms for designated university research budgets (kenkyuhi), the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science funding application process (kaken) and understanding of employment contract systems for full and part-time faculty allowed me to ask questions I otherwise would not have been able to inquire about. This hopefully helps to lend deeper insights to the chapters that follow.

3.6.2 Making knowledge about knowledge making

Investigating the process of producing knowledge has a substantial history, outlined in part in Chapter 2. This kind of inquiry allows for questioning the values widely promulgated within HE, to interrogate just what it means for knowledge to be produced within HE, and to question who can determine what is valued and what is not. As Lillis and Curry (2010) demonstrate, there are pulls within HE for more ‘valuable’ research to be increasingly promoted at the expense of other kinds of research that are less valued and valuable according to certain measures but are nevertheless important to the scholars engaging in and benefitting from them. The investigation can help to make
more explicit what some of the hidden values of HE within Japan and globally are, and what impact those values have on authors’ experiences of seeking to produce knowledge from within Japanese HE.

3.7 Summary

This chapter began with a discussion of the stance taken toward knowledge in this thesis, explaining that two complimentary paradigms, new literacies studies and critical discourse analysis, have been applied to the interpretive investigation presented here. Next, the thesis research design was explained, including research questions, information about the author participants, and how data was collected. Following this, interview transcription, creation of author profiles, generation of text histories, and investigation of the cycles of correspondence between authors and brokers surrounding their publications were discussed. This chapter finished with a discussion of the issues of researching knowledge making raised by the investigation.
4. The writing for publication practices of Japan-based authors

4.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the following research question:

Why do early career Japan-based language teachers write for academic publication and what academic publication practices do they engage in?

It uses the methodological tool of author profiles, based on Lillis and Curry’s (2010) “scholar profile” (p. 20) to summarize seven authors’ publications and writing for publication experiences (see 3.4.2). It draws primarily on the semi-structured interviews with the authors (see 3.4.1), incorporating historical artifacts such as resumes and job announcements where appropriate to add additional context (see 3.3.3).

First the authors’ writing for publication practices are summarized, followed by the seven author profiles. Next issues identified in their profiles, along with similarities and
differences, are discussed, followed by a summary of key findings discussed in the chapter.

4.2 Summary of the authors’ publications

This section summarizes the authors’ publications, examining where and in what languages they publish (Table 4-1). Manuscripts were classified using the categories outlined in Table 3-6. To distinguish between different “publication types” (Huang & Chang, 2008, p. 1821), the categories employed by Huang and Chang (2008) were used, specifically: “journal articles”, “book chapters”, “conference and working papers”, and “other” (p. 1821). However, I felt it important to add additional nuance to the category of ‘journal’, particularly in light of Salager-Meyer’s (2014) distinctions between different kinds of journals, where she refers to one type as “mainstream/center publications” (p. 2) or those “referred to as ‘mainstream’, ‘center’, ‘high-ranking’, or ‘elite’” (p. 2) which “are indexed in the Science Citation Index, the Social Science Citation Index or the Arts and Humanities Citation Index, all published by Thomson Reuters” (p. 2) and “written in English” (p. 2). The other type of journal Salager-Meyer identifies is “domestic peripheral journals” (p. 2) which “refers to those journals published in peripheral countries that are mainly absent from international databases” (p. 2), such as those listed above, and which she claims, “are mostly written in the researchers’ native language” (p. 2). Whether journals were indexed in the ISI indexes at the time of writing has been noted using the label “indexed”. In-house journals published by Japanese universities, or kiyos, as they appear to have evaluative processes quite different from the other journals the authors submitted their
manuscripts to (see David’s discussion of this in 4.3.3), have been counted separately.

The specific journals or publications associated with specific manuscripts cannot be identified to ensure anonymity, although examples from the data for each category used are included in Table 3-6 to illustrate the kind and range of publications involved. As language medium has been a theme in the literature reviewed (see Chapter 2), language medium has also been tracked.

### Table 4-1. Summary of authors’ publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author name, employment status¹</th>
<th>Inside or outside-Japan publication</th>
<th>Journal article (# indexed)</th>
<th>In-house university journals (kiyo)</th>
<th>Book chapter</th>
<th>Conference proceedings paper</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason, f-t term</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside-Japan</td>
<td>1 (1)¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan, f-t term</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside-Japan</td>
<td>1 (1)¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David, f-t term</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside-Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junpei, f-t PhD student</td>
<td>Japan, J / E²</td>
<td>4 / 8</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>5 / 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside-Japan</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy, p-t</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside-Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, f-t term</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside-Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, f-t term</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside-Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This is the same publication, the text history for which is analyzed in 5.3.1; ¹ f-t term: full-time, limited term contract, p-t: part-time; ² J / E: Japanese medium / English medium

While quantifying writing for publication is problematic (Seglen, 1997) and can mask complexity and heterogeneity in writing practice, it does offer a way to examine these
authors as a group. All the authors have written for publication outside Japan, although only three, Jason, Alan, and Junpei, have contributed to outside-Japan indexed journals. Junpei is the only author with more than one outside-Japan indexed publication. All the authors with full-time university employment had more than one university kiyo publication. Junpei, the only Japanese author, has publications in Japanese and English. Jason, Alan, and John, all full-time contract teachers, have book chapter publications. Jordan and David, also full-time contract teachers, do not have book publications, nor does Kathy, a part-time lecturer, or Junpei, a full-time PhD student. Conference proceedings papers are relatively well represented across all the authors.

4.3 Author profiles

The author profiles are presented here separately with the analysis and synthesis following in the next section.

4.3.1 Jason

Jason, North American\(^1\), has been living and teaching English in Japan since the early 1990s, although he explains he did not become interested in writing for academic publication until introduced to teacher research on his master's in TESOL in the mid-

\(^1\) The countries of origin of the foreign residents of Japan have been withheld to preserve author anonymity.
2000s. He views his writing for academic publication as integral to his professional development, part of “being a member of the community” (Jason Interview 1) and sees his research and his teaching practice as interdependent. His first writing for academic publication was a chapter in a book co-edited by a teacher on his master’s program, published in 2008. His four book chapter publications are all coauthored, two with teachers from his master’s studies, one with Alan (profiled in 4.3.2), a friend and former colleague, and the fourth with other former colleagues. Two of Jason’s three conference proceedings papers are coauthored and two of his three research articles in in-house university kiyo journals are coauthored. The text history of his first outside-Japan indexed journal article (coauthored with Alan) is analyzed in 5.3.1. He has given 19 Japan-based presentations, eight co-presented, and most recently one co-presented outside-Japan presentation.

Regarding his article in the outside-Japan indexed journal, Jason says his coauthor, Alan, suggested the journal, and that he considered it an “interesting challenge” as “neither of us had done anything outside of Japan” (Jason Interview 1). Jason described publication outside Japan as a “next step” for himself. He observes a “big challenge” in writing MS28 (see Table 3-4) was “addressing an international audience” not necessarily aware of or interested in the specifics of the Japanese English teaching and learning context (Jason Interview 1). He considers the process of having written MS28 substantially different from the outside-Japan book chapters he authored, saying journal article publication was “much more intense” (Jason Interview 1) in terms of the amount of research, authoring, and revision work involved. Jason remains interested in publication within Japan, stating he “planned to keep publishing in the [university]
kiyo” and with Japan-based journals. He says where he seeks publication “depends” on what he’s writing about (Jason Interview 1).

Jason describes himself as a “teacher who does some research” (Jason Interview 1). He is primarily interested in classroom-based research and themes of teacher development through action research. He describes his writing for academic publication as intended to improve his classroom practice and to facilitate his participation in the “English teacher community” (Jason Interview 1). He has also published one English language textbook and accompanying teacher’s manual with a Japan-based publisher and is planning to publish additional textbooks in the future in addition to continuing to write and publish academically.

At our first interview Jason was an Associate Professor on a limited term contract in his second full-time university position. During the research period he renewed his contract and was promoted to Professor, still on a limited term contract. His first full-time university position was at a university where an alumnus of his master’s program worked. Prior to teaching at university, he spent more than a decade teaching at a vocational college for foreign languages, and toward the end of his time there, also taught at a university part-time to build a resume that would qualify him for full-time university work.

Jason has also volunteered in an editorial role with a Japan-based journal. He describes that work as an extension of his participation in the community of English language teachers in Japan. He notes many of his presentation opportunities and some of his publication opportunities have their origins in his volunteer journal work.
Jason did not mention pressure to publish as a motivating factor for his writing for academic publication practice in our initial interview. However, as his employment contract came due for renewal, he noted that his Dean asked him about the number of publications he had completed during his time in his position. He was “told that 15 was the number to shoot for” (Jason Interview 2) over a four-year period. This did influence his choice of publication venues, as he chose a conference proceedings for one coauthored manuscript because he felt it would result in faster publication than submission to a journal. He also explains, “Later on, I was asked how many of these [manuscripts] I had authored by myself, implying that [the single authored manuscripts] would be looked upon more favorably” (Jason Interview 2). In quantitative institutional evaluations of publications within Japan, including at Jason’s university, coauthored work is often assessed at half of the numeric value of single authored work.

Regarding research support, the universities Jason has worked for full-time provided annual stipends, with the first university providing approximately 100,000 JPY (1,000 USD) per year and his current university about 300,000 JPY (3,000 USD) annually initially, although the research support has decreased by about 30% since he began working there.

4.3.2 Alan

Alan, North American, has been living and working in Japan for more than 20 years. His resume submitted for his current position at the time of writing, as a full-time Associate Professor at a public national university responsible for teaching English as a foreign language, noted three of his conference papers were coauthored, along with
two teaching practice articles, and one university kiyo paper. His resume also listed 19 Japan-based presentations, eight of which were co-presented, and 12 outside-Japan presentations, one of which was co-presented. After starting at his current position, he also coauthored with Jason (profiled in 4.3.1) his first teaching research paper published in an outside-Japan indexed journal (its text history is analyzed in 5.3.1) and his first book chapter with a publisher based outside Japan.

When asked about his choice of journal for his outside-Japan indexed journal paper co-authored with Jason, Alan explained, “I said to [Jason] that we both needed to have a publication that was a journal publication and international – outside Japan …” (Alan Interview 1). When asked to expand, he explained, “if your only publications are [university] kiyo articles, you’re not going to go very far” (Alan Interview 1). He went on to elaborate that “if you’re like we are – constantly having to look for jobs every four to six years – then you have to make sure that your publications are going to be ranked well” and that he had discovered the kinds of journals he had been writing for, based on his understanding of Japanese university publication rating systems, “get a zero”, lower than the “one” given for university kiyo publications, “because they think that you’re making a contribution to the university or something [when writing a university kiyo article] but then, other than that, they want to see papers from international journal publications …” (Alan Interview 1). While the institutional evaluation system from Alan’s university was not available for analysis, the evaluation system at another Japanese national university lists the criteria for including journal publications on one faculty evaluation form as journal articles published in journals with an ‘impact factor’ of 2.5 or higher, although this is not universally the case across universities (Document 2017-
Another faculty evaluation system, also for a Japanese national university, allocates points based on the regional level of the journal, with 10 points for ‘international level’ (国際レベル) publications and one point for ‘school level’ (学校レベル) publications (Document 2013-1-16-1). Alan’s evaluation of the rating system is that “it’s not necessarily based on the real quality of the journal. It’s based on what the people who are on these hiring committees perceive to be the worth of the journal, right?” (Alan Interview 1).

As a foreign resident of Japan in his 50s on a limited term contract he worries his “chances of getting another full-time job in Japan with poor Japanese ability [...] are almost nil” (Alan Interview 1). He saw publishing the outside-Japan book chapter and particularly the outside-Japan indexed journal article as a means “to make my possibility of being hired somewhere else better” (Alan Interview 1). This feeling of pressure to improve his writing for publication performance for official university evaluations is based on his experience of being hired at his current position, before his outside-Japan book chapter and outside-Japan indexed journal article were published. He related that, “for this position, my publications were considered a very big, big point” as one of his hiring committee members explained to him after he started working that his “publications were weak, but my teaching record was really good [and] in the demonstration lesson I did they were impressed” (Alan Interview 1). However, he feels that “if I were going for a job that was a tenured position I [...] wouldn’t even have made the interview stage with my publications as they were then” (Alan Interview 1). While not all advertised positions in Japan list minimum publication requirements for selection, one “tenured” position advertised at a Japanese private university listed, “8
or more academic articles or books (at least two of which are refereed)” for Associate Professor applicants and “3 or more academic articles or books (at least 1 of which is refereed)” for Lecturer applicants (Document 2018-5-18-1). The same position lists “a level of Japanese proficiency adequate for administrative and educational duties” as another requirement, suggesting Alan’s concerns about his limited Japanese language proficiency restricting what jobs he may qualify for are well-founded. By contrast, a three-year “Instructor by Contractual Appointment” contract position advertised at a private university listed as “Qualifications”, “Evidence of scholarly work related to language teaching is desirable,” implying that while ‘desirable’, publications were not required to be hired for the position, suggesting that in Japan limited-term contract positions may indeed require fewer publications than tenured positions, as Alan describes (Document 2018-3-13-1).

In terms of work experience, when Alan was working at a high school full-time he took on part-time university work once a week with the intention of transitioning from high school into university work. After this year, he moved to a full-time term contract position at another university, which he could renew annually for up to a maximum of six years. In his fifth year he moved to a third university on a four-year contract that he could apply to renew for an additional two years.

At his first full-time university position Alan became a co-researcher on a Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) research grant (kaken). One of his coauthored manuscripts is based on the grant research, for which he explains he did most of the authorship work. One of his single authored university kyo manuscripts was also based
on the grant research. Alan explains that he understands experience of prior co-researcher status on such grants improves one’s future chances of grant application success, and that while he hasn’t applied for another grant yet, he’s “thinking seriously of it” although he feels “it’s important to have a Japanese person” (Alan Interview 1) as a co-researcher on any future grant proposals he submits.

Alan completed his master’s with a North American university that offers classes in Japan. He feels his experience on the program did not prepare him sufficiently for writing for publication. He attributes this to the “professors” on the program giving “kinder” feedback, which did not prepare him for “really nasty” comments from evaluators when he started writing for academic publication (Alan Interview 1). His feeling regarding his degree is that he “thought we should have been prepared more than we were especially with research” (Alan Interview 1). He says he did publish manuscripts in university kiyō journals from his master’s, along with one Japan-based journal manuscript, “that was almost exactly the paper I wrote for a short course” (Alan Interview 1).

Alan says his initial experiences with Japanese university kiyō journal publications were that, “as long as you have all your Is dotted and your Ts crossed – and even sometimes then it doesn’t matter – the paper gets accepted” (Alan Interview 1). However, in one instance a university kiyō journal, “sent the paper I gave to them back with lots of comments and I had to do a more extensive rewrite than I was used to doing” (Alan Interview 1). He notes that, “at first, I was annoyed, of course, but then I thought no, I feel better about it” (Alan Interview 1). However, upon reading the journal, he noticed a paper by “the Director of the Center” “had some pretty grievous errors” (Alan Interview
1. This led him to feel the authors contributing to the journal were not treated equally (Alan Interview 1). Alan notes that at his third and current, at the time of writing, university all faculty contributing to the center’s journal are required to complete an ethics course and to follow explicit guidelines that include mention of a “blind review” process for “academic paper” and “research note” submissions (Alan Document 2).

With respect to academic writing, Alan says he “never enjoyed academic writing” and that one strategy he uses to overcome this dislike is coauthoring manuscripts (Alan Interview 1). He said, “I like writing with other people because then it motivates [me] to do it more and if you write with someone like [Jason] – he’s a really good writer – then it’s more enjoyable” (Alan Interview 1). Alan receives an annual research budget from his university that he can use for expenses such as conference travel, although he did not specify the precise amount of the budget.

Alan feels that his experience of working with Jason as a coauthor on two manuscripts has helped to address some of his perceived shortcomings as a writer. Their outside-Japan book chapter publication was a reflection on their research process for their outside-Japan indexed journal article, and Alan says of it, “Sometimes [when Jason] was in the process of writing it, [he] would say these things and I’d say, ‘[Jason] come on it says we’re Associate Professors [...] we can’t admit to this, you know” (Alan Interview 1). Alan describes his research as classroom and (personal) teacher development research, saying, “I’m thinking of myself as someone who’s becoming a teacher-researcher. I’m still becoming both. I’m not satisfied with myself as a teacher and I’m certainly not satisfied with myself as a researcher but for a teacher-researcher
it’s not something separate. This is something [Jason] and I talked about in [our book chapter]” (Alan Interview 1).

4.3.3 David

David, North American, has lived in Japan since 2002. When David began participating in the investigation, he was a contracted lecturer responsible for teaching English as a foreign language at a private university (his second full-time university position), having previously worked through an outsourcing company at another university (his first full-time university position). His first writing for publication was a manuscript for the in-house university publication at his first university. A friend who had recruited him for the position advised David, “if you want to survive in Japan in the university circuit publish publish publish” (David Interview 1). He describes that during the application process for his second university position, having had a manuscript accepted for publication was a key part of the decision to hire him. As he explains, it “made the difference of me getting the job or not” (David Interview 1, see also discussion below).

His understanding regarding expectations for publication at his second university was that teachers were expected to publish one paper in the university’s journal during their five-year contract period, which he describes as, “very laid back, very easy going” (David Interview 1). David says he became conscious of the need to distinguish himself through his publications in the third year of his five-year contract at his second full-time position when he applied to four full-time university openings and received a follow-up from only one of the four universities. He describes his job applications at that time as, “testing the waters” (David Interview 2). He was surprised and disappointed that his
applications generated so little interest. As he explains it, “I’m starting to look at it from the hiring committee’s point of view, what are they looking at when they see my resume. When I’m looking at my resume, I’m thinking like, ‘How did I get the job I have now with even less than what was here before? How do I get them to look at me? At least let me in the door for an interview?’ I thought I need to add a few more lines in there. I’ve got to get busy with the publications and the presentations” (David Interview 2). Partly because of job hunting pressure, David authored four more university kiyo journal manuscripts, two Japan-based journal research articles, one outside-Japan conference proceedings paper, and one outside-Japan journal article between 2011 and 2014. In terms of presentations he has a total of 12 Japan presentations and 3 outside-Japan presentations. He was able to successfully secure a new five-year contracted lecturer position at a third university in the fourth year of his contract at his second university.

David describes the university kiyo journals he has had experience publishing in as requesting he proofread manuscripts after submission, but as not involving peer review evaluation. When asked about how he plans his academic writing and how he considers the specific publication he will submit his work to, he explains, “Since I’m only submitting to [the university] kiyo” his main concern is “getting the paper written” because “it’s already a shoo-in” (David Interview 2), meaning publication is virtually guaranteed. While publication is guaranteed, he notes he is concerned, “about the quality […] like how well am I articulating my ideas and the research […] If anything I’m doing it for pride and also […] this could be a publication I submit to a job” (David Interview 2). Here David is referring to requirements that job applicants include selected published manuscripts along with their application documents when applying to
university positions in Japan. For example, a tenured position requested applicants include copies of “5 academic articles or books (at least 2 of which are refereed)” for Associate Professor applicants and “3 academic articles or books (at least 1 of which is refereed) for Lecturer applicants” (Document 2018-5-18-1), thus David is aware he may submit copies of a university kiyō manuscript as part of a job application package when seeking new employment. He went on to say,

[…] although it's not peer reviewed hopefully someone will read it [...] and then say OK, it's not peer reviewed. It's [...] from his kiyō but let's look at the research [...] so I am trying my best to make it as good a publication as possible. (David Interview 1)

Here David acknowledges university kiyō publications may not be considered as prestigious as peer-reviewed journal publications but expresses the hope that hiring committees will consider the research described in them rather than evaluating them solely based on the journal in which they were published.

Regarding the process of writing, at the start of his participation in the investigation David felt he was largely writing in isolation. During our initial interview he noted that at his second university he had one English teacher colleague who was working on her PhD, but he felt there was little collegial support for writing for academic publication or collaborative research. He notes he took the position partly in the hopes of working with the university’s Program Director, but shortly before David started, the director he hoped to work with moved to a different university and David did not feel the new director was interested in the kind of collaboration David was. Over time, David
participated in two online courses where the course instructors gave him some feedback on his writing, he began some collaborative work with his colleague studying for her PhD, and he also engaged in some collaborative work with the former director.

David’s collaboration with the former director developed partly through an unsuccessful job application to the university the director had moved to and to which the director had encouraged David to apply. The director was still doing adjunct teaching at David’s university, and helped David to secure adjunct teaching at a third university, which meant they had the opportunity to meet and discuss research. David “mentioned how my primary reason for going into [the second full-time university position] was to work with [the director] and learn how he did research” which led to the director inviting David to “collaborate with me on” (David Interview 1) a project. David explains they agreed to work on a project where David assisted in data collection, with his data combined with the director’s as a collaborator to be submitted for publication. As he puts it, “I joined in, just to sort of learn how things were done” and that “I was pretty much spoken to as opposed to sharing ideas” (David Interview 1). However, over time their relationship developed from one where initially David felt a junior member, and that “I pretty much considered it his baby” (David Interview 1) to one where “there’s a lot more dialog” (David Interview 2) with David taking responsibility for a presentation abstract submission and taking first authorship on a manuscript based on the collaboration for an outside-Japan journal. David furthermore feels this collaboration has potential for further expansion, saying, “It’s starting to look like he’s interested in doing even more projects with me” (David Interview 2), a development David views positively. David’s
research is based on his classroom teaching, largely investigating applications of technology to pedagogy.

Living near Tokyo means David has relatively easy access to professional development seminars, including free graduate lecture seminars provided by a North American university. Through those seminars he has relatively regular contact with other English language teachers interested in professional development and is able to get information about potential job openings for both full-time and adjunct teaching positions. David also has access to research support money through his university, although he must request prior authorization to use it, such as getting a trip to a conference approved.

David completed his master’s via distance learning part-time with a university in Australia, and he feels the program did not necessarily prepare him for writing for academic publication. He describes the program’s assignments as oriented toward commentary on pedagogy and developing course plans but did not feel any of the assignments he wrote on his program would translate into publishable manuscripts. In this sense, he feels jealous of teachers he knows who completed programs where they produced master’s assignments that ultimately went on to be published. Another issue David faced is that his master’s program was teaching rather than research oriented, and after he graduated, he realized this meant he was not considered sufficiently qualified to be accepted as a student onto most PhD programs. However, he was eventually able to find a PhD program willing to accept him.

David’s first outside-Japan academic publication and his first to go through peer review has its text history analysis discussed in 5.2.2. Regarding the process of preparing the
manuscript, he said, “It was my first time to actually look at the guidelines [for the journal] and just follow along and say, ‘OK, this is the language that they want it to be in.’ It was very, very interesting. […] They have one line that stipulated you cannot use personal pronouns like I, we, our” (David Interview 2). He went on to say:

...so of course while I’m writing it, I’m looking at other similar articles I found. If I’m writing in this style, I’ve got to see how other people did it, so I’m looking at it and it is quite awkward because [...] one of them was ‘the author of this research found that’ and I was like, ‘Wow, is that ever awkward.’ [laughs] Why don’t you say, ‘And I?’ (David Interview 2)

He added:

...I submitted it, and it was very, very interesting. I wouldn’t say it was fun. The time frame was way too short, but I went for it anyways and I got it in. I did the best that I could. Unfortunately, I didn’t have anyone to proofread it for me. (David Interview 2)

4.3.4 Junpei

Junpei, Japanese, is a PhD student researching English language education at a national university in Japan. He attended a private Japanese university for his undergraduate degree then immediately enrolled in the second language acquisition master’s program at his current (at the time of writing) university. Following graduation from his master’s program, he moved into the university’s PhD program, along with
three classmates from his master’s program. One of his English medium Japan journal articles, MS1 (its text history is analyzed in 5.3.3), was adapted from his English medium undergraduate thesis. Eight of the other manuscripts on his resume, all published in Japan, are extended abstracts from conference presentations, three in English medium and five in Japanese. Regarding conference presentations, Junpei has 38 listed, two of which are outside-Japan conference presentations. Of his 36 presentations given in Japan, 28 were Japanese medium and eight English medium. Junpei has co-authored and co-presented extensively with the other students on his master’s and PhD courses and his supervisors. About half of his published manuscripts are coauthored and about half of his presentations have been co-presented. He did not mention experience of teaching when discussing his writing for academic publication practices.

When asked about his choice of language medium of publication, Junpei notes that he is primarily interested in the potential readership of his manuscripts. He explains one manuscript on the topic of learning Japanese as a second language was written in Japanese because he believes, “almost all Japanese language teacher[s] can read Japanese” (Junpei Interview 1). Similarly, he wrote another manuscript in English because it “is about English language education” (Junpei Interview 1) and he envisioned his audience to be English teachers. He adds, “In the future I want to write a lot of research paper[s] in English and I want to submit [them] to international journal[s] if it is possible and I want many researchers to read my research paper[s]” (Junpei Interview 1), as he sees English publication facilitating access to a larger potential readership.
Junpei’s selection of journals for publication is oriented toward prestigious publication. He submitted two of his Japanese language publications to “the two biggest journal[s] in Japanese language teaching” (Junpei Interview 1). With respect to his first English medium publication (its text history is analyzed in 5.3.3), Junpei extracted data from his longer undergraduate thesis for a joint Japan conference presentation with his undergraduate thesis supervisor then initially coauthored a manuscript with his supervisor, submitting it to a prestigious Japan English medium language journal. Following rejection, Junpei submitted the manuscript solo-authored to an indexed outside-Japan journal. After a second rejection, he submitted the manuscript to a second Japan-based journal where it was ultimately published. Junpei selected the third and final journal because, “professors I know well were the editors and the reviewers” (Junpei Interview 1). While he was not successful in publishing this manuscript in his first two journals of choice, saying “I couldn’t do so well” (Junpei Interview 1), he has since successfully published manuscripts in both journals.

Junpei first came to believe it would be possible to publish MS1 in an outside-Japan indexed journal through an exchange with his supervisor. He stated, “we were planning to submit the manuscript to [an] international journal. I was really excited because this is a big chance to publish [with a] prestigious journal. I had yearned for [publication in an] international journal and [to be a] researcher. My ex-supervisor had experienced publishing [in] international journals, so I did not think this was a story in my dream. Therefore, I was disappointed at what my ex-supervisor said later. I said, ‘I would like to submit to [an] international journal so I [will] rewrite the entire manuscript.’ I wanted him to rethink about it, but after rewriting, he said ‘after all this is not the quality for [an]
international journal” (Junpei Interview 2). Junpei’s supervisor instead “suggested submitting to [the] bulletin [kiyo] published [by] his university. Therefore, I desperately submitted the manuscript to the international journal without his name” (Junpei Interview 2).

Regarding Junpei’s English writing experience, he originally wrote his undergraduate thesis in Japanese then translated it into English, but he wrote his master’s dissertation in English from the start. During his undergraduate studies Junpei did take writing classes for credit toward graduation but did not take any writing classes specifically intended to assist him with writing his graduation thesis in English. He says when writing his thesis, he read some Japanese medium books about, “effective writing” in English (Junpei Interview 1). With respect to the language medium of his thesis, he had a choice of English or Japanese for both his undergraduate and master’s thesis and chose to write both in English. He says of this choice, “I thought I needed more practice in English [because] in the future I want to write a lot of research paper[s] in English and I want to submit [them] to international journal[s]” (Junpei Interview 1). He says he views his English medium writing for publication in a similar light, saying of his choice to write English medium manuscripts for journals, “I thought I had to write in English now [because] I need practice and experience” (Junpei Interview 1). He says, “writing research paper[s] is really difficult for me but” that writing in Japanese “is easier” than writing in English, and “so if I write research paper[s] in Japanese every time maybe I [won’t] write in English at all [laughs]” (Junpei Interview 1). Because of the difficulty he has writing in English, he feels, “I need the experience of writing in English [medium] so if I write research paper[s] in English, I think I can write well when I get older” (Junpei
Interview 1). Junpei also notes that his coursework, including class assignments, is in Japanese with only his theses in English.

Regarding the writing process, Junpei said he “always” shares his work “for research paper[s] or for conference presentation[s]” with other students on his program before presenting or submitting it, both for his English medium and Japanese medium work, something he does only “sometimes” for his coursework assignments (Junpei Interview 1). He stated how in one instance, when preparing an English medium presentation, “I first make my slide[s] by myself and after that my elder colleague watch[es] my presentation and criticize[s] some things and I remake the presentation slide[s] and manuscript again” (Junpei Interview 1). He feels the process is similar for his Japanese medium presentations, although, “I make a lot of grammatical mistakes in English but in Japanese, I don’t do that […] so I think my colleague[s] focus on the contents in Japanese presentation[s] but in English they have to focus on more grammatical [and] linguistic mistakes” (Junpei Interview 1). He also noted that for his English presentations, “even though I don’t read any manuscript, I have to write it before the English presentation and I have to remember [it] and so it’s really difficult for me [laughs]” (Junpei Interview 1). He viewed at least some of his English medium Japan presentations as preparation for upcoming outside-Japan presentations, saying, “I’m planning to [give] presentation[s] in international conference[s] in America and Australia so I would like to prepare for [these] conference[s] because I have no experience [of giving] a presentation in English” (Junpei Interview 1). He feels the process of memorizing a transcript of what he wants to say for his English medium presentations
is much more time consuming relative to his Japanese medium presentations, where he doesn't feel the need to do this.

Junpei is an active member of his university’s postgraduate department, attending seminars and participating in both formal collaborative research groups and less formal, collegial collaborations. This is reflected in the fact that many of his coauthors and copresenters are fellow students. He has also adapted papers written for his postgraduate classes into conference presentations and published manuscripts. He is a recipient of a grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and is also a research fellow with the society. Junpei says he must have one publication related to his PhD research in a “peer-reviewed journal” to graduate from his program, although he says that the journal and the language medium are not specified.\(^2\)

Junpei hopes to go from his PhD program into full-time work as an English as a foreign language teacher at a university in Japan. His hope is that he will be able to present his research at conferences outside Japan and to write for outside-Japan journals. He did not express a feeling of pressure to publish as part of the reasons behind his writing for publication and presentation activities, although he did note that some other students on his program felt such pressure in the last year of their program when they realized they needed a journal publication to graduate. Junpei’s research explores

\(^2\) This distinction between ‘peer-reviewed’ and ‘non-peer-reviewed’ publications is a relatively common one in Japanese HE. One set of instructions for completing a job application for a private Japanese university instructed applicants to “separate published academic papers as ‘Peer-reviewed’ and ‘Non-peer-reviewed.’ And list them separately” (Document 2017-5-25-23).
issues of relevance to language teaching but does not specifically explore his experience of language teaching or learning within his classrooms; it is rather oriented toward an exploration of more theoretical issues in language teaching and learning.

4.3.5 Jordan

Jordan, African, has been living in Japan for almost twenty years. He completed his master’s via distance learning with a UK university while still living in Japan in 2006 and then began teaching English as a foreign language part-time at different universities. After seven years of part-time teaching, he now has full-time university work with a two-year contract that is not limited in the number of times he can apply for renewal. Jordan also enrolled in and completed a PhD in a subspecialty of sociology outside of language teaching taught in English with a Japanese university, graduating in 2017.

At the time of his initial participation in the study, Jordan had just finished his first semester of full-time university work. When he applied for this position, he had three publications, including one Japan journal manuscript, one conference proceedings paper, and one university kiyo publication, all coauthored with different coauthors. He says of his writing for publication, “I have been slow, but now with the new position [I have] more chances, more funds even. I can be supported in my research, so I feel like it’s a beginning” (Jordan Interview 1). He felt he had been slow to publish partly because previously, as a part-time teacher he “used to spend a lot of time moving between the schools and that was tiring and left me very little time to concentrate and do any kind of research” (Jordan Interview 1). His prediction that his writing for publication activity
would increase at his new position was accurate, as he published several additional manuscripts during his first two-year contract, including another university kiyo paper, an outside-Japan conference proceedings paper, a manuscript for a Japan journal column, two book reviews, one for a Japan journal and one for an outside-Japan journal, as well as a report for a Japan journal on a conference he attended outside Japan. The text history for his outside-Japan conference proceedings paper is analyzed in 5.3.4.

Regarding his writing for academic publication in his new position, Jordan states that he sees it as an opportunity to communicate to “my employers my feeling and my philosophy” (Jordan Interview 1) regarding systems he would like to see developed at his university. As the staff of university kiyo journals are often senior academics at those universities, there is the potential for them to read Jordan’s work as it goes through the submission and publication process. Also, his publishing of this work allows him to include it as part of his contract renewal process, which is another place where senior faculty may again be exposed to the ideas he promotes in his writing. When asked about pressure to publish, Jordan notes “I’m expected to publish, literally every year, I have to publish a paper”, which he relates to his two-year contract renewal process, “They expect me to publish, to be publishing because my contract is two years with no limit. I can really keep renewing. One of the things they measure is the publishing and working diligently, so I think partly yes, there’s a pressure to publish” (Jordan Interview 1). However, Jordan feels this pressure is secondary to the main reason he writes for publication, which he describes as “interest” (Jordan Interview 1). This interest centers around his responsibility for teaching “what they call oral communication classes”
(Jordan Interview 1) while his research interests are student autonomy and self-access. He sees himself “trying to frame my teaching, my new position towards” the research areas he is interested in (Jordan Interview 1). He says, “I have a background of work with self-access, so I want to show them that we also need self-access here” (Jordan Interview 1). He sees some of his writing for academic publication in his first year of full-time work as related to this pedagogical theme. More recently, in 2017, he published two Japan journal articles related to his PhD research. Jordan noted that the PhD program, “had a requirement to publish at least THREE articles, at least ONE of which must be peer reviewed” in an email (Jordan Interview 10, caps in original). He noted considerable anxiety surrounding the need to meet these requirements, writing in an email:

I started early to prepare articles for publication, but I also got some early rejections and challenging revisions. I had intended to put away the compulsory peer reviewed paper as early as before the end of year 3, but I only got confirmation well into the 4th and final year. Yes, there was as much pressure with the papers as with revising parts of the thesis to the supervisor’s required standards. (Jordan Interview 11)

Jordan’s first in-house university kiyo journal publication resulted from a full-time colleague at a university Jordan was working at part-time approaching him about submitting a paper together. As Jordan explained it,

This is my friend, he wanted to publish something also. He came to me, basically, and said, ‘I want to publish – I haven’t published and I’m really in
danger.' As I told you, some universities expect full-timers to publish, so I told him, 'OK, I can look at some of my [master's] assignments that we can [use] to publish your paper.' I was happy also because I needed to build up some publications. (Jordan Interview 1)

Jordan says of that university’s journal, “I couldn’t publish by myself. I had to put a full-time [faculty member’s] name in the paper” (Jordan Interview 1). While Jordan was happy at the time to have published the manuscript, he also feels a bit disappointed that he did not publish the work in a more prestigious journal, as “it was a good paper” (Jordan Interview 1). He says regarding his feelings of his experience with this manuscript, “But that was OK. He gained, I gained” (Jordan Interview 1), although he feels he did most of the work on the manuscript, with his full-time colleague providing “editing, proofreading, stuff like that, but basically it went as it was. It was my edit, my work” (Jordan Interview 1).

Jordan feels his other coauthorship experiences have involved a more equal distribution of work, saying, “We kind of share the work 50-50” (Jordan Interview 1). He has known one of his coauthors since his original part-time language center work, and they have collaborated on at least five different manuscripts. He also had a Japanese coauthor for a Japan journal manuscript where they shared the authoring workload evenly.

Jordan says of the hiring process for his current position that he was offered the position mainly because of his “teaching experience and philosophy” (Jordan Interview 1). He says there was no minimum number of required publications advertised along with the
position, although “they expected some” (Jordan Interview 1, see also Alan’s profile, 4.3.2 and David’s profile, 4.3.3).

4.3.6 Kathy

Kathy, North American, graduated with her master’s via full-time study in the US then moved to Japan and taught English part-time at a university and various private language schools. All three of her publications (Table 4-1) were initially conference presentations that were subsequently written up for publication, with two of them coauthored. The text history of her first writing for academic publication, MS23, a coauthored Japan conference proceedings paper, is analyzed in 5.3.5.

When Kathy first came to Japan after graduating with her master’s, she was relatively confident in her academic writing, saying she felt “pretty well prepared” (Kathy Interview 1) by her master’s coursework. However, she quickly came to feel that being in Japan limited her ability to access resources, such as academic literature, more than she originally thought it would, particularly relative to the access she enjoyed as a graduate student in North America. She also had difficulty developing research support networks in Japan. While she attended teacher development workshops relatively frequently, she felt those workshops included people considerably more experienced than her who had been in Japan much longer and who she didn’t “feel comfortable asking” (Kathy Interview 1) for writing for publication and professional development advice. While she did engage in collaborative work with colleagues at the universities she was working at part-time, she felt the distribution of work was relatively uneven, with her shouldering
much of the authoring responsibilities because in one case her coauthor had “a family and kids so is really busy” (Kathy Interview 12). This coauthor was working full-time at a university, and so was able to access academic resources Kathy could not, but in the end Kathy “pretty much did the work” (Kathy Interview 12), of authoring and making post-submission revisions to the manuscript, while her coauthor provided literature required to revise the manuscript.

Another difficulty Kathy faced was that her adjunct schedule was highly variable, which resulted in her being unable to plan for and execute extended projects. As she states, “I never stayed in one place long enough to actually complete anything substantial” (Kathy Interview 34).

In terms of writing for publication, Kathy was uncertain about where she should submit her work, and what journals might be interested in her writing, saying she felt unaware “of what journals to try to publish in” (Kathy Interview 6). She also initially viewed being an author working with journal brokers as resembling her experience during her graduate school work, where her faculty supervisors guided her writing and offered revision advice. However, Kathy’s first writing for publication experience did not include the kind of guidance and support she expected, with the Editor she corresponded with reluctant to discuss changes to the manuscript while Kathy was revising it (see 6.2.1).

Regarding her experience of revising manuscripts, she states, “So many times I knew a passage was awkward and couldn’t fix it myself and always valued when someone else with a fresh perspective tried to reword/resay it and it helped me clarify my point” (Kathy Interview 22). However, Kathy’s expectations regarding journal broker
interaction changed over time. Two years after her first experience of writing for publication, she commented on reviewing for a Japan conference proceedings, saying,

As I was giving feedback […] I noticed I used a markedly different style than previous years. I usually was friendly and tried to change the language I found confusing and tried to ‘fix’ what I felt needed it. This time, after submitting [my reviewer feedback] and rereading my comments I felt I was giving the type of comments that I as a writer hated and found so unhelpful. Things like ‘this isn’t clear, reword or rephrase.’ (Kathy Interview 22).

She adds, “I don’t know why I changed my style. Most probably due to speed – it’s much faster to tell the author to do it again instead of interpreting and trying to do it myself!” (Kathy Interview 22).

Kathy explained her interest in writing for academic publication as based on a desire to complete a PhD and to “be a researcher” (Kathy Interview 1) in the future, with her writing for publication representing “a first step” (Kathy Interview 1) along that path. However, an issue she faced was being unable to resolve the competition she felt between time required to teach and time required to do and write research. She wrote in an email:

Recently, I have been thinking about why I find it so hard to find the time to work on professional development AND teach at the same time. [...] The reason I haven’t been so good at getting writing done for publications is I’m really busy prepping my classes, grading, etc. I spend a lot of time on it. I’m sure for teachers
who are in a tenure position and teach the same classes year after year don't have to constantly develop new courses and materials and thus they are better able to research and write, but for young/new/part-time teachers, either the quality of the teaching goes down or the personal life is sacrificed. (Kathy Interview 10)

Kathy describes her academic writing for publication as linked to her classroom practice, writing:

Describing what I was doing in the classroom seemed to be the most useful in terms of giving other teachers ideas to use in the classroom. That's ultimately all I ever wanted from research—ideas to make teaching easier and more fun for everyone involved. (Kathy Interview 35)

Kathy was unable to resolve the conflict she perceived between teaching and writing for publication and left Japan to take a position as a secondary school teacher on an intensive English course in another country in Asia. As a part-time adjunct teacher Kathy did not receive any research support money and funded her conference travel using her personal income.

4.3.7 John

John, North American, completed his master's in English teaching with a Japanese university that offers English medium instruction then began working full-time with the same university after graduating. He has since enrolled in the university’s English medium PhD program while continuing to work as a full-time term contract lecturer on
his second contract, having changed departments once. As a master’s student he “began to get interested in” writing for academic publication through “learning about the importance of publishing in our field of work, the weight that comes with that” (John Interview 1). He goes on to explain, “I basically tried to learn how to get published, where you can publish and that kind of became my new goal, but it was difficult at first because I didn't really know where to begin” (John Interview 1). Regarding his writing for publication, his first published manuscript was a Japan conference proceedings paper, followed by an outside-Japan book chapter which started as an outside-Japan conference proceedings paper (see Table 4-1). He has given two Japan presentations and eight outside-Japan presentations.

When John was initially interested in writing for publication but unsure about how to begin, his “head advisor” from his master’s dissertation provided some direction by “really pushing people to present [at an annual Japan conference] – so he recommended that I write an abstract and submit it” (John Interview 1). John goes on to explain, “he encourages people to present any way they can, if there’s an opportunity,” noting that “After I graduated I started presenting overseas and he was really excited about that” (John Interview 1). John links his classroom language teaching practice to his interest in doing research and presenting at conferences, saying:

[...] if you're not presenting [research] – I don't want to say there's no point. I mean for class involvement and personal involvement, it's good to carry out
research but it's really important to get that information out and share it. (John Interview 1)

Regarding the process of writing and soliciting writing support, in preparing his abstract for his first presentation, John consulted his advisor, although he explained his advisor did not revise his manuscripts directly:

He will not write – he will look at your abstract and he'll look at your paper, but he won't edit it for you, he'll say, 'There's some flaws.' and the problems and, 'You need to fix these.' He'll kind of point out the problems which is really good, that's more helpful than him telling us what you need to change specifically. (John Interview 1)

The above extract shows John values having problematic text pointed out to him but being expected to revise it himself.

Following his Japan presentation, John published a manuscript in the conference’s proceedings. He noted “just having a chance to publish in the [conference] proceedings, although they're not I guess as respected as other journals or outlets, it was a really useful place to start, I guess. I have no idea.” (John Interview 1). Regarding the writing process, he explained he consulted with his advisor first then corresponded extensively with “an editor” (the exchanges are discussed in 6.2.2):

I wrote a draft for the proceedings article with [my advisor’s] help […] that was accepted as well. And then after it was accepted, I was given [an editor] to help me with the process of fine tuning it, working out the little problems. When it was
accepted, they said, ‘Yeah, this is a good paper, but there are several things we need to fix.’ That was my first time working with an editor, which was quite intimidating. It was someone I did not know that I was emailing back and forth with. Yeah, they were giving me quite a lot of notes and at the beginning I remember thinking, ‘I can’t do this.’ And I felt a lot of pressure. I would make changes – I would revise it – and then I would [send it] back thinking, is this good? […] I must have done that ten or more times. I felt like it was never going to be perfect and it was quite frustrating, but that was my first experience and I think because [it was] my first experience, it was [the] most difficult.

(John Interview 1)

The extract above shows John’s uncertainty regarding the revision process for his manuscript. He was not sure until it was finally accepted how many revisions needed to be made or how much time the process would take. The Editor appeared willing and able to view and comment on multiple drafts, but the sense of having made an open-ended commitment to revising his manuscript, and the stress this entailed, were issues John raised (this is returned to in 7.3.1). He does feel this experience helped him with his subsequent writing for publication, saying “from that experience I was able to kind of look at my own writing and say, ‘What are they going to think when they read this? What kind of comments could I expect?’ So, it was useful to have that in mind” (John Interview 1).
Regarding John’s outside-Japan book chapter (its text history is analyzed in 5.3.6 and its correspondence in 6.2.3), he explains the manuscript began as an outside-Japan conference proceedings paper:

…it was just a normal proceeding – so it’s going to be an in-house or an online little cheap thing – but the proceedings were solicited by one of the sponsors […] so after my paper was accepted for the proceeding they gave me a few notes and it was accepted and then maybe a month later I got the email […] Actually […] it’s gonna be in a book and it's gonna be on Amazon and now you’re going to be working with a British editor […] And then suddenly […] I got another email from them and they […] basically said that, “You need to rewrite 90% of the paper if we're gonna publish it.” And suddenly they’d sent so many notes and I'd realized so many things and I didn’t think it was going to make it. They said because it was going to be in a book they were cutting a lot of the papers out and I didn't think mine was going to make it. But finally it was. Those notes, I revised it I don't know how many more times, many, and then finally they accepted it… (John Interview 1)

John’s interview extract above shows the ambiguity he perceived in the publication and revision process for this manuscript, as it was not clear until quite late in the process whether his manuscript would be accepted or not (see also 6.2.3). It also illustrates the difference he perceives in prestige and quality between publication in conference proceedings, which he describes as ‘an in-house or an online little cheap thing’ and book publication, which he describes as ‘it was going to be in a book they were cutting a lot of the papers out’, demonstrating how he considers the book publication more
prestigious and thus more demanding in terms of quality than conference proceedings paper publication. This is further reinforced later in the interview, as John signals this book publication as setting him somewhat apart from and ahead of his colleagues in terms of his publication record, “And the book […] is not called proceedings, it’s called [book title] and it’s in my library now, so that was […] lucky. You know I've got this book now and I think some colleagues are kind of envious of that one. It was an accidental fluke” (John Interview 1). This change in the type of publication is tracked in the text history analysis in 5.3.6. However, John does have some mixed feelings about his published book chapter manuscript, as several errors persisted in the final version. As he states, “I looked back over the paper in the book and am still embarrassed by a couple of grammar mistakes/typos that made it into the final paper. Nothing I can do about it now, though.” (John Interview 3). He expands on the role he assumed the Editor of the book was going to fill in checking for errors in his manuscript, writing in an email:

I do feel though that the editor should have caught (and fixed) some of the mistakes/typos. I was pretty new to the publishing process at that time and expected the editor to iron out all the kinks before it was published. I’ve since learned that many editors don’t read through manuscripts very carefully. We’re all busy, I understand. Or they expect the author to hand in a perfect final draft. (John Interview 4)

John states that his process of writing for academic publication is quite different from his master’s coursework, as with his coursework he did not seek revision assistance or
advice, while with his writing for publication, he regularly revises his work through correspondence with official brokers. When asked why he did not seek revision assistance with his coursework, he answered, “the problem is, I would have loved to show [my coursework] to other students but the fact that I knew they weren't – I knew they could be better [than me] and I didn't have a lot of confidence. It felt awkward giving [them] my papers knowing that it's not good [...] It's difficult to get real friends – someone I know well” because “they might laugh or joke about it or bring it up, or think that, 'Oh you're not going to be great.' or 'I'm a much better writer than this guy.' They would always have that on me or they could hold that above me I guess. And I just don’t want to expose my weakness to someone I know” (John Interview 1). He goes on to add that time for commenting is also an issue:

The other reason is [...] that, I'm busy. My friends are busy. I don't want to bother people. I had a very interesting situation where I was [at a seminar outside Japan], and [...] a graduate student doing his MA [whose] research area was similar to mine [...] was asking my advice after my presentation and he asked if I would mind reading something and getting my notes and my advice on it. And a week later he sent me his entire MA thesis and that was 200 and something pages [...] I emailed him and said, I'll look at the first three chapters. I'll write back what I can with them. [...] I worry if I give my colleagues something to read, they're busy and they have families. (John Interview 1)

In contrast, John feels that with his writing for publication, “…working with a blind reviewer or editor that I've never met before, I felt much more comfortable with that. I felt more comfortable than giving it to a friend of mine personally” (John Interview 1).
Comparing the writing he does for publication now to his master’s coursework, he says the differences, “are huge” (John Interview 1), adding:

It looks like someone else wrote it. When I was taking the classes, there was no revision process, it was like I wrote it, handed it in, here’s the rating. That was the routine. […] So just the fact that working with an editor, working with someone who’s a much stronger writer than myself and giving me their advice and everything, it was really useful. But I’d never really done that before, I’d never worked with an editor or had help with my papers. All through school, university, there was never that process, it was just one time I write it, hand it in, that’s great. (John Interview 1)

Regarding pressure to publish, he notes that when changing full-time positions within his university to a new contract toward the end of his first contract, his university did not appear to place a high priority on publications. As he states:

…with this new contract I started last year […] it was a full-time lecturer job, but there was no initial publishing requirement which I thought was very strange. I had a four-year contract with another department and this job is helping right with my contract [nearly finishing] so I asked them if the […] publications help me […] and they said that they should help but they’re not required. (John Interview 1)

Within his current department, John has eight colleagues, and he notes that of the eight “Only a couple of the teachers are interested in publishing. There’s me and there [are]
two others that are actually publishing," which he feels may be related to the apparent lack of emphasis on writing for publication for faculty in his position at his university. John receives some annual research support money for conference travel and other expenses.

4.4 Analysis and synthesis of author experiences of writing for academic publication

Examining the seven authors’ profiles, while they are all involved in university English education in Japan, their heterogeneity is striking. This analysis of the author profiles from 4.3 examines three themes from their experiences that emerge to different extents across the profiles: issues of pressure to publish, support networks and writing for publication, and the nature of the authors’ research orientations.

4.4.1 Pressure to publish

In terms of why the authors write for publication, pressure to publish for employment reasons was present in all the authors’ accounts. They acknowledged expectations to publish at currently held positions and in preparation for applying to future positions. Two authors, Alan and David, noted employment pressure as a primary reason for writing for publication. Junpei and Kathy were both interested in becoming researchers in the future, seeing their writing for publication as part of that desired career trajectory. John was the only author who explicitly mentioned his employer not prioritizing publication.
Jordan mentions that in his current position he is expected to publish a manuscript every year. Considering the timeline of journal publication outside of Japan, with Jason and Alan's indexed journal manuscript taking two years to be published (see 5.3.1), and one of Junpei's manuscripts nearly three years (ultimately in a Japan-based journal; see 5.3.3), achieving this goal would require publishing at least some manuscripts in venues with a faster publication turnaround time than those typical of prestigious English language publications (Hargens, 1990). Jason's experience may be particularly illuminating in this respect, as he was told in the fourth year of his five-year contract that the expectation was for him to have produced at least 15 publications, just under four per year. Where he had published those 15 manuscripts did not seem to be as important as the number of publications in his case.

The authors considered outside-Japan publication to be more prestigious, with Junpei emphasizing his desire to publish outside Japan and Alan noting he felt it was important to his future job prospects. Jason considers his coauthored outside-Japan indexed journal publication particularly prestigious but feels less strongly about his outside-Japan book chapter publications, at one point saying that other than the journal article, he “hasn’t done anything outside of Japan” (Interview 1) despite having published two outside-Japan book chapters.

The authors have all published manuscripts outside Japan, although most of their work is published within Japan. One reason for this may be access, as authors who have to self-fund conference travel and research such as Junpei, Kathy, and Jordan (when he was working part-time) have cheaper and easier access to Japan conferences and by
extension Japan conference proceedings. Another may be the issue of pressure regarding frequency of publications mentioned above. Also, university kyo journals are published within Japan, which contributes to the number of Japan publications for the authors publishing in them. That most of the authors’ manuscripts are published in Japan suggests that while publishing manuscripts outside Japan is a part of the authors’ academic writing production, it is only a part. It is thus important to acknowledge their writing for publication within Japan in studying their writing for academic publishing practices.

As the one Japanese author profiled, it is impossible to generalize beyond Junpei’s specific circumstances. However, in contrast to the theme of the “problem” (Okamura, 2006, p. 69; see discussion in 2.6) of writing for publication in English emphasized in some of the literature on Japan-based authors writing for academic publication in English, Junpei acknowledges the extra work that comes with writing for publication in English but does not frame it as “problematic” (Flowerdew, 1999, p. 142). For Junpei, his writing for publication in English was a goal he set for himself as an undergraduate student as part of his desire to become a “researcher” working at a Japanese university who presents at “international conference[s]” and publishes in “international journal[s]” (Interview 1). This is not to say he does not face difficulties in writing in English. All the authors face difficulties in their writing for academic publication, as Chapters 5 and 6 further illustrate. Nonetheless, Junpei does not describe his writing in English as a problem to overcome but rather as a challenge he has set for himself to achieve.

Kathy, as a part-time adjunct lecturer, and Jordan, when he was working part-time, both noted the importance of writing for publication to securing further employment. While
not all part-time adjunct teaching positions in Japan explicitly state publications as part of the qualification requirements, the majority tend to require applicants to submit what one private university advertising for “part-time lecturer” positions referred to as a “List of publications and research/educational activities” (Document 2017-10-23-1), implying the expectation of some research activities and writing for publication on the part of applicants. Less commonly, universities explicitly outline publication requirements, such as one city university noting “2 publications minimum are required” for an advertised part-time position (Document 2017-11-4-1).

4.4.2 Access to resources and support networks facilitates writing for publication

The authors’ accounts reiterate what previous research has found, namely that writing for academic publication is a social endeavor with a variety of brokers involved in the production of manuscripts beyond the named authors (Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Lillis & Curry, 2010). Additionally, (lack of) access to material resources, such as access to academic articles and conference presentations, facilitates (and limits) the authors’ publishing activities.

Four of the six authors who studied for their postgraduate degrees from Japan appeared to be relatively well connected to research writing support networks. Jason, Jordan, and John benefitted from connections developed during their master’s coursework. For Jason this was through collaboration and consultation with his master’s supervisor and connections to his university’s alumni in Japan. For Jordan this
was through a network of students and alumni who facilitated his presenting and publishing. John benefited from his master’s supervisor’s support in presenting and publishing a conference proceedings paper. Junpei consulted and collaborated extensively with the students and faculty on his PhD program. David and Alan’s experiences were different. Alan felt his coursework did not sufficiently prepare him to write for publication, specifically regarding dealing with Reviewer evaluations and doing research. David felt his master’s coursework did not yield manuscripts with potential for publication or prepare him to write for publication. David chose where to work partly based on the hopes of collaborating with a colleague, and eventually developed some collaborative research relationships. Kathy, having completed her master’s coursework full time in North America before moving to Japan, felt the lack of a support network in Japan, and expressed difficulty developing one.

Presentations were important to the authors’ writing for publication activities. All the text histories analyzed in Chapter 5 include a conference presentation at some point in their trajectory. Table 4-2 summarizes the authors’ within-Japan and outside-Japan presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jason</th>
<th>Alan</th>
<th>David</th>
<th>Junpei</th>
<th>Kathy</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In JP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of JP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In JP</td>
<td>28 / 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In JP</td>
<td></td>
<td>In JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In JP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 in Japan in Japanese, 2 in Japan in English
Comparing Table 4-2 and Table 4-1, authors with more presentations have also published more, and conversely those with fewer presentations have fewer publications. Also, those employed full-time for longer periods appear to have given more presentations (Junpei being the exception), with David representing a mid-range in terms of five years of full-time employment. The only full-time PhD student, Junpei, stands out as having given many presentations, which is perhaps representative of the opportunities that receipt of grant funding and being part of an active PhD program can offer. Alan has participated in several teaching workshops across Asia, which raises the number of presentations he has given outside of Japan, potentially facilitated by his access to institutional support for conference travel and previous grant funding. Jason felt his presenting was part of being an active member of the community of English language teachers in Japan, noting that through doing conference presentations, opportunities opened for him to do invited presentations in Japan. Jordan noted that in addition to opportunities to publish in conference proceedings through presenting, by attending a conference outside Japan, he was invited to write a book review, demonstrating some of the potential secondary benefits of conference travel. John’s outside-Japan book chapter publication was originally a proceedings paper that later transformed into a contribution to an edited book. Kathy, the only adjunct teacher, has done considerably less presenting, perhaps representative of her lack of access to research funds to support conference travel. Jordan’s experience reinforces this conclusion, as after securing full-time employment (and thereby institutional financial support for research and conference travel), his frequency of conference presentations and academic publishing increased.
Where the authors publish (and in what language) appears to be relatively complex, author dependent, and facilitated (and restricted) by the resources the authors have (or lack) access to. Alan, Kathy, and John expressed a lack of knowledge about where to publish, especially at the beginning of their writing for academic publication. Alan explains how he came to understand that his earlier publications were generally rated quite poorly, leading him to seek more prestigious outside-Japan indexed journal publication. In John’s case, his master’s supervisor strongly encouraged him to present and publish, but when applying for an internal position, he was told his publications “should help” but were “not required” (John Interview 1). David, as full-time contract faculty, considered being able to publish in his university’s kiyo an advantage, as he could follow a publication process he describes as not including evaluative peer review and the probability of rejection (a description corroborated by Alan). On the other hand, Kathy, the one part-time adjunct teacher, did not have ready access to university kiyo journals. Jordan describes adding a full-time colleague as a named coauthor to access university kiyo publication when he was still working part-time. David viewed university kiyo publication as a safe way to ensure the minimum number of publications needed for future job applications, while gradually expanding his writing to include more diverse publication types, facilitated through collaborations he sought out. Jason sees himself continuing to write for Japan publication while simultaneously seeking publication outside Japan. Junpei expressed a strong preference for prestigious English medium writing for publication, although he has published in Japanese, and said his decision regarding which language to use for his writing for publication is dependent on the audience he is seeking to reach with his work.
4.4.3 Pedagogical research orientation

All the authors profiled here (and whose text histories are analyzed in Chapter 5) describe themselves as working within the field of second or foreign English language teaching and learning. Researchers within this field have raised as a prominent issue a “problematic gap between theory/research on the one hand and classroom practice on the other” (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014, p. xi), and so exploring the kind of research the authors profiled here are doing can help to illuminate the nature of their research and where it may fall relative to ‘theory/research on the one hand and classroom practice on the other’.

Junpei does not link his writing for publication to his classroom teaching practice, but rather appears to consider his research and writing for publication as separate from his adjunct teaching. On the other hand, the other six authors see their writing for publication as interlinked with their teaching, something Jason and Alan explicitly refer to as action research, while Kathy “never considered my projects to be action research” (Kathy Interview 34) rather seeing her research as “describing what I was doing in the classroom” (Kathy Interview 35). Kathy explicitly mentions seeking to address fellow teachers, a sentiment Jason, Alan, and John share. Jordan’s writing for publication expanded beyond classroom research into his PhD field, with two of his Japan journal articles related to his PhD research, which is outside of language learning and teaching. In addition, Jordan saw some of his writing for publication oriented toward his employers and potentially influencing internal university policies. David considered
future potential employers an audience for his university kiyo writing, seeing them as assessing his potential as a future employee at their institutions.

In considering the question of research/theory versus classroom research, five of the seven authors’ research is largely oriented toward classroom research. One of the seven, Junpei, is largely oriented toward research/theory. Jordan, who recently completed his PhD, shows a double orientation, one toward pedagogic classroom research and the other research/theory in the topic of his PhD.

A strong theme from Kathy’s profile was the issue of managing time to teach and time to research, a theme that also came out in Jordan’s experience working part-time prior to his taking a full-time contract position. For the full-time contract teachers this did not appear to be as much of an issue, and in Jordan’s case, he found that moving into full-time employment gave him the ability to spend more time and energy on research and writing for publication, lending some support to Kathy’s observation that teachers in full-time positions may be able to find more time for writing and research than teachers employed part-time.

4.5 Summary

This chapter has analyzed author profiles for the seven authors whose text histories are analyzed in the next chapter. The analysis and synthesis identified three emergent themes from the authors’ profiles: pressure to publish, access to human and material resources, and the pedagogical orientation of most of the authors’ writing for academic publication. These themes are returned to in the discussion of the contribution to knowledge that this thesis makes in 8.2.3.
5. How manuscripts change: Text history analysis

5.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the following research question:

2. What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions?

While some attention is paid to the correspondence associated with the manuscripts in this chapter, the focus is on how this correspondence leads to transformations in the manuscripts themselves, or what Lillis and Curry (2015) refer to as “uptake” (p. 132; also see 3.4.3). Analysis of author-broker correspondence is the focus of Chapter 6. This chapter tracks changes to manuscripts across distinct versions (Gosden, 1995; Daly, 2016), examining processes of manuscript revision during their publication trajectories (Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Lillis & Curry, 2010, 2015).

This chapter begins by describing the graphical representation developed to represent the six texts’ trajectories before presenting the six text history analyses. It then turns to three themes that emerge from the analysis: the volume of revision...
work, the brokers involved in the texts’ trajectories, including discussion of the importance of authors’ networks to writing for publication, and an examination of how the manuscripts changed. How the manuscripts changed was examined using the Change Heuristics (discussed in 3.4.3) for all six text history analyses, and included attention to where changes occurred, when they occurred in their trajectories towards publication, and the nature of the changes. The six text histories were analyzed to the same level of detail, including developing the graphical representations, the text history analyses presented in 5.3, and the Change Heuristics (a sample of which is extracted in Table 3-8).

5.2 Developing a graphic to represent the text histories

One challenge of qualitative research is the collection of complex data requiring organization and explanation (Silverman, 2011). This became evident in the investigation reported here as the volume and variability of manuscript versions, correspondence, and interview transcripts for each of the different authors and their manuscripts complicated understanding their trajectories and how their manuscripts changed. In organizing these different sources of information, it became apparent that a graphical representation of the manuscripts’ trajectories would be helpful. Such a graphic would serve three primary purposes. First it would facilitate explaining the complexity of the texts’ trajectories, mapping what work was done when and by who. Second, it would help to inform analysis, facilitating the “dialectical tacking between the most local of local detail and the most global of global structure in such a way as to bring both into view simultaneously” called for by Geertz (1974, p. 43), and one of the objectives of the methodological stance adopted by the investigation (see 3.2 for discussion of the orientation to knowledge
making taken in this thesis). Finally, it would serve as a frame for further analysis and discussion, as it would facilitate contextualizing manuscript version and correspondence data within a given text’s trajectory. The graphic developed draws on empirical data to represent the manuscripts’ trajectories while at the same time offering a global view of the overall path a given manuscript’s trajectory took.

Some graphical representations of manuscript trajectories have been published, but these have tended to represent idealized trajectories, rather than those of actual manuscripts. Writing from the perspective of a journal Editor, Weller (2001) offers one such representation, reproduced in Figure 5-1, which examines the processes manuscripts may go through at a journal, along with some of the possible decisions that may be made with respect to a submitted manuscript. Weller emphasizes the decision processes journals go through in evaluating submissions, foregrounding what the evaluator options are at different stages, and what the implications of these options are to a manuscript’s trajectory. The brokers or evaluators involved are not the focus of attention, and the brokers that authors may enlist outside of formal journal review and evaluation are not represented.
Figure 5.1. Weller’s (2001) “Path of a manuscript through the editorial review process” (p. 2)

Writing about the role “professional editors” (p. 223) play in revising manuscripts pre-review, Burrough-Boenisch (2003) used a graphic to represent the different “shapers” of a hypothetical “NNS-authored” manuscript (Figure 5-2). In this graphic, the brokers in the trajectory are foregrounded while how they shape and evaluate the manuscript is backgrounded.
Finally, Lillis and Curry (2006) represented the brokers involved in text production along with their orientations toward manuscript revisions (Figure 5-3), examining different types of broker and the kinds of changes they made to manuscripts. In their representation, the different brokers and the kinds of changes they initiate are
foregrounded while the stages where these changes occur in a manuscript's trajectory is not the focus of attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF BROKER</th>
<th>TEXT EXTRACT</th>
<th>BROKER COMMENT/ ACTION</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>We could say that the target group participants are more middle-class than the random sample participants.</td>
<td>Query by broker Isn't this a bit problematic. What do you mean by middle class?</td>
<td>Knowledge content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 1: General academic</td>
<td>Reformulations made to text by broker Correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between mental rotation ability and intelligence subtests (Table 2 and 3). The result indicated a negative correlation between verbal abilities and performance time of mental rotations.</td>
<td>Target journal conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2: Discipline specialist</td>
<td>The evaluation of the X methodology is discussed and recommendations for intervention activities are proposed.</td>
<td>Section deleted by broker</td>
<td>Disciplinary conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 3: Subfield specialist</td>
<td>She enjoyed attending school and her school notes were very good at first grade.</td>
<td>Corrections to lexical item and preposition made by broker She enjoyed attending school and her school marks were very good in the first grade.</td>
<td>Specialist discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 4: LANGUAGE PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>Research was undertaken on 5 locations.</td>
<td>Correction to preposition made by broker Research was undertaken in 5 locations.</td>
<td>Sentence level changes/corrections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5-3. Lillis and Curry’s (2006) “Representation of brokers involved in academic text production” (p. 15)*

The graphics presented above capture only narrow aspects of a given text’s trajectory. The challenge posed by the investigation reported here, and the contribution this research can potentially make, is in developing a more
comprehensive representation of manuscript trajectories. The representation developed organizes complex empirical data to map the trajectories of the manuscripts, including information about the brokers involved, changes made to the manuscripts, evaluations received, and the timeline of publication. Chronology was used to organize the information presented (an element not included in the three Figures discussed above), as it facilitated mapping data across a given text’s trajectory. Different manuscript versions were added to represent the different parts of the trajectories. Next, the different brokers, processes, and evaluations within the manuscript trajectories were included. Finally, the different versions of the manuscripts were compared to give an approximate picture of how much the manuscripts changed during their trajectories (see 3.4.3 for discussion of the manuscript comparison process). Thus, the text history analysis graphic developed tracks the trajectories of the texts analyzed, focusing on the process, the brokers, their evaluations, and the number of changes made across versions. Junpei’s graphic is used as an example in Figure 5-4. The different elements of the graphic are discussed in detail below.
Figure 5-4. Sample text history analysis graphic: Junpei's Japan journal manuscript

At the top of Figure 5-4, ① includes the timeline for the text history, with each date representing submission of a manuscript to a broker or the return of an evaluation. The second arrow from the top, colored blue, tracks the changes from the earliest available version of the manuscript, Version 1, to the final available version of the manuscript, summarizing the total number of changes made. The text immediately under the blue arrow tracks changes from version to version.

In two cases the final published version of the manuscript was not available for analysis (Junpei’s Japan journal manuscript, Figure 5-7, and John’s outside-Japan book chapter, Figure 5-10). When this was the case, the version used as the final for the manuscript change analysis is noted.

In the middle of Figure 5-4, ② includes blue rectangular boxes summarizing key manuscript versions, usually submitted to brokers or publications and sometimes received from brokers, including information about manuscript length (in words) and
where the manuscript was submitted to or received from. The white rectangular boxes summarize the evaluations returned. There is some information about the extent of the comments made on each version of the manuscript, either by quantifying the length of an evaluation (in words or characters) or the number of changes or comments made. Where possible, quotations from the data are used to illustrate broker titles and the evaluations provided.

At the bottom of Figure 5-4, includes arrows tracking changes in the working lives of the authors relevant to the text trajectory, such as changes in work or study circumstances. This at least partially illustrates the authors aren’t exclusively working on their writing for academic publication during the periods represented but are rather engaged in several different academic pursuits in addition to writing for academic publication.

One of the shortcomings of the kind of idealized representations of text trajectories presented by Weller (2001) and Burrough-Boenisch (2003) is that the different brokers involved in a specific text’s trajectory may be oversimplified. For example, using the label ‘Reviewer’ may suggest that all Reviewers are performing similar evaluative tasks across journals and manuscripts. As one of the objectives of the research presented here is to develop an emic, data-centered view of the manuscript publication and revision process, attention has been given in the discussion that follows to using labels for brokers as they appear in the correspondence provided by authors. Quotations and citations to primary sources are included at first mention for each of the different text histories to indicate how the brokers were referred to in the correspondence.
It is important to note that the investigation in this thesis only examines manuscript versions and correspondence provided by the authors for analysis, and so the actual text trajectories are likely to be much more complicated than what is depicted. However, the graphic offers a rich visual representation of complex trajectories that can help illuminate the processes manuscripts go through before they are published.

5.3 The text history analyses: Examining how the manuscripts change

5.3.1 Outside-Japan indexed journal: Jason and Alan’s text history analysis

This is the only available manuscript in the dataset that was successfully submitted to and published in an outside-Japan indexed journal. Its trajectory is shown in Figure 5-5. There are two authors, Jason, profiled in 4.3.1 and Alan, profiled in 4.3.2. They began their research collaboration as full-time colleagues at the same university and after completing limited term contracts moved to different universities in the spring of 2013 (bottom arrow in Figure 5-5), although they continued to collaborate on some writing for publication and classroom research projects, including the manuscript analyzed here. Alan was interested in publishing in “a publication that was a journal publication and international – outside Japan” (Alan Interview 1; see 4.3.2). Jason explained his interest in the target journal as seeking to take his writing and research “to the next level” and an “exciting opportunity” (Jason Interview 1; see 4.3.1). The journal was suggested by Alan for its reputation for accepting practice-based language teaching research, and their investigation was planned and conducted with this journal in mind. The classroom research began in spring 2011. Jason and Alan had a proposal accepted for a Japan
conference in November of that same year (the entry for 2011.11 in Figure 5-5). Jason explained the research presentation was integral to the completion of the project, as it provided an impetus to organize and analyze their data. Jason encountered a friend through his master’s studies at the conference who was on the Editorial Board of the journal and who offered to read the manuscript before submission for peer review. After their presentation, Jason and Alan spent more than a year preparing Version 1 of the manuscript, which they sent to Jason’s editorial board member friend for comment in the spring of 2013. This contact read and commented on Versions 1 and 2 of the manuscript (Figure 5-5) before submission of Version 3 to the target journal in October 2013 (Figure 5-5) which completed the pre-submission part of the manuscript’s trajectory.

Version 3 was submitted to the target journal with the ‘Editor’ responding, including Reviewers’ comments and an ‘Editor’s note’ with additional explanation of the revisions required (MS28Email13). Between Versions 3 and 4, as the authors worked to address the “methodological issues” raised by the Reviewers and marked as important by the Editor (MS28Email13), Jason and Alan consulted me as a colleague and someone they knew with experience of publishing about how to revise their manuscript (see 3.4.3 for a discussion of my role in the research). My advice to expand their data analysis led to Version 4 of the manuscript which was sent to the target journal as a “re-submission” (MS28Email13). Jason and Alan received the review results from the Editor with the decision, “it will not be necessary for the article to be reviewed by the Panel” (MS28Email15), indicating another review would not be necessary. In addition to the reviews of their manuscript, the
Editor included a request for further explanation of the teaching intervention Jason and Alan’s manuscript describes.

Next Jason and Alan used the evaluations of Version 4 to revise their manuscript, submitting Version 5 to the journal May 2014 (Figure 5-5). This initiated journal “copyediting,” where Jason and Alan were contacted about additional changes (MS28Email17). The manuscript’s appendix was expanded at the Editor’s request, resulting in the large increase in word count between Version 5 and 6 (Figure 5-5). Between Version 6 and 7 there were several formatting changes applied by the journal Copyeditor, which accounts for the changes tracked in Figure 5-5, as the text of the manuscript wasn’t significantly changed, but there was a considerable amount of formulaic text added when the Microsoft Word document was converted into the journal’s published PDF format, including a running header, journal issue and volume numbers, DOI information, and page numbers.
Figure 5-5. Publication trajectory of Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal manuscript
5.3.2 Outside-Japan journal: David’s text history analysis

David is profiled in 4.3.3. His outside-Japan journal paper’s trajectory is shown in Figure 5-6. This paper is his first publication outside Japan, and his first “reviewed” (MS22Email4) paper. The publication opportunity came after he gave a presentation for an outside-Japan conference, when the language teacher association that organizes the conference sent an email inviting him to contribute a paper based on his presentation to the association’s journal, with a deadline of less than a week to submit for consideration for the journal’s earliest issue. David prepared a manuscript for submission before the deadline (Version 1 in Figure 5-6) and emailed it to the specified Editor, Editor 1 in Figure 5-6. Receipt was acknowledged by Editor 2 and a consolidated review document, contributed to by an unspecified number of Reviewers, was returned by Editor 2 with the invitation for David to “revise the paper along the lines outlined” for the journal to “consider your submission again” (MS22Email4; dated 2013-6 in Figure 5-6). David independently revised his manuscript and resubmitted Version 2. David was then contacted by Editor 3, who interacted with David for the remainder of the paper’s trajectory. This email from Editor 3 is the first indication in the correspondence that the manuscript is likely to be published, with the Editor writing, “There are no major changes to content to be made at this stage…” (MS22Email9), implying the manuscript has been (at least tentatively) accepted for publication. Until this point in the journal’s evaluation process it was unclear from the correspondence whether the manuscript was going to be accepted for publication, and prior correspondence from the journal included explicit mention of the possibility of rejection; “In the past, not all papers were accepted” (MS22Email4). David made additional revisions in Versions 3, 4, and 5. From
Version 6 Editor 3 mentions “a copy editing process” (MS22Email16) with changes made by the journal staff that conclude with Version 7 (Figure 5-6). The journal staff also appear to have made changes between the version David saw for final approval, Version 7, and the final published version of the manuscript, Version 8 (Figure 5-6). Unfortunately not all of the versions of the manuscript were available for analysis, so the versions used for this text history analysis include the first submitted version of the manuscript (Version 1 in Figure 5-6), the last three prepublication versions of the manuscript (Versions 5, 6, & 7 in Figure 5-6) and the final published version of the manuscript (Version 8 in Figure 5-6), along with 19 emails between David and the three Editors and the Reviews of Version 1 (Figure 5-6).
Figure 5-6. Publication trajectory of David’s outside-Japan journal manuscript
5.3.3 Japan journal: Junpei’s text history analysis

As explained in 4.3.4, this text began as Junpei’s English medium undergraduate graduation thesis. Junpei developed data from his thesis into a joint Japan conference presentation with his undergraduate thesis supervisor, then initially coauthored Version 1 with his supervisor (Figure 5-7). The publication trajectory analyzed here spans about two years, from initial submission of Version 1 to the first journal to acceptance of Version 5 for publication at the third journal (Figure 5-7). Version 1 was initially submitted during Junpei’s first year as a master’s student in language education at a Japanese national university (different from his private undergraduate university) and was accepted for publication during his first year of PhD study at the same university (the bottommost arrow in Figure 5-7).

Version 1 was reviewed by three Reviewers at the first (English language medium) Japan journal and “rejected” (不採用; where original correspondence was in Japanese the original is included in parentheses along with English translations in double quotations) in a decision letter sent from the “Chairman” (委員長) of the “Bulletin Editorial Board” (紀要編集委員会) to Junpei along with three Japanese medium reviews (MS3Doc1; Figure 5-7). Junpei believed the rejection was because he and his supervisor, “did not have enough time to revise and rewrite” (Junpei Interview 2) the manuscript before the deadline for submitting it for review. As described in 4.3.4, his undergraduate supervisor then encouraged him to submit the manuscript to a “more prestigious journal”, but after reading a revised version of the manuscript (not available
for analysis and therefore not tracked in Figure 5-7) his supervisor decided it was “not the quality for [an] international journal” (Junpei Interview 2). This led Junpei to submit Version 2 as a single author to an international indexed journal (Figure 5-7; see also 4.3.4). Figure 5-7 tracks Junpei’s undergraduate thesis supervisor as a coauthor through Version 1 of the manuscript in the third arrow from the bottom of Figure 5-7, followed by Junpei as the sole author after Version 1. Junpei revised Version 1 into Version 2 largely independently, although he mentioned consulting an Australian colleague for language checks (intermediate versions of these checks were not available for analysis). Version 2 was reviewed by one Reviewer and rejected (dated 2012-9 in Figure 5-7). Junpei received a decision letter from the “Co-Editors” of the journal stating, “we cannot proceed any further with your submission” along with comments from one “referee” (MS1Email1). Following rejection of Version 2, Junpei revised the manuscript into Version 3, which he submitted to the second (mixed language medium, English and Japanese) Japan journal, where faculty on his master’s and PhD courses are Editors and Reviewers (Figure 5-7; see also 4.3.4). Three Reviewers from this third journal “examined” (審査を行ってまいりました) the manuscript and the journal’s “Editor-in-Chief” (紀要編集員長) returned the decision of “Re-examine” (再審査する) along with evaluations from three “referees” (査読者), two Japanese medium and one English medium, dated 2013-6 in Figure 5-7 (MS3Doc3). Junpei revised the manuscript and submitted Version 4 for another evaluation, which included comments from one Reviewer (dated 2011-9 in Figure 5-7), returning an evaluation accepting the manuscript as a “Research Note” (採択（リサーチ・ノート
(MS3Doc4). Following this, Junpei further revised his manuscript into Version 5, the version accepted as a Research Note for publication (Figure 5-7).
Figure 5-7. Publication trajectory of Junpei’s Japan journal manuscript
5.3.4 Outside-Japan conference proceedings: Jordan’s text history analysis

Jordan is profiled in 4.3.5. This text history, represented in Figure 5-7, analyzes a conference proceedings paper based on his first outside-Japan conference presentation, given in an Anglophone country with his longtime research collaborator, a colleague from his part-time self-access center work. Two months after the conference they received an invitation to submit a “long summary” paper (JordanMS16Email1). Jordan and his colleague responded with a manuscript submission (Version 1 in Figure 5-7) which was “peer reviewed” by two Reviewers and returned to Jordan and his coauthor “subject to alterations” (MS16Email4, dated 2013-3 in Figure 5-8). The reviews and decision were sent when Jordan was outside of Japan and he and his coauthor did not respond. The Editors sent two follow-up messages about a month apart, inquiring about the status of revisions and seeking permission to republish in the proceedings a summary of the conference, unrelated to Jordan’s submitted manuscript, that Jordan had published in a Japan journal. Jordan and his coauthor replied to the second follow-up message to first confirm resubmission was still possible, then revised the manuscript over a weekend, sending the revised file, Version 2 in Figure 5-8, two days after the second reminder message. Jordan also secured permission for the republication of his conference summary in separate emails. The Editors replied with further change requests tracked in the document (Version 3 in Figure 5-7) which resulted in a final prepublication version of the manuscript (Version 4 in Figure 5-7). The Editors made further changes for “minor typos” (Jordan MS16
Email9) to Version 4 without consulting the authors before online publication (Version 5 in Figure 5-7).
Figure 5-8. Publication trajectory of Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings
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5.3.5 Japan conference proceedings: Kathy’s text history analysis

Kathy, as her profile in 4.3.6 explains, was working part-time at a university and private language schools in Japan when she gave her first presentation at a Japan conference in November 2011. The proceedings manuscript analyzed here is Kathy’s first academic publication. Before submitting her manuscript, she asked her father and a university language teacher colleague to read and comment on it (Version 1 in Figure 5-9). Their comments and change suggestions (Versions 2 and 3 in Figure 5-9) were consolidated into Version 4 (Figure 5-9) which was submitted to the conference proceedings. Two of the three Reviewers included in-text comments and change suggestions (Versions 5 and 6 in Figure 5-9). Kathy was assigned an Editor to consult on the revision process and instructed “to consider all the Reviewers’ comments carefully as you revise” (KathyMS24Email1, dated 2011-3 in Figure 5-9).

The Editor assigned to Kathy instructed her to complete her revisions in two weeks, asking her to, “please revise your paper addressing all the comments, suggestions and questions from the Reviewers. Then, send it to me” (KathyMS24Email3). While preparing Version 7 Kathy solicited guidance from this Editor, writing in an email, “I’ve revised my paper according to the reviewers [sic] comments. I’m still struggling with an appropriate conclusion” (KathyMS24Email4). The Editor’s reply instructed her to, “First, complete your Conclusion, and check the format of all the paper. I am waiting for your (completely) revised paper” (KathyMS24Email5). Kathy sent Version 7 to this Editor April 2011 (Figure 5-9). July 28th Kathy received an email from the Editor asking her to address 48 points (Figure 5-9). In follow-up correspondence the same day, the Editor
added, “We have very little time. Just add all the missing information and make all the necessary corrections in the text (following my suggestions) as soon as possible. […] It would be nice if you could send me the final revised text by tomorrow” (KathyMS24Email9). Kathy also had grades due to her university the same day but prioritized revising her manuscript and returned it to the Editor the following day as Version 8 (Figure 5-9). This was the version accepted for publication. It went through a layout process where the proceedings formatting and styling was added and was ultimately published online September 2011. Unfortunately, no correspondence was available for analysis between Kathy and the proceedings staff after Version 8 of the manuscript, so this correspondence history finishes with submission of Version 8 to Kathy’s Editor. Version 9 in Figure 5-9 is the published PDF.
Figure 5-9. Publication trajectory of Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings manuscript
5.3.6 Outside-Japan book chapter: John’s text history analysis

John is profiled in 4.3.7. The text history analyzed here is his first book chapter publication and his first publication outside Japan other than conference proceedings papers. This opportunity to publish came after he gave a presentation at a conference outside Japan. He independently prepared and submitted this manuscript as a conference proceedings paper (Version 1 in Figure 5-10) which was evaluated by one Reviewer (dated 2011-7 in Figure 5-10), with the Editor writing, “I am pleased to inform you that your paper for [Publication Name] has been selected for the proceedings” (JohnMS19Email2).

John then revised Version 1, although examining his account of the publication process (John Interview 1, see 4.3.7), there appears to be correspondence missing between July and December 2011 where versions of the manuscript and evaluations unavailable for analysis were likely exchanged (see John’s comments on the process in 4.3.7). This is one reason for the simplicity of the publication trajectory depicted in Figure 5-10 relative to the other text histories analyzed in 5.3, as the record of John’s manuscript during the period where the Editor announced the change from a proceedings publication to an edited book is unfortunately incomplete. The next version of the manuscript available for analysis was Version 2, sent from John to the Editor December 2011 (Figure 5-10).

The Editor replied with further change requests in Version 3. John integrated these into Version 4 (Figure 5-10) then the Editor requested further changes (Version 5 in Figure
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5-10). John made these changes in Version 6 (Figure 5-10), which was accepted for publication, with the book released April 2012 as a small print academic book published by a UK-based academic press (Version 7 in Figure 5-10). Version 6 is the last prepublication manuscript available for analysis, and it is unclear whether there was further correspondence with John regarding layout and copyediting changes to the manuscript. While he doesn’t remember receiving any such correspondence, his email history from that time is incomplete. Only six of the ten published manuscript pages were available for analysis in PDF form.
Figure 5-10. Publication trajectory of John’s outside-Japan book chapter
5.4 Analysis and synthesis of the text histories

The discussion now returns to how the text histories analyzed in 5.3 help to answer the research question addressed in this chapter:

What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions?

Drawing on the text history analyses, three key themes are explored here in answering the questions posed:

- The volume of revision and of evaluation work (5.4.1);
- The importance of authors’ networks in writing for academic publication (5.4.2); and
- The changes made to the manuscripts, including in which sections of the manuscripts, when in their trajectory, and by whom (5.4.3).

While the three key themes discussed below were evident across all six of the manuscripts, in the sections that follow specific manuscripts are used as illustrative examples to evidence the claims made. The Change Codes for the six manuscripts in their Change Heuristics (see 3.4.3, specifically Table 3-8) are referred to in the sections that follow. The Change Codes are explained in Table 3-7. Briefly, the numbered codes stand for:

1  Additions
2  Deletions
3  Reformulation
4  Reshuffling
5.4.1 Volume of revision and evaluation work

This section discusses the volume of revision and of evaluation work in the text history analyses. The implications of this work for changes to the manuscripts is discussed in more detail in the following sections.

All the text history analyses involved several rounds of submission, feedback, and revision which included evaluations and revisions by brokers (the brokers involved are discussed in 5.4.2) in addition to drafting and revision work. Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper text history analysis (5.3.5) involves the largest number of manuscript versions at nine (Figure 5-9). However, Kathy’s manuscript trajectory may not involve more revision work than the other manuscripts analyzed. Rather, the larger number of versions in her text history analysis may reflect greater completeness of the data available for analysis. For example, Junpei mentioned manuscript versions used for language checks that were not provided for analysis, John’s outside-Japan book chapter appears to have involved additional correspondence not available for analysis, and Jason and Alan’s manuscript included my commenting on an interim version between Versions 3 and 4 not available for analysis (for discussion of completeness with respect to the text history analyses, see 3.4.3). Thus, while the text histories analyzed do offer a valuable
means to make visible how manuscripts are revised during their trajectories, caution is also required regarding the conclusions drawn.

One way to visualize the extent of changes made to the manuscripts during their trajectories is to map the number of Change Codes for each of the six manuscripts in their Change Heuristics (see 5.4 for an explanation of the Change Codes). As the six manuscripts were different lengths, the number of Change Codes per 100 words was used to create a relative metric so the manuscripts’ changes could be compared. This is represented in Figure 5-11. Appendix G contains the raw Change Code counts for the Change Heuristics produced for the six text history analyses.
Figure 5-11. Change Codes per 100 words for the six text history analyses
While it is difficult to identify a pattern from the Change Codes charted in Figure 5-11, it does show that across all six of the text history analyses the manuscripts were changed extensively between their first and final published versions, empirically signaling the extent of revisions.

The two ‘non-native speaker of English’ authors, Junpei and Jordan, do not appear to have Change Codes unique from the other authors in Figure 5-11. Additionally, with all the manuscripts exhibiting Sentence level changes/corrections (code 8), author language background did not appear to be a predictor of Sentence level changes and corrections in these manuscripts’ histories.

Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper appears to involve fewer changes across all the Change Codes (Figure 5-11). This could suggest that had the brokers judged the manuscript to require more changes, it might have been rejected after the first official evaluation (Version 3 in Figure 5-5). This is what a similar type of journal did with Junpei’s manuscript, rejecting it following one round of evaluation (Version 2 in Figure 5-7). The relatively smaller number of changes to Jason and Alan’s manuscript could also be indicative of their greater experience of writing for publication relative to the other authors profiled (see 4.3 for the author profiles).

The complexity of the changes made to the manuscripts and the difficulty of identifying specific patterns across text types or author backgrounds is illustrated by the Addition (code 1), Deletion (code 2), and Publishing convention (code 10) changes in Figure 5-11. Examining Additions, David, Junpei, Jordan, and Kathy’s manuscripts appear to cluster somewhat, with David, Jordan, and Kathy’s clustering around Deletions, and with Publishing convention David and Jordan appear to
cluster separately from Junpei and Kathy. This may suggest that at least with these texts and these authors, there isn’t one single characteristic, such as author language background or publication type, that can account for the types of changes made to the manuscripts. Rather, the manuscript revisions appear to be locally specific to the contexts in which they were produced, with the volume of revision work standing out across all six text history analyses.

In addition to the volume of changes, another substantial component of the six text history analyses was the volume of broker evaluations. Junpei’s Japan journal manuscript was ultimately read and evaluated by seven Reviewers and at least one Editor before publication (the brokers involved are discussed in 5.4.2, specifically Table 5-2). While Junpei wrote his manuscript in English, the correspondence he received from the Japan-based journals was largely in Japanese (Table 5-1). Statistics for the lengths of the reviews, both in translation and the original Japanese, are included in Table 5-1. All three initial reviews (Versions 1, 2, & 3 in Figure 5-7) included an evaluation of nearly 1,000 words that discussed the manuscript in detail (Table 5-1). This length approximates the average review length (1,009 words) of the “Major revisions” reviews in Paltridge (2017, p. 27). At almost 4,300 words in total, the brokers’ evaluations of Junpei’s manuscript are about half the word count of his published manuscript (Table 5-1, also see Figure 5-7), illustrating the extensive amount of work that went into evaluating it across the three different journals it was submitted to.

Turning to Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal manuscript, in addition to Jason’s Editorial Advisory Board member friend, the manuscript was read and evaluated by three Reviewers, the Editor, and a Copyeditor before publication (Figure 5-5). The journal had a strict word count limit, and unlike Junpei’s
manuscript, there is not an increase in their manuscript’s word count from Version 1 to Version 5 (Figure 5-5; Table 5-4). The Editor’s evaluation of Version 5 included a request to expand the appendices, which contributed to the increase in word count with Version 6 (Figure 5-5; Table 5-4). Illustrating how substantial the broker evaluations were, at a total of about 2,200 words, they were about half the length of the main text of the manuscript and one third of the full published manuscript, including the End matter (Table 5-4). While this is relatively shorter than for Junpei’s manuscript, Jason and Alan’s manuscript was only submitted to one journal, whereas Junpei’s was submitted to three different journals before it was published, and Junpei’s manuscript was evaluated more times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version¹</th>
<th>Broker(s)</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>English word/ Japanese character count</th>
<th>Version²</th>
<th>Broker(s)</th>
<th>English word count</th>
<th>Version³</th>
<th>Broker(s)</th>
<th>English word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>246 / 460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Editors</td>
<td>61 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 2</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>971 / 1,790</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>98 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 3</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>254 / 436</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 2</td>
<td>201 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reviewer 4</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reviewer 2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Editors’ changes tracked in MS</td>
<td>49 insertions, 40 deletions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 5 (A)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proofreading changes (authors not consulted)</td>
<td>78 insertions, 69 deletions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reviewer 6 (B)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>183 / 378</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reviewer 3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 7 (C)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>915 / 1,663</td>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 3</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>255 / 466</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Copyeditor &amp; Editor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>11 comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 3</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ see Figure 5-7 for details of each version  
² see Figure 5-5 for details of each version  
³ See Figure 5-8 for details regarding each version
Finally, comparing the evaluations of Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings manuscript to the evaluations of Junpei’s and Jason and Alan’s manuscript, Jordan’s are shorter (Table 5-1) and appear to lead to fewer changes. For Jordan’s manuscript, between Versions 1 and 2 (Figure 5-8) there are 19 insertions, 20 deletions, and 2 moves (see definition 3.4.3) versus 131, 151, and 8 respectively for Jason and Alan’s post-review revisions of Version 3 (Figure 5-5) and 154, 145, and 10 for Junpei’s post-review revisions of Version 3 (Figure 5-7). While Jordan’s manuscript is significantly shorter, a quarter the length of Jason and Alan’s manuscript, these changes are still relatively fewer, even after adjusting for differences in manuscript length. The shorter evaluations may reflect the shorter length of Jordan’s manuscript, although at nearly 300 words, the reviews are more than 25% the word count of the published manuscript (Table 5-1, see also Figure 5-8). The text trajectory of Jordan’s manuscript is different from Junpei’s and Jason’s and Alan’s in that after resubmission of the revised manuscript following review there were a considerable number of revisions made by the Editors: 53 insertions and 42 deletions (Version 3 in Figure 5-8). Furthermore, after author approval of these changes, comparing the final published manuscript (Version 5 in Figure 5-8) with the author approved (Version 4) manuscript, further changes were made by the proceedings staff between Versions 4 and 5: 78 insertions and 69 deletions (author versus broker responsibility for revising manuscripts is returned to in 6.2).

To summarize the main theme of this section, all six of the text histories evidenced a considerable amount of revision and evaluation work throughout their trajectories. Author language background did not appear to be predictive of the kinds of changes made and all six manuscripts exhibited sentence level changes/corrections (code 8 in Figure 5-11). The significance of the changes made are discussed in 5.4.3.
5.4.2 Importance of networks to writing for publication

This section examines who the authors interacted with during their texts’ trajectories and the significance of these interactions for publication. It begins with a summary and discussion of the different brokers, official and unofficial, who interacted with the authors during the text histories analyzed in 5.3. Next, the significance of a feature common to all six of the text histories analyzed, that their trajectories began with conference presentations, is discussed. The different brokers that interacted with the authors and acted on their texts are summarized in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2. Brokers who interacted with the manuscripts during their trajectories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broker</th>
<th>Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper</th>
<th>David’s outside-Japan journal paper</th>
<th>Junpei’s Japan journal paper</th>
<th>Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings paper</th>
<th>Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper</th>
<th>John’s outside-Japan book chapter paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Official Brokers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyeditor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unofficial Brokers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>at least 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend &amp; Journal EAB Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-2 illustrates that all the manuscripts include multiple official brokers, and in some cases just how many official brokers is not immediately obvious. For example, how many Reviewers read and evaluated David’s outside-Japan journal paper was not clear, as the Reviewers’ comments were consolidated and not consistently distinguished between in the review document he received. Also, three of the
manuscripts, Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings paper, Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper, and John’s outside-Japan book chapter exhibited changes between the final author approved version and the published version, although there was either no correspondence between the publications and the authors regarding these changes or the authors did not provide this communication for analysis.

Examining unofficial brokers, at least three of the six manuscripts’ trajectories include them (Table 5-2): two of the three journal article text history analyses, including Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper and Junpei’s Japan journal paper, along with Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper.

Junpei’s text trajectory includes at least one colleague who did multiple language checks of his manuscript. Kathy, North American and a ‘native speaker’ of English, also asked two unofficial brokers, her father (Family in Table 5-2) and a colleague, to look over her manuscript before she submitted it (Versions 2 & 3 in Figure 5-9). Interestingly, these are also the two authors who were explicitly told in reviews that there were language problems with their manuscripts, a topic returned to in 7.3.3. Also salient is David’s observation that he did not know an unofficial broker to ask to look over his manuscript (see 4.3.3), along with the extremely short one-week period he had to write and submit his manuscript to make the journal’s earliest available issue (returned to in 6.3.2), suggesting had he had the time and known the right people, he may have sought feedback from an unofficial broker. He did seek such support for other manuscripts whose text histories were not analyzed in this chapter.
Jason and Alan and Junpei differ from Kathy in that their unofficial brokers also happen to, at least in some cases, be affiliated with the journals they were seeking to publish in. In Jason and Alan’s case, a journal Editorial Advisory Board Member friend of Jason’s commented on two versions of their manuscript before they submitted it for review (Figure 5-5). In Junpei’s case, he notes that the Reviewers and Editors of the journal he ultimately published in include his academic supervisors (see 4.3.4).

That Jason and Alan’s and Junpei’s manuscripts were aimed toward relatively more prestigious publications and they also included more, and more academic, unofficial brokers is likely not a coincidence. Jason and Alan seemed aware of the difficulty of publishing in their target journal from the start of their project and sought to mitigate this difficulty through enlisting a variety of different unofficial brokers to help them understand and navigate the writing and revision process (see 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and Figure 5-5). Jason felt this support was instrumental to the successful publication of their manuscript in their preferred journal, commenting that the pre-submission feedback improved their manuscript to the point where it was not rejected outright after the first review. He also felt that the assistance they received in interpreting a specific Reviewer request, examined in 5.4.3, was instrumental to their ability to change their manuscript to meet the official brokers’ expectations. Junpei, after unsuccessful attempts to publish in a prestigious Japan journal and a prestigious outside-Japan indexed journal, noted that he chose the third and final Japan journal because he was familiar with its Editorial and Review staff (see 4.3.4). More prestigious publication tending to be associated with more, and more experienced,
academic brokers was also a finding Lillis and Curry (2010) observed among the authors and manuscripts they analyzed (see also 2.3).

The overlap between what have been referred to here as ‘Official’ and ‘unofficial’ brokers in some cases should also be acknowledged. The Journal Editorial Advisory Board Member Jason and Alan consulted was counted in Table 5-2 as an unofficial broker because that individual was not involved in the journal’s official review and evaluation of their manuscript (to their knowledge), and so was acting in an unofficial capacity with respect to their manuscript. In a text history analysis where this same individual reviewed a manuscript for the journal, they would be counted as an official broker in Table 5-2, demonstrating the relational nature of these categories. An important point here is that much of the literature on manuscript reviews reviewed in 2.5 would not have included this broker’s unofficial feedback to the authors (with Lillis and Curry, 2010 an important exception), as that activity falls outside the purview of official journal review systems. The above analysis helps to demonstrate the significant amount of different types of brokering involved in academic text production.

Another aspect of the networking involved in the six manuscripts’ trajectories is that they were all presented as conference presentations, and the authors generally felt presenting their work was instrumental to their publishing it. Conference presentations were also important in enabling author access to brokers and publication opportunities in several cases.

The importance of conference presentations to the manuscript trajectories is most obvious in the case of the conference proceedings papers: Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings paper and Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper.
where conference presentation was a precondition to publication. Also included in this list is Junpei’s Japan journal paper, which was initially submitted to a Japan journal that required the paper to have been presented at the journal association’s conference (Version 1 in Figure 5-7) and John’s outside-Japan book chapter, which began as an outside-Japan conference proceedings paper (Version 1 in Figure 5-10) before the proceedings became an edited book and his manuscript one of the chapters in the book (from Version 2 in Figure 5-10). Therefore, presenting at the conference was effectively a precondition to publishing a chapter in the book. David’s outside-Japan journal paper publication opportunity came in an email from the association that hosted an outside-Japan conference he had presented at, inviting presenters to submit manuscripts to the association’s journal (dated 2013.3 in Figure 5-6), so while submission of a manuscript to the journal without first presenting at the association’s conference was possible, in David’s case publishing his manuscript in that particular journal was linked to his having presented at the conference.

Even in the case of Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper, Jason felt their commitment to present their research at a Japan conference helped him to persevere in the data analysis. Jason noted that without the necessity to present at the Japan conference, he believed he would have likely dropped the project altogether because of the difficulty of interpreting their data. Furthermore, Jason happened to meet his journal Editorial Advisory Board Member friend at the conference, who offered to give feedback on their manuscript prior to submitting it for review. If Jason and Alan had not attended the conference they may not have persevered in analyzing their data, and if Jason had not met his friend there, he may
not have been able to solicit the feedback they did before they submitted their
manuscript for review. This could have resulted in rejection after an initial review,
which was the case with Junpei’s manuscript when he submitted it to an outside-
Japan indexed journal.

Conference presentations were also linked to additional publishing opportunities,
beyond the papers whose text histories are analyzed here. Jordan’s conference
attendance led directly to two additional publications, including a book review for an
international indexed journal that he was invited to do by the book’s author at the
conference and a review of the conference for a Japan journal. The proceedings
Editors wanted to republish Jordan’s review of the conference, so when the Editors
followed up on his conference proceedings paper a month after having not received
a reply to the initial evaluation of Jordan’s manuscript (see 5.3.4), they
simultaneously asked whether republication of his conference review would be
possible. What is unclear is whether the Editors would have followed up on Jordan’s
manuscript had they not also been interested in republication of his review of the
conference.

Such brokering of multiple manuscripts by multiple brokers exhibited itself in
Jordan’s book review as well when, after not hearing back from the journal for more
than a month, he contacted someone affiliated with the journal that he had met at
the conference, and this contact in turn followed up with the Book Reviews Editor of
the journal, possibly resulting in a faster response, and perhaps avoiding the Book
Reviews Editor not responding to the submission at all. In Kathy’s case, she did not
have such a well-developed network, and ended up waiting three months before
hearing back from the Editor she was assigned to work with on her Japan
conference proceedings paper (Figure 5-9). This suggests that knowing people at journals and other publications, as in Jordan and Jason’s case, can facilitate the publication process, while not knowing people, as in Kathy’s case, can result in delayed communication, at least in some instances. It also shows that conference attendance alone is not sufficient for developing such contacts. In Jordan’s case it was helpful because at the conference he sought out the author of the book he ultimately reviewed, and the book’s author introduced him to the person he ended up contacting at the journal. In Jason’s case, he already knew his friend from his master’s studies and happened to meet her at the conference as he was beginning to struggle with the challenge of authoring a manuscript for the journal she served as a Reviewer for. In contrast, Kathy did not appear to have or develop such connections through attending conferences.

In summary, there were a variety of official and unofficial brokers who interacted with the authors during their manuscripts’ trajectories. With respect to the official brokers, it was not always obvious from the authors’ point of view how many there were, and some changes appeared to be made to some of the manuscripts between the final version approved for publication by the authors and the published manuscripts. Unofficial brokers proved key for several manuscripts, providing access and opportunities the authors otherwise might not have had. Finally, presentations at conferences were part of the text trajectories for all six of the manuscripts, and in several cases, contacts initiated or renewed at these conferences proved instrumental when it came to publishing, with Jason and Alan’s experience particularly salient. A final observation is that all the authors relied to some extent on some form of personal or professional network in their texts’
trajectories, including facilitating access to physical resources, such as Kathy’s full-time coauthor of a manuscript not analyzed here supplying downloaded articles to use in a literature review and in terms of seeking support for writing and revision, such as in Jason and Alan’s experience described above.

5.4.3 Examining how the manuscripts changed

This section examines how the manuscripts were revised and when during their trajectories. Different ways of quantifying the manuscript changes were tried, including:

- Identifying the number of changes based on Microsoft Word’s document comparison analysis (included in the Figures in 5.3),
- Identifying the numbers of changes per section within the manuscripts (an example is included in Appendix H),
- Examining what vocabulary was added and removed using two-way keyword comparisons (see 3.4.3) between the first and final available versions of the manuscripts (an example is included in Appendix I),
- Examining the Change Codes from the text heuristics by manuscript section (Table 5-3), and
- Identifying the changing word counts of different sections of the manuscripts (Table 5-4).

This analysis begins by discussing quantitative changes to all six of the manuscripts then uses more detailed analysis of specific manuscripts to examine specific textual changes in more depth. The detailed analysis uses all six of the manuscripts to present representative examples from the text history analyses.
Regarding where the manuscripts change, Table 5-3 shows they were changed throughout, as there aren’t any sections of any of the manuscripts that show no changes between the first and final available versions. Some manuscripts were changed more than others, with Junpei’s manuscript exhibiting particularly high numbers of changes relative to the others (Table 5-3) and Jordan’s and John’s manuscripts exhibiting relatively fewer changes (Table 5-3).

Three of the manuscripts increased in overall length: Jason and Alan’s, Junpei’s, and John’s (Table 5-4). In Jason and Alan’s case, this came at the request of the Editor to expand their appendices between Versions 5 and 7 (Table 5-4). Junpei’s and John’s manuscripts increased in length across every version, with both increasing in length more than 40% (Table 5-4). Junpei’s Discussion and End Matter & References sections expanded while John’s Introduction, Literature Review, and References & Tables sections expanded (Table 5-4).

Certain manuscript sections were changed more than others. Across all six manuscripts, Methods sections appear to have been a locus of changes (‘The project’ in David’s and Jordan’s manuscripts; Table 5-3). Junpei’s Methods section more than doubled in word count between Versions 1 and 5 (Table 5-4). Jason and Alan’s decreased by 32% between Versions 2 and 3 but ultimately increased 26% between Versions 1 and 7 (Table 5-4). Jordan’s (The project, Table 5-4) increased by 36% in total, and David’s (The project, Table 5-4) by 23%. These changes appear to be made throughout the manuscripts’ trajectories, as methods sections do not appear to be finalized until the manuscripts are published. For example, while the methods sections of the four manuscripts mentioned above increased in length, Kathy’s and John’s did not substantially increase in length, but their changing word
counts across versions suggests they changed throughout their trajectories (Table 5-4). These sections represent 34% and 24% of the Change Codes for their manuscripts, respectively (Table 5-3).
Table 5-3. Change codes and instances per manuscript section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Change code instances</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th># of change codes</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Change code instances</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th># of change codes</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Change code instances</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th># of change codes</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front matter &amp; Abstract</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Front matter &amp; Abstract</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Front matter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Introduction¹</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A problematic situation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Theoretical framework</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology &amp; results</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The project</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End matter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>End matter and References</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>End matter and References</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan's outside-Japan...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ No section heading
Table 5.4. The manuscripts’ changing word counts by section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper</th>
<th>David’s outside-Japan journal paper</th>
<th>Junpei’s Japan journal paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front matter &amp; Abstract</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A problematic situation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods &amp; results</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End matter</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,127</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>3,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Jason and Alan’s conference proceedings paper</th>
<th>Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper</th>
<th>John’s outside-Japan book chapter paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front matter</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References &amp; Tables</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,371</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 3,104 | 3,693 | 4,506 | 4,579 |

V = Version; see Figures in 5.3 for more information about each version; *No section heading
The changes made to the Methods sections of manuscripts are discussed next. As the discussion below illustrates, the changes were not straightforward and involved author struggle with broker evaluations and repeated changes seeking to address broker criticisms and meet broker expectations. Across the manuscripts technical detail, definitions of terms, and explanation of analytical instruments and concepts were added. These were generally coded as changes to Argument and Positioning, as Junpei’s Japan journal paper and Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper illustrate below.

The increase in word count to Junpei’s Methods section included the addition of explanations of the data collection and analysis methods used along with quotations of and citations to the literature upon which they were based. Throughout the trajectory of the manuscript, Reviewers extensively criticized how Junpei conducted his research and reported his investigation. This generally took the form of identifying inadequate or missing explanation, as in the following Reviewer’s criticism of his explanation of the measurements he used:

In particular, a description of the procedure for quantifying the degree of awareness of the language form (how and using what unit) is lacking.

特に言語形式への気付きの度合いの数値化の手順についての記述(何をどのようにどのようにどのような単位を用いたのかなど)が欠けている。(Junpei MS1 V1Letter)

This comment appears to have led to the Addition of 278 words across 2 paragraphs elaborating on the language units used to analyze the data he collected, including the Addition of four citations. Later, the Reviewer of Version 3 noted the explanation of the instructions given to Junpei’s research participants was inadequate:
 [...] the instructions given before the first reading and underlining were not clearly explained. I feel this is a very important point because [explanation of technical detail]. (Junpei MS1 V3Letter)

This comment appears to have been the impetus for the Addition of 212 words across three paragraphs describing the task Junpei used to collect the data for the research described in his paper, including 103 words of direct quotations and five citations. The changes Junpei implements add to the overall complexity and density of his Methods section, expanding on technical detail and adding citations and definitions.

Not all the Reviewers’ criticisms of and comments on Junpei’s Methods section were acted on or practically actionable. For example, the Reviewer of Version 2 had the following comment regarding the task Junpei used for his research:

Were the participants familiar with the type of task used (both the reading and underlining and the oral task)? Were the tasks piloted? (Junpei MS1 V3 Reviewer)

While Junpei added the 278 words over three paragraphs explaining the task used, he did not explicitly address either of these Reviewer concerns, perhaps because this would have weakened the Methods section of his paper. If he did not assess participant familiarity with the task and did not pilot the task beforehand, stating this explicitly could open his manuscript to even more Reviewer criticism. Adding technical detail without directly addressing these concerns may have helped to conceal these potential shortcomings. As a strategy, this was ultimately at least a partial success, as the brokers of the later versions of his manuscript at the third and final journal did not raise these specific issues in their evaluations (from Version 3
in Figure 5-7). However, while Junpei submitted the manuscript as a Research Article, the journal accepted it as a Research Note. Accepting the manuscript as a relatively less prestigious Research Note suggests the journal brokers did not judge the manuscript to meet their expectations for Research Article publication.

Junpei’s paper was different from the other five papers’ text histories analyzed in this chapter as it was the only one to represent the research it described as ‘experimental’ as opposed to pedagogically-focused investigations. The following 39-word explanation that he added to his paper helps to illustrate this:

For each recording and activity, the participants met in pairs with the researcher in a quiet room. Participants were first asked to perform “Reading and Underlining.” Participants read a short text and underlined what they noticed within two minutes. (Junpei MS1 Version 4)

Although Junpei’s was the only paper to frame itself as experimental research with a text history analyzed here, the textual changes discussed above that Junpei made to his Methods section resemble the kinds of changes made to the Methods sections of the other five authors’ manuscripts, in that technical detail was added and there was a shift to describing the research as opposed to the pedagogy. The tendency across the manuscripts to add positivistic experimental elements in manuscript revisions is returned to in 7.2.1.

The addition of technical detail to Jason and Alan’s Methods section came through increasing references to and explanation of action research. In their initial submission to the journal (Version 3 in Figure 5-5), their methods section referenced “three sources of data” (Jason & Alan MS28 V3) and did not explicitly refer to ‘action research’. That term was used three times before their methods section and three
times after it, but not in the methods section itself (Jason & Alan MS28 V3). Reviewer 2’s summary comments stated, “there are serious issues with the methodology and data analyses that make this paper difficult to recommend for publication” (Jason & Alan MS28 V3Letter) which the Editor reiterates in a “note” at the bottom of the response letter, writing:

[...] please consider the point Reviewer 1 makes at the outset, about the breadth of the paper and the occasional lack of depth. It would be useful to foreground the Action Research nature of the project more clearly, as Review 2 suggests, and also deal in more detail with the methodological issues Review 2 identifies. Overall, Reviewer 2's call for more depth, particularly re. research methodology, is valid. (Jason & Alan MS28 V3Letter)

Jason and Alan explicitly referred to this advice in their “response to reviewer and editor comments” file that accompanied their resubmission of Version 4 (Figure 5-5), summarizing the changes they made:

In light of the editor's suggestion that we "foreground the Action Research nature of the project more clearly", Reviewer 1's concerns about the paper’s breadth and lack of depth, and Reviewer 2's call for more detail regarding methodological issues [...] we are now framing the paper as an action research approach to treating speaking skills with EFL students (as the Editor suggested). Whereas the previous structure centred on the three types of data collected, we have now used the three iterative cycles of action research as the organising framework. We hope this presents our methodology, results and discussion within a clearer, easier-to-follow format. (Jason & Alan MS28 V4ResponsiveReviewers)
Jason and Alan’s changes to their manuscript’s Methods section were worked and reworked over several rounds of review and revision. In their final manuscript (Version 7 in Figure 5-5), their Methods section opens with an added 34-word direct quotation from the literature defining action research then they explain their investigation “went through three distinct rounds of investigation and reflection, where the results of one cycle influenced subsequent ones” (Jason & Alan MS28 V7). Their first revision after review (Version 4 in Figure 5-5) included a sentence paraphrasing action research as, “an inherently iterative process, where a round of research is reflected upon and often followed by additional rounds of inquiry” (Jason & Alan MS28 V4) to which a Reviewer responded:

‘round of research’ & ‘rounds of inquiry’ – is the reference here to the ACTION rather than the RESEARCH? Actually it is the cycles of curriculum action or pedagogical practice which are primary in Action Research, with the cycles of research making sense of these. (Jason & Alan MS28 V4Letter)

Jason and Alan responded by deleting the paraphrasing sentence and leading with the direct quotation to the literature defining action research.

Changes to the manuscripts’ methods sections represented changes to how the research was reported. None of the authors gathered additional data following review. Rather, they expanded on their explanations of how they gathered and analyzed the data they already had, and in some cases, specifically with Junpei’s and Jason and Alan’s manuscripts, they (re)analyzed data they had already gathered prior to submission. For example, Jason and Alan, in the first version of their manuscript submitted to the journal (Version 3 in Figure 5-5), wrote, “Recordings [...] were then analyzed to roughly gauge progress over the course of
the academic year” (Jason & Alan MS28 V3). Reviewer 1 commented, “‘roughly
gauge progress’: Why not use test results?” (Jason & Alan MS28 V3Letter) which
led to the addition of a data table measuring four aspects of their students’ language
production, the results of which inform their discussion of the relative success of
their teaching intervention. However, while the recordings used for their analysis
existed prior to submission of their manuscript for review, it was only after receiving
the Reviewers’ evaluations of their manuscript that Jason and Alan considered how
they could analyze those recordings to quantitatively evidence the claims they
made. This change in how they analyzed their data in their manuscript was
suggested by the unofficial broker they consulted following review, as they were
uncertain about how to address the methodology criticisms pointed out by the two
Reviewers and the Editor. Jason noted that the review and revision process was
instrumental to their data being analyzed in this way. He said he only committed to
doing the “work” of analyzing the transcripts quantitatively after he became
convinced it was necessary for their manuscript to be successfully published in their
preferred journal (Jason Interview 2). This unofficial broker also provided some of
the references they used to determine what measurements to use for their analysis.

Literature reviews were a focus of changes for three manuscripts: Jason and Alan’s
(‘A problematic situation’), David’s (Theoretical Framework), Jordan’s (Introduction),
and John’s (Table 5-3). These changes tended to involve attention to Argument
(code 5) and Positioning (code 6) through replacing text that did not include
reference to the literature with text more densely interspersed with citations. David’s
manuscript is illustrative of these changes.
David ultimately removes two paragraphs, one 64 words and the other 72, that did not include references to the literature, replacing them with a 147-word paragraph with four citations to the literature and a 124-word paragraph with two citations. The two citations in the new 124-word paragraph were explicitly suggested for inclusion by the Reviewers. The removed 64-word paragraph follows:

It is not enough for students to only focus on developing the language skills. Intrinsic motivation, or motivation that comes from within the learner’s personal desires to acquire the language is connected to higher successful outcomes in language development. Imagining oneself as a user of the language is a successful technique that helps the learner see the potential of possible “selves” to develop. (David MS22 Version 1, removed in Version 5)

The review document David received assessed handling of “relevant theories” in Version 1 of his manuscript as “lacking”, illustrated through the following extract from the evaluation of his manuscript following review:

Reviewers’ comments:
The writer presents relevant theories but the review itself is significantly lacking in how these theories inform the present study. “Imagined communities,” [and two more quoted examples] are all presented as discrete concepts but what is their relevance to second language learning? For example, how does the process of “imagining” membership in a L2 learning community influence the “motivation” in the learning of English […]? (David MS22 V1Review)
From Version 5 (Figure 5-6), David's manuscript has the following new 147-word paragraph in place of the 64-word paragraph, which is carried through to publication:

While English remains the dominant language for globalization, the traditional concept that learners’ motivation for learning the language is integration with “the norm-developing inner circle countries” may not be entirely accurate (Ryan, 2006, p. 42). Lamb (2004) found that Indonesian learners associated English more with international culture than with any community bound by geographical location. Similarly, Ryan (2009) observed that Japanese students rated their reasons for studying English higher when the target culture was left “undefined” (p. 131). These studies present an important shift in our re-evaluation of the L2 self as a motivational system and how our learners identify with their sense of belonging in a global community. Perhaps what is really intrinsic to EFL students’ motivation in learning English is the opportunity it affords them to restructure “a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (Norton, 2000, p. 444). (David MS22 Version 5)

David’s original paragraph is largely working toward an argument for the importance of language learners developing images of their potential selves as a means for increasing student motivation. The revised paragraph keeps this stance, adding Positioning with respect to the literature with the quotation of Norton and evidencing the claim through citation of Ryan and Lamb. There is also the Addition of further Argument and Positioning through the old/new dichotomy established in the revised text: “the traditional concept that” toward the beginning versus “an important shift” later in the paragraph, which appears to serve the purpose of addressing the
Reviewers’ question, “how does the process of ‘imagining’ membership in a L2 learning community influence the ‘motivation’ in the learning of English?” This could perhaps be implied in the text’s original “It is not enough for,” although in the revised version David makes the contrast more explicit while at the same time Positioning his manuscript with respect to the literature.

Results & Discussion sections also exhibited considerable changes in the cases of Junpei’s, Kathy’s (Discussion), and John’s (Results & Conclusion) manuscripts (Table 5-3). These changes tended to involve the Addition of evidence and expansion of the knowledge claims made. John’s manuscript illustrates these changes.

In Version 3 of John’s manuscript (Figure 5-10), the Editor used Track Changes to suggest several changes, expanding the knowledge claims made with the Addition of 133 words to his Results section, as follows:

Correlating with the [data], it was found that students had a more in-depth understanding of [topic], shown in [data]. For instance, as tabulated below [...] Furthermore, students demonstrated an increased [results] [...] This can be a critical point to re-visit in future research in [topic]: to effectively teach [topic], students are required to master [knowledge claim]. (John MS19 Version 3)

The Editor’s in-text comments on this Addition show interest in John expanding the knowledge claims made:

Consider expanding on this section: is it possible to relate [topic] with the [topic]? This may require some concrete/statistical data. If recordings are
involved in this study and it is therefore possible to do some counting, consider expanding this section, e.g. [suggested text to add] If possible, to add gradation/depth to the discussion, consider [editor composed text] Of course, if this finding is not positively affirmed, the author can also discuss the absence of it and see if it can lead to a constructive observation on pedagogy. (John MS19 Version 3)

John’s text history analysis demonstrates how the manuscript’s Results & Discussion sections were generally changed: through the Addition of evidence and the expansion of knowledge claims. These changes to the authors’ manuscripts analyzed here contrast with Myers (1985), who hypothesized and evidenced a tendency for authors to initially make stronger claims than brokers would allow, leading to a gradual narrowing of the knowledge claims in the manuscripts’ trajectories he analyzed (see 2.3). In the authors’ text histories analyzed here, the opposite is also occurring, with brokers recommending authors expand the knowledge claims they make. These requests to expand knowledge claims are returned to in discussion of the shift from a teaching orientation to research orientation across the manuscripts in 7.2.1.

Concerning where in the manuscripts’ trajectories they were changed, Table 5-4 shows the manuscripts were changed throughout their trajectories, although at certain points in certain texts’ trajectories, some manuscripts appeared to be revised more than others. Changes appear to be particularly prominent following initial submission and review (between Versions 3 & 4 for Jason and Alan’s manuscript; 1 & 2 for David’s; 1, 2, 3, & 4 for Junpei’s; 1 & 2 for Jordan’s; 4 & 7 for Kathy’s; and 1 & 2 for John’s). For example, Jordan’s Implications approximately tripled in length
while his Introduction lost 38% of its word count between Versions 1 and 2. Kathy’s Discussion decreased in word count by 35% while her Conclusion more than tripled in length between Versions 4 and 7 (Table 5-4).

The reduction in length of Jordan’s Introduction is almost entirely accounted for by the partial Deletion (54 words) and Reshuffling (71 words) of a 125-word paragraph to his Implications section. This paragraph described a presentation given at the same conference Jordan wrote his proceedings paper for. Reviewer 1’s comment on Jordan’s introduction noted the need to make it more concise:

I would prefer more about the project you were reporting on and less of an introduction which runs to nearly half your paper (334 words). I understand the need to situate the project and you do that well, I just think you can do it more concisely. I recommend, therefore, some re-writing to reduce the introduction and beef-up the actual report. (Jordan MS16 Reviewer 1)

The 54 words reshuffled to Jordan’s Implications section from his introduction were included along with 104 words of added text, creating a new paragraph of 178 words that accounts for the near tripling of this section. Thus, the connection to the presentation given at the same conference remains in the final version but becomes part of the discussion of the results of the project described in Jordan’s paper, rather than a background context for his investigation, as it was presented in Version 1 (Figure 5-8).

The changes to Kathy’s paper appeared to involve moving information about the objectives of her research from her Discussion to her Conclusion. In Version 7 she deleted a 53-word paragraph from her Discussion explaining the contents and
structure of the section along with 173 words describing the “objectives” and “student motivation” underlying the teaching activity described in her paper. Additionally, a substantial part of the changes to her Conclusion came through a 101-word paragraph added in Version 7 then further revised in Version 8 that begins with the phrase, “The intention of this study was to” then summarizes the objectives of the investigation described in her paper.

Implications and Conclusions sections also appear to be a focus of revision, with Jason and Alan’s implications section losing 38% of its word count between Versions 1 to 4 while their conclusion appears to stabilize after the initial review, from Version 4, after doubling between Versions 1 and 2 then more than halving between Versions 2 and 3 (Table 5-4). Following review and some editorial revisions, David’s Discussion lost 39% of its word count between Versions 1 and 5, then between Versions 6 and 7, during ‘copy editing’ (Figure 5-6) it lost another 15% of its original length, ultimately more than halving (Table 5-4). Junpei’s Discussion gained word count across every version (Table 5-4). During editorial revisions following review (after receiving an ‘acceptance’ letter; Figure 5-10), John’s Results section nearly doubled between Versions 2 and 4 then then gained another 10% in Version 6 (Table 5-4).

To summarize, regarding where and when the manuscripts change, they appear to be revised throughout, both in terms of where in the text and in terms of when in their trajectories, with the revisions following review appearing to be particularly numerous, although this is not the only point in their trajectories where (considerable) changes are made. The manuscripts’ Methods sections appear to be a focus of revision, although while these sections may represent a plurality of the
changes made to four of the manuscripts (David’s, Junpei’s, Kathy’s, & John’s; Table 5-3), they represent a majority of the changes with only Jordan’s manuscript (The project, Table 5-3). With Jason and Alan’s manuscript, changes to the Methods section are the second most numerous, after their literature review section (A problematic situation, Table 5-3). The changes made are generally characterized by the Addition of technical detail and referencing, along with Addition of or changes to Argument and Positioning.

5.5 Summary

This chapter has presented the six text history analyses and discussed three key themes emerging from examination of the texts’ trajectories. These included the volume of revision work done by both authors and brokers, the importance of authors’ networks to writing for academic publication, particularly in the case of high-stakes, high prestige journal article publication, and how the manuscripts changed during their trajectories. With respect to changes to the manuscripts, the Addition of technical detail and changes to Positioning and Argument were prominent.

The next chapter turns to an analysis of the correspondence around writing for academic publication. The research question explored in this chapter concerning how authors’ manuscripts were evaluated is returned to in 7.3. The methodological contributions this chapter makes are discussed in 8.3, with the contribution of the text history analyses discussed in 8.3.1, the Change Heuristic as a research tool evaluated in 8.3.2, and benefits of analysis of revisions to manuscripts across their trajectories considered in 8.3.3.
6. Patterns of exchange in author-broker interaction:

Communication and expectation

6.1 Introduction

This third and final data-based chapter addresses the following research question:

3. What does the correspondence surrounding the authors’ writing for academic publication reveal regarding text brokering processes and relationships between authors and brokers?

Specifically, changes to manuscripts and relationships between authors and brokers are examined, exploring how both influence “uptake” (Austin, 1962, p. 116; Lillis & Curry, 2015, p. 133). In doing so, this chapter builds on earlier analyses of Reviewer correspondence, such as Canagarajah and Lee (2014) and Li (2006) (see 2.5).

Examining sets of correspondence between authors and brokers in this chapter facilitates “analyzing sets or clusters of reviews relating to each paper and the consequences of these clusters in uptake” (Lillis and Curry, 2015, p. 130). This goes beyond a “focus on individual reviews, providing taxonomies of features” (Lillis and Curry, 2015, p. 130) to examining the structure of the correspondence, or its
“exchange structure” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 153). The graphical representations of the text trajectories in Chapter 5 (see Figures 5-4 to 5-10) suggest that a dominant structure in the author-broker correspondence involves initial author manuscript submission followed by iterations of broker feedback which initiate (further) author manuscript revision and submission for (further) evaluation. This pattern represents an identifiable “exchange structure” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 153), in that there is “a recurrent patterning of the turns of different participants” (p. 153), in this case between authors and official brokers. While Fairclough applies exchange structure to analysis of spoken discourse, it is useful here to apply it to the written exchanges between authors and brokers. This facilitates examination of the structure of the interaction and its nature, in terms of social preferences or norms regarding preferred and “dispreferred” (p. 154) responses. Thus exchange structure illuminates the “distribution of rights and obligations between powerful and non-powerful participants” (p. 153) in the production of academic texts.

One norm that Fairclough (1992) outlines is that the ‘powerful’ participants in an interaction have more options as to how and when to respond than ‘non-powerful’ participants, a theme explored with respect to the correspondence between the authors and brokers in this chapter. The analysis in this chapter shows how brokers act as powerful participants and authors as non-powerful participants in the correspondence. Analysis followed a “context-first” (Askehave & Swales, 2001, p. 207) approach, meaning investigating the correspondence from the level of exchange structure while being conscious of local rhetorical features, rather than trying to characterize typical features of specific sub-genres within the correspondence, such as letters to the Editor, decision letters, and reviews (see
In doing so, the analysis presented here seeks to pay “attention to the process of text production” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 7), the need for which in writing for academic publication research has been pointed out by Lillis and Curry (2010, 2015).

In addition to the six text histories analyzed in 5.3, three additional text histories from the 29 texts (see Table 3-3) are included in the discussion and analysis in this chapter to examine changes in revision responsibility in the exchanges. This decision to broaden the data base for analysis of exchanges was to ensure that both ‘preferred’ and ‘dispreferred’ patterns of exchanges identified in the larger dataset would be included (see 3.3.2). The chapter presents five patterns of exchange identified in the sets of correspondence in 6.2, followed by a summary of the chapter in 6.3.

6.2 Patterns of exchange in the sets of correspondence

The ‘preferred’ stance of brokers toward author responsibility for revision in the sets of correspondence was one where the author was held responsible for revising their work (explored first in 6.2.1). When authors were not certain of how to revise their manuscripts, this could result in a “dispreferred” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 154) discussion of what revisions were expected and occasionally the shifting of revision work responsibility (discussed in 6.2.2). Official broker communication about whether the authors’ manuscripts would be published, and uncertainty in those communications, was a dominant feature of the exchange structures across the sets of correspondence (examined in 6.2.3). The last two subsections address author difficulty in understanding and implementing changes (in 6.2.4) and the significance of turnaround times in the correspondence (in 6.2.5).
6.2.1 Author responsibility for revision: The ‘preferred’ exchange structure

In examining stances toward who has responsibility for revision work, most of the exchanges can be characterized as exhibiting a stance of author-as-responsible for enacting the change work indicated in the evaluations of their manuscripts. This is reflected in Junpei’s Japan journal paper’s text history, as at no point in its trajectory did the official brokers return a marked-up copy of his manuscript to him. Rather, it was his responsibility to implement the changes to his manuscript and to interpret how to implement those changes across all the evaluations he received. Part of the Reviewer’s evaluation of Version 4 (Figure 5-7) includes the assessment that Junpei did not sufficiently implement the changes indicated in the reviews of Version 3 of his manuscript:

However, it cannot be said that all the problems pointed out have been improved (especially regarding these research results [two examples]), so unfortunately as a reviewer it is not possible to recommend publication as a “Research Paper” this time. We would instead like you to consider publishing your manuscript as a Research Note.

しかししながら、指摘された問題点が全て改善されたとは言い難く（特に研究結果の [two examples]）、残念ながら今回「論文」として学会誌への掲載は査読者として推薦することはできないが、リサーチ・ノートとして掲載することを検討していただきたい。（Junpei MS1 V4 Letter）

Language work is explicitly indicated as necessary in the evaluations of every version of Junpei’s manuscript, as evidenced in Table 6-1 by Reviewers’ reference to ‘English mistakes’ (英語の間違い), ‘errors in the English’ (英語のミス), and
‘grammatical mistakes’. This comes in addition to a variety of other revision work called for in the evaluations.

The stance taken by the Reviewers in Table 6-1 is both that there are a number of ‘mistakes’ in the English of Junpei’s manuscript and that it is Junpei’s responsibility

### Table 6-1. Reviewer comments on Junpei’s English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Japanese original</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Version 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>なお、[list of 5 errors, followed by] など小さな誤りも散見されますが、再度見直しで修正をお願いします。</td>
<td>In addition, [list of 5 errors]. Similar small errors are scattered throughout your paper. Please revise these before the second review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 2</td>
<td>英語の間違いが数多く、文章の推敲不足も随所にあり、たいへん読み難かった。被験者のlinguistic formの間違いを執筆者が正しく判断できるのかどうか読者が疑問に思う恐れもあるので、必ず英文校閲に出されたい。</td>
<td>There are many English mistakes, and there are also sentences which aren’t elaborated on throughout, so the paper was very difficult to read. Since readers may question whether the author can successfully identify the &quot;linguistic form&quot; mistakes of the research subjects, this manuscript should be reviewed by an English reviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 3</td>
<td>全般的に、不注意によると思われる英語のミスなどが散見されます。内容的にも、正確さを欠くものが散見されます。</td>
<td>Overall, mistakes in English that seem to be due to carelessness are scattered throughout. Regarding content, statements that lack accuracy were scattered throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Version 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 4</td>
<td>First of all, this manuscript needs to be proofread by a native speaker of English. There are so many grammatical mistakes, so many convoluted sentences (I will provide some examples of both cases in the corresponding section) that the reading of the paper is very difficult, which obviously negatively impacts the evaluation of the findings reported. As mentioned above, the manuscript has to be proofread by a native speaker of English. There are many problems with article usage […], subject-verb agreement […], preposition misuse, wrong choice of lexical items […] etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Version 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 5</td>
<td>明解性 [Clarification]: The reason for this score is the numerous grammatical errors and APA formatting errors. These could be fixed by thoroughly reviewing and proofreading the manuscript.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 7</td>
<td>その他、記述の点で多々間違いが見られる。確認されたい。</td>
<td>Also, there are many mistakes in terms of your description. These should be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Version 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>文法ミスやわかりにくい文章が多々見受けられたので、必ず英語母語者にチェックを受けること。</td>
<td>Because there are many difficult to understand sentences or grammar mistakes, your manuscript requires an English native speaker check.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 See Figure 5-7 for version information
as the author to redress these errors, through soliciting “an English native speaker check” (英語母語話者のチェック) and ‘thoroughly reviewing and proofreading the manuscript’.

Further evidence of official brokers taking an ‘author-as-responsible’ stance for enacting the changes indicated in the evaluations of Junpei’s manuscript were included in the letter from the Editor sent to Junpei following evaluation of Version 3 (Figure 5-7), where toward the end the following caution is included:

The submitted manuscript will be printed as is. Please check the format, etc. again before resubmitting.

That Junpei’s manuscript is not published in its revised and resubmitted form ‘as is’ (Version 4) but is rather evaluated again with further changes requested is taken up in the discussion of the communication of publication decisions in 6.2.3. What is salient for the discussion here is that the need to make these changes is presented in the correspondence as Junpei’s responsibility, and the way Junpei responds signals he is both aware of and accommodating to these expectations. This is indicative of the power the brokers hold in that they assign responsibility to Junpei to revise his manuscript, and Junpei’s lack of power to question being assigned that responsibility. He does not contact the journal to request clarification of specific criticisms nor does he respond that prior to every submission of his manuscript he has requested the ‘native speaker check’ (Table 6-1) called for in the evaluations. He returns his revised manuscript (after soliciting yet another ‘native speaker check’ (英語母語話者のチェック) and ‘thoroughly reviewing and proofreading the manuscript’.

That Junpei’s manuscript is not published in its revised and resubmitted form ‘as is’
check’). Following a further evaluation of Version 4, Junpei makes further changes and accepts the decision to publish his manuscript as a Research Note rather than a Research Paper.

The tendency of official brokers to take a stance of author responsibility for manuscript revision comes through particularly strongly in Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper, which includes her unsuccessfully attempting to solicit revision support. Her first contact post-submission was from the “Editor-in-Chief” (Kathy MS23 Email1), who instructed Kathy to “…consider all the reviewers’ comments carefully as you revise.” Two Reviewers’ reports were attached to the email along with two file attachments with in-text comments and tracked changes (dated 2011.3 in Figure 5-9). The Reviewer comments demonstrate different assessments of her manuscript. Reviewer A includes an extensive critique of the pedagogy described in Kathy’s manuscript, finishing the review with, “Otherwise [sic], the article is impeccable” (Kathy MS23 Email1). Reviewer D writes, “The manuscript is on a topic of interest to teachers and researchers alike within [field]. It is generally well written and persuasive. The author needs to carefully review the manuscript for colloquial speech and long sentences […]” (Kathy MS23 Email1). With one Reviewer describing the article as, “impeccable” and the other noting Kathy “needs to carefully review the manuscript for colloquial speech and long sentences,” there appears to be a difference in these two Reviewers’ assessments of the extent of revisions required. In one of the two attached files with tracked changes and comments from a Reviewer, highlighted text and margin comments indicated where she should

3 See 3.4.3 for an explanation of manuscript correspondence data notations.
revise ‘colloquial speech and long sentences’. For example, there was a 45-word and a 14-word sentence with the comment, “Sentences like these need to be broken up. They are much to [sic] long. [...] Please review your manuscript with an eye to sentence length” (Kathy MS23 V6). There are other margin comments requesting Kathy “recast” specific sentences and words “for flow”, “for coherency”, and because the text is “colloquial” (Kathy MS23 V6). The Reviewer does not make these changes, but rather indicates where they feel they should be made in the manuscript. The second file included more critical comments of a similar nature, highlighting what was perceived to be problematic text and posing questions, as illustrated in Figure 6-1.

Figure 6-1. Examples of Reviewer margin questions and comments in Kathy's Japan conference proceedings paper (Kathy MS23 V5)

The Editor-in-Chief’s message copies in a second Editor, who was assigned “…as your editor to help you revise as necessary and prepare the paper for possible publication”, instructing Kathy to contact the assigned Editor “to begin the editing process” (Kathy MS23 Email1).

Kathy then introduced herself to the second Editor, noting she, “…will look forward to getting your input for revisions and editing” (Kathy MS 23 Email2). The Editor’s reply appeared to respond to Kathy’s expressed hope for guidance regarding the revisions to her paper by suggesting they were Kathy’s responsibility, stating, “First,
please revise your paper addressing all the comments, suggestions and questions from the reviewers” (Kathy MS23 Email3), finishing the message with, “If you have any questions, please contact me” (Kathy MS23 Email3).

At this point in Kathy’s manuscript trajectory, the correspondence Kathy received from the official brokers implies two approaches to the revision work (see 5.4.1) required. The Reviewers have taken an ‘author-as-responsible’ approach, signaling in the manuscript problematic text with the implication that Kathy is expected to revise it. The second Editor explicitly instructed Kathy to revise her paper “first” before sending the revised manuscript. The other implied approach is one of ‘broker-as-(partially)-responsible’. The Editor-in-Chief explained the second Editor would “help you revise as necessary and prepare the paper for possible publication” in an “editing process” and the second Editor finished Email 3 to Kathy with, “If you have any questions, please contact me,” implying Kathy may be able to consult the second Editor about how to revise her manuscript. Influencing Kathy’s interpretation of these messages is that this is her first experience of writing for publication, and at this point she envisioned the author-broker relationship as potentially resembling her relationships with her master’s supervisors, who supported her postgraduate writing by explaining how she could revise her written work (see 4.3.6). This means Kathy partly expected the author-broker relationship would be closer to the second approach implied in the correspondence, or ‘broker-as-(partially)-responsible’, than the former ‘author-as-responsible’ approach.

Kathy tried to elicit support, sending an email (with no attachment) explaining, “I’ve revised my paper […],” noting an ongoing problem with her revisions, “I'm still struggling with an appropriate conclusion” (Kathy MS23 Email4), and asking some
direct questions about word length requirements. The Editor’s reply answered Kathy’s direct questions and appeared to respond to Kathy’s mention of her trouble with her conclusion, stating, “I am waiting for your (completely) revised paper” (Kathy MS23 Email5), reasserting the expectation that Kathy first complete revising her manuscript before the Editor would commit to work on it. The stance that the revisions are Kathy’s responsibility is perhaps further reinforced with a, “Good luck!” (Kathy MS23 Email5) at the end of the message, in contrast to the Editor’s earlier, “If you have any questions, please contact me”. This change may further signal that additional correspondence is unwelcome until Kathy has delivered her “(completely) revised paper”.

After Kathy sent the Editor her revised manuscript, Version 7 (Figure 5-9), the Editor responded with a list of 48 items Kathy was to “please consider revising” (Kathy MS23 Email7). This message also indicates an ‘author-as-responsible’ approach to the (further) revisions the Editor feels need to be made, as the email points out problematic sections of text but does not offer guidance detailing what is problematic or how the text should be improved beyond the instructions to “consider revising”. In an email message to me, Kathy commented on the Editor’s request, writing, “I’m happy to finally get the kind of commentary/feedback that I wanted from the beginning. This was what I was expecting” (Kathy MS23 Email10). However, she continues to struggle with the author-as-responsible stance taken, writing, “This comment: Please revise for better style. Sorry, but I wrote it in the first place. I probably don’t have a better style. What does that mean?” (Kathy MS23 Email10).

As Kathy’s experience is the only example from the data of an author unsuccessfully seeking to solicit shared revision work with an official broker, it perhaps represents
an extreme example, although it is illustrative of the power brokers hold over stances toward responsibility for revision within the manuscripts’ exchange structures.

Editors generally took more responsibility for manuscript revision after authors were considered to have done sufficient work independently to warrant official brokers committing to work on the manuscripts. This was evident in Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper, as Version 6 was revised by the journal in a “copyediting” process following the decision that “additional review” was “unnecessary” (Figure 5-5). This copyediting included changes made by official journal brokers to their manuscript and requests for confirmation that the changes made were “acceptable” (Jason & Alan MS28 V6). The revisions included but were not limited to language work. For example, the following sentence, which included both an Argument (Figure 5-11) regarding the methods of their research, “detailed description,” and contributed to the Cohesion (Figure 5-11) of the manuscript, “What follows”, was removed:

What follows is a detailed description of the methodology and results from the three cycles of our study. (Jason & Alan MS28 V6)

Across the manuscripts’ text histories, revisions late in their trajectories involved changes that went beyond sentence level corrections to changes to representation and knowledge claims, further examples of which follow below.

Whilst a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance was taken quite late in Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper’s trajectory, brokers did also take such stances earlier in other manuscripts’ trajectories. Specifically, Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings paper (see 5.3.4), David’s outside-Japan journal paper (see 5.3.2), and John’s outside-Japan book chapter paper (see 5.3.6)
exhibited faster transitions to a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance toward the changes indicated for their manuscripts. With Jordan’s manuscript, this comes following Version 2, which Jordan and his coauthor revised independently following review of Version 1 (Figure 5-8). The Editors return Version 3, which includes 53 insertions and 42 deletions (Figure 5-8). While these revisions are concerned with language, they also address the level of knowledge claims made within the manuscript. For example, the following original sentence:

Whereas comprehensible input is beneficial for learners, output allows them to test and restructure their knowledge. (Jordan MS16 V2)

Is changed by the Editors to:

While comprehensible input is of course vital l [sic] for learners, it is their actual output which allows them to test and restructure their knowledge.

(Jordan MS16 V3)

From the standpoint of ‘standard’ English, the Version 2 text is error free, whereas the Version 3 text has an error added because of the Editors’ incomplete deletion of ‘beneficial’, as the ‘l’ remains in the changed text. From the standpoint of strength of argument, the change of ‘beneficial’ to ‘of course vital’ demonstrates a strengthening of the argument made in the first clause of the sentence, and the addition of the that clause (‘which’) to the second part of the sentence accommodates adding ‘actual’ before ‘output’, making for a stronger claim there as well, using ‘their actual output’ versus only ‘output’.

Further changes are made between the published manuscript, Version 5, and the final version the authors submitted for publication, Version 4. These were signaled
in the Editors’ evaluation of Version 3 with the note, “We will edit the article once again for minor typos, APA etc. at a later stage” (Jordan MS16 Email9). When asked about these changes, Jordan replied that to his knowledge he and his coauthor did not receive additional correspondence from the Editors after Version 4 before publication was announced (Jordan Interview 5). While there are instances of corrections of ‘minor typos, APA etc’ in the revisions made, there are also revisions that go beyond such changes in scope. For example, the following original sentence:

This paper focuses on one such space in a Japanese university, which we both helped set up in 2005 as a part of the English program’s pedagogical innovations. (Jordan MS16 V4)

Was changed to:

This paper focuses on one such space at a Japanese university, which was set up in 2005 as part of the English program’s pedagogical innovations. (Jordan MS16 V5)

The authors’ explicit signaling of their agency with ‘we both helped set up’ was removed in the revised version’s ‘was set up’ in addition to some minor changes, such as ‘in’ to ‘at’ and the deletion of ‘a’ in ‘as a part’, although the extent to which these additional changes are corrections of errors in the original Version 4 manuscript is debatable. Of interest to the analysis here is that the official brokers appeared to not construe these changes ‘as a shared responsibility’ but rather as the sole responsibility of the brokers, with the named authors of the manuscript apparently not privy to or explicitly informed of the changes made. Rather, to find these changes, the authors would have had to compare their published manuscript (after publication was announced) with the final version of the manuscript they
submitted for publication (Version 4), which is what I did to identify them. John’s outside-Japan book chapter (see 5.3.6) also had further edits made to the manuscript between the final author version (Version 6 in Figure 5-10) and the published manuscript (Version 7).

The stances toward responsibility for revising the manuscripts in the exchange structures indicate how the brokers exercised more power than the authors, deciding when (not) to take responsibility for revisions, when (not) to inform authors about changes made, when (not) to expect authors to do the work of revising their manuscripts, and when (not) to explain to authors what changes were necessary, as in Kathy’s experience outlined above (author difficulty in understanding and implementing changes is returned to in 6.2.4).

6.2.2 Questioning revision work responsibility: ‘Dispreferred’ exchange options

Having outlined the dominant stance of ‘author-as-responsible’ for revision work in the exchange structures in 6.2.1, the discussion now turns to “dispreferred” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 154) exchange options in the discourse. Specifically, a salient characteristic of some exchanges was the (sometimes) changeable nature of revision work responsibility. As Kathy’s experience summarized in 6.2.1 demonstrates, authors were not always successful at initiating a shift from an author-as-responsible to a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance, but there were some instances of such shifts in some of the correspondence. This section examines an instance of an author successfully changing an official broker’s stance toward author revision responsibility, another of an Editor spontaneously changing
his stance toward revision responsibility, and an instance where the Editor begins by taking an author-as-responsible stance then later shifts to a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance. The common theme across these different sets of correspondence is that it appears to be the prerogative of the official brokers to determine the stance taken toward who is responsible for revision, with the authors appearing to have only limited ability to influence the stance taken, and only when brokers comply with such requests.

The first example is from the set of correspondence for Kathy’s third publication, MS25, an outside-Japan journal paper. The exchange begins with the official brokers taking an author-as-responsible stance (see 6.2.1) to the revision work. In the first post-submission email, the “Assistant Editor” (Kathy MS25 Email1) wrote,

The Editorial Board for [Publication name] has reviewed your submission […] the Board would like to request that you make some editorial changes and resubmit your paper for further consideration. (Kathy MS25 Email1)

Kathy and her coauthor made the first round of revisions independently then sent Version 2 to the Editor. The Editor replied with a marked-up version (data unavailable) in Email 5, writing, “I have asked you to make quite a few additional changes” (Kathy MS25 Email5) suggesting a continued author-as-responsible stance to the required revision work. In Email 6 Kathy acknowledged receipt of the Assistant Editor’s message, writing, “We just got back from a long holiday here in [country],” and asked about the deadline for returning the further manuscript revisions. The Editor’s reply in Email 7 answered Kathy’s question about the deadline for returning revisions and responded to her mention of her holiday, writing, “I hope you had a good trip to [country]! I have been there a couple of times and
really enjoyed it.” This switch from an almost exclusive discussion of Kathy’s manuscript to the personal topic of Kathy’s holiday appears to have helped with her successful effort to shift the brokering stance taken to broker-as-(partially)-responsible (see 6.2.1). In email 8 Kathy writes, “I was wondering if we might do the revisions in smaller stages?” (Kathy MS25 Email8) and attaches a file with provisional changes and four responses to the Editor’s earlier requests for changes highlighted in the text of the manuscript (Version 4, Figure 5-9). The Editor’s reply (Email11) accepted Kathy’s request from Email 8, responding to her queries in the attached Version 5, writing in the email, “You are really doing a nice job of getting the article into a more reader-friendly form. That is the kind of editing that most of our articles need.”

How the broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance played out in the correspondence helps to illustrate how this shift in revision work responsibility influenced uptake in Kathy’s manuscript. A Reviewer criticism of Version 1 of the manuscript was that there weren’t enough details regarding the teaching techniques used, with one Reviewer writing, “Author needs to add more details about how they taught students” (MS25 Email1). The Editor appears to take up this theme in commenting on a description of a technology solution described in the manuscript, asking for “a specific instance from your experience with one of your classes to illustrate your point” in Version 3. In Version 4, Kathy responds to the comment, “This is a rather difficult request and I’m not sure what you mean/are asking for.” The Editor’s reply in Version 5 is, “I think your additional appendix material provides enough examples, so you can ignore this.” Thus, in this instance an initial Reviewer criticism, insufficient pedagogic detail, appears to have been taken up by the Editor when
commenting on the revised article (Version 3), indicating further efforts to address this issue were necessary. Kathy had difficulty translating this request into changes to the text of the manuscript, and so raised it as a question for clarification in Version 4. The Editor’s assessment in Version 5 is that this request has already been addressed elsewhere in the manuscript, and so no further changes were necessary in relation to this point. Three of the four queries in Kathy’s Version 4 manuscript were answered this way, with the Editor indicating no further revision was necessary regarding those issues. In response to the fourth query the Editor elaborated on how Kathy could change the manuscript to address the concern raised. What is not clear from the interaction analyzed here is what influence the personal dimension in the correspondence (discussion of Kathy’s vacation) had on the shift of Editor stance to a broker-as-(partially)-responsible one, but it appears to have played some role in the Editor shifting stance and agreeing to examine Kathy’s manuscript more closely.

Another example of a shift from an author-as-responsible stance to a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance to revision work (see 5.4.1) responsibility in a set of correspondence comes from Eri’s Japan conference proceedings paper’s (MS27) text history. Following a similar pattern as that described for Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper (Figure 5-9), the “Co-Editors” write to Eri with the review results, introducing someone from the “Editorial Team to help you revise and prepare your paper for publication” (MS27 Email1). Both Reviewer reports flag language issues. Reviewer A notes “a few awkward sentences/expressions and some grammar/spelling mistakes” and Reviewer B observes “there are many language and formatting issues that will need to be addressed” (Eri MS27 Email1). In Email 2 the Editor asks her to “revise your paper according to the comments below and the files attached.” In Email 3 Eri sends her revised file to the Editor, then
in Email 4 the Editor replies, noting, “errors in the Reference data and errors with formatting,” asking Eri to make further corrections, and attaching the publication’s sample formatting pdf file. Eri replies in Email 5, writing “I’m not very sure where I should correct” and asking a technical question about the reference formatting.

Up until this point, the correspondence followed an author-as-responsible stance, but in Email 6 (Eri MS27) the Editor wrote, “I read through and started making some small changes – I ended up making quite a lot throughout the whole piece.” Here the Editor appears to have taken a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance by revising the manuscript directly. While the Editor’s Email 4 only noted problems with bibliographic formatting, between manuscript Version 3 (Email 3) and Version 4 (Email 7) there were 94 insertions, 88 deletions, and 10 moves (see definition 3.4.3) throughout the manuscript, indicating the revisions made were more extensive than the limited problems outlined in Email 4. Email 6 includes further manuscript revisions made by the Editor in addition to requests for Eri to make two additional changes, which Eri makes before returning the final available version of the manuscript to the Editor (Email 7, Version 4).

Eri’s experience with MS27 differs from Kathy’s experience with MS25 in that Kathy explicitly requested a change in the stance toward revision responsibility taken by asking, ‘I was wondering if we might do the revisions in smaller stages?’ Eri does not make such an explicit request and appears to implicitly accept the author-as-responsible stance taken, although she does ask for clarification of what technical formatting errors persisted in her revised manuscript (Email 5), which is not something that Jason and Alan did with their outside-Japan indexed journal paper (see 5.3.1) or Junpei with his Japan journal paper (see 5.3.3). This question from
Eri appears to lead the Editor to look more closely at her manuscript, initiating a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance as the Editor makes most of the required changes to the manuscript.

Finally, an instance of a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance from very early in the revision process was observed with John’s Japan conference proceedings paper’s text history, MS18. While the correspondence available is incomplete, it includes 13 messages sent between John and the Editor he communicated with. The first email available includes comments on “big picture issues” (MS18 Email1). In the message there is mention of an accompanying file with change markup that was not available for analysis. John’s reply makes a request that resembles Kathy’s request in her outside-Japan journal paper’s correspondence (MS25), with him writing, “I think it’s easier if I try to rework parts at a time instead of tackling the entire paper in one go” (MS18 Email2). The Editor’s reply states, “I read your intro and it is looking better. I just wrote the majority of my comments on the draft that I am attaching back to you” (MS18 Email5). The issues addressed in the exchange gradually shift to more specific, text-level changes later in the discourse. For example, in the final email from the Editor to John (MS18 Email13), the concerns raised regard “formatting”, specific wording changes, and “reference” formatting, in contrast to the “big picture issues” (Email1) flagged in the Editor’s initial message.

The stance toward revision work responsibility taken in John’s Japan conference proceedings paper’s (MS18) text history stands out because the Editor appears to have independently assumed a broker-as-(partially)-responsible stance. In other words, as in Eri’s case, John does not appear to have had a choice regarding the stance taken, suggesting it is the brokers who hold the power to decide the stance.
toward revision work responsibility in the exchanges. This is reinforced by the accounts of Kathy’s experience relayed above, both the unsuccessful attempt to shift the revision responsibility stance for her Japan conference proceedings paper correspondence described in 6.2.1 and the successful shift in responsibility with her outside-Japan journal paper correspondence discussed above.

6.2.3 (Not) communicating publication decisions in the exchanges

Having explored preferred and dispreferred stances toward the responsibilities of authors and brokers for revision work (see 5.4.1) in 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, the next three subsections explore different features or characteristics within the exchanges more generally. The first feature, discussed here, examines how publication decisions were communicated in the sets of correspondence. What is evident from the text histories analyzed in this thesis is that while the categories of ‘editorial screening’ and ‘review’ (see discussion of Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002 in 2.5 for definitions) could be inferred from the text histories, it was not always obvious from the correspondence what the brokers’ evaluations were, who made an evaluation, and whether the decision to accept a given manuscript for publication had been finalized or was conditional.

Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper’s trajectory appeared to most closely resemble the editorial process outlined by Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002). Following evaluation of Version 3 of their manuscript, they were given an explicit ‘re-submission’ decision (Figure 5-5). Following evaluation of Version 4 of their manuscript, they were informed “it will not be necessary for the article to be reviewed by the Panel” (Jason & Alan MS28 V4Letter) again. After submitting
Version 5 of their manuscript, they were informed the journal would “accept the revised version of your manuscript” (Jason & Alan MS28 V4Letter). In the same letter there was also mention of “Copy-editing and minor queries” (Jason & Alan MS28 V4Letter), a stage in the manuscript production process Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans do not explicitly address. As was pointed out in 5.4.3, it is also at this stage in the evaluation process, between Versions 5 and 6 (Figure 5-5), that Jason and Alan added a large amount of material to their manuscript’s End matter (Table 5-4), particularly their appendix (End Matter in Table 5-4), at the Editor’s request, drastically increasing its overall word count. While the copyediting changes were available for analysis (Version 6 in Figure 5-5), the email correspondence that accompanied the file was not, and so how these changes were explained in the correspondence is unclear.

Junpei’s manuscript trajectory also closely resembles Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans’ (2002) characterization of the manuscript evaluation process through to the evaluations of Version 3 (Figure 5-7). Following submission of Version 3 Junpei is explicitly informed of the decision to “re-examine” (再審査する) his manuscript (Junpei MS1 V3Letter). It is less clear who evaluated Version 4 of his manuscript and what the next stages of the publication process would entail. The Reviewer writes:

Carefully reading this paper (Manuscript [number], [description]) while considering the referee’s comments and corrections, it is obvious that the contributor made a great deal of efforts in research experiments and the like in creating this paper
The second half of the Reviewer’s comments have already been extracted in 6.2.1. What is not clear from the review text is who has completed this assessment. While Junpei’s Version 3 manuscript included evaluations from three “Reviewers” (査読者) (Junpei MS1 V3Letter), the Reviewer of Version 4 wrote in the second part of the assessment “as a reviewer” (査読者として) without identifying which Reviewer they were. Similarly, the Editor wrote “From the reviewer, I have the following comments” (再査読者から、以下のコメントがあります) (Junpei MS1 V4Letter). Which of the Reviewers is writing, or whether this is a new Reviewer, is not communicated in the correspondence. In addition, while the first letter Junpei received included instructions regarding when to resubmit his manuscript by, and that it “will be printed as is” (そのまま印刷されます) (Junpei MS1 V3Letter), this newer letter includes a final decision, “Accept (as a Research Note)” (採択(リサーチ・ノートとして)) and the instructions “Confirm the feedback and to the extent possible, please make the requested corrections” (ご確認いただき、修正を可能な範囲を[sic]行ってください) along with a deadline for resubmission, but does not include an explanation of how his revised manuscript will be handled (Junpei MS1 V4Letter).

In the Reviewer’s evaluation of Junpei’s manuscript, there are comments that would appear to be quite difficult to act on at this point in the manuscript’s trajectory. For example, the first comment is, “The number of participants is small” (参加者数が少ない). Between this version of the manuscript and the final version Junpei submits 268
for publication, the number of participants described as participating in his research does not change. Furthermore, it does not seem practical for Junpei to have tried to increase the number of his participants at this point in the process, as the letter gives him only 14 days to return the final version of his manuscript (Junpei MS1 V4Letter). Rather, this letter appears to be communicating a decision of “accepting/inviting the authors to resubmit the article as a Research Note” (Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans, 2002, p. 468), although whether the Version 5 manuscript will be accepted as submitted or will be revised further is not explicitly addressed in the correspondence. In this case, Junpei’s Version 5 manuscript appears to have been published as submitted.

The lack of clarity regarding the revision and evaluation process in official broker communication pointed out above comes through even more strongly in other manuscripts’ text histories. Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper and John’s outside-Japan book chapter paper are representative of this lack of clarity in the publication decision process.

In Kathy’s case, the Editor-in-Chief wrote following evaluation of Version 4 of her manuscript, “I would like to see this paper included in the Proceedings [...]” (Kathy MS23 Email1). There is not an explicit signaling of the extent of the revisions that are necessary beyond the instructions “to consider all the reviewers’ comments carefully as you revise” (Kathy MS23 Email1). Furthermore, in Kathy’s subsequent messages with her assigned Editor, there is not an explicit ‘decision’ statement with respect to her manuscript. The requirement to make further changes is expressed, with the Editor writing, “make all the necessary corrections in the text (following my suggestions) as soon as possible” (KathyMS24Email9), but there is no mention of
whether those changes would be the final ones, or if the Editor would be requesting further changes to the manuscript.

The process John’s outside-Japan book chapter paper underwent is even more uncertain regarding the editorial decision made at different points in the set of correspondence. Version 1 includes the assessment ‘your paper [...] has been selected’ with ‘a little addition and alteration’ (Figure 5-10) but the text of the review states, “This article must be retitled and restructured, using standard article sections” (John MS19 V1Feedback), suggesting that the manuscript requires more than ‘a little addition and alteration’. The evaluation of Version 2 of the manuscript does not include a clear decision statement, but rather two contrasting evaluations, including ‘We would very much like to include’ and ‘we require you to add some material’ (Figure 5-10), neither of which represent a clear decision statement with respect to the process the evaluation of the revised manuscript will follow. The assessment of Version 4 includes the statement, ‘Your adjusted text has been reviewed’ (Figure 5-10), although another round of ‘review’ was not explicitly flagged as planned or necessary in the evaluation of Version 2 of the manuscript.

Kathy’s outside-Japan journal paper, MS25, John’s Japan conference proceedings paper, MS18, and Eri’s Japan conference proceedings paper, MS27, exhibit similar uncertainty in the communication of publication decisions, as the Editors the authors correspond with did not explicitly signal whether or when a manuscript was ‘accepted’ versus ‘requires revisions’. John, referring to his Japan conference proceedings paper, MS18, noted this was a source of frustration, saying, “I felt like it was never going to be perfect and it was quite frustrating” (John Interview 1). This
theme of uncertainty in manuscript evaluations and its impact on how authors engaged with the revision process is returned to in 7.3.1.

6.2.4 Author difficulty in understanding and implementing changes

This section discusses uncertainty in official broker communication surrounding requirements to make changes to manuscripts and author difficulty in implementing changes. This was visible to a certain extent across almost all the sets of correspondence, with David’s outside-Japan journal paper a potential exception. Two examples are used to illustrate this struggle here.

Jason and Alan’s changes to their description of their Methods section has already been discussed in 5.4.3. What is of significance to the discussion here is Reviewer 1’s comment on Version 3 of their manuscript, “‘roughly gauge progress’: Why not use test results?” (Jason & Alan MS28 V3Letter). This became part of a larger question Jason and Alan had about the official brokers’ negative assessment of their manuscript’s description of its “research methodology” (Jason & Alan MS28 V3Letter). Jason and Alan found a resolution to this dilemma through consulting me as an unofficial broker (see 5.3.1). I noted that the methodology criticism appeared to be pointing out that their manuscript did not evidence the changes in student production they were claiming and suggested the addition of measurements of student production using instruments from the SLA literature. This resulted in Jason reanalyzing their student recordings and their ultimately successfully revising their manuscript to address the Reviewers’ criticisms in Version 4. While Reviewer 1’s comment ultimately led to their quantitatively assessing their students’ oral production to address the official brokers’ methodology criticism, that comment as written did not lead directly to the decision to add quantitative analysis to their
manuscript. Rather, my interpretation (as an unofficial broker) of the evaluation they had received from the official brokers was instrumental to their devising a strategy to address and resolve the issue raised.

However, not all the authors had an unofficial broker to help them interpret official broker comments. An example of an ongoing struggle to accommodate the requirements of Reviewers can be seen in Junpei’s Japan journal paper’s text history (see 5.3.3), whereby Junpei to a certain extent appears to not have adequately addressed all (or enough) of the concerns the Reviewers raised, as the manuscript was accepted as a Research Note rather than a Research Article (see discussion in 6.2.3). One example of Junpei’s struggle to accommodate Reviewer criticisms across multiple versions of his manuscript comes from a Table with TOEIC score information for the participants in his research, along with the following claim:

Following this statistical data, in this study, differences between these groups are considered as very minimal. (Junpei MS1 V1)

Reviewer 3 challenges this claim, noting a difference in the standard deviation for one of the three groups’ TOEIC scores and pointing out Junpei did not account for this:

There was no test for the difference between the average values of the three groups. Moreover, the standard deviation of the Control Group appears to be much lower than the other groups. (Junpei MS1 V1 Letter)

Junpei tries to address this Reviewer’s concern in Version 2 by explaining the difference as ‘obvious’: “Although standard deviation of the control group is obviously small […]” (Junpei MS1 Version 2). The Reviewer responds: “Why does
the author say that ‘Although standard deviation of the control group is obviously small […]’. Why is it so obvious?” (Junpei MS1 V2Letter). Junpei’s response is to remove the added sentence in Version 3. However, in the evaluation of Version 3 the issue is raised again, this time by two Reviewers, one of whom suggests the solution Junpei ultimately implements, which was to use a statistical test to demonstrate that the difference in test scores between the different learner groups in his research are indeed non-significant:

Reviewer A: [...] TOEIC scores are shown as evidence of group similarity. However, statistical tests were not conducted to assess the presence / lack of statistically significant differences among the groups. The standard deviation of the control group is clearly different from the other two groups.

Reviewer C: The Control Group’s SD is smaller than the others. Can they be regarded as equivalent? (Control Group の SD が他と比べて小さい。同等とみなしてよいか。) (Junpei MS1 V3Letter)

From Version 4 the sentence, “A one-way ANOVA also showed that the differences of the scores of each group were not statistically significant…” (Junpei MS1 V4) was added, which was carried through to the final version, and which appeared to resolve this issue. This specific example of struggle suggests Junpei did not understand the Version 1 Reviewer’s implied suggestion that it was necessary to test for significant differences statistically until the explicit request for a ‘statistical’ test by Reviewer A commenting on Version 3, indicating that for Junpei picking up on which aspects of Reviewers’ comments required action, particularly when that action was not explicitly described, was a nontrivial task.
Kathy and John’s manuscripts also evidenced similar struggles to accommodate official brokers’ requested revisions. The above examples, along with Kathy and John’s experiences, suggest that when authors are assessed as having not adequately revised their manuscripts, this may not reflect unwillingness on their part to accommodate official broker demands, but may suggest that they have misunderstood or misinterpreted the official brokers’ evaluations.

6.2.5 The significance of turnaround times in the exchanges

Turnaround times, who can decide them, and who must abide by them, are another salient feature of the exchanges. The brokers set deadlines the authors were expected to follow, while at the same time brokers were apparently not themselves subject to the same restrictions. This is perhaps most striking in the text history of Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper (see 5.3.5). Kathy was given two weeks to revise her manuscript following review of Version 4 (dated 2011.3 in Figure 5-9), a deadline she met. Then the Editor does not respond to Kathy’s Version 7 for almost four months. When the Editor does reply, Kathy is given only one day, “by tomorrow” (Kathy MS24 Email9), to complete Version 8 of her manuscript.

While Junpei’s Japan journal and Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal papers are given longer turnaround times, the consequences of not making the deadlines are explicitly laid out in their text histories. The letter Junpei receives after evaluation of Version 3 of his manuscript states:

The deadline for submitting the revised manuscript is [date—approx. 1 month later]. When the deadline date has passed, it will be understood you do not intend to resubmit and your manuscript will be considered withdrawn.
書き直し原稿提出の締め切りは、[date—approx. 1 month later] とさせていただきます。締め切り日を過ぎた場合には、再提出の意思がなく、投稿を撤回したものとして理解します。(Junpei MS1 V3Letter)

Jason and Alan’s official broker evaluation of Version 3 of their manuscript states:

In order to be treated as a re-submission, re-written articles must be received within six months. (Jason & Alan MS28 V3Letter)

What the sets of correspondence analyzed do not include is a commitment from the brokers regarding when they will return evaluations of the revised manuscripts authors send them.

While most of the official broker correspondence set specific deadlines and consequences for not meeting those deadlines, a minority of correspondence demonstrated some flexibility regarding deadlines. David’s outside-Japan journal paper’s text history shows more flexibility in deadlines than those discussed above. There is a deadline set for returning revisions, but this is described as, “to be considered for publication in” (David MS22 V1Letter) the earliest possible issue of the journal. The implication is that the manuscript could be considered for a later issue if the revisions are not completed on time. Jordan is given a little more than a month to revise his outside-Japan conference proceedings paper, but then is given additional time after missing this deadline (see discussion in 5.4.1), suggesting that at least in some cases brokers may exercise flexibility with respect to revision deadlines.

Related to, but distinct from, the issue of turnaround times are assumptions of author availability. Across the exchanges there is the assumption of author availability to
do additional work on their manuscripts with little or no planning or warning time. Jordan’s outside-Japan conference proceedings paper demonstrates this to some extent. While he is taking a one-month holiday to return to his country of origin, he receives the evaluation of his manuscript and is given a one-month turnaround time to complete revisions, a deadline which he (understandably) misses. In Jordan’s case, the deadline is ultimately extended, and he and his coauthor spend a weekend completing their revisions.

In Kathy’s case, she is given until “by tomorrow” (MS24 Email9) to revise her manuscript following almost four months of no contact from her Editor. Kathy said that the same day the Editor’s request arrived, Kathy had grades due to one of the universities she was teaching at part-time, and she decided to prioritize revising her manuscript over completing her grading.

Jason and Alan, having been given deadlines throughout the revision process for their outside-Japan indexed journal paper’s manuscript, are given a further deadline during copyediting, receiving the following instructions:

We aim to publish your paper online within four to six weeks of receipt. You should receive the link to the PDF proof of your article by email within the next two to three weeks, and you will be asked to return corrections within three working days. (Jason & Alan MS28 V8Letter)

Again, the assumption in the correspondence is that the authors will make themselves available to complete this work according to the timelines set by the official brokers.
6.3 Summary

This chapter has examined the exchange structures in the sets of correspondence associated with the text histories analyzed in Chapter 5. The dominant exchange structure was identified as initial author manuscript submission followed by iterations of broker feedback which initiated (further) author manuscript revision and submission for (further) evaluation, with evidence of preferred and dispreferred stances towards responsibility for revision. Five key features of the author-broker exchanges were analyzed: stances toward author and broker responsibility for revision, changes in stances toward revision work responsibility, (not) communicating publication decisions, author difficulty in understanding and implementing changes, and the significance of turnaround times.

The ‘preferred’ stance toward revision responsibility identified was ‘author-as-responsible’, where the authors were responsible for deciding what changes needed to be made to their manuscripts and implementing those changes. This somewhat resembles Lillis and Curry’s (2015) identification of a “concerned-deficit (It’s your problem)” (p. 138) stance toward the changes indicated in the evaluations of manuscripts whose correspondence they examined, where authors were responsible for producing manuscripts to standard. Whereas Lillis and Curry were specifically interested in investigating “reviewer orientations towards ‘English’, ‘language’ and ‘language work’” (p. 128) in the correspondence they analyzed, the analysis in this chapter has demonstrated that such stances apply to manuscripts more generally, beyond a narrow focus on language issues. To a lesser extent, a ‘dispreferred’ ‘broker-as-(partially)-responsible’ stance toward revision was identified in some of the sets of correspondence, where the brokers took (some)
responsibility for identifying and implementing the manuscript changes they felt were necessary. This somewhat resembles Lillis and Curry’s (2015) “concerned-interventionist” (p. 139) orientation, “whereby evaluators construe language work to be done as part of the forging of knowledge production and see this work as a shared responsibility” (p. 139).

While some changes in revision work responsibility were identified in some of the sets of correspondence, official brokers held the power to decide what stance toward revision work responsibility would be taken. Authors had only a limited ability to influence who had responsibility for the revision work in the exchanges. Analyzing how publication decisions were communicated showed that brokers did not always clearly communicate what assessment had been made of a manuscript and how revised manuscript versions would be handled upon resubmission. These authors’ experiences of stances toward manuscript revision within the sets of correspondence were shown to not necessarily reflect the depictions of journal review processes from the literature, such as those by Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans (2002).

Issues of authors struggling to understand and implement changes were considered, evidencing author difficulty in interpreting Reviewer evaluations in several cases. The significance of turnaround times in the chains of correspondence was also discussed, particularly how the authors were held to deadlines set by official brokers, while the brokers appeared to not be held to deadlines to the same extent. Official broker assumptions regarding author availability to engage in additional revision work were also discussed, particularly how this impacted on authors’ personal and professional lives.
7. Discussion of Japan-based authors’ experiences of writing for academic publication: Revisiting the research questions

7.1 Introduction

This chapter synthesizes key findings emerging from the data analyzed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 with respect to the research questions, exploring issues such as pressure to publish, multiple target communities for publication and tensions surrounding production of papers oriented toward English language teaching pedagogy rather than ‘research’. The chapter is organized around each of the research questions, followed by a chapter summary.

7.2 Why do early career Japan-based language teachers write for academic publication and what academic publication practices do they engage in?

A key aspect of the authors’ experiences that stands out is the heterogeneity across the different authors and across individual authors’ experiences of writing different
manuscripts. For example, Jason and Alan had quite a different experience of writing for publication from Kathy (see 6.2.1), and even when writing the same coauthored paper, Jason and Alan expressed very different reasons underlying their selection of journal (see 4.3.1 & 4.3.2). David was (at least initially) much less connected to unofficial brokers than Junpei, Kathy, Jason and Alan (see 4.3). Jordan’s reasons for writing for university kiyo journals changed between when he was working part-time and after he secured full-time contract employment (see 4.3.5). This heterogeneity of author experience contrasts with the frequently oversimplistic depictions of author motivation and experience in the literature reviewed (see 2.6).

7.2.1 The significance of authors tending to view their writing as pedagogically oriented while brokers tended toward a research orientation

There was a common tension in the evaluations of the authors’ work between an English language teaching versus research orientation, with authors tending to view their writing as pedagogically oriented while brokers tended to take a research orientation. Specifically, the six foreign residents of Japan were oriented toward writing for publication as a means of improving their teaching practice (see 4.4.3). However, in manuscript revisions a main change to methods sections involved the removal of classroom teaching-oriented guidance and discussion of classroom activities while technical detail, definitions of terms, and explanation of analytical instruments and concepts tended to be added (see 5.4.3). Author difficulties in understanding how to change their manuscripts tended to involve Reviewer
requests to address methodological and research-oriented issues, influencing how their work was represented (see 6.2.3).

The authors’ orientation toward their writing for publication, with improving their classroom language teaching being a key goal (excepting Junpei), is discussed in 4.4.3. Kathy is perhaps representative of this. She wrote in an email that the purpose of her writing for publication was to explore “ideas to make teaching easier and more fun for everyone involved” (Kathy Interview 35; see 4.3.6). The changes requested to Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings manuscript (see 5.3.5) illustrate a contrasting broker interest in the research aspects of her manuscript over its pedagogical content. For example, compare Kathy’s pedagogical orientation above with the following in-text Reviewer comment:

Method comment: not a clear description of the methodology. This paragraph should be informative enough so that anyone reading the article could duplicate what the author did. (Kathy MS23 Version 5; see Figure 5-9)

The Reviewer’s use of the word ‘duplicate’ appears to take a positivist stance toward research writing for publication (Ssempala & Tillotson, 2015), implying Kathy needed to account for the conditions in which she taught this material in a way that could be reproduced in other classrooms. That the two Editors Kathy interacted with note that she should consider ‘all’ of the feedback from the Reviewers (see 5.3.5) further implies that they (at least implicitly) agree with this Reviewer’s stance. The consequent changes made to the manuscript included attention to the technological aspects of Kathy’s teaching and information about the specific teaching material Kathy used in her lessons. The additions of these technology-oriented descriptions were accompanied by the removal of commentary regarding the teaching context
within which this pedagogic material was deployed. For example, that the syllabus at the institution was “relatively free of university or departmental requirements”, that Kathy considered the film clips to provide “an example of the output desired”, and that the film clips used included a “scenario, whether ordering in a restaurant, asking to try on clothing in a store, or speaking to a professor at a university” (Kathy MS23 Version 4). This illustrates how attention to classroom teacher concerns were removed, while concerns related to research replicability were added, a change characteristic of all six of the text history analyses.

Junpei’s Japan journal paper, which he characterized as ‘research’ rather than ‘teaching’ oriented can help, through contrast, to illustrate how the changes made to a research-oriented manuscript mirror those made to the teaching-oriented manuscripts of the other text histories analyzed (see 5.3). Specifically, the changes to Junpei’s methods section included additional explanation of the methods of the experimental design of the investigation described in his paper and changes to the vocabulary used to reference his research participants. References to his research participants were changed from an orientation toward their role in the task they completed: “speakers” and “hearer” (Junpei MS1 Version 1) to an orientation toward their role in the research: “participant” (Junpei MS1 Version 5). The original sentence Junpei used in Version 1 (Figure 5-7) to describe the task participants completed was, “In this task, speakers were required to introduce some friends in the picture to the hearer.” This became, in Version 5, “In this task, one participant was required to introduce some ‘friends’ in a picture to another participant.” Consistent with a research orientation, the brokers evaluated the task’s research efficacy. A concern of two Reviewers was that it involved interaction between two
participants, meaning “They listen to not only the output but also the partner’s English” (アウトプットだけでなく、相手の英語も聞いている), with the consequence that “there is no control of output and input” (アウトプットとインプットの点で統制がとれていない) (Version 3 Reviewer C). Here the Reviewers evaluated the task as a research instrument, identifying the use of pairs for the activity as a weakness, as they felt this resulted in insufficient control of language input. They criticized the task for lacking adequate control (in the Reviewers’ opinions) over the experimental conditions, questioning the quality of the data Junpei collected. In other words, the Reviewers did not evaluate the task as a teaching activity. Rather, they criticized its usefulness in Junpei’s research. The identified shortcomings of the task are cited by the Reviewer who recommended accepting the manuscript as a ‘Research Note’ rather than an ‘Article’ following Junpei’s submission of Version 4 (see Figure 5-7).

As Junpei’s manuscript was oriented toward language learning research in contrast to pedagogy, it may be unsurprising that in its final version its research-orientation was enhanced relative to earlier versions of the manuscript. However, all six of the manuscripts analyzed underwent similar changes, despite the authors of the other manuscripts considering their work ‘teaching-oriented’. This was illustrated with respect to Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper above, and Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper in 5.4.3, where the Reviewers raised methodological concerns, which the authors invested considerable effort in addressing. Ultimately what Jason and Alan characterized rather loosely as action research in earlier versions of their manuscript ended up outlining three explicit action research “cycles” (Version 7 in Figure 5-5) in its final version. The third of these cycles was exclusively research oriented, as the course had ended and neither of the authors were teaching at that institution anymore.
The potential benefits of language teachers investigating and reporting on innovations in their classroom practice, often framed as “action research” (Burns, 2010, p. 2), have been lauded for some time (for example in Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988). There have also been descriptions of “periphery journals” seeking to disseminate teacher classroom research (Cárdenas & Rainey, 2017, p. 158). However, penetration of teacher research into international indexed journals has been described as inadequate, with the “problematic gap between theory/research on the one hand and classroom practice on the other” (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014, p. xi) in the English language teaching and learning field generally (discussed in 4.4.3) persisting and perhaps widening (Garton & Richards, 2015). What the research reported here shows is that the stances brokers take toward authors’ texts influences how authors report their work in their published manuscripts, as initially practice-oriented work is shifted through the review and revision process toward more research-oriented work. In all six of the text histories analyzed in Chapter 5 there was a tendency for pedagogical aspects of methods to be de-emphasized and for (further) emphasis of aspects of research. This occurred as the texts progressed in their trajectories from initial through to published versions and related to both changes recommended by brokers and the “uptake” (Lillis and Curry, 2015, p. 130) of those changes.

Such broker stances, and the changes they result in, may serve to exacerbate the ‘gap’ in the field between theory/research and teaching practice identified by Lantolf and Poehner (2014). This could be because when faced with official brokers’ requirements to focus on research, such as requests to expand on investigative methods (Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper; see 5.3.5) or to explain
issues of methodology (David’s outside Japan journal paper; see 5.3.2) rather than the pedagogic aspects of their work, teachers may become disenchanted with writing for publication, as Kathy’s experience evidences (see 6.2). Such authors may choose to not disseminate their work through publications (Kathy leaves Japan in part to work in a position where there is not an expectation that she write for publication), or to concentrate on publications where their work can be published relatively more easily without needing to meet the expectations of official brokers, like university kiyo journals (as David notes; see 4.3.3). Alternatively, authors more interested in research may find themselves more attracted to publishing, and so their writing may shift from a classroom focus initially to more of the research focus expected of published work as they gain experience. What the research reported here contributes is a picture of how this gap influenced the authors’ writing for publication, offering some insights as to its nature and how it is perpetuated through writing “in disciplines” (Bazerman, 1980, p. 657), in this case the discipline of English language teaching research.

7.2.2 Authors write for multiple communities

The research presented in this thesis suggests there is considerable variation in author thinking about what communities they are writing for. Individual authors wrote for very local communities, including communities as small as the institutions they work for (such as with Jordan’s later university kiyo journal articles). Two publication types are outlined here as examples of this variation, exploring author experiences of pressure to publish. These include the publishing of university kiyo journal articles between Jordan (see 4.3.5) and David (see 4.3.3) and publication of the outside-Japan indexed journal article by Jason and Alan (see 5.3.1).
Regarding university kiyo journal publication, David viewed this as a relatively sure way to acquire the required publications necessary for securing future limited-term contract employment (see 4.3.3). He acknowledged that peer-reviewed, relatively higher stakes international journal publication was more desirable than university kiyo journal publication, but that publication in university kiyo journals was a “shoo-in” (David Interview 2), as he felt acceptance was automatic and publication schedules were relatively certain, while peer-reviewed publication carried with it the risk of rejection and relatively uncertain publication schedules. Uncertain peer-reviewed journal schedules may or may not meet timelines for contract renewal and job applications, which David measured in one or two years, while some journal publications for some authors took as long as three years (such as Junpei’s Japan journal publication; see Figure 5-7). David felt that his university kiyo journal publications, while they may not be ‘peer reviewed’, could help showcase the quality of his work to internal review committees and external hiring committees. He acknowledged others outside of these relatively narrow groups may read his work, but he was largely focused on the potential of these publications to advance his personal career interests.

Jordan’s reasoning behind why he wrote for university kiyo journals changed over time. Jordan’s first university kiyo journal publication was intended to help a full-time contracted colleague who was feeling acute pressure to publish “something” (Jordan Interview 1) quickly (see 4.3.5). Jordan adapted a master’s course assignment for his colleague’s university kiyo journal as a coauthored paper. As the university kiyo journal only accepted submissions at least partially authored by full-time faculty, co-authoring was necessary for Jordan to publish in the journal. Jordan also felt he
needed the publication to move from part-time to full-time university work. Whitshed (2011), interviewing part-time adjunct teachers of English, also noted them observing that, “many universities did not allow adjuncts to publish articles in their journals, which are reserved for full-time academics” (p. 174). Later, after securing full-time contract university work, Jordan continued to write university kiyo journal papers, but he saw these as largely directed internally, as they were intended to influence the institution’s provision of language education resources toward programs Jordan thought important. He envisioned his audience as his senior colleagues responsible for editing the university kiyo journal and the committee members that would read samples of his writing submitted along with his annual contract renewal application. Thus, while originally Jordan saw his initial university kiyo journal paper as intended to assist both his colleague and himself with expectations regarding writing for publication, Jordan saw his later university kiyo journal papers as intended to influence (very) local policy makers, and not as focused around issues of expectations to publish.

The discussion above examined one publication type, university kiyo journal publication, and how author reasoning behind publishing university kiyo journal papers differed between two authors and over time for one author. The next example shows how two authors of the same paper, Jason and Alan, had very different motives behind choice of publication type, and how such differences may help to ultimately facilitate successful publication. Alan viewed publication in an “international – outside Japan” (Alan Interview 1) journal as focused around the need to successfully apply for future full-time university contract positions, and early in the research process made this case to Jason (see 4.3.2). Jason was focused on the opportunity and challenge that publishing in an international indexed journal
presented, feeling he had experience of publishing within Japan but “nothing international” (Jason Interview 1, see 4.3.1). In the case of their manuscript (see Figure 5-5), it may be that these two different perspectives were complimentary in some sense, as Alan pushed for them to select an outside-Japan indexed journal as a target publication and Jason’s interest in the challenge posed by pursuing publication in the journal led him to consult a variety of brokers who facilitated their efforts. This included soliciting pre-submission feedback from a Reviewer with the journal, consulting a colleague about how to interpret Reviewer evaluations, and completing additional analysis to address Reviewer criticisms. Seen from this perspective, Alan’s focus on publishing an outside-Japan indexed journal paper was complimented by Jason’s focus on the process of writing, analysis, and revision. This is not to say that Jason did not benefit professionally from the publication. It was ultimately part of his successful application for contract renewal and promotion. However, Jason’s reasons for writing the paper were not primarily focused around issues of contract renewal and promotion, in contrast to how some literature depicts author reasoning regarding writing for international English publication (see 2.3).

The research presented in this thesis contributes empirical evidence about authors writing for academic publication, adding further perspectives to a topic of continuing controversy and debate. The literature reviewed in 2.3 tended to characterize author practices of writing for academic publication in two ways: using a relatively simple model of authors writing as part of a community or using a relatively more complex model of authors writing within and for various communities. The former tends to view authors as writing within a ‘publish or perish’ paradigm, where they struggle to publish their work to gain access to resources, such as employment and research
funds, that accompany successful publication (see, for example, Lee & Lee, 2013).

Part of this interpretation is that writing for publication involves participating in a field's conversation, with the journal evaluation process mediating what is and can be said within a given field. This is described by Englander and López-Bonilla (2011) as follows:

Publishing scientific articles is a crucial activity performed by a scientist to demonstrate inclusion as part of the community of scientists: a community constituted by journal editors, Reviewers, authors and readers. A manuscript submitted to journals is first read by Reviewers, and their decision to accept it creates membership in the community for the author with its attendant privileges of ingroup status. Rejection bars such membership. (p. 396)

The problematic aspects of this relatively simpler characterization of author practice are highlighted through asking questions such as:

- Who is constitutive of such communities?
- Who are the gatekeepers within a specific field?
- Where should divisions be drawn between specialisms and sub-specialisms?

The relatively more complex model of author practice reviewed in 2.3 saw authors writing for multiple communities, with different reasonings behind contributions to these different communities. This included the high-stakes ‘publish or perish’ paradigm outlined above along with a desire to contribute to more local and practice-oriented (as opposed to research-oriented) communities. While Lillis and Curry’s (2010) model of seven communities that authors write for was the most complex reviewed, several other researchers have also noted authors writing for more than just the ‘international’ English language, high-stakes English research community.
Lillis (2013) refers to relatively high-stakes centering pulls as “centripetal” (p. 133) and more disruptive de-centering pulls as “centrifugal” (p. 133), noting that both can simultaneously act on authors and the manuscripts they produce, influencing where and how they publish (see 2.3).

Debate continues about who constitute writing for academic publication communities, and whether the experiences of authors writing from outside of the Anglophone center really are different from those writing from within the center (see 2.3, specifically Hyland, 2016 & Politzer-Ahles, et al., 2016). The research presented in this thesis demonstrates that the authors profiled and investigated here were writing for multiple communities, suggesting the more complex models of author publication behavior better represent their experiences.

The implications of the investigation reported in this thesis are that the authors’ perspectives on their writing for academic publication are not well represented by simpler models of author practice, which do not capture the variety involved in these authors’ ideas of community and audience. Rather, a more complex understanding of author practice regarding where and how they publish is more representative of their experiences. Specifically, the research described here makes two contributions: the author experiences demonstrate greater complexity than is generally represented in ‘publish or perish’ descriptions of author publication practices and the authors’ concepts of community appear to be more varied than has been previously described, with community also represented by very local, institution-level groups in some cases (see 4.3.5).
7.2.3 **Author difficulty in selecting journals to submit manuscripts to**

For many of the authors in this investigation, choosing where to submit their manuscripts was a nontrivial task, with considerable evidence of uncertainty for many of them. Such uncertainty included knowledge of what counted as a ‘good’ publication, what was important for career progression, and what was not. The difficulties the authors faced in selecting journals to submit manuscripts to are explored here.

Alan noted that he sought outside-Japan indexed journal publication after learning that the kinds of publications he had been contributing to previously “get a zero” on institutional evaluations, lower than the “one” (Alan Interview 1) awarded for university koyo journal publication. Jason heard from his academic dean that to qualify for promotion he needed 15 publications, although he was given this information three years into a five-year contract as he was preparing his renewal application, leaving him little time to try to meet those requirements. As the type of publication did not seem to be particularly important, Jason pursued a conference proceedings paper to secure the necessary number of published papers for his application. John, discussing his first publication, in a conference proceedings, stated, “just having a chance to publish in the [conference] proceedings, although they’re not I guess as respected as other journals or outlets, it was a really useful place to start, I guess. I have no idea.” (John Interview 1), although he feels his book chapter paper is relatively higher prestige, saying “You know I’ve got this book now and I think some colleagues are kind of envious of that one.” (John Interview 1). Kathy explicitly observed in an email that she felt knowing where to publish was
problematic, “Another insight I had today about the difficulty of publishing – not being aware of what journals to try to publish in” (Kathy Interview 6).

The author uncertainty summarized above appears to be at least partially institutional in nature, as authors are held to standards that may only be available in Japanese, and even when institutional documents are in English, there appears to be an assumption that terms are clearly understood and defined while there is some ambiguity as to possible interpretations. Here these issues are discussed, highlighting author uncertainty regarding how their writing for publication is evaluated.

One common term in hiring documents is ‘refereed’, apparently referring to whether papers have been peer reviewed. A “national science university” “seeking candidates for part-time teaching positions” noted that one of five required qualifications for the position included, “Publication of at least two refereed academic papers.” (Document 2017-12-17-1). The same document requests “application materials” including:

1) Resume in English, detailing: Personal background information, qualifications, relevant work experience, presentations, publications (indicate whether they are refereed or not) or other academic research activities.

2) Electronic copies of two refereed publications.

(formattting my emphasis)

Another request in application documents is to sort papers by type. For example, another national university’s application form included four categories of publication in the following order: “Books”, “Book Chapters”, “Original Articles” and “Others”
noting, “Proceedings and academic reports should be listed as ‘Others’” (Document 2011-2-14-1).

Examining the institutional requirements outlined above, they appear concerned with whether manuscripts are refereed and their type (see 3.4.3 for discussion of manuscript types). Potential ambiguity in how manuscripts should be classified, and how their relative importance is evaluated, can be highlighted by considering some specific examples from the authors’ papers analyzed in this thesis. John’s outside-Japan book chapter (Figure 5-10) was a chapter in a conference proceedings published as a book. Yet whether hiring committees would consider it a book chapter, or whether its origins as a conference proceedings means it should be listed as ‘other’ is unclear from the instructions available in the documents cited above. John’s interpretation appears to be that it is a book chapter and not a proceedings paper (see interview extract above). Refereeing has similar potential for uncertainty, as there is considerable variability in review practice across fields and journals (Benos, et al., 2006; Hargens, 1990 also see 3.4.3). For example, one English language teaching journal describes itself under the heading of ‘Disclaimer’ as:

[...] a peer-reviewed publication. Articles submitted by prospective authors are carefully considered by our editorial team, and where appropriate, feedback and advice is provided. The Journal is not blind refereed. (Document 2017-12-31)

Whether the journal’s self-description as ‘a peer-reviewed publication’ is synonymous with hiring committee expectations that publications be ‘refereed’ is unclear, but what the extract from the journal above helps to illustrate is the potential
ambiguity authors may face when deciding how to present their work to review and hiring committees, and the uncertainty they may experience with regard to how those committees ultimately evaluate and interpret the choices they make about how they represent their published work.

Among the seven authors profiled in Chapter 4, Junpei was an exception when it came to uncertainty about how publications are evaluated institutionally. He expressed awareness of what journals were considered prestigious, and the kinds of publications he would need to secure work following his PhD studies. Whether this is because Junpei was a Japanese PhD student at a Japanese national university and so had access to privileged information regarding institutional expectations (the two other Japanese PhD students interviewed expressed similar familiarity with expectations regarding writing for publication in Japanese HE), or if it was due to some other factor is not a conclusion that can be drawn through the investigation reported in this thesis. Also, how well-founded Junpei’s (and the other Japanese PhD students’) confidence was could not be evaluated in this investigation. I did interview Japanese authors who exhibited uncertainty regarding institutional evaluation criteria. Eri, whose Japan conference proceedings paper correspondence is discussed in 6.2.2, was working at the same university for more than twenty years and noted she was unsure how her writing for publication was evaluated, but that she had been informed she had not been publishing enough. Another Japanese full-time contract lecturer, Aya, also noted that it was not clear to her, particularly at the beginning of her seeking full-time employment, what publications were preferred by hiring committees. She noted most of the information she received on the topic was from fellow contract lecturer language teachers, rather
than official institutional guidelines or guidance from senior faculty on hiring or review committees.

The author uncertainty with respect to where to publish and how their published academic work would be evaluated that is discussed above can be contrasted with the literature reviewed, where there tends to be an assumption that information about where to publish is readily available to authors and selecting a journal is a relatively straightforward matter of parsing institutional requirements and expectations (see, for example, Li, 2014). As this research was primarily interested in authors’ writing for academic publication, how they navigate such uncertainty in their job applications, including representation of their publications in documents submitted for hiring and promotion review, was not a focus of analysis. However, what the research described in this thesis demonstrates is that there is considerable potential for uncertainty regarding how their writing for publication is evaluated, and that the authors, particularly Kathy and Alan, noted this as problematic when describing the process behind deciding where to submit their work. Furthermore, this issue was raised by the authors profiled in this thesis, while in the literature reviewed there tends to be an assumption that deciding where to publish is unproblematic. For example, Canagarajah and Lee (2014), in discussing whether Lee’s manuscript, submitted to *TESOL Quarterly*, should be published as a ‘Forum’ piece or as a ‘full-length article’, observe that the former isn’t counted in institutional evaluations of author publications, while the latter is, writing, “While we do give such articles space in the journal, we don’t treat them as fully fledged research articles. Forum articles don’t get institutional credit, and nor are they treated as enjoying equal stature with full-length articles” (p. 74). That the claim ‘Forum articles don’t get institutional credit’ is presented as objectively true and unambiguous signals the
kinds of assumptions that tend to be made in the literature with respect to author knowledge of institutional evaluation and review systems. What the authors’ experiences as related in this thesis suggest is that such evaluation and review systems may be more opaque than is generally acknowledged. Answering whether this opacity is specific to these authors, to Japan, or is more widespread among authors writing for publication globally is beyond the scope of the investigation presented in this thesis.

7.3 What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions?

In addressing this second research question, this section focuses on three areas of significance that arose from the data analysis: the role that uncertainty in official broker (see Table 5-2) communication plays in manuscript revision, official broker pressure for authors to account for additional contexts in their writing for publication, and discussion of what official brokers evaluate in addition to authors’ manuscripts.

7.3.1 Uncertainty in evaluative brokering practices

The author experiences described in this thesis suggest that uncertainty regarding the journal publication decision during brokering, at least from the authors’ perspectives, is the norm rather than the exception across most of the text histories analyzed. The author-broker interactions exhibited uncertainty in author-broker
communication across many of the manuscripts with respect to how many times a manuscript was to be reviewed and when a manuscript was 'accepted' (see 6.2.3). One of the implications of such uncertainty in the communication was that in many instances where the authors’ manuscripts were in their trajectories, whether they had been accepted, whether they required 'minor revisions' but not further review, whether they were going to be peer reviewed again, and the extent to which the changes requested were (not) negotiable or mandatory was generally not explicitly outlined to the authors.

Uncertainty driving author revisions is particularly prominent in John’s and Kathy’s experiences, although it was generally prevalent across the sets of correspondence analyzed. In John’s case, with his first Japan conference proceedings paper, he commented on the uncertainty regarding the decision status of his paper during ongoing revisions, “I felt like it was never going to be perfect and it was quite frustrating” (John Interview 1; see also 4.3.7). The correspondence around his outside-Japan book chapter exhibited similar uncertainty, with the Editor returning multiple requests for further revisions and eventually (re)writing entire paragraphs when John failed (from the Editor’s perspective) to make the necessary changes (its text history is analyzed in 5.3.6). Regarding this revision and re-revision process, John observed:

They said because it was going to be in a book they were cutting a lot of the papers out and I didn’t think mine was going to make it. But finally, it was. Those notes, I revised it I don’t know how many more times, many, and then finally they accepted it […] (John Interview 1; see also 4.3.7)
John’s receiving “notes” and revising his manuscript “many more times, many” under the threat of it being ‘cut’ helps to illustrate how the uncertainty of whether his manuscript was going to be accepted or not appears to have driven him to further revision work in the hope it would be accepted.

With Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper, the Editors’ instructions were to first “completely” (Kathy MS23 Email5) revise her manuscript according to “all the reviewers’ comments” (Kathy MS23 Email1) before submitting a revised version. The Editor then returned feedback requesting further revisions, but whether these were final revisions, or if there would be further requests for changes was not explicitly addressed in the correspondence. A next day deadline resulted in Kathy prioritizing the requested changes to her manuscript over other pending work obligations (see 6.2.2). In other words, the possibility of Kathy’s manuscript being accepted drove her to do additional revision work despite it being unclear whether her manuscript would ultimately be accepted or not.

Contrasting with the authors’ experiences of uncertainty over review decisions described above, the literature reviewed tends to consider peer review to be relatively stable and transparent (see, for example, Flowerdew and Dudley-Evans, 2002) with the “various stages” (Paltridge, 2017, p. 23) and Reviewer assessments clear to authors. However, as Weller (2001) observes, the practice of peer review can be quite variable, and is not implemented consistently across fields or individual journals within fields (see also 7.2.3). Canagarajah and Lee (2014), in discussing a manuscript submitted to *TESOL Quarterly*, offer a relatively rare perspective on an Editor’s reasoning process behind manuscript review decision communication. Canagarajah was particularly concerned about Reviewers returning a decision of
“minor changes” (p. 85) on Lee’s manuscript, which he describes as “accept pending changes” (p. 84). Canagarajah, the journal Editor, notes this as a decision after which he can work with an author directly to further revise the manuscript without the need to consult peer Reviewers again. As Lee notes, her understanding of ‘minor’ referred to relatively few and narrow changes to her manuscript. However, the revisions requested at the point in the brokering process where Canagarajah made a ‘minor changes’ decision included a Reviewer’s changes to more than 1/3 of the text of Lee’s manuscript. The misunderstanding of terminology and intent between Lee and Canagarajah signals the potential for disconnect between Editor decision and author interpretation, or what I have referred to as ‘uncertainty’ above. Canagarajah potentially viewed the term ‘minor revisions’ as a technical one, a kind of hurdle past which Lee’s paper needed to progress in its trajectory if it were going to be published. On the other hand, Lee, as author, was more focused on the process as it was acting on her manuscript, and viewed the term as inaccurate, as she felt the changes requested were more involved than what she felt ‘minor revisions’ indicated.

Lillis (2001), examining HE student writing and tutor feedback, refers to an “institutional practice of mystery” (p. 58) in UK HE, in that the communication from students’ tutors is opaque (from the students’ perspectives) with respect to what is expected of them in their assessed assignments. While the research presented in this thesis is interested in writing for academic publication, a similar sense of ‘mystery’ or uncertainty was prevalent throughout the chains of correspondence analyzed. This not only included expectations regarding how authors’ manuscripts should be changed (discussed in 6.3.1), but also uncertainty regarding the brokering process, including the trajectories of author manuscripts and where their
manuscripts were in those trajectories. It is generally only after the manuscripts were accepted for publication that it was possible to reconstruct where the different manuscript versions were along their trajectories (see 5.3). One of the consequences of this uncertainty, or mystery, in the texts’ trajectories appears to be to drive further author revision work. Related to the two examples outlined above, Jason mentions this explicitly with respect to his and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper, noting that the extra analysis he did prior to a second review of their manuscript was a “big gamble” that “paid off in the end” (Jason Interview 2). This theme is returned to with respect to issues of risk in writing for academic publication in 7.4.2.

7.3.2 Variability in broker expectations for authors to account for teaching ‘context’

The authors’ text histories analyzed in Chapter 5 and their exchange structures analyzed in Chapter 6 demonstrated pressures on them to account for teaching context in different ways in their writing. How this was a challenge for the authors and its implications for their published papers is discussed here. Broker comments concerning context were prevalent throughout the manuscripts analyzed in this thesis. Two illustrative examples help to demonstrate how this manifested in the texts’ histories.

Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper received comments following review noting that the journal:

[...] has an international readership, meaning that the Journal has to ensure that articles published reflect this. In practical terms, this means that articles
must offer generic insights rather than those relating to specific situations.

(Version 3 Letter)

One of the consequences of this evaluation was the removal of “Japanese university” from the title of the manuscript and Japan/Japanese from elsewhere in the paper, with 13 uses reduced to 9 between Versions 3 and 7. As the authors explain in their summary of revisions, sent with Version 4, “[...] we are now framing the paper as an action research approach to treating speaking skills with EFL students.” Thus, the representation of the research in the published manuscript appears intended to reflect a more teaching context-independent description than that used in earlier versions.

While Jason and Alan faced requests to de-contextualize their representation of their teaching context in their paper, David’s outside-Japan journal paper’s review called for expanding discussion of his teaching context. One Reviewer of Version 1 wrote, “The EFL context, where this study takes place, is not clearly explained.” David was also asked to consider the needs and concerns of teachers working in “developing contexts”. Another Reviewer commented, “The suggested activities may not be practical or relevant in diverse contexts” (David MS22 V1Letter). Thus, David was expected to explicitly account for his teaching context in his writing and to consider how his teaching context-specific investigation could be relevant to ‘diverse [teaching] contexts’. In revising his manuscript, David removed the name of his university and used instead a more generic description, “women’s university in urban Japan” (Version 8). In addition, he added to the Discussion a citation to a US-published book concerned with assessing students’ abilities to use “instructional
technology” (Version 8), apparently responding to the Reviewers’ requests to consider ‘diverse contexts’.

The changes made to Jason & Alan’s manuscript and David’s manuscript were concerned with issues of teaching context, with Jason and Alan asked to reduce their emphasis on their teaching context, while David was asked to both strengthen and enhance the description of his teaching context and to account for additional teaching contexts outside of his immediate experience. The implications for the writing for academic publication literature of these differences in broker stance toward representation of teaching context in the authors’ writing are discussed next. One implication is that the broker stances taken are quite different for the two manuscripts, despite both being outside-Japan, self-described ‘international’ journals.

The differences in broker stance toward how manuscripts should deal with teaching context appear at least partially related to journal type. Jason and Alan were seeking publication in an outside-Japan indexed journal, which the journal notes in the Editor’s message, pointing to a need for their paper to acknowledge and be relevant to a wide range of teaching contexts. On the other hand, David was writing for an outside-Japan journal affiliated with a ‘developing’ Asian country’s TESOL association, and so the Reviewers appear concerned that David describe his teaching context and the potential relevance of his paper to teachers in ‘developing’ countries’ teaching contexts. Thus, individual journal policies, practices, and interests were important in shaping the manuscripts. This suggests the power of specific journal and broker concerns to influence published texts. It also brings into question the usefulness of the relatively common advice to authors that publishing
in smaller, regional journals can somehow help them prepare for publication in higher prestige international indexed journals. One such example is the advice offered by Union University’s Center for Faculty Development (n.d.):

If you are a novice at academic publication, test out your ideas (and writing) by submitting manuscripts to a local source before you attempt a national journal. Most disciplines have state associations which publish newsletters, whose editors are always eager to receive contributions. (my emphasis)

Despite such advice, strategies developed through publishing in more local or regional journals, such as explicitly considering one’s local teaching context (as in David’s case), may not serve authors well when they seek more prestigious ‘international’ indexed journal publication. Jason and Alan’s experience helps to reinforce this, as both had extensive experience of writing for Japan publication, and the brokers’ evaluation of their initially submitted manuscript was that it was too teaching context dependent. The common advice for authors to first write for publication with smaller, regional publications may encourage writing strategies (such as David being asked to focus more on his specific teaching context) that impede efforts to publish in more prestigious indexed ‘international’ journals (such as the Editor’s note to Jason and Alan to ‘offer generic insights’).

Reflecting Jason and Alan’s experience, Canagarajah (1996) notes authors writing from outside the global Anglophone center may experience pressure to make their work relevant to such center contexts. Similarly, Lillis and Curry (2010) observe how one of their author participants felt unable to contribute new information from outside the Anglophone center, observing, “Saying something from Central Europe which is new is not good, not allowed” (p. 107). The authors’ experiences analyzed in this
thesis show they were expected to consider how their classroom research could be relevant to or applied in teaching contexts outside those in which they work. This was irrespective of whether the authors had experience of those other contexts, as illustrated for Jason and Alan and David’s papers above, which are representative of the texts analyzed in this thesis more generally. For teachers interested in disseminating their practice, such as Kathy, the requirement to infer potential relevance may be disenfranchising because, as in Lee’s case discussed above (Canagarajah and Lee, 2014), such requirements may go against why the authors chose to write about their experience in the first place (partly because of the conflict she perceived between expectations to publish and time requirements for maintaining teaching quality, Kathy ultimately did leave the profession). What the research presented in this thesis shows is these kinds of demands led to the authors’ published papers tending to downplay the classroom-grounded nature of their work and emphasizing research over pedagogy (see 5.4.3 and 7.2.1).

7.3.3 Evaluating texts, evaluating authors in broker discourse

The author-broker correspondence analyzed in this thesis suggests that in addition to evaluating manuscripts, brokers are evaluating the authors. These evaluations manifested in two ways in the correspondence analyzed: evaluation of author effort and evaluation of author language ability.

Broker evaluation of author effort appeared concerned with whether authors devoted sufficient time and attention to their manuscripts. When this was evaluated to be insufficient, brokers often attributed to authors, for example, “carelessness” (不注意) (Junpei MS1 Version 1 Reviewer 3), not requesting proofreading before
submitting their manuscripts, or neglecting publishing conventions. In one instance, Reviewer D commented on Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings, “The author needs to carefully review the manuscript for colloquial speech and long sentences which disrupt the flow of the submission,” concluding, “I recommend accepting the article after a careful review of the writing style.” Implied in the Reviewer’s evaluation is that there is a ‘writing style’ generally accepted in writing for academic publication, that Kathy is aware of it, and that Kathy has given inadequate attention to adhering to it in her manuscript. Opaque to the Reviewer, but visible to Kathy and through the text history analysis in Figure 5-9 is that Kathy solicited proofreading and revision advice from two unofficial brokers, a colleague and her father, before submitting her manuscript. While from Kathy’s perspective she submitted the most polished manuscript she could produce, the Reviewers’ evaluation is that she has not given sufficient attention to detail in her writing. The Editor’s evaluation of Kathy’s Version 7 similarly appears to assume that Kathy is aware of a correct ‘style’ and if the places where her manuscript does not conform to that style are pointed out to her, she will be able to make the necessary revisions. Kathy’s email commentary about the Editor’s feedback was:

This comment: Please revise for better style. Sorry, but I wrote it in the first place. I probably don’t have a better style. What does that mean? (Interview 7)

The extract from Kathy above shows that she found it difficult to understand and interpret how to respond to requests to address the ‘style’ of her manuscript, while the broker evaluations (implicitly) appear to assume that addressing issues of ‘style’
are straightforward and actionable through signaling problematic text in her manuscript.

The evaluators of Junpei’s manuscript similarly commented on and assessed his commitment to the manuscript and his ability to revise the manuscript based on their assessment of the text. For example, assessing Junpei as lacking commitment, Reviewer 3 commented on Version 1:

> Overall, mistakes in English that seem to be due to carelessness are scattered throughout.

The ‘carelessness’ comment implies that the Reviewer believes Junpei should have been able to identify the errors but has nevertheless allowed them to persist in the submitted manuscript. Assessing Junpei’s ability to successfully revise the manuscript, Reviewer 2 commented on Version 1:

> Since readers may question whether the author can successfully identify the "linguistic form" mistakes of the research subjects, this manuscript should be reviewed by an English reviewer.

The extract above, by pointing out the need for an “English reviewer” appears to be signaling the Reviewer’s conclusion that Junpei’s language background is not as a
user of English as a first language. Broker evaluations of Junpei’s English are discussed at greater length in 6.2.1.

When broker evaluation of author effort was that it had been sufficient, this was generally included as part of a broker’s positive evaluation of a manuscript version. For example, the Editor’s email response to Version 2 of David’s outside-Japan journal wrote, “thank you for the efforts you have made to address the points raised during the initial round of reviews.” Later in the same email the Editor writes, “thank you again for the additional work you have undertaken on your article.” The Editor praising David’s ‘work’ and ‘efforts’ presents a contrast to the ‘carelessness’ Junpei was accused of.

What is significant in these broker evaluations of author effort is that such effort is largely invisible to the brokers, and their evaluations of what the authors should have done but failed to do is often mistaken. For example, Kathy requested proofreading by two brokers before submission (see Figure 5-9) and Junpei requested native speaker checks of multiple versions of his manuscript before submission (see 5.3.3). What brokers appear to tend to do is to evaluate manuscripts they consider successful as resulting from sufficient author effort and manuscripts they consider inadequate as resulting from insufficient author effort. In other words, it is the authors who are being evaluated along with their manuscripts, and an inadequate manuscript appears to signal to Reviewers that the author is somehow inadequate. This theme is returned to in discussion of risk in academic writing for publication in 7.4.2.

In contrast to the evaluations of authors outlined above, while genre analysis of manuscript reviews has identified several different dimensions through which
manuscripts are evaluated, the general assessment is that authors’ texts are the primary focus of evaluation during review (see 2.5). For example, Paltridge (2017) explains “the aim of peer review” as “to filter out work that has not been well planned, carried out, and written up” aiming “to ensure that the work is reported on correctly” (p. 25, formatting my emphasis). Thus, Paltridge frames the point of evaluation as the ‘work’ rather than the author(s). One exception to this trend in the literature is Tardy and Matsuda (2009) who, in surveying how “editorial board members” (p. 35) construct authorial voice, noted that Reviewers also formed evaluative impressions of the anonymous authors of the texts they review. As one board member wrote:

The most “telling” type of author self-reveal is the tentative-voiced author with a manuscript [sic] that appears to be a paper prepared for a graduate class by someone new to the field and not very certain of how to prepare a research paper. Often such manuscripts further self-reveal as being written by a non-native speaker based on an accumulation of language errors. I have rarely if ever recommended publication of these pieces that are written by novices who should not have been encouraged to submit them in the first place. (Respondent 10) (p. 43, [sic] in original)

The Reviewer in the above extract claims that, through the texts authors submit for anonymous review, several conclusions can be drawn about them (as opposed to their text) regarding their level of experience (novices), their knowledge of research papers (not very certain), their language background (non-native speaker) and their right to publish (should not have been encouraged to submit). Another respondent evaluated author attention to ‘copy-editing’:
[...] a lack of careful copy-editing (which creates an impression of the writer as rather slip-shod, which doesn’t help the writer’s overall credibility all that much.) (Respondent 16) (p. 40)

In the extract above the Reviewer uses errors in manuscripts to evaluate whether an author gave sufficient time and attention to their work (rather slip-shod). This suggests authors are being evaluated in addition to their work, which is an expanded interpretation of Reviewer evaluations compared to genre analysis studies of reviews where the starting point of analysis appears to be that it is the text (and not the author) that is evaluated (Kourilova, 1998; Fortanet, 2008; Mungra and Webber, 2010; see 2.5). In contrast, the author experiences analyzed in this thesis suggest it is both the authors’ texts and the authors themselves that are evaluated during their manuscripts’ trajectories, rather than their texts alone.

7.4 What does the correspondence surrounding the authors’ writing for academic publication reveal regarding text brokering processes and relationships between authors and brokers?

In answering this third research question, this section examines three areas of significance that arose from the data analysis: the importance of discoursal construction of identity in chains of correspondence, evidence of risk in writing for academic publication, and invisibilizing the process of text production in published manuscripts.
7.4.1 The importance of discoursal construction of identity in the sets of correspondence

This discussion builds on brokers’ evaluations of authors and their manuscripts in the sets of correspondence (see 7.3.3), exploring how authors and brokers were represented, particularly with respect to issues of ‘identity,’ specifically Ivanič’s (1997) conceptualization of “the discoursal construction of writer identity” (p. 37), referring “to language-in-its-social-context” (p. 37). In the exchange structures analyzed (see 6.1) there were a variety of different actors referenced (authors, Editors, Reviewers), who in turn referenced a variety of different phenomena (the manuscript, the journal, the review process). Thus, in an Editor’s letter to the author, the Editor as official broker would not only rhetorically construct their identity as an Editor, they may also construct an identity for the Reviewers, for the author, for the journal, and for the author’s manuscript. Similarly, authors may construct an identity for the Reviewers and their manuscript in their reply. The discussion in this section focuses on three phenomena emerging from analysis of the exchange structures: the identity discourse of broker authority, the identity discourse of the review and revision process, particularly as it relates to (journal) quality, and author (and official broker) representations of themselves as more than writers (and evaluators) of academic texts.

A broker identity of authority was constructed in the discourse via the use of titles (elaborated on below), outlining the process of review and revision, and setting deadlines. Titles were generally conferred to all the official brokers referenced in the discourse sent to authors. Furthermore, groups of official brokers, such as the Reviewers at a given journal, tended to be assigned multiple titles, such as
Reviewers as a group also being referred to as the “Editorial Board” (Table 7-1) and “the panel” (Jason & Alan MS28 V4Letter). In contrast, authors were either referred to by name, with the term “the author(s)” (Table 7-1), or “you”. A title of “Mr.” was used in two of the sets of correspondence: David’s and Jason and Alan’s. While official brokers tended to use author names, most authors used official broker titles in addition to names. Thus, the exchange structures resembled the example from David’s correspondence extracted in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1. An example of the identity of authority in David’s set of correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email 2. Author submission to journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Mr. Editor’s full name</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Assistant Editor-in-Chief</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal name</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear <em>Mr. Editor’s full name</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please find attached my manuscript for submission to the Summer Issue of <em>Journal name</em>. Regards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email 3. Journal response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dear <em>Author full name</em>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your submission titled, “<em>Manuscript title</em>” to <em>Journal name</em>. All papers submitted will be reviewed by <em>members of our international editorial board</em>. In the past, not all papers were accepted. Each paper that meets the criteria for inclusion in <em>Journal name</em> […] may be accepted at that point or returned to the <em>author(s)</em> for revisions. Once revisions are received, <em>members of the international editorial board</em> will again review the paper. If further revisions are necessary, the <em>author(s)</em> will be contacted by the <em>editorial board</em>. […] This selection and publication process for the Summer Issue Volume 3 should be complete in <em>Month, Year</em> […].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your submission has been given the number # for blind review. […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerely,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Full name</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Publication Assistant</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formatting my emphasis: underlining represents text substituted to maintain anonymity and *italics* represents explicit identity construction-oriented text

David’s initial submission email includes official broker titles, as does the response he receives acknowledging submission. The Reviewer identity constructed in the Editor’s letter following review is that they are not only Reviewers, but members of
the journal’s “editorial board”. Further, these board members are “international”. The Reviewers are given a title, “members of the international editorial board” and the person writing has a title, “Publication Assistant”, while David’s identity is represented using his full name in the salutation and an anonymized “the author(s)” throughout the body of the message. The letter also establishes an identity of authority by outlining the process of review (assigning a manuscript number, labeling the evaluation as a “blind review”) and explicitly noting the possibility of rejection following review, writing, “not all papers were accepted” and “may be accepted”. Finally, the letter notes the timing for completion of “This selection and publication process”. Significantly, in the discourse only official brokers set deadlines (see 6.2.5).

How official brokers referenced the review process in the correspondence also involved identity work. Labels such as “peer review” (Jordan MS16 Email3) “blind review” (David MS22 Email3) and “anonymous review” (Jason & Alan MS28 V4Letter) helped to establish evaluating manuscripts as a high prestige gatekeeping activity (as it also tends to be represented in the literature; see Weller, 2001; Benos, et al., 2006). What is of interest is that these labels were used for the correspondence in Jason and Alan’s relatively high prestige outside-Japan indexed journal paper (“anonymous review”) and in relatively lower prestige publications, such as Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper (“reviewed”). Table 7-2 illustrates how the official broker correspondence surrounding Jordan’s outside-Japan conference paper appeared to balance both a desire to indicate the high prestige nature of peer review and to acknowledge the relatively lower prestige activity of publishing a conference paper.
Table 7-2. Prestige of process versus publication type in Jordan's outside-Japan conference proceedings paper correspondence

| Dear Everyone, |
| We are editing an online, double blind, refereed publication called “Publication title” which is a collection of long summaries of all the various presentations that were delivered at the conference and could include summaries of plenaries, keynotes, workshops, papers, swap shop sessions, interactive fair exhibits and posters. We will also include short pieces about the other conference activities such as the wine tasting and conference dinner etc. |
| As you were involved in presenting in one of these formats, we would like to invite you to submit a long summary (750 words) for us to include in our publication. Please note that, as we are asking for summaries only, this will not prevent you from also submitting a full article for publication elsewhere if you wish. |

The use of “double blind, refereed publication” appears to be referencing the prestige language of peer review, while the use of “online” partially mitigates this, as online publications are conferred less prestige than print publications in some institutional evaluations (Sweeney, 2000). Rather than requesting a “full article”, the email is soliciting “long summaries”, which allows authors to keep open the possibility of publishing “a full article” “elsewhere”, presumably in a relatively higher prestige publication type, while still contributing to the conference proceedings.

Finally, while it was not a common feature of the correspondence, when authors and official brokers referenced rhetorical identities outside of the roles of author and evaluator of an academic text, this tended to bode well for the overall outcome of the correspondence and the manuscript. Jason and Alan’s experience of contacting an Editorial Board Member friend of Jason’s bears this out, as do Kathy and David’s experiences interacting with their Editors. The importance of this for Kathy’s first publication with an outside-Japan journal was discussed in 6.2.2. In David’s case, after a two-day delay in responding to a message from the Editor, he wrote, “Sorry for the delay. Your email caught me frolicking in the sun (which is what I believe summer is all about, right?)” (David MS22 Email16). The Editor responded in kind,
mentioning the weather where she was based. It is perhaps telling that this exchange came quite late in the correspondence, at Email 16, after David and the Editor had already discussed several issues regarding revisions to his manuscript.

While referencing identities outside of author and official broker roles tended to suggest better outcomes, there was a tendency to avoid referencing such additional identities in the correspondence. Jordan’s correspondence helps to demonstrate this. Jordan and his coauthor missed a March 6 email with the review results that gave an April 17 deadline for returning revisions. An Editor wrote April 30, noting it was possible a message from the authors may have been missed on the Editor’s end, “I’ve been away for a long time and even if I’ve been through my emails when I returned I might have missed it if you have sent it to me” (Jordan MS16 Email4).

Jordan, who had spent a month visiting his home country, does not note that he has also been away in follow-up correspondence, writing:

I must apologize on my co-author’s behalf that we somehow overlooked the request for revisions to our contribution to the [proceedings name] you had sent us back in March. And even when the reminder came, we somehow failed to respond, thinking also it may be too late. We have got in touch and decided we should work on the revisions over the coming weekend and send them over by early next week. (Jordan MS16 Email6)

Despite having a legitimate personal reason for missing the initial message (Jordan’s trip to his home country), he nevertheless includes an apology without additional expression of an identity beyond that of author of the academic text being discussed. Thus, it is the Editor who could be ‘away’ while the assumption is that
Jordan and his coauthor were (should have been) continuously available (see also 6.2.5).

Turning to the literature, an ongoing focus of genre analysis is author self-reference in academic writing and issues of discoursal construction of identity in academic writing for publication (Flowerdew & Wang, 2015; Hyland, 2002; Rahimivand & Kuhi, 2014). Such research has sought to build on Ivanič’s (1997) earlier work into the construction of identity in academic writing more generally. However, at least in the field of academic writing for publication, the focus of discoursal construction of identity has primarily involved analyzing published manuscripts, with less attention to how identities are realized in sets of correspondence involving authors and official brokers. Tardy and Matsuda (2009) examine official broker construction of authorial identity indirectly through questionnaires, but how such constructions are realized in official broker correspondence remains underexplored. Considering Swales’ (1996) early interest in analyzing submission letters sent along with manuscripts to journals, examining how official broker and author identities are constructed in the discourse of writing for academic publication (exchange structures) is of interest.

This section addressed the current underrepresentation in the literature of analysis of sets of correspondence as they relate to identity construction in writing for academic publication by discussing issues of identity evident in the sets of correspondence analyzed in this thesis.

### 7.4.2 Evidence of risk in writing for academic publication

Risk emerged as a key theme in the analysis of the sets of correspondence. The author experiences examined show how the authors managed what they could say and where in their writing for academic publication, depending on the gatekeepers.
involved. There were several evident dimensions of risk. The first is the risk of (not) getting published, and the benefits and consequences that follow on from this. The second is a risk to face as the authors themselves were judged in addition to their manuscripts and because the authors, through writing for publication, were seeking to enact and construct individual identities. The act of writing and having their writing evaluated simultaneously helped to realize and challenge these identities. Third and finally is risk with respect to their manuscripts and how what it was possible to say in their writing for academic publication was shaped through official broker evaluations.

While literature on writing for academic publication tends to describe writing and publishing academic work as representing participation in a community (see discussion 7.2.2), community was only a part of the authors’ considerations influencing where they sought to publish their work. Generally, higher prestige publications were felt to address larger and more desirable communities, but there were risks associated with seeking such publications. As Aya, David, and Jordan explained, they faced institutional expectations of regular publication: “every year” in Jordan’s case (Jordan Interview 1). As the higher prestige publication trajectories analyzed in this thesis took more time (a finding reflected in earlier studies; see Hargens, 1990) and there was no guarantee of publication, even quite late into the research and writing process (see also Hargens, 1990), seeking higher prestige publication represented one aspect of risk for the authors.

There were active efforts to mitigate such risk by, for example, seeking regular university kiyō journal publication of relatively easier to publish papers, which David felt were a “shoo-in” (David Interview 2) while taking more time and effort for the
publication of more prestigious publication types, such as Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper. Junpei’s Japan journal paper (see 5.3.3) is one example of an aspiration for a high prestige journal publication ultimately not working out, as the first two high-prestige journals Junpei submitted his manuscript to rejected it, with it ultimately being published in a relatively limited distribution Japan journal as a ‘Research Note’. The process in that case ultimately took more than three years, longer than many of the authors on full-time limited term contracts would likely be able to accommodate. In this respect, as a full-time student, Junpei was perhaps at an advantage in that he had the luxury of not feeling a need to publish his manuscript within a limited timeframe and so could ‘risk’ submitting it to higher prestige publications first. However, the inverse consequence was that the authors on full-time limited term contracts were disincentivized to a certain extent from seeking higher prestige (and higher risk) publication as it might result in difficulties finding their next term employment, as they would not be able to demonstrate sufficient publications within expected timescales. Thus, the voices heard in such high prestige publications may be limited to those who can afford the luxury of a long, drawn out, uncertain publication trajectory.

Author work invested into manuscripts that were not certain to be published was generally viewed as a “gamble” (Jason Interview 2), as authors acknowledged that despite the time and effort invested, they “can’t guarantee anything” (Jason & Alan MS28 Email6) in terms of whether their work would ultimately be published or not. Teachers on limited term contracts seemed reluctant to take such gambles and risk being unable to find new employment when their current contracts finished. Alan was perhaps an exception to this, as he saw high prestige publication as important to securing future employment despite being on a limited term contract, noting that
as he aged (he is in his fifties at the time of writing), it was becoming increasingly
difficult to find new contract employment.

The uncertainty regarding the evaluation process and the publication decision in the
official broker correspondence (see discussion 7.3.1) appeared to reinforce the
possibility of manuscript rejection and therefore increased risk. For example, the
Editor wrote following review of Jason and Alan’s Version 3 (see Figure 5-5), “I must
emphasize that this is not an offer of publication” (MS28Letter). The message from
official brokers was almost universally that it was the authors’ responsibility to
address the concerns of the Reviewers, that inadequate attention to the Reviewers’
requests and criticisms could and would result in rejection, and that ‘acceptance’
remained conditional on successful further revisions until very late in the
manuscripts’ trajectories. In such circumstances, the “safe” alternative was often the
only viable option, as “more original” alternatives also entailed “more work” (Jason
& Alan MS28 Email6), uncertain prospects for success, and generally involved
pushing against changes indicated by brokers.

In some cases, asking for clarification carried a certain amount of risk, as
demonstrated in Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper, where asking for
clarification and help from an Editor resulted in a request to first send the
“(completely) revised” manuscript (Kathy MS24 Email5; see 6.2.2). Furthermore,
implementing changes to manuscripts entailed risk, as often the changes expected
were either unclear from the authors’ perspective (such as Kathy’s uncertainty about
what a ‘better style’ of writing would be; see discussion 7.3.3) or requested changes
it was not possible for the authors to implement in the timescales allowed (such as
the criticism that Junpei did not have enough participants in the same letter giving
him 14 days to return a revised version of his manuscript; see discussion 6.2.3). Lee and Canagarajah (2014) note how such uncertainty ultimately led to Lee withdrawing her manuscript from publication consideration altogether.

The potential risk to authors’ face is evident throughout the broker correspondence, as the brokers tended to judge both the authors and their texts (see discussion 7.3.3). John was conscious of the risk to face of sending his writing to his colleagues, feeling that inadequate prose would lead to the assessment of him as inadequate as an author of academic texts (see 4.3.7). While John’s example is a particularly clear one, the analysis here shows that brokers evaluated the authors’ abilities across the chains of correspondence (see 7.3.3). Furthermore, the authors did not challenge such assessments directly, but rather responded indirectly to such criticisms by revising their manuscripts to try to better meet the brokers’ (often unclear) expectations. This was particularly disenchanting for Kathy, who ultimately left the profession, partly because she had trouble developing a sense of success as an author publishing academic texts.

That risk in terms of needing to secure publications and in terms of threats to author face and identity ultimately shaped what it was possible for authors to say in their manuscripts has also been discussed in the literature. Flowerdew (2008) discusses “English as an Additional Language” writers’ “experience in international publishing” (p. 77), noting they may face various dimensions of “stigma” (p. 78) when seeking publication. Lee’s experience is particularly telling to illuminate the role risk can play in writing for publication. She observed regarding the Reviewers’ requests to add more evidence to her manuscript:
I felt that trying to qualify my experiences or legitimise them through objective research or ‘empirical’ studies would devalue my story and my point that stories such as mine are often silenced due to ‘lack of proof’. (Canagarajah & Lee, 2014, p. 75)

Lee goes on to observe, following a decision of ‘minor revisions’ from the Editor, “I figured […] I was expected to follow what the Reviewers wanted, and make these changes” (p. 86). The authors whose correspondence was analyzed in this thesis were not as explicit as Lee regarding how they changed their manuscripts. Nevertheless, the text histories and correspondence analyzed show that the authors were expected to conform to broker expectations, with very little space or opportunity to explain and justify disagreements with official brokers. Showing some contrast to Lee, many of the authors felt their manuscripts were improved through the brokering and revision process, although the authors were generally implementing a vision of how their manuscripts should be revised that was outlined by their brokers, rather than realizing objectives the authors had formulated for their manuscripts themselves. This means that ultimately the vision outlined in the manuscripts for their contribution to the academic discourse was generally not entirely determined by the authors but tended to also be framed by the brokers who evaluated the manuscripts. How this impacted representation of teacher research in the authors’ manuscripts was discussed in 7.2.1 and how it impacted issues of context in the authors’ manuscripts was discussed in 7.3.2.

Analyzing risk explicitly as a factor in the production of academic texts is a relatively recent area of inquiry. Thesen (2014) theorizes a conception of risk in academic writing “concerned with the experiential domain, the lived world of researchers” (p.
12) as they weigh what it is possible to say in their academic writing and where. Thesen further raises issues of writing “from the margins” (p. 5), observing risk may be particularly acute for authors writing from those margins, as writing for publication takes place in “contested spaces” (p. 3), social spaces where authors and brokers negotiate both access to writing for publication and the form such access may take. Thesen explains that:

many student and novice researchers experience a sense of loss at the compromises made when developing a written account of their research. In the process of writing various experiences and modes of expression are revised or erased along the way. (p. 1)

Thesen (2014) argues there is a need to understand what is being revised and erased in academic work from the perspective of those whose voices are affected: the authors. One such voice is Lee’s (Canagarajah & Lee, 2014), discussed above. As issues of risk in academic writing are a relatively new area of inquiry, the author experiences examined in this thesis provide valuable additional empirical findings and perspectives.

7.4.3 Invisibilizing the process of text production in published manuscripts

While the process of review and revision clearly shaped the authors’ published manuscripts (see 5.4.1), a striking aspect of that shaping was how the process of text production was invisibilized in the published manuscripts. In the correspondence analyzed in this thesis, the negotiation between authors and the brokers they interacted with was not featured in the published manuscripts beyond the changes made to the texts. What parts of the published manuscripts were
changed as a result of the brokering process, and which were retained from the original submission, was only apparent through comparison of different versions of the manuscripts analyzed in this thesis, as the published manuscripts themselves did not make the revision and brokering process explicit, beyond noting “revision received” dates in the case of Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper or descriptions of the journal review process in “information for authors” (Document 2018-1-23) sections of journal websites.

Broker expectations that the review process should remain invisible become particularly apparent when examining the one instance where an author tried to make the review process explicit in a manuscript. Junpei sought in Version 4 of his manuscript (see Figure 5-7) to make part of the Reviewers’ evaluation of Version 3 explicit through the addition of two footnotes, with one stating an “anonymous Reviewer pointed out” a shortcoming of the paper, going on to explain why this shortcoming could not be adequately addressed given the current state of the field. The second footnote similarly dealt with a Reviewer criticism of his study design, where he added some explanation regarding how this concern was accounted for in his investigation. However, in the evaluation of his revised manuscript, this attempt to make explicit part of the prepublication evaluation of Junpei’s manuscript was marked as inappropriate by the ‘second reader’, who writes:

In the first part of the Notes, “An anonymous reviewer pointed out/asked” should be omitted (as it’s not seen in academic papers). Once you have made the modifications you feel are necessary in response to the reviewer comments, the paper is yours, and so such description is unnecessary.
Of interest here is Junpei’s effort to explicitly signal in his manuscript that it was evaluated as part of the submission process to the journal, and to visibly take up and respond to some of those evaluative comments in his revised manuscript, making the Reviewers’ contribution explicit (as opposed to changing the text without referencing the Reviewers’ comments). Of further interest are the Reviewer’s arguments against doing this. One argument refers to academic writing conventions, stating explicit acknowledgment of Reviewer comments is “not seen” (見た事はありません). This potentially demonstrates “centripetal” (Lillis, 2013, p. 133) pressure toward following (perceived to be standard) publishing conventions, with the evaluators referencing their experience and understanding of conventions that they feel constrain published academic papers. Such perceived conventions appear to be used by the Reviewers to help them decide what is possible and appropriate.

The other argument asserts the review process should be occluded and not explicitly referenced in the final manuscript as the knowledge claims made in the final version are Junpei’s (and not the reviewers’). This assertion appears to suggest that the evaluators believe the published manuscript should not include within it the concept of it representing a co-constructed artifact of the official evaluation and revision process.

Reflecting the invisibilizing of the manuscript evaluation and revision process discussed above, Swales (1996) refers to the discourse of writing for academic
publication as an “occluded genre” (p. 45) as the Reviewers’ assessments and the correspondence surrounding manuscript submission and review are generally not made visible. The changes made to the authors’ manuscripts generally, and Junpei’s experience as discussed above specifically, reinforce Swales’ description of brokering correspondence as occluded. Much of the literature examining writing for publication focuses on published manuscripts (see 2.2), such as Motta-Roth’s (2009) description of “three levels of realization (or instantiation)” (p. 322) of language as they apply to published manuscripts: genre, register, and text. However, what such descriptions do not explicitly account for, and what Swales signaled by referencing occluded genres in writing for academic publication, is that published texts result from negotiations between specific actors and publication trajectories. The sets of correspondence and text histories analyzed in this thesis demonstrate and help to make visible how such negotiations acted on the authors’ published texts.

7.5 Summary

This chapter has discussed each of the research questions with respect to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, linking issues identified there to the data discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Issues identified in researching the first question, “Why do early career Japan-based English language teachers write for academic publication and what academic publication practices do they engage in?” included the following:

- The revision process tended to push manuscripts away from representing teaching practice toward representing research practice (7.2.1),
• Authors wrote for a variety of communities (7.2.2), suggesting more complex models of discourse community are more representative of the data analyzed in this thesis, and

• Selecting what journals to publish in was nontrivial for most of the authors (7.2.3).

Regarding the second research question, “What evaluations do Japan-based English language teachers’ manuscripts receive? How do their manuscripts change during preparation for submission, review, and editing? Who do they interact with, and what is the significance of these interactions?” the following themes were discussed:

• Uncertainty in the correspondence (7.3.1), particularly with respect to the process the manuscripts went through in their trajectories,

• Pressure on the authors to change the stances taken toward ‘context’ in their manuscripts (7.3.2), and

• How the authors were evaluated in addition to their texts (7.3.3).

Concerning the third research question, “What does the correspondence surrounding the authors’ writing for academic publication reveal regarding text brokering processes and relationships between authors and brokers?” the following were discussed:

• Identity in the sets of correspondence (7.4.1), including broker construction of identities of authority, which left little room for authors to assert their identities in the correspondence,
• Risk as manifested in the authors’ writing for publication (7.4.2), particularly regarding author considerations of both the need to publish and to conform to (often unclear) broker expectations regarding how manuscripts should be changed to be accepted for publication, and

• How the brokering process was made invisible in the published manuscripts (7.4.3), even when an author sought to make the review process explicit.
8. Conclusion to the investigation of Japan-based authors writing for academic publication

8.1 Introduction

This chapter turns to the contributions of this thesis to the literature reviewed and to methodologies of writing for academic publication. First, three contributions this thesis makes to the literature then four methodological contributions are discussed. Following this, the chapter acknowledges some of the shortcomings and limitations of the research before concluding with a summary.

8.2 Contributions to the writing for academic publication literature

This section discusses three key contributions the research presented in this thesis makes to investigations of writing for academic publication practices.
8.2.1 The importance of broker-author correspondence in shaping academic knowlde production

It is well-established that writing for academic publication represents an important and high-stakes part of academic knowledge production (Lillis & Curry, 2010). One way such writing has been investigated is through analyzing published texts using discourse analysis and genre analysis (Swales, 1990). As explained in 2.2, one objective of such research is to characterize successful models of published academic texts in the hope this will facilitate authors to publish their work (Swales, 1990). However, as Thesen (2014) notes, “pro forma ‘how-to’ guides and manuals” tend to “present a smooth surface, a sort of paint-by-numbers approach that flattens and denies” authors’ “struggles over meaning” (p. 6). Such criticism can also apply to analyses of published texts. For example, limiting analysis to published manuscripts restricts what researchers are able to explore, as it is not possible to examine how the texts were changed along their publication trajectories. By analyzing multiple versions of texts together with the correspondence that shaped them in their trajectories, the investigation presented in this thesis contributes to the growing body of research exploring processes of writing for academic publication. It adds additional perspective to earlier investigations of author experiences and how their manuscripts change, such as Flowerdew (2000), Curry and Lillis (2010), and Lillis and Curry (see discussion 2.4).

The research described in this thesis further demonstrates that the correspondence relating to writing for academic publication (the process of submission, evaluation and revision) does indeed shape final published texts (see 5.4). There are parallels between Lillis and Curry's (2010) analysis of how the scholars’ texts they analyzed
changed and the ways brokers shaped the texts analyzed in this thesis. The author experiences analyzed in Lillis and Curry include accounts of the brokering process mediating what it was possible to say and claim in published writing and in transforming the focus of papers. Significant aspects of such shaping in the investigation presented in this thesis included refocusing the manuscripts on research rather than pedagogy (see 7.2.1) and shifting how they address issues of context (see 7.3.2). The analysis has also shown that the processes that shape the authors’ manuscripts are indeed “occluded” (Swales, 1996, p. 46) in their published versions. Even when Junpei attempted to make part of the Reviewers’ evaluation of his manuscript explicit in his manuscript’s revisions, this was disallowed (see 7.4.3).

Examining the correspondence surrounding the authors’ writing for academic publication, critically examining the different roles filled by official brokers, particularly Editors, allowed for interrogating how different individual Editors differed in how they interacted with authors, with some actively co-constructing texts (see 6.2.2) and others taking what Lillis and Curry (2015) describe as a “concerned-deficit (It’s your problem)” (p. 138) stance toward the changes indicated in the evaluations of manuscripts. A key contribution of this thesis is the finding that editors fulfill multiple roles in their interactions with authors, serving as gatekeepers in some instances (such as with Junpei’s Version 2 manuscript being rejected; see Figure 5-7) and as co-creators of text in other instances (such as with John’s outside Japan book chapter, see 5.3.6). This finding is consistent with editors’ accounts of their practice as indicated in Starfield and Paltridge (2019), editors of *English for Specific Purposes* (Starfield & Paltridge) and *TESOL Quarterly* (Paltridge), who describe editors as, “sometimes tightrope walkers: mediating between authors, reviewers and publishers” (p. 267).
A further key contribution of this investigation is making manuscript trajectories more visible through the text trajectory graphics explained in 5.2 and presented in 5.3. These graphics demonstrate how the idealized trajectories proposed by Weller (2001) and Burrough-Boenisch (2003) do not capture the complexity of the manuscript trajectories analyzed for and described in this thesis. Specifically, the evaluations made by journals were not always as evident in the correspondence analyzed as is implied in Weller's (2001) representation (see 5.2, Figure 5-1 and 6.2.3).

Finally, there has been an argument made that authors tend to initially make broad knowledge claims that the journal review and brokering process seeks to then narrow (Myers, 1985; see 2.3). While the manuscript revisions analyzed did exhibit narrowing of knowledge claims, authors in some cases were also asked to broaden their knowledge claims (see 5.4.3). This indicates that the brokering processes for the manuscripts analyzed in this thesis are more nuanced than earlier literature has suggested. This could be due to several factors. The investigation in this thesis analyzed knowledge production in a different field, language teaching, whereas Myers examined natural sciences writing. The classroom-oriented nature of most of the writing examined in this thesis (as opposed to research-oriented writing) may have influenced the specific ways in which the manuscripts were changed, which do not directly map to narrowing or broadening of knowledge claims. Finally, differences in author and official broker interests in the kinds of knowledge claims being made may have played a role in how the manuscripts were changed, in that most authors were interested in pedagogical framings of their writing, while most official brokers were interested in the writing being framed as ‘research’. The
reasons behind the changes to knowledge claims in this thesis being different from earlier research is likely due to a complex combination of different factors, including those listed here. Exploring such factors across a larger number of disciplinary areas is a potential topic for further future research.

8.2.2 Representations of authors that transcend straightforward binaries

Since Canagarajah’s (1996) observation that the empirical base of research into scholars’ experiences of writing for academic publication was small, researchers have investigated Japan-based academics (Casanave, 1998; Okamura, 2004, 2006), Hong Kong and Chinese academics (Flowerdew, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2007), and European scholars (Curry and Lillis, 2010; Lillis & Curry, 2010). However, debate continues about whether scholars on the ‘periphery’ of global knowledge production writing for publication face challenges unique from those authors writing from and residing in the global center face (see 2.3, specifically Hyland, 2016 & Politzer-Ahles, et al., 2016). Hyland notes, “academic English is no one’s first language” (p. 61), drawing on Ferguson, Pérez-Llantada, and Plo’s (2011) assertion “that academic writing, or academic literacy, is not part of the native speaker’s inheritance: it is acquired rather through lengthy formal education and is far from a universal skill” (p. 42). However, Turner (2011) illustrated how contemporary academic discourse ideals are an intellectual inheritance of center HE. Also, in so far as institutions of HE in the global ‘periphery’ model themselves on center HE institutions, they also influence global HE more generally. Furthermore, Bazerman (1988) has demonstrated how now-dominant ideals of academic discourse were negotiated and developed among authors writing in and from global centers of knowledge production, linking the discourses of scientific
exploration from the early days of the scientific enterprise to more modern discourses of scientific research writing.

Perhaps one issue with the ongoing debate that Hyland (2016) and Politzer-Ahles, et al. (2016) engage in is the tendency to use binaries to compare different groups of authors and their writing for publication practices. While this may function as a useful tool for distinguishing between groups for comparison, it may mask a variety of factors that underlie the complex process of writing for academic publication. As Junpei’s experience shows, Reviewers certainly did raise his not being a ‘native’ speaker of English as an issue in the reviews he received, but this thesis also shows that ‘native’ English is not sufficient for authors to have their work published without modification, as all the manuscript trajectories analyzed in Chapter 5 included changes between their initial submitted versions and final published versions. As Lillis and Curry (2015) have pointed out, there is a tendency in the writing for academic publication literature to assume “a clear dichotomy between ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ users of English” (p. 130), along with a tendency for “implicit slippage between [conceptions of] ‘non-native’ English users and novice writers/scholars” (p. 130). Further issues that could be added to that list include tendencies for the literature to assume:

- Writing for academic publication primarily involves journal publication,
- Writing for journal publication primarily involves ‘international’ indexed journal publication,
- Concepts of community and audience are bounded rather than dynamic,
- Authors enjoy equal access to publishing networks, information about publishing opportunities, and assessments of publication quality, and
Authors view themselves as seeking to join and contribute to an academic, scholarly ‘conversation’

Regarding the first two points, while the authors’ writing for publication did include journal publication (although not exclusively), most of the authors’ publications were not outside-Japan indexed journal papers (see 4.2). Additionally, the communities authors wrote for were at times quite local and could change over time (see 7.2.2).

Concerning issues of access to information, some authors were better connected than others. For example, Junpei, Jason and Alan, and Jordan enjoyed access to networks that facilitated publication opportunities, while Kathy had considerable trouble engaging network resources that could successfully facilitate her writing for publication (see 5.4.2). However, the accuracy of the information authors had access to was variable. For example, while David noted the importance of writing for publication for his career prospects, he was ultimately passed over for promotion to a tenured position in his faculty, despite the successful candidate having fewer publications (Interview 4). Alan discovered the publication types he had been pursuing were not as institutionally valued as he had thought, which led him to seek publication of an outside-Japan indexed journal paper (see 4.3.2). Finally, most authors saw themselves as teachers investigating and writing about their teaching practice (Junpei was the exception). They tended to be skeptical of academic knowledge production processes, seeing them as removed from their everyday teaching practice. Many saw themselves as seeking to speak to fellow language teachers, rather than to language researchers or theorists (see Kathy’s profile, 4.3.6).
8.2.3 Japan-based writing for academic publication

While there have been some studies into the practices of Japan-based authors writing for academic publication (namely Casanave, 1998; Gosden, 1996, 2001; see 2.6), the empirical base of research remains limited. Thus, another contribution of the research presented in this thesis is to provide additional empirical evidence of the practices of Japan-based authors writing for academic publication. Beyond this, there are certain assumptions the literature concerning Japan-based authors tends to make that the investigation presented in this thesis has sought to address. These include the assumption that Japan-based authors are Japanese, that authors are (primarily) writing for English publication outside of Japan, and that the experiences of Japan-based authors are distinct from authors based outside of Japan (see 2.6).

Regarding the assumption that Japan-based authors are Japanese, considering the global internationalization of HE (Thesen, 2014), including within Japan (Huang, 2009), it is no longer (if it ever was) safe to assume that authors writing from a country originate from that country. In contrast, the literature on Japan-based authors writing for academic publication has tended to conflate Japan-based authors as Japanese and to assume their experiences are unique from authors writing within and for the center of global knowledge production (see 2.6). Such assumptions likely oversimplify the processes underlying production of academic knowledge. By including authors who are foreign nationals resident in Japan this investigation expands the research base on Japan-based authors beyond the exclusive depiction of Japanese authors’ experiences. Thus, this research, while including Japanese authors, also primarily included authors resident in but not from Japan. By doing so, a picture of some of the issues that the authors faced related
to global migration within HE could be explored. This included the finding that the authors tended to not be particularly well informed about how their writing for academic publication would be evaluated during their texts' trajectories (see 7.3.1) and institutionally following publication (see 7.2.2), that knowing and deciding where to publish their work was a nontrivial challenge (see 7.2.3), and that access to networks and the resources they can provide in terms of writing support and publishing opportunities was an important facilitator of many of the authors successfully publishing their work (see 4.4.2 and 5.4.2).

While ‘international’ English medium indexed journal publication is certainly a high-profile aspect of academic knowledge production in global HE (Lillis & Curry, 2010), exclusively focusing on such publication practices can mask the complexity of writing practice that authors experience and can result in researchers focusing on a specific kind of academic author that pursues such publication. The limited research base of Japanese authors writing for publication has tended to consider writing in English for publication synonymous with writing for international English publication in prestigious Anglophone center journals. One notable exception to this is Talandis (2010), who examined authors writing in English for publication in Japan-based journals (see 2.6). By examining where the authors investigated in this thesis wrote for publication, the question of what communities they wrote for could be explored.

While outside-Japan indexed journal publication was an aspiration of many of the authors, only a few published their work in such journals, while most of their published papers were represented by other publication types, including university kiyō journals, more ‘periphery’ journals, and book chapters (see 4.2). This suggests that an exclusive focus on high prestige publication may obscure the diversity of
writing for publication practices of authors, a finding Lillis and Curry (2010) also come to with respect to European scholars. That the authors investigated in this thesis did not publish primarily in journals is also consistent with Huang and Chang’s (2008) findings for Hong Kong based academics working in the fields of Linguistics and English.

With respect to why authors write for publication, much literature has depicted scholars writing for academic publication as seeking “professional promotion” (López-Navarro et al., 2015, p. 8) and “pursuing extra remuneration” (p. 8). This thesis adds to such research by exploring why these Japan-based authors wrote for academic publication. While authors did write for publication to secure future employment opportunities (see, in particular, David and Alan’s profiles in 4.3.3 and 4.3.2, respectively), they also noted a variety of other reasons for writing for publication, including improving their teaching practice (see Kathy’s profile, 4.3.6) and addressing various audiences of interest to them (see Jordan’s profile, 4.3.5).

One issue that arose in the data was how the authors’ initially ‘teaching-focused’ manuscripts were transformed through brokering and revision to more resemble ‘research’ oriented prose (see 5.4.3 & 7.2.1). The issue of a divide between theory and practice in the field of language teaching and learning research has been raised as a ‘problem’ generally, rather than an issue specific to Japan (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014; Cárdenas & Rainey, 2017). Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that aspects of this divide manifested in how the authors’ manuscripts were changed when they were writing for publication outside of Japan (Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper; see 5.3.1) and when they were writing for publication within Japan (Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper; see 5.3.5).
Furthermore, while authors did report experiencing centripetal and centrifugal pressures, these were also successfully leveraged by authors, at least in some cases, showing how they both act and are acted on regarding evaluation of knowledge production. For example, the ability to contribute to local university kiyo journals was a means to ensure expected publication quantity while authors pursued more prestigious, higher risk publications (David’s case; see 4.3.3). Junpei was encouraged to accept publication in his supervisor’s university kiyo journal but resisted this push toward a (relatively) less prestigious publication type, seeking instead (ultimately unsuccessful, at least with that manuscript) outside-Japan indexed journal publication (see 4.3.4 and 5.3.3). One Japanese PhD student not profiled in Chapter 4 explained that he saw outside-Japan indexed journal publication as a means to circumvent the Japan-based journal power structures he felt critical of. He did not see outside-Japan English publication as replacing within-Japan publication, but as a way to build a reputation for himself within Japan without having to conform to the expectations and constraints he felt contributing to a Japan-based journal would entail. In this sense, he felt global knowledge production added to, rather than restricted, his writing for academic publication options.

8.3 Methodological contributions

In addition to contributing to the literature on Japan-based author practices of writing for publication, this thesis offers several contributions to the methodology of investigating writing for academic publication more broadly. These are outlined here, including:

- The development of a graphical representation of manuscript trajectories,
• Adaptation and application of the manuscript Change Heuristic originally developed by Knorr-Cetina (1981) and later expanded by Gosden (1995) then Lillis and Curry (2006, 2010),
• Further evidence supporting the need to analyze manuscripts across their trajectories, and
• Further evidence supporting the need to analyze chains of correspondence as they influence “uptake” (Lillis and Curry, 2015, p. 130).

8.3.1 Developing a graphical representation of manuscript trajectories

There have been a variety of efforts to graphically represent manuscript trajectories in the literature to date, although as explained in 5.2, these have tended to employ hypothetical trajectories (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Weller, 2001) or to examine specific aspects of textual brokering or manuscript changes (Lillis & Curry, 2006). Considerable effort went into developing a suitably nuanced graphic to represent the detailed complexity of the text histories analyzed in this thesis (see 5.2). The text history graphic developed for the analyses presented in 5.3 offers an improvement on earlier representations of text trajectories as it captures several important elements of a manuscript's publication trajectory. It represents:

• A time-oriented perspective, tracking when versions were submitted and feedback received,
• Information about the various versions submitted to and returned from brokers,
• Information about the quantity of changes between versions and between the first available and final published versions,
• Information about how many and what kinds of brokers interacted with the authors and their manuscripts, and
• Information about the evaluations authors received, including how many reviews, how many Reviewers, length of reviews, and other brokers the authors interacted with during the text trajectory.

The graphic developed can show a variety of different elements of a text’s trajectory at a glance that have not previously been made explicit. It also served as a ready frame on which to build further analysis, including analysis of how the manuscripts changed in 5.4 and analysis of the exchange structures realized in the correspondence surrounding the manuscript trajectories in Chapter 6.

While the graphical representation of text trajectories developed has demonstrated its utility for the research presented in this thesis, it also has considerable potential as a methodological tool to facilitate further future research. This potential includes comparing text trajectories within and between fields and publication types. The six text trajectories analyzed in 5.3 show that the graphic was successfully applied to manuscript trajectories in the field of English language teaching across six different publication types. Comparing text trajectories in fields other than English language teaching, within multiple texts of the same publication type, and across multiple texts for a single author are some potential further applications of this methodological tool. More broadly, examining manuscript trajectories outside of writing for academic publication, such as university assignment work, is another potential application of the graphic.
8.3.2 Evaluating the Change Heuristic as a research tool

The Change Heuristic as a methodological tool has undergone considerable transformation as it has been applied across different studies of how manuscripts are changed during their trajectories (see 3.4.3). Categories have been added and expanded, and their definitions refined to meet different research objectives. This has included the addition and refinement of change categories and transformation of the focus of analysis. The research presented in this thesis has further adapted the heuristic to fit the research questions posed. In this section the Change Heuristic as a research tool is discussed, with attention to the contribution this thesis makes to its further evolution and development, along with commentary on what the tool facilitates regarding analysis and what it may obscure.

As the research presented in this thesis sought to examine complexity in writing for academic publication practices (see 3.2), one of the analytical decisions made was to initially document how the manuscripts changed between their first available and final published versions then to analyze and discuss these changes (see 3.4.3). This stance differs from that taken by Gosden (1995) and Lillis and Curry (2006, 2010), the two studies that most closely reflect the kind of analysis applied using the heuristic as described in this thesis. Gosden set out to examine the results and discussion sections from the manuscripts he analyzed, claiming these were “more typically the focus of revision and rhetorical manipulation” (p. 46). Lillis and Curry (2006) examined “salient” changes, defined as “a relational notion, related to specific trajectories and publication text histories” (p. 9). Both strategies have the advantage of focusing analysis on different aspects of how manuscripts change. For example, Gosden found about 60 percent of the manuscripts’ T-units changed,
noting about 60 percent of those changes represented “rhetorical machining” (p. 42), including changes to “discourse structure” (p. 47), “researchers’ claims” (p. 47), and “technical detail” (p. 47). However, unexplored in Gosden’s research was the relationship between the changes made to the results and discussion sections Gosden analyzed and the rest of the manuscripts. Additionally, Lillis and Curry’s focus on salient changes may mask complexity in terms of how the manuscripts are changed. Thus, a potential disadvantage of such approaches, highlighted by the analysis reported in this thesis, is that they may make incorrect assumptions regarding how manuscripts change, including which sections of manuscripts are subject to more revision and whether “rhetorical machining” (Gosden, 1995, p. 42; Swales, 1990, p. 125) changes are indeed as straightforward as assumed.

Regarding Gosden’s (1995) claim that methods and discussion sections are “more typically the focus of revision and rhetorical manipulation” (p. 46), for the manuscripts analyzed in this thesis, changes to these sections typically represented a plurality, but not majority, of the changes made across the different manuscript trajectories (see 5.4.3). Thus, Gosden’s assertion that methods and discussion sections are particularly relevant for analysis is perhaps overstated, at least for the manuscripts analyzed in this thesis. Rather, the manuscripts were changed throughout, including their methods and discussion sections.

Further, one of the assertions implied in Gosden’s (1995) work is that determining whether a change is rhetorical machining or not is relatively straightforward. Gosden notes regarding the coding process:

The final category of textual revisions noted here concerns the polishing of language, generally below clause level. This last category is naturally an
important aspect in the final stages of the creation of ‘successful’ drafts, particularly for NNSs. However, since we are interested in a social-constructionist view of textual revision, the analysis presented here will concentrate on those recognizably harder processes [...] with particular emphasis on the rhetorical machining of texts. Instances of polishing, of cleaning up ‘careless mistakes,’ will therefore not be coded here... (p. 43)

Gosden asserts that socially constructed textual processes (a social-constructionist view of textual revision) would not be represented in ‘instances of polishing, of cleaning up careless mistakes’. However, the manuscript trajectories analyzed in this thesis suggest changes are not necessarily straightforwardly representative of rhetorical machining or not. For example, there were several instances where a relatively straightforward-appearing change, upon closer examination revealed further underlying complexity. One such example is a change in Junpei’s Japan journal publication, from the use of the plural “forms” (Version 1, Figure 5-7) to the use of the singular “form” (Version 5) in the following extracts: “calling learner’s attention to linguistic forms” (Version 1) versus “calling learner’s attention to linguistic form” (Version 5). On initial analysis this appears to be a straightforward sentence-level change/correction of plural to singular, an interpretation Junpei himself appears to support, as when I asked him about these changes, he replied in an email:

I know form/forms were distinguished in the context of “focus on form” and “focus on forms”. But I was not aware of the difference between form/forms in this case. This distinction is related to definiteness and specificity, and is
quite difficult for non-natives. I still feel difficulty with this now. (Junpei Interview 3).

However, examining the Reviewers’ evaluations of Junpei’s manuscript shows this section of text was given considerable attention, and that the reviewers appear to see this text as referencing terms from the literature that, they feel, Junpei has not explicitly defined. Reviewer 2 of Version 1 requested additional definition of terms:

> It is necessary to clearly explain the definitions of focused forms and other terms in the Introduction by giving examples.

> Introduction の部分で focused forms などの定義を例を挙げながら明確に説明することが必要である。

Then the Reviewer of Version 2 specifically flagged Junpei’s use of the plural ‘forms’, writing:

> forms or form?? I think the author should clarify concepts here. As is well known, within a cognitive-psychological approach to second language acquisition, there is a clear distinction between form and forms (cf. Long and Robinson, 1998).

Thus, while Junpei appears to interpret the use of form/forms to be ‘related to definiteness and specificity’, and a result of his language background (‘non-native’ in his words), the reviewers appear to consider his use of the term form/forms as signaling concepts from the wider literature (‘Long and Robinson, 1998’ according to the Reviewer of Version 2). The consequence of this to analysis is that what appeared on initial examination to be a relatively straightforward sentence level
change of a plural to a singular form in Junpei’s manuscript, or ‘polishing’ in Gosden’s terms, upon examination of the reviewers’ comments can be interpreted as being related to how concepts from the literature are (perhaps inadvertently and implicitly) incorporated into the manuscript. Thus, the change made is reflective of Junpei’s response to the Reviewers’ efforts to understand and interpret the concepts referenced in the manuscript, suggesting that the positioning of the manuscript may also have been affected by this change. Had this investigation assumed such changes were not of interest at the outset of analysis, the subtleties in such differences in interpretation by authors and official brokers, and the changes taken up in the published manuscripts, may not have been examined.

It is important to point out, though, that the change categories used remain interpretive, in that the coding was a manual process of determining what the different changes represented. Reference to Reviewer comments and author responses to evaluations helped in the coding process, but it remained up to me as analyst to decide what category of change (or more often categories of changes) were being made. A critical discussion of issues with respect to researcher interpretations of data is included in 8.4.3. That said, categorizing changes provided one means of better understanding how the manuscripts were revised during their trajectories, as the analysis in 5.4.1 demonstrates.

**8.3.3 Analysis of revisions to manuscripts across their trajectories**

While the empirical research into author experiences of writing for academic publication is growing, most studies published to date have been conducted from the perspective of editorial datasets of manuscripts, reviews, and revisions (see
While analysis of manuscript trajectories from a journal’s perspective offers several advantages in terms of convenience of data collection, journals do not necessarily have a complete picture of a given text’s trajectory. There are several issues with respect to text collection and analysis by journal brokers that the research reported in this thesis, and author practices-oriented research more generally, can address. These include:

- Ethical concerns regarding informed consent and voluntary participation, along with the unequal power distribution in relationships between authors and journal Editors
- Limited access to a text’s revision history and trajectory
- Assumptions about journal evaluation and review processes not being problematic for authors to understand

Generally, the datasets reported on in journal Editors’ investigations of journal review and revision practices have involved analysis of manuscripts submitted to the journal (such as in Belcher, 2007). However, one principle of ethical research practice is informed prior consent. This is difficult to arrange in a relationship where the author first submits a manuscript for review to a journal, then the journal Editors decide to include that manuscript in an investigation of the journal’s review and revision policies and practices. Soliciting author experiences, as was done in the investigation reported in this thesis, allows for authors to first consent to participation in the research before providing their work for analysis. Additionally, voluntary participation as a principle can be considered problematic when relatively more powerful journal Editors solicit permission to use authors’ text trajectories for research. Research such as that presented in this thesis can address this issue by
soliciting manuscripts from authors from outside of a publication brokering relationship. While this does not exempt me as a researcher from ethical considerations regarding handling of author information and research data (see 3.5), it does show how the research presented in this thesis has sought to account for ethical concerns in the research process.

Regarding the issue of journals having limited access to text trajectories, Jason and Alan’s outside-Japan indexed journal paper (see 5.3.1), Junpei’s Japan journal paper (see 5.3.3), and Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper (see 5.3.5) show that text histories do not necessarily begin and end with submission to a single journal. In all three cases, there was considerable revision work done to the manuscripts before they were submitted. Accessing only the documents available to the journal or proceedings publications would have resulted in a less rich picture of the texts’ trajectories and could have oversimplified what were otherwise quite complex text trajectories.

Finally, when journal Editors and brokers describe their evaluation and review processes, they tend to view these as relatively straightforward and transparent (see 2.5). However, examining the authors’ experiences of their texts’ trajectories in this thesis showed that in many cases the trajectories of their texts through journal review, evaluation, and revision was rather opaque, and involved considerable uncertainty regarding how many times a manuscript was to be reviewed and when the decision to publish a manuscript was ultimately made in the texts' trajectories (see 6.3.1 and 7.3.1).
8.3.4 Analysis of sets of correspondence

As explained in 2.5, one way the literature has analyzed the correspondence of brokering, such as editorial letters and reviews, has been through a genre analysis approach, examining sets of reviews or editorial decision letters for their discursive features. Such analysis has characterized different issues brokers raise in manuscript evaluations. However, as Lillis and Curry (2015) point out, such analyses examine the Reviewers’ evaluations or the Editors’ letters independently of the manuscripts they are evaluating. This makes it difficult for such studies to explore how the brokers’ comments are ‘taken up’ in the manuscripts.

To examine issues of “uptake” (Austin, 1962, p. 116; Lillis and Curry, 2015, p. 130) in the correspondence and how it influenced the changes made to the manuscripts analyzed in this thesis, the decision was made to examine sets of correspondence along with the different manuscript versions that they were evaluating (see 3.4.4). This allowed for examination of both the development (or avoidance of developing) interpersonal relationships between the authors and the brokers they interacted with, including occasionally correspondence that went beyond discussing the manuscripts and revisions to them (see 6.2.2). It also allowed for examining imbalances in power between brokers and authors, and how those manifested in the manuscripts’ correspondence (see 6.2).

Analysis of sets of correspondence as a methodological tool would benefit from a deeper and broader empirical research base, as investigations of manuscripts’ correspondence within and between specific journals and fields would help to better characterize how variable or standard review practices and correspondence are. Looking beyond writing for academic publication research, sets of correspondence
could also be useful for examining how tutors and tutees develop relationships and discussions of student texts, and how such correspondence influences uptake in students’ assessed assignments, particularly in cases of distance education where email may be the only way that tutors and students correspond.

8.4 Critical reflection on the research

As with all large projects lasting the span of years, the project described in this thesis evolved during the research process. As part of this, decisions were made regarding what promising developments could be practically pursued and which fell outside the scope of this thesis. Consistent with the critical research approach outlined in 3.6, this section reflects on the research reported in this thesis, outlining issues with respect to completeness of the text histories, the restricted focus on writing for academic publication practices, and some of the issues arising from the author interviews.

8.4.1 Implications of incomplete version and correspondence histories

While the analysis of the text histories presented in 5.3 is an accurate representation of the data provided by the authors, it nevertheless represents a partial picture of the texts’ complete trajectories. As Lillis and Curry (2006) observe, “no text history is ever fully complete, in that frequently, drafts are discarded and written exchanges destroyed” (p. 8). Nevertheless, while it may not be possible to collect and analyze a ‘complete’ text history, the kinds of partial histories examined in this thesis can offer useful insights regarding how the manuscripts are shaped and changed in their trajectories. The focus of the investigation presented in this thesis has been on versions of manuscripts exchanged with brokers (see 3.4.3), but there is
nevertheless considerable textual revision of potential interest that goes on as authors revise manuscripts between consultations with brokers. Further, some of the versions of manuscripts exchanged with brokers were not available for analysis. This could have been because the authors chose to not provide those manuscript versions for analysis, forgot about them, or they were no longer available. Junpei mentioned exchanging printed versions of his manuscript with his fellow postgraduate students and the ‘native speaker checks’ he solicited involved paper versions of his manuscript that were no longer available. The decision to include the most complete text histories available for analysis hopefully helped to compensate for lost manuscript versions by ensuring that the manuscripts analyzed included data rich in information about how the manuscripts changed in their trajectories. The oral exchanges surrounding manuscript production and revision are also relevant to text production processes (Gunnarsson, 1997) but were not explored in the analysis presented in this thesis. Despite this, the analysis of the manuscript versions presented does demonstrate the considerable changes they underwent along with (some of) the processes that shaped those changes.

8.4.2 Implications of restricted focus on writing for publication

The investigation described in this thesis and the research questions it sought to address were all concerned with authors’ writing for academic publication practices. There were several other potentially interesting and relevant topics raised during the research, all of which are fruitful avenues for potential future research, but which remain relatively unexplored here. One such question involves the extent to which the authors saw themselves doing ‘research’, and what their definition of research was as it related to their classroom practice and writing for academic publication.
This would likely raise issues of identity as it relates to their writing, a theme explored by Ivanič (1997). The issue of the authors’ conception of the research they did for their writing for publication is also potentially related to the divide between research and theory in second language teaching and learning discussed in 7.2.1. However, as compelling and potentially relevant as this issue is, the decision was made to examine the authors' writing for academic publication practices and leave questions of authors’ stances toward their (teaching) research to future potential investigations. This may point up another implicit assumption in the writing for academic publication literature reviewed in this thesis: that authors writing for publication see themselves as scholars, as opposed to teachers. It may be that the dilemma of research practice versus teaching praxis explored in 7.2.1 is unique to language teachers, or the research-practice ‘divide’ could be a dilemma faced by authors writing for academic publication across a variety of fields.

Another assumption from the literature that is also somewhat problematic is that student coursework and writing for publication represent different and distinct processes. The work presented in this thesis also maintained this assumption, examining writing for publication exclusively, but the authors profiled saw connections between their assessed postgraduate assignment work and their writing for publication, and several authors published assignments in some form, including Junpei’s undergraduate thesis being transformed into a Japan journal paper (see 5.3.3) and Jordan’s account of publishing a master’s assignment in a university kyo journal (see 4.3.5). The authors were also students at different points in the research. For example, Junpei was a PhD student when he participated (see 4.3.4), Jordan joined a PhD program and graduated during the research period (see
4.3.5), and David is completing his PhD at the same time this thesis is being written (see 4.3.3). Overlaps between student coursework writing and writing for publication are a potentially fruitful area for future research. This includes potential overlap between proofreaders of student coursework (Harwood, Austin, & Macaulay, 2009) and brokers of writing for publication in how they shape authors’ texts as well as differences in student and “expert” (Harwood, 2005a, p. 244) use of personal pronouns in their assignment and published writing. However, such investigations lie outside of the scope of the research questions addressed in this thesis.

Finally, writing for academic publication, while a high-stakes aspect of HE knowledge production, is hardly the only kind of writing the authors profiled here engage in. A broader examination of professional writing practices generally could lead to interesting and important insights regarding author beliefs about writing for academic publication and its place in their larger professional lives. For example, Tusting and Barton (2015) investigated the professional writing practices of UK-based academics working in HE, taking a broad perspective of writing practices, including such activities as writing emails, internal university documents, and student assessments, in addition to writing for publication. Such an investigation among authors residing outside of the Anglophone center of HE may offer additional interesting insights into issues of language and communication in HE professional practice.

The advantage of maintaining a focus on author experiences and practices of writing for publication in this thesis was that it made examining how their manuscripts changed possible. It also facilitated identifying issues the authors faced, such as
how the knowledge claims made in their manuscripts were transformed through brokering as part of the submission, review, and revision process.

8.4.3 Critical reflection on author interviews and issues of researcher interpretation of data

As the interviews with authors were considered meaning making events, it is important to critically reflect on what was possible in the interviews analyzed for the research presented in this thesis. While this investigation began with the intention of including equal numbers of Japanese authors and authors from outside of Japan, and the total number of interview participants was relatively balanced, with 9 Japanese and 14 foreign residents of Japan (see Appendix D), it quickly became apparent that my various identities, including as a researcher, along with my relative level of research experience, influenced what it was possible to glean from the author interviews and the kinds of data that it was possible for me to collect in terms of manuscripts, reviews, and chains of correspondence. Several authors declined to provide samples of their writing and the reviews they had received. Thus, a decision was made to concentrate on the seven authors profiled in 4.3, as their interviews could be linked to specific text history analyses, along with those texts’ chains of correspondence. Discussion from the larger set of 23 authors has been incorporated where it was felt important to address the research questions asked, particularly in 6.2.

The advantage of having author interviews and their texts interlinked is that it was possible to connect specific practices in their writing with specific life experiences, such as Kathy’s image of writing for publication as reflective of the supervisor-
supervisee relationship in her master’s program (see 4.3.6) to her interactions with an Editor (see 6.2). One disadvantage is that the variety of experiences accounted for in the research presented in this thesis is largely restricted to the seven core authors. While I feel the data presented has offered adequate answers to the research questions posed, I also feel that a greater variety of author experiences would have further enriched the investigative findings reported here.

Also, just as there were tensions behind power relationships in the text histories and sets of correspondence analyzed, there were also tensions and power relationships in the interviews. Some authors were quite reluctant to provide their writing for academic publication. Gender perhaps played a role here, as I am a male foreign resident of Japan, and no Japanese female provided a rich text history of more than two versions of a manuscript. Further, Japanese authors seemed to think that it would be inappropriate to provide information about their writing for publication practice. For example, one author said her writing for publication resume was considered confidential and not something she could provide, even for anonymous analysis in this thesis. The extent to which this represents institutional policies and the extent to which this is a response to a male Anglophone foreign resident asking for potentially sensitive information is unclear.

Further, as a researcher my skills developed as the research proceeded, with initially clumsy interviews that restricted the space for authors to describe their writing for publication practices developing into spaces where authors appeared to feel more comfortable discussing their practices, and where as researcher I was more attuned to steering the conversation toward topics of interest to the research questions posed. There is nevertheless a risk of implicit researcher bias in the
interpretations presented in this thesis. Wherever possible, interpretations of data have been member checked (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rager, 2005) by the authors themselves to try to hedge against such bias. In this sense, one of Jordan’s replies to a query regarding analysis of his experience in Chapter 7 is quite encouraging to me as researcher:

Dear Theron, thank you for again sharing with me your analysis of my own contribution to your ongoing research. I do agree with your analysis of what I reported in one of our earliest interactions on this particular issue. (Jordan Interview 7)

Beyond member checking sections of data analysis, an effort has been made to link the analysis of author experiences and practices in Chapter 4 to analysis of the text histories in Chapter 5 and analysis of the sets of correspondence in Chapter 6. It is hoped that such triangulation of data and analysis helps to mitigate against implicit researcher bias and bring the topic of analysis, Japan-based English language teachers’ experiences and practices of writing for academic publication, to the fore.

8.5 Summary

This chapter has outlined the contributions of this thesis to the literature reviewed and to methodologies of writing for academic publication. Three contributions this thesis makes to the literature were discussed. The first was the contribution to examining processes of knowledge production in the academy, specifically writing for academic publication. The second contribution was to challenge some of the binary representations of authors that tend to be implicit assumptions of much of the
literature reviewed. The third contribution comes through adding to the empirical research base examining Japan-based authors writing for academic publication.

Four methodological contributions were outlined. This thesis describes development of a graphical representation of a text trajectory analysis. It further develops the Change Heuristic as an analytical tool. It demonstrates the importance of analyzing manuscript changes across their publication trajectories. Finally, it demonstrates the importance of analyzing the chains of correspondence associated with specific manuscripts, as opposed to analyzing sets of reviews separately from the manuscripts they evaluate.

The chapter concluded by acknowledging some of the shortcomings and limitations of the research described in this thesis through a critical discussion of issues of completeness of manuscript versions and their correspondence, noting the impossibility of collecting a ‘complete’ text history. Issues arising from the restricted focus of this thesis on writing for academic publication were also explored. Finally, the interviews were critically reflected on along with issues of researcher interpretation of data, including discussion of some of the ways the investigation here sought to mitigate researcher bias through member checking.

To conclude, this thesis has presented an analysis of Japan-based authors’ experiences and practices of writing for academic publication. It has explored authors’ experiences of pressure to publish, issues of their access to resources, and the tendency for the authors to take a pedagogical orientation toward their writing for publication (Chapter 4). The analysis of author profiles was linked to in-depth analysis of six text histories, describing the volume of revision work the manuscripts underwent and the importance of networks to writing for academic publication.
(Chapter 5). Next sets of correspondence were analyzed to explore what was being negotiated in authors’ interactions with the brokers that shaped their texts (Chapter 6). This analysis showed that the processes of evaluation and the expectations of brokers were often opaque to the authors. A synthetic discussion of the data chapters further explored the implications of this investigation to the research questions posed (Chapter 7). This was followed by discussion in this chapter of the contributions and limitations of the research presented in this thesis. Overall a complex picture has emerged of the authors’ practices of writing for academic publication, including both its importance to their careers and the uncertainty that arises from trying to meet institutional and broker expectations for authors’ published texts. While there remains research to be done into issues of writing for academic publication, this thesis has helped to reveal previously “occluded” (Swales, 1996, p. 46) practices and processes of relevance to Japan-based authors writing for academic publication, English language teachers writing for academic publication, and writing for publication research more broadly.
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Appendix B. Letter soliciting author volunteers

The Open University
Welfos Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA United Kingdom

Telephone +44 (1908) 274096
Fax +44 (1908) 653218
theron@theronmuller.com
+44 (0)1438 763
T.LILLES@OPEN.UK
General inquiries +44 (1908) 653203

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

Invitation to join Theron Muller’s PhD research

I’m Theron Muller, a part-time PhD student with Open University, UK. I’m conducting research into early career scholars’ experiences of and motivations for pursuing academic publication and would like to invite you to take part. Please take some time to review the information here, particularly regarding the purposes for the research. You are also welcome to contact me if something is unclear or you would like more information. If you decide to participate, you are welcome to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

This study is lead by me (Theron Muller, theron@theronmuller.com) as part of my PhD at Open University, UK working under the supervision of Theresa Lillies (t.lillies@open.ac.uk) and Ann Hewings (ah387@OPENMAIL.open.ac.uk). This study aims to ask early career teachers and researchers in the fields of language teaching and applied linguistics about their experiences of and motivations for pursuing academic publishing. The study uses semi-structured interviews, held every two to four months, and asks participants to share drafts of papers, correspondence with editors and reviews of their papers.

All information collected will be kept strictly confidential. You will be identified by a pseudonym and any information about your name, location, names of people you know, or similar sensitive information will be kept anonymous.

The key findings of this research will be included in Theron’s PhD thesis. Some results may also be published in academic books or journals and presented at academic conferences. Storage of all material will be limited to Theron and his advisors. Consent will be sought from participants before using extracts from transcripts or correspondence as examples, even though any extracts will be presented anonymously.

If you are interested in participating, contact me and I’ll send you the participant consent form, which I’ll ask you to return to me via post. If you incur any costs from participating, such as copying or mailing drafts of papers, I can reimburse you for expenses incurred, but I can’t pay you for participating in the research. If you choose to withdraw, you can do so any time via postal mail or by emailing me.
Participant Consent Form

To understand the literacy practices of emerging scholars in their efforts toward publishing academically, Theron Muller is conducting a PhD research through the Open University, UK.

The project involves Skype or phone conversations for the collection of data about your literacy history, writing practices and motivations. Theron would also like to correspond with you periodically about your academic writing and collect drafts and final versions of the texts you are writing, particularly those you are trying to publish. In addition, Theron is interested to learn about your correspondence with journal editors and reviewers and the involvement of others in the production of your texts.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary. Anyone may stop participating at any time before the study ends. There are no identifiable risks in participating in the study. All participants will be asked to select pseudonyms, to be used both in storing data, in the thesis and in any future publications. The information gained in this study should be useful to help emerging academics better navigate pursuit of publications and conferences. This research may be published in academic publications or presented at academic conferences, and data from the research may be included in Theron’s PhD thesis, to be submitted to Open University. All participants and data are used anonymously unless otherwise agreed.

If you have any questions, please contact us at the information given above.

Theron Muller, PhD student
Principal Investigator

Theresa M. Lillis, PhD
Principal Supervisor

Ann Hewings, PhD
Supervisor

I have read the above information and give my consent to participate in the study and for my data to be used in the investigator’s thesis, academic publications, and academic presentations.

________________________  ___________________
Signature                  Date
Appendix D. Complete list of author participants

Nine authors were Japanese and 14 foreign residents of Japan. All were working in the broad area of language teaching, generally English language teaching, although some also taught Japanese and other subjects in addition to English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author participant (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Japanese or foreign resident of Japan</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.K.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT PhD English education student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.K.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT PhD English education student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junpei</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT PhD English education student, PT English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT PhD English education student, PT English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT undergraduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT English teacher and part-time PhD student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.U.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT university English teacher, 20+ years working experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT university English teacher, PhD from US university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sota</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.K.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.P.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher, part-time PhD student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>PT university English teacher, left Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher, part-time PhD student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author participant (pseudonym)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Japanese or foreign resident of Japan</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Foreign resident</td>
<td>FT university English teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Semi-structured interview questions for authors

A. Questions about positioning

1. Please describe a little bit about your current context.
   1.1. How does your current work situation influence your current interests in academic research and writing?

2. How do you see yourself as an academic writer or researcher?
   2.1. Could you please describe your interest and motivation toward academic publishing?

3. Could you please describe the kinds of people you consult in the process of pursuing academic writing and research?
   3.1. Do they differ from the people you meet professionally or socially?
   3.2. Please tell me about the different projects you are involved in or were involved in, and who you worked with on those projects.

B. Questions about academic writing.

1. Could you please give me an idea of your experience of writing in general before you started writing academically?

2. What about your experience of academic writing until now?

3. Did doing your master’s/formal studies change your perceptions of academic writing?

4. What issues do you remember facing as you worked through your master’s/formal studies?

5. What was your experience of starting the process of writing assignments? How did you go about it?

6. How do you go about finding and collecting literature for your writing and research?
7. How do you organize information from your readings or papers you collect?

8. Have you faced issues regarding organization of readings and papers?

9. Have you changed your system of organizing readings and papers over time?
Appendix F. Sample initial interview transcript extract, with Aya

T: ...so if you could just talk to me a little bit about your current work context.

A: [X] University that is a private university located in Shiga mainly I in charge of economic students especially first and second year students um my job is teaching general English purpose for them I have a nine lessons per week ee one class is is called communica- communni communi um e: community room or something like just you know peop- bunch of people show up and then like you know mainly focusing on speaking and uh I use textbook. I think I have like six or seven different textbooks e: half of them are focusing on qualification types e: TOEFL TOEIC The other one is text-based reading and also listening. Listening class students aiming to go study abroad, so [sighs] lecture type of listening

T: OK and u:m how does your current work situation relate to your academic research and writing interest?

A: Uh luck- luckily I can connect my research and my work I mean classroom teaching [research] [T: mhm] a:nd especially like focus on the: the reading but it's reading class but reading combined with writing [T: mhm] yeah approach I- which I'm using in the classroom u:m Yeah I just started u:h I have uh oh it's it's alrea- it's already having like um I'm already having some problems to take a balance betwee:n Yeah I have to write something and I have to produce something I have to teach [T: mhm] [that's] the difficult things right now [so

T: A:h] OK So: u:m what are the expectations for you to do the writing and to do to: you said you have to write something do- does your [university] [A: ?] have like guidelines about what you're expected to write or:

A: My: my PhD you mean

T: Ah your PhD
A: Or: or my students [laughs] [or:
T: or] u:h your job. Your university do they w- do they want you to be writing stuff or
A: No
T: OK so you're [doing] [A: ?] your PhD [and] [A: yeah] you're ah [A: yeah] OK [so]
[A: yeah] you're having trouble balancing the PhD [A: yes] requirements and [A: exactly] OK I see and you just how far along are you with your PhD
uh two weeks three weeks [laughs]
so you just started OK
A: uh yes
T: all right well congratulations on passing the interview
A: thank you very much [laughs]
T: And so um where do you feel you are as a academic uh writer or researcher uh in terms of experience
A: Would you please explain the question a little bit more details
T: Uh sure u:m the- the: my research what I'm trying t- what I'm trying to look at are kind of emerging scholars? trying to publish academically so I'm trying to look at people who are- who have less experience cause most of the research tends to include participants who already have a PhD who already have kind of postdoctorate research um experience and I'm curious I'm more curious about how people develop that experience? How peopl[e:
A: Oh
T: If that makes sense to you so I was so I- when I'm talking to people that I- I'm still trying to figure out how do I draw a box around people like this person is new this person isn't new if that makes sense to you because I know that you've written some in the past
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A: Yup yup

T: and so I was curious where you feel you're at like you're on your PhD do you feel like you're kind of a beginning researcher or you have some experience and you're kind of confident or does that make sense?

A: Yeah makes sense e:h I should u:h uh I'm I'm approaching new field which I have probably never done [yup so] [T: mhm] in terms of that sense I am new researcher but I have some experiences of writing a:nd then: I have some publication as well an:d that is stuff like 2008 that was like my second master [and I] [T: mhm] was in Australia and then yeah during one point five years I learn how to research and how to e: do the fie- field work [um] [T: mhm] qualitative research but gradually forgot what I did so now I had- had to have like a recovering process [an:d] [T: mhm]that was my writing yeah and publications e: hm: m: [2.0] I have some experience so I'm not the really really n- n- not the newcomer I think

T: mhm

A: Yeah. but I don't know what I'm doing is a different what I used done right so I'm just I don't know

T: OK so what's different about what you're doing now and what you used to be doing?

A: Right used to be I was I do uh did the classroom discourse analysis [now] [T: mhm] uh focusing on text genre approach analysis [and I've] [T: mhm] trying to: analyze students' material and also I'm going to teach e: the genre approach writing [in a cla]ssroom [T: mhm] so: u:h the common things is discourse [and also] [T: mhm] community things but you know the focus is of mm spoken texts or written texts written texts I have never done so I'm little bit worried about

T: Ah OK I see
A: Yes

T: All right and so you said you started doing your writing as kind of a refreshing could you tell me a little bit about the writing you started doing as a kind of refreshing getting ready for the PhD or:

A: Yeah yes so so so so so so so u:m very first publication I failed of course and then I got the rev-you know the uh the some of advice from reviewers and I revised but I couldn't make it I think [T: mhm] that was JALT [T: OK] [JALT] publication and then I just left it and then I couldn't write the paper from the scratch that so I- I decided I would like to reuse what I wrote which was my master thesis

T: mhm

A: And then I you know cut down my master thesis three or four different parts [and then] [T: mhm] I yes revise and write revise and write it took what like probably like one year

T: mhm

A: to continue that kind of things uh and then uh made to publish that just JALT an:d then I have s: luckily I have a really helpful um proofreader so that's why I yes I could keep I think I could keep publish you know another publication and uh one more publications and that's helping because if I wrote publication I could write my Reading CV [my] [T: mhm] help for my you know next career stepping stones career and also I can put information of my you know the the jyouseki [translation: resume] [so] [T: mhm] somebody could find me right and then finally I think my former supervisor found me I I I was a new student student I think and he decided he gave me a opportunity to write publication one more so it's kind of stepping stone stepping stone stepping stone and during the process I learned yes I learned how to write hai [depends on] [T: OK] journal and depends on organizations like really fine I have to
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have you know they have a different approach [so] [T: mhm] have to be able to understand also distinguish what they like
T: OK I see and um where you're at at your university, if you don't mind my asking are you on a contract now do you have like a limit to how long [A: yes] [you] can stay there
A: OK Uh that's the contract five years and this is my second year so I have three years [so] [T: OK] re uh renewable [T: mhm] yup
T: So ca- uh oh I see so it's a one year contract renewable up to five years [OK A: to five] years yes
T: I see so you when you mentioned your gyou- youseki you're thinking about your resume for your next position
A: mm yeah yeah yeah [yeah
T: OK]
A: Perhaps yes everybody doing OK [T: [laughs]] [everybody doing] my colleagues yes everybody doing we have a lot of like forty between forty and fifty yes teachers or contract teachers and then seventy eighty or maybe one hundred teachers are part-time lecturers and then you know many of my colleagues doing PhD at the same time you know teaching
T: Ah because they know their contract's [going to be finishing] [A: yes they con-]
OK do you have do they have tenured faculty also [there?]
A: y:es yes? yes yes?
T: [yes
A: do I] have do they have yes
T: They have yes
A: yes they have
T: is it quite a few or just a few
A: my department there are mm four four or five
T: four or five wow
A: yeah four or [five
T: so forty or fifty contract teachers and then four or five [I see
A: four or five yes depends on the department I think but my- my department is
second small second lar- no second large yes one [so
T: Ah] second largest OK I thought it was interesting you said that you: published
those papers and you put them on your resume and then your s- uh your MA
supervisor found you?
A: Uh yeah yeah yeah not uh that was I think I put them y- you know the working
history and also the publications data onto the website
T: Ah [OK
A: He confirmed me and then he con- you know ? me
T: [and he
A: told me] I also informed him I think [this is a] [T: I] paper I published and then that
was you know you know I did in other university and then you helped me da da da
da da and then nn
T: And then he gave you an invitation to write another [paper
A: Yes] yes
T: Ah OK
Appendix G. Sample follow-up second interview transcript extract, with David

D: Greetings.
T: Hey man.
D: How are you doing, Theron?
T: Just fine.

[small talk omitted]

D: All right, so fire away. You got questions? Let's do this [chuckles].
T: Okay, your co-authored paper there. Last time we talked that was in peer review, if you could just update me on it?
D: Okay. I asked [my coauthor] about it. When I went to [name] University for the [job] interview - which would be now about two weeks ago - I asked him about it, and I said, "Hey, so what's the follow up on that?" And he said that if I was interested, I could do a proceedings with it. If I wanted to present it, I could and then write-up, and then maybe we could submit it as a proceedings afterwards. I didn't bite, only because I've got so much on my plate as it is. Though it is kind of tempting. The only thing I'm not inspired to do this, or say his number crunching was a bit suspicious. I'm not sure how to talk about the correlation, when it follows the straight line?
T: Yeah. There's a-
D: Pearson's "r."
T: Yeah, the correlation coefficient.
D: I don't know how to do that, and I don't know how to talk about those numbers. And I don't know how to say we found significance using Pearson's correlation. So
that's the only thing preventing me from trying to present it at a conference or something somewhere.

T: You're saying that you're not sure how to talk about the statistics that are in the paper?

D: That's right.

T: And so that makes you reluctant to present about it at a conference.

D: That, yes, that's right. Also, the way he generated numbers for some stats on another part of the paper. I found was not very reliable/valid. Maybe a year and a half ago, we had talked about it, and I was just studying with [name] at the time doing the t-test, and I was thinking about, "Well, the conditions aren't set right before being able to do a t-test like that." And I can't remember the specifics of it, just enough to say that, "Hmm, I'm not sure about how you did the numbers on this." I just let it slide I said, "Well, I did my part and we'll see where it goes from here." I pretty much considered it his baby, so I'll let him go with it. If I could get my name on it, if it does get published yahoo, otherwise, if I did something similar, I would make sure those parameters were well in check.

T: How did you get in touch with him in order to start the collaboration?

D: He was the supervisor at [name] University for four years, and when I got hired he left. He then went on to [name], another women's college in Tokyo, and he was a supervisor there. We kept in touch and only because, well, for a number of reasons. One, because he was a part-timer, he was still hired on as a part-timer at [name], and so we had the chance to talk even more. He found out the kind of work that I do and the research that I'm interested in. He also said that there was a position available at [name] for a part-timer, and I needed some extra work. And I took that on, and when I did do that, I mentioned how my primary reason for going
in to [name] was to work with him and learn how he did research and this kind of thing. I guess in a way he's sort of saying, was thinking, "Well, why don't you collaborate with me on this project in [name], and we'll use your class and my class, and we'll do this idea." I said, "Sure, why not?" So I joined in, just to sort of learn how things were done. So I did what he told me to do in my class for running the same numbers and the same research, and provided the data. When it came down to sit and to talk about it, he did ask me for some support for the peer review, which I wasn't very successful on. And when it came to talking about the numbers, I was just taking [name]'s course at the time for statistics and t-tests. that sort of got a bit- he didn't seem very confident about the way he generated his numbers, too. The more questions I asked, the more evasive he got. I was like, "Oh, okay, well, I'll just, sure, mind my place and let it slide." So I did learn from that- and that was that, we're good at numbers in that- if one has to do a test of sort of a project like that, it's good to have the numbers part of it down. What do I mean by the numbers? Just make sure you have your instruments well organized.

T: When you say instruments, what do you mean by that?

D: Now of the way he evaluated, the way students for example, were able to reproduce language from their speeches, that they were asked to produce during the task. He said he'd marked off like one out of every ten words to be a blank, out of the speeches that they'd given us, and then we had to sort of evaluate whether they were able to recall it not. He didn't really set a very strong criteria about what was considered an appropriate response, like if the student came close, sort of spelt around the word using only English, that would be acceptable or not. He didn't say whether or not that was- basically, we were guessing along the way, and he didn't check for those parameters on my side. So I kept asking questions like, "Is it okay if
the word was misspelt, or if they try to use some Katakana or something like that, and so what was okay, what wasn't okay was very questionable.

T: Could you tell me just a little bit more about the research that you did then?

D: Students had to make a poster based on the concept of travelling, and they would present this poster in separate booths where we set up stations. I think it was maybe seven different stations, whereas students would simultaneously be presenting to two or three of their classmates. I think it was only two classmates. And we start it all at the same time, and then they would present their poster. They were allowed to read from their script. In essence, we took their scripts back, and we whited out every ten words of the script, didn't tell them that we were going to give them a quiz the following week, which we did. And then we asked them to recall as many words as possible from the first 50 words of their script where every ten words was removed, whether it was an article, or a noun, or a verb didn't matter, because every ten words was removed. And then using the data from that, we would try to assess whether or not are they able to recall their parts well enough from having performed six times in a row. That was one aspect. What was considered an appropriate response or not, wasn't very clear. I had a lot of trouble figuring out, "Okay, should I count this as having been written in or not?" For example, it was New York, and the person would just put NY, the acronym. Was that acceptable? Do I give the student the benefit of the doubt that they know that the N of NY is New from New York? This kind of thing. What was breaking up the word for example, if it was like, not a collocation but a compound noun for example. Is it okay to split the compound noun and only give the first part of it or the second part of it, or shouldn't the whole compound be considered as a word that needs to be reproduced?
T: You marked your student's quiz, and he marked his student's quizzes, and then all the data was put together?

D: Yeah, and we didn't check each other's work. One of the things I was kind of concerned about, I thought we should have done.

T: What do you feel like your relationship is with him at this point in time? You said that you got involved. I guess, what was your relationship at the time is probably a better question. You said you got involved because he had been the director when you got your job, and you were looking forward to working with him and then he left.

D: That's right.

T: And started working somewhere else. So where did you see your relationship with him when you started on the project?

D: I felt we knew each other well enough on a social level and on a work level. But our chatter had been limited to just pretty much what we could do in the teacher's room over lunch. When it came to talking about research or whatever, I was pretty much spoken to as opposed to sharing ideas. So it was definitely a lopsided professional understanding of each other. I wasn't really asked a lot to expand my ideas at the research that I was interested in. It was understood that he was the go-to-guy for this kind of work and this kind of research that he knew more than I did. That was the feeling I had. Contributing to this project, I felt I was very limited to just crunching the numbers - being told what to do, and then just sort of do it. That I had anything to say on the stats part, let alone the research part of it, I just didn't feel that it was my place to do that.

T: Do you think that his positioning of you was accurate, or do you feel like you could have contributed more?
D: I think it's because it was his project, and he knew pretty much where he wanted to go with this, and what he was trying to achieve. That he did all the groundwork to get the project going. That if there was a way I contributed to something, he did give me an opportunity to do that, it was more or less a case of, "Okay, show me what you-- here's what I'll give you to do and show me what you can come up with, but I'll be the final word on whether or not we could use it or not." And, what I think I would have appreciated was like, "Okay, why didn't you like the sources I brought up for the background research or literature review." I would have appreciated that. I think I would have learned more from that, but I was never given the chance to either ask, nor was I given any explanation. I don't feel after this experience, I don't feel like I want to do research with him again. Just because I don't think I'm assertive enough or it's already understood that he's at a higher level, and I don't think I could ever reach that level. I'd rather start somewhere where it's understood we're both working at it and we're both peers working at it. I didn't feel we were peers when we were working on the project.

T: Okay. Is he quite a bit older than you or...?

D: I'm 43, so I just assume most people are younger than me [laughter]. I think he's late 30s?

T: Oh, Okay. So he's physically younger than you but does he have more experience than you?

D: Yes, he has more experience than I do. Yeah. He's working on his grant proposal for some project right now at [name] University, so I think it's going to be the first one that he's trying to get.

T: So he since moved from that other university to [name].

D: That's correct, yeah.
T: Okay. And was he the contact person to let you know that [name] was hiring?

D: That's right, he was.

T: Okay, so he was rooting for you then.

D: He was, and he gave me a lot of the questions that I could expect in the interview and stuff. There’s just one thing that I wrote on my resume - and we talked about it earlier - that he realized, "Wow, you shouldn't have put that on there, because that's pretty much why I didn't get the job." But no, he’s real great support. I didn't really exude a lot of confidence at the time with both publishing and how all of this works. So by the time I came in to [a] course [on writing for academic publishing], I was really like, "Hey, how does this work? How does this whole publishing thing work?"

I'm definitely not the same person I was a year ago, and I think I would have contributed a lot more. I would have been able to help the project a lot more had I been more confident.

T: So I'm just curious, did he share the results of the review with you? Or did he keep those to himself? Because you had said it was sent out and it was--

D: Rejected:

T: :rejected, right.

D: He did. He sent me an email at one point, or was it verbal? He just said- it might have been an email. It says it was rejected by one place and he didn't even give me a reason why. And I've submitted to another place now and so we're just sort of waiting on that. So I think he's following the rule book, where you just submit to one place at a time.

T: But he isn't telling you where it's submitted and he didn't say, "It was rejected and here are the reviews." He didn't give you that additional information?
D: For the first one, there was no review to give because it was just rejected. He might have told me what journal he sent it to, but I don't have a record of that.

T: He might have told you verbally.

D: Yeah, verbally or in an email. I don't know how to track that down.

T: No problem. And then...your [?] publication [...]?

D: Yes.

T: That went through, is my guess?

D: The deadline is the 31st of December.

T: So I'm keeping you from your work.

D: No, not at all. I actually cleaned up all my classes from- what I do is I prepare for the following week. And in between getting married and running around all over the place, I finally caught up with cleaning up last week's stuff.

T: Oh, that's right. Congratulations, I forgot about that [chuckles].

D: So I've actually cleaned up pretty much 90% of all the classes I had from last week, and now I've set the stage where it's just sit down and do what I call Professional Development. And I can't believe I'd like to have a whole week off next week as well. So the kiyo will definitely be done by the 31st, and I submitted that online. And there's a new guy in charge of it, so normally the kiyo would have been submitted by the first week of November. We're kind of lucky that we had it extended until this point, but they want it by the 31st. So I'm going to mail that off. I just need to touch it up a bit more. Since we last spoke, maybe I put in three hours more work into it, I could say. But I'm changing the- I went from the top, bottom. So from lit review all the way down, I just sort of did a part at a time. I've moved a lot of stuff around. And what I was hoping for, is to get it so that all the APA is perfect and everything is fine. And if I had a bit more time, just looking at the clock and say,
"Okay. Can I say something more in the lit reviewer? Can I bring something more into the- I'm talking about results or the conclusion and try to plug in more stuff just to flush it out." This is where I'm at right now. I think I'm going to be touching up the APA, that's all that's left to do on it. And then look at it as a finished piece and then say, "Can I say something more about it?" You saved the copy, I think, of it.

T: What?

D: You saved the copy of it the last time we had a chat, didn't you?

T: Yes. Because you have sent it to me [...].

D: I think the deal was, I was going to send you a follow-up.

T: Yeah. Send me the final version. That's fine.

D: This is going to be the final version. So what I'll do is by the 31st, I'll send it off to you.

T: Perfect. I had one participant one time say, "I'll CC you on the emails I sent to editors." And I said, "No, no, no, don't CC me [laughter]." That will look really strange. Once you sent the email, you can forward it on to me if that's fine.

D: Sure, sure. I'll send it directly to you.

T: Do you tend to use Gmail, or do you tend to use the university email that you have?

D: Which is also hooked up with Gmail, incidentally. It's got a weird finish. It's got like [name].ac.jp but it's actually Google mail. So I conveniently forward all the mail from the work account to my primary Gmail account, which is [name]. And whenever I send mail and move things around, I just change the From Address.

T: Open University has the same system. They go through Google for their mail.

D: Yeah, it's excellent.
T: I was just going to say if you have an email and you're not sure how to get to it, you can always do a search. Google's- the Gmail search functionality is spectacular. That's how I figure everything out.

D: Yeah. Like that feature recently, I don't know how to do it but it was- if you do a search, I think you do [?] colon and you can say pdf-- attachments colon pdf, and you put something else like a [?] after that. Then I'll have every email with Theron and a pdf attached to it. So I think it's amazing.

T: Yeah. So have you got- do you have any other projects underway or any other ideas brewing?

D: I do, and not in this-- I haven't come up with these, just because I know it's going to have my name on- [laughter]. So last time we had a meeting was- I think it was [month].

T: Yes. [date].

D: Since that time, I announced that one of the first classes that we had with the fall semester of [course name], that I got accepted to [conference name]. So what I need to do, is sit down and map out how I'm going to do my 30 minutes workshop, I believe it is. So I've been running this idea in my classes where I've got students blogging each other between classes. It's going to be great, I can't wait to talk about that. I'm hoping to get a proceedings out of that. I'm just not sure if [conference name] does proceedings.

T: Yes, they do.

D: Great. Let me just write that down, Theron.

T: No problem. I think [name] was involved with it at one point in time, I don't know if he still is or not.
D: [name], okay, I'll look into that. So I'm doing the [conference name] presentation, I've got my tickets booked, hotel booked, ready to go. I just need some sit down time to put the presentation together with [conference name] publishing proceedings, or submitting of proceedings to that. Other projects, I wrote two papers over the summer, so I found out that the university I'm at, also has a different publication thing, called the [name] something or other.

T: Another journal?

D: Yeah. It's another in-house journal. It's like [kiyo], but for [another] department. The [kiyo] I submit to, is for the whole university. [name] is just for the English department. They have their own little publication in there, and I found out that I couldn't submit two papers to the [kiyo]. But I talked to a few people, and I found out that I could submit my other paper to the [name], which they wanted yesterday. That's no problem. They talked to me before and I said, "I understood that January 7th would have been okay, as well." As soon as I get my [kiyo] one done, then I'm onto the other one. Which I think [name]- [...] 

[elided to preserve anonymity]

T: Okay. And then out of those-- so you've got those three different projects. You've got one on the fluency- the writing fluency project, the other one on vocabulary, and then you have this third one where you're going to be presenting on the students blogging at [university name] Do you see some relationship between all of those, or are those kind of three standalone projects?

D: They're three stand-alone projects, yeah. I didn't mention that I'm also submitting to [conference name] in [city]. I'm thinking of doing a poster presentation. I didn't
want to do a full on presentation presentation, but I thought, "I should try for at least the-" this other thing. I thought, "Maybe a poster presentation, I could handle. I think I could do that." I forgot what my idea was though [laughter]. I think it'll come to me when I sit down and actually do it. I said, "I could present on this." Oh, it was the one we talked about last [time] it was the whole coding errors one. So when I correct students papers [...] For that idea, I was thinking of doing a poster presentation at the [conference name] [city] in May. So it's spread out. I think it's spread out nicely. So that I've got the two papers which are all pretty much already done now, to be submitted by the next week or so. Then I've got the one in February, [conference name]. And then I've got May for the [conference name] one. I've got all these ideas that are just brewing and cooking up and stuff, so I need to sit down and write it and present it. There's one more I forgot to mention, I just did a presentation at [organization name].

T: A workshop?

D: It was called the [name].

T: The [name]. Okay.

D: And so the [name] was actually on this thing I'm talking about right now - the coding errors. I thought, "Am I running into a conflict now? If I submit this paper to the [journal title], and then I also use kind of like the ideas from that, maybe add on to it a bit more. Flesh it out a bit more and present in [city]. Would that be a conflict?"

T: I don't think so. I would make sure your presentation was two different titles. But I don't think-- I wouldn't think you would run in a problem with that.

D: Because the [city], I don't really intend to publish anything from that. I just want to do a poster presentation.
T: Yeah, if it's just a poster presentation you don't have to worry about it. You just don't want to publish the same paper in two different places.

D: Sure. And that's it.

T: It sounds like you're all full of ideas. If I was talking to you a year ago, would you have had all these ideas or no?

D: No.

T: Where do they come from, do you think?

D: It's just stuff I'm already doing. And friends just say- what was interesting the- I went for the interview at [name] University. The person who took the lead for the interview - I don't know what you call him, the MC? What do you call a guy like that? The head honcho?

T: Yeah, the lead interviewer, I guess.

D: The lead interviewer. Nice guy. He wrote a really nice paper in the most recent [journal name] on motivation. [?]. Anyways, my office mate, who's doing her PhD at [university], said, "There's this guy who just wrote an article and I just came across him." And he wrote something on this idea that, and someone was telling me, "Oh, you have to read this, it's really great." And my office mate said, "Well, what's the idea about?" He said, "It's this guy who wrote his paper on using screencasting for responding to blogs, the students." And she says, "What's so special about that? My office mates are already doing that. Has been doing that for the last year and a half." So she told me about it, and I said, "Oh really? Someone wrote something on it. Who wrote it?" She dug it up, and it's like the same guy who just interview me at [university]. I said, "He wrote a paper on that? Great, I can't wait to read it." And then she sort of scolded me a little bit, she's says, "[name], why aren't you writing all of this stuff? Why aren't you putting that out there? You're already doing these
ideas, then why aren't you doing this?” I said, “I'm on it.” I said, “I'm on it.” I've already got like a bunch of projects for it going as it is, but sure, why not. So I think my whole thing is I have no shortage of ideas, I'm always trying something new. Things that work, just really interested in techniques that work - whether it includes tech or not. What I haven't been able to do, is get it out to the community in the printed word - it's the most popular medium. I've always been interested in doing presentations, I'm really a show to, hands-on sort of person. But it's the publications that I've always shied away from. I just thought, 'Well, that's what smart people do [laughter]."

T: How many presentations have you given over the years then?
D: Including the one I did at [name], I've done two at [name] already, three at [name]. Have I presented anywhere else? I'd say about five.

T: About five? Okay. How long have you been doing the presentations?
D: My first presentation was back in the day in 2005, was my first ever presentation at [organization name], of all places. I was working at [city] as a JET, and someone said, "Hey, you should really present your video idea to a bunch of people at the [name]." And I did and it was a horrifying experience. I was grilled. I was- yeah, I was burned alive. I had all these skeptics and academics that were just throwing quotes at me. So and so says, "That idea will never work." And I was just this ex-librarian and doing a JET program saying, "Hey, it's working with my kids. I just don't have the theory and the names to say why it's working. I just know it's working." And it was such a negative experience. I was completely turned off from academics or anything to do with that. I just stopped presenting. I stopped everything, pretty much. Then I found the courage to do it again. Thanks to meeting the right people along the way. People like [name] and [name], who took me under their wing. Oh yeah,
I've presented at [organization name] a couple of times. Definitely seven presentations.

T: Okay. [organization name] was through [name] and [name]?

D: Yeah through [name], then I met [name] doing [organization name].

T: So you've presented at [organization name], three times. The first time wasn't a very happy experience, what about the latter two times?

D: The latter two times was under new management, so [name] has revived it from the ashes and he had a new crew, an entire new crew. In fact, I was in the revival stages. I was their [role title] for a bunch of months, and then I just passed the torch to someone else. So it was a big coalition of efforts to get [name] not just back and going again, but also with the right people and the right attitude where it encouraged people, anybody, to present. And the latest idea of doing [name], were just limited to 10 minutes or 15 minute presentations. It's just perfect. So you're not up there for an hour, an hour and a half with a break and then this kind of thing, but you just present take-away ideas that you can get within the first 5, 10 or 15 minutes. It has been great. And yeah, it's my second year running now, just going with a 10 minute idea and showing how things work.

T: So you haven't seen any of those people who grilled you back in 2005?

D: Yeah, no, they're all gone now. I have never seen any of them again, actually. One person though is still around. Incidentally, he's the head of the [organization name] or something like that. Japanese guy named [name], I think. Can't remember his family name, but he's the only person I remember from that 2005 experience, who's still- and he actually liked my latest presentation. He said, "Wow, I'm going to use that." I said, "Great. Thanks, [name]."

T: So he doesn't remember you?
D: He does, he does. In fact, he knows me from trying to- because for awhile, [name] wasn't active. It was maybe a couple years, there was no [name]. And then when we tried to bring it back from the ashes again, he immediately came back from the woodwork and said, "Yes, yes, yes. Let's get it back again." So yeah, he's a good guy. He's one of the good guys.

T: So he isn't one of the people that grilled back in 2005?

D: No.[silence]

T: And then have you had any more conversations with your office mate? You mentioned your office mate is doing her PhD, because you said that she isn't at all interested in Japanese publications or the Japanese scene. She's looking at North American publications, is that right?

D: That's right.

T: Have you talked to her about doing anything with her, or you're kind of both going your separate ways?

D: Well, I just found out that she is collaborating with the guy I was with who went to [university name], on another project. And they're doing this grant project now. So between her newborn child well, he's not so new anymore, but between her one year old child and doing her PhD, and now collaborating with the friend from [name] University - she's got a full plate. And what we do is just encourage each other to keep going with our projects, and we do that really, really well. When I work with her- again, I don't really see her as a peer. I really see her like some- like, 'What can I contribute to what she knows?' Kind of thing. Though I would really like to find out- one thing I'm interested in learning more about, is how to do peer review for the [name] journal that she's on, or is it connections- one of the things that she does. And I think that will be great, because I can learn how to review and see what's
going on out there, just from the reviewing part. So if I ever got on board with something with her, I would probably ask her, "Can you get me in on that?"

[silence]

T: I got all kinds of questions, [name]. But I don't know that I need to go through all of those-- I don't know if you need to go through all those, linearly. Did you want to add anything else at this point or you're pretty happy?

D: No. I'm pretty good. Just don't be afraid to ask anything.

T: I'm still in the process of figuring out, I was transcribing the last talk we had earlier and I'm still in the process of figuring out transcription conventions and how to delve in to some of these questions that I'm asking. I think I've gotten a good update from you, and the next time I'll send you a message, it will probably be in March, which is hopefully before your semester has started. Your semester starts in April, is that right?

D: Yeah. About April 5th, 6th, 7th - around that.

T: I'm going to be in the UK from mid-March until the end of March, so I'll probably try to send you a message once I get back from there.

D: Is that to be on hand for the Open University?

T: Yeah, it's a bit complicated.

[small talk omitted]

D: Well, good luck with that. I hope that goes well.

T: Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much. And thanks again for taking the time out of your vacation to talk to me about these things. And then by the time March comes, I should be a bit more together with the transcription and the questions and so on
and so forth. And I'll have some deeper questions to ask you, hopefully. All right, good luck with your articles, [name].

D: Sure. So that's it, no more questions?

T: Yep, if that's okay with you.

D: Yeah, I'm fine. I'm fine. Thank you very much.

[small talk omitted]
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Appendix I. Examining where manuscripts change: Kathy’s Japan conference proceedings paper’s changes by section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracked changes &amp; word count</th>
<th>Front matter</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Literature review</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>References &amp; end matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertsions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count Version 1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count Version 8</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix J. Examining words added and deleted: Two-way keyword comparison of Junpei’s Japan journal paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Words added (V5 compared to V1)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Words deleted (V1 compared to V5)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Instances</td>
<td>Keyness</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Instances</td>
<td>Keyness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>doi</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.808</td>
<td>forms</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>23.076</td>
<td>toward</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.603</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>showed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.552</td>
<td>draw</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>form</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.032</td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>produce</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.062</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.648</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.402</td>
<td>elements</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>clause</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.352</td>
<td>negotiation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>