

英語を母語としない学者のライティング経験 —日本における将来的研究に向けての文献的考察— The Writing Experiences of NNES Scholars: A Literature Review for Future Research in Japan

松野 まい MATSUNO, Mai

● 国際基督教大学大学院教育学研究科
Graduate School of Education, International Christian University

Keywords 英語を母語としない学者, ライティングと出版, アカデミックリテラシー, 第二言語ライティング研究, 学界のグローバル化
NNES scholars, writing and publishing, academic literacies, L2 writing research, the globalization of academia

ABSTRACT

多くの研究者が認識しているように、学界のグローバル化と学術出版の英語化に伴い、研究を英語で発信することは、英語を母語としない学者の間でも規範となってきた。本稿ではまず、アカデミックリテラシー研究の既存のテーマ的分類に基づき、日本以外における、そうした学者のライティング経験に関する新しい二つの研究群を選択的に概観する。第一の研究群は、英語圏における専門分野のコミュニティ特有のライティング慣習への適応にあたっての苦労を考察するもの、第二の研究群は、国際出版と国内出版の均衡に向けて努力するなかでの葛藤について探求するものである。次に、応用言語学、TESOL、言語教育といった第二言語関連分野の専門家のライティング経験を扱った文献の稀少性と重要性を議論する。最後に、数少ない先例を考察したうえで、日本における関連研究の方向性を提案する。

As acknowledged by many researchers, the globalization of academia and the Anglicization of academic publishing have made disseminating research in English the norm, even among nonnative-English-speaking (NNES) scholars. Building upon existing thematic categories of academic literacies research, this article provides a selective overview of two emerging bodies of research into the writing experiences of NNES scholars conducted outside of Japan. The first selected body of research examines scholars' struggles to adapt to the literacy practices of disciplinary communities in the English-speaking world. The second body of

research reviewed explores the complexities these scholars face when trying to strike a balance between their local and international publishing endeavors. A discussion is then offered on the paucity and significance of existing literature on the comparable experiences of NNES professionals in L2 related fields, including applied linguistics, TESOL, and language education. Finally, following a review of a few local precedents, some potential directions for related studies in Japan are suggested.

1. Introduction

The field of second language (L2) writing has engendered increased interest in the writing and publishing experiences of nonnative-English-speaking (NNES) scholars in their home countries. As acknowledged by many researchers, this interest seems to stem from an observation of the various challenges NNES scholars face, due to the ongoing globalization of academia and infiltration of the institutional evaluation system that emphasizes high-impact English-medium research outputs (e.g., Flowerdew, 1999, 2000; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Englander, 2009; Li, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010). A growing body of literature, partly reviewed in this article, captures the struggles and complexities confronting these scholars from both pedagogical and sociopolitical perspectives (for a fuller review examining NNES scholars' related experiences not only in their home countries but also in English-speaking countries, see Uzuner, 2008). On the other hand, there remains much room for critical and self-reflexive research that explores the comparable experiences of NNES professionals in L2 related fields, including applied linguistics, TESOL, and language education. Rarer still are such studies based in Japan in any disciplinary context. Building upon existing thematic categories of academic literacies research (Duff, 2010; Lillis & Scott, 2007), this article provides an overview of two emerging bodies of research into the writing experiences of NNES scholars conducted outside of Japan. The first selected body of research examines the scholars' struggles to adapt to the literacy practices of disciplinary communities in the English-speaking world. The second body of research reviewed

explores the complexities the scholars face when trying to strike a balance between their local and international publishing endeavors. A discussion is then offered on the paucity and significance of existing literature on the comparable experiences of NNES professionals in L2 related fields. Finally, following a review of a few local precedents, potential directions for related studies in Japan are suggested.

2. Research on NNES Scholars' Writing Experiences Conducted Outside of Japan

Some researchers (Duff, 2010; Lillis & Scott, 2007) propose that studies on academic literacies involve two conflicting issues: the issues of adaptation to the existing literacy practices of the majority versus scrutiny and contestation of them. Although these issues are intertwined, some studies, often pedagogical or "normative" (Lillis & Scott 2007, p.12) in nature, mainly explore the former, and others, sociopolitical or "transformative" (Lillis & Scott, 2007, p.12) in nature, mainly focus on the latter, while subsuming the former. Based on these two thematic categories, the following overview introduces (1) studies on difficulties NNES scholars face when adapting to the literacy practices of English-speaking disciplinary communities, and (2) studies on the complexities NNES scholars face when trying to strike a balance between their local and international publishing endeavors.

2.1 Studies on the Difficulties NNES Scholars Face When Adapting to the Literacy Practices of English-Speaking Disciplinary Communities

This emerging body of research explores specific problems scholars encounter when trying to learn and adapt to the literacy practices of English-speaking disciplinary communities. The representative studies that explore this theme include those conducted by John Flowerdew and Yongyan Li among Chinese scholars and Karen Englandar among Mexican counterparts. According to the studies, NNES scholars are clearly under pressure to publish research articles (RAs) in English-medium flagship international journals, mainly due to the institutional faculty assessment system, which is in favor of the practice.

Unsurprisingly, findings reveal that one of the most daunting challenges scholars face when seeking to publish in international journals is the language barrier (Flowerdew, 1999, 2000; Englandar, 2009). For example, Flowerdew's (1999) interviews with 26 Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong scholars from various disciplines showed that the scholars perceived themselves to be at a disadvantage because they had "less facility of expression" (p. 243) and "less rich vocabulary" (p. 243); therefore, it "took [them] longer to write" (p. 243) their papers as compared to their native-English-speaking counterparts. The interviews also revealed that these writing difficulties not only pertained to the linguistic domain but also to larger, textual realms. For example, the NNES scholars found it difficult to make appropriately strong, well-supported arguments for their own research; revise content effectively; employ variety in their writing styles; and write particular parts of articles, such as introductions and discussions.

Furthermore, Flowerdew's (2000) case study of one returnee Hong Kong scholar indicated that while the abovementioned problems are serious, the most overwhelming hurdle for NNES scholars may be poor connections with mainstream academic communities.

In the study, the scholar reportedly lamented that once he returned to his home country, he was isolated from ongoing discipline-specific "dialogues" (p. 135) with other members of the communities. Englandar (2009) conducted an interview study with three locally based Spanish-speaking scholars on their revision process in the context of publishing in international journals. She also found that scholars' writing problems ranged from issues associated with language and textual concerns to those concerning access to key resources and discourses. The research further indicated that the scholars' originally established identity as full-fledged authors was weakened and considerably transformed as a result of their conformance to the reviewers' critical suggestions.

However, this body of research also uncovers coping strategies that NNES scholars use to overcome writing struggles. For example, Englandar (2009) reported that a Spanish-speaking scholar used strategies such as making extensive use of a bilingual dictionary and applying an in-depth analysis of exemplary journal articles in his own field of expertise. Li's (2007) case study in mainland China also showed that novice scholars can be equally versatile when dealing with writing challenges. In fact, one third-year doctoral candidate in physics, who was writing an English RA primarily as part of his graduation requirement, devised a variety of coping strategies similar to the participants in Englandar (2009). These strategies are as follows: (1) "Interacting with his local research community" (p. 64) to brainstorm for his article topic; (2) "Negotiating with the laboratory data" (p. 64) to decide which portion of the paper to focus on; (3) Investing conscious effort into specific areas of writing (i.e., word clarity and logic) and "drawing on [his] past experience of writing research articles" (p. 65); (4) "Using [the] L1 to sharpen meaning" whenever he "got stuck in English" (p. 66) when outlining his ideas; (5) Using experts' published articles as sample papers on which to model his own study (p. 67); (6) Highlighting the significance of the contributions made by his own research communities in his text to

“impress the referee” (p. 70); and (7) Paraphrasing any specialized terms used in his local community into more simple words, “considering the expectation of the target journal and its readership” (p. 70). In general, this body of research not only highlights a range of writing challenges faced by the scholars but also points to their potential capability to surmount these challenges (for other related studies on novice NNES scholars by Li, see Li, 2002; Li, 2006; Li & Flowerdew, 2007).

2.2 Studies on the Complexities NNES Scholars Face When Trying to Strike a Balance between Their Local and International Publishing Endeavors

This body of research focuses on the complexities experienced by NNES scholars regarding the choice of publishing locally in their first language while being simultaneously under pressure to contribute to international journals published in English, as discussed in Section 2.1. The scholars’ concerns often become compounded as they find their interest in publishing for their own local communities of readers at odds with the institutional reward system, which is in favor of English-medium international publications. Some of the major studies dealing with this issue include Lillis and Curry’s (2010) research conducted in Europe (see also Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2006) and Flowerdew and Li (2009)’s work in China. Lillis and Curry’s ethnographic literacy research (2010) explored the abovementioned dilemma for 50 locally trained NNES scholars from shared disciplines (i.e., psychology and education) across different universities in Spain, Hungary, Portugal, and Slovakia. The findings showed that the participants had a clear motivation for publishing internationally, that is, mainly as a means to obtain positions, promotions, and research funds. However, many of the participants’ stories suggested that their in-depth locally contextualized knowledge could not be easily delivered through the medium of international publishing. According to Lillis and Curry (2010), one of the particularly challenging aspects of

publishing internationally for the NNES psychologists and educationalists is the discipline-specific requirement to integrate locally situated research with “theoretical discourses that aspire to universality” (p. 24). At the same time, the scholars highly valued local publishing experience mainly because of their desire and need to actively contribute to their first-language disciplinary and professional communities.

Flowerdew and Li (2009) conducted an interview study involving 20 Chinese scholars—trained both locally and internationally—from various humanities and social sciences (HSS) fields at one university. These scholars faced difficulties similar to those reported by the participants in Lillis and Curry (2010). The study explored the scholars’ attitudes toward the institutional reward system that encourages publication in international journals. Flowerdew and Li (2009) found that the overwhelming majority of the participants, even those trained in the West, viewed local publishing as a more important means of establishing their local careers, compared to international publishing. In summary, this second body of research illuminates NNES scholars’ proactive decision-making process involved in balancing international and local publishing endeavors, even in the face of the increasing institutional emphasis on English-medium publishing.

3. Paucity and Significance of Studies on NNES Professionals’ Writing Experiences in L2 Related Fields

The emerging area of research into NNES scholars’ writing experiences in non-English speaking countries outside Japan, as discussed, provides insights into a range of challenges associated with L2 scholarly publishing and potential ways of overcoming the challenges. It also sheds light on the sociopolitical issues of how global practices are “negotiated at the local level” (Flowerdew & Li, 2009, p. 1).

Despite their potential significance, however, few studies have investigated the writing and publishing

experiences of NNES professionals, who are part of the L2 related disciplines including applied linguistics, TESOL, and language education. Naturally, due to the practice-based nature of such fields, when NNES professionals become the target of investigation, the major focus is their experience as teacher trainees or as in-service teachers rather than their experience as scholars. This form of investigation, which falls under the category of teacher identity studies, illuminates how NNES professionals' learned theories and approaches that predominated their graduate programs in the English-speaking world turned out to be in conflict with their local settings once they started or resumed their teaching careers in their home countries (for a review, see Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004). However, this critical awareness of the divide between the practices of the mainstream and peripheral members of the fields has not been fully applied to the contexts of writing in L2 related fields. Thus, little is known about the writing experiences of NNES professionals as members of the fields, their discipline-specific literacy challenges, and opportunities thereof. The only studies that explore this theme were conducted by Shi (2002, 2003), who interviewed returnee TESOL professionals struggling to write in their home languages after exposure to the discourse patterns of English-medium literature. The self-conflict of these TESOL professionals resonates with that of the participants in Flowerdew and Li's (2009) study. They valued locally acclaimed Chinese-medium publications for their own careers even though they preferred to write in English.

To further the inquiry in this direction, a small body of related literature on English-speaking scholars provides some important insights. Swales (1998) explored the writing and publishing experiences of three mainstream language teaching professionals, including himself, as part of an ethnographic text-based study (or textography) at the University of Michigan. The study reveals that their writing experiences extended beyond the confines of the genres of RAs and considerably shaped their career development in the institutional

setting. This research is valuable in that it highlights the potential diversity in the genres that NNES professionals within the L2 related fields are engaged in and the considerable individual differences in their writing careers.

An anthology of mainstream language teaching professionals' autobiographical narratives on writing and publishing for RAs is similarly informative, as it intimately describes the collective literacy practices specific to the disciplines (Casanave & Vandrick, 2003). This anthology also includes several personal essays written by NNES professionals in the L2 related fields. These exceptionally successful authors have already established their scholarly careers and become influential insiders. However, their narratives serve as self-reflexive case studies recounting how they struggled to establish a niche as peripheral scholars, negotiate with editors while maintaining their voice, choose appropriate journals, manage time, and take advantage of local research networks and resources (for examples, see reflective narratives by Kubota, 2003; Canagarajah, 2003; and Sasaki, 2003 in the volume).

As an increasing number of NNES professionals are entering L2 related fields, and as these fields are becoming increasingly globalized, it is meaningful to explore how writing and publishing affects NNES professionals in their home contexts by appropriately applying or synthesizing Swales' (1998) textography and Casanave and Vandrick's (2003) narrative-oriented approach. In so doing, it would also be worthwhile to pay thematic attention to the following issues faced by psychologists and educationalists, according to Lillis and Curry (2010): (1) the potential challenges of delivering "locally situated" knowledge to mainstream discourse that emphasizes "universality" and (2) the locally oriented professional obligation of scholars to publish in their first language. These issues specific to psychology and education should be relevant to L2 related fields, which are under the influence of the tradition of the two disciplines.

4. Potential Directions for Related Studies in Japan

Studies on Japanese scholars' writing experiences in any disciplinary context remain scarce. To date, L2 writing research based in Japan has largely been conducted within the classroom context and among undergraduate students (e.g., Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2009; Sasaki, 2009). While such research continues to be of importance, due attention should also be paid to local NNES scholars' engagement in and potential issues associated with advanced academic literacies. The significance of writing and research has become ever more evident for NNES scholars in Japan, although exactly how their productions are valued by their institutions is not as explicit as in other non-English speaking countries. In general, the prerequisites for hiring and promoting instructors at Japanese universities include doctoral degrees, which constitute proof of the capability of knowledge production. Eighty percent of Japanese universities include research and publications as part of their faculty assessment criteria, although the degree to which these criteria are emphasized and how different kinds of publications (e.g., international or domestic journal articles, monographs, book chapters) are evaluated seems to be at the discretion of individual institutions (Shimada, Okui, & Hayashi, 2009). Some policy researchers have articulated the need for more faculty writing and research outputs, preferably at a global level, and particularly in response to shrinking research time and declining research productivity (Kanda & Kuwahara, 2011) in the wake of university reform policies encouraging high-quality teaching and curriculum practices (National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation, n.d.).

An examination of a few, yet important, works related to Japanese scholars, along with all the studies discussed above, suggests potential directions for future research. Two important studies, conducted respectively by Gosden (1996) and Okamura (2006)

with Japanese scholars in the hard sciences, illuminate the challenges associated with writing and publishing in English. These studies are relevant to the first body of research discussed in Section 2.1. In his interview study with 16 novice scholars of applied physics, chemistry, and cell biology, Gosden (1996) examined their revision process of writing RAs in English and described how removed the participants were from the desirable practices of academic writing followed in English-speaking academic communities. Although some of the participants were aware of the usefulness of emulating textual models gained from expert papers—as the participants in Englander (2009) and Li (2007) had done—many others apparently felt unable to do so. In addition, the majority of the participants tended to focus on sentence-level editing when revising their drafts, seemingly unaware that revision also entails macro-level alterations such as the reworking of ideas and organization at both the paragraph and textual levels. More importantly, the participants reported that when writing papers, they rarely envisioned their audience, most likely because such papers are typically shown only to supervisors in Japan. It is notable that 13 experienced NNES scholars in Okamura's (2006) interview study faced similar writing challenges. The participants were in the science and engineering departments at major research universities and were regular contributors to English-medium journals published in the U.S., England, and Japan; yet even these participants were reported to have linguistic handicaps, including weak vocabulary and word choice issues, as well as higher-level concerns over the persuasiveness of the argument to the target audience. To overcome these challenges, most of the participants reportedly developed immediate coping strategies similar to those found among NNES scholars in other countries. However, only a handful were interested in developing their overall English skills to a level where they could interact effortlessly with their English-speaking counterparts and network with them. As emphasized by the respective researchers, the studies

of novice and experienced scientists in Japan indicated the need for explicit instructions and support for NNES scholars to gain a sense of awareness of real audiences, as well as to develop basic writing and revision skills. Updated research among local NNES scientists would help uncover more specific English and writing problems that can be fed into advanced scientific writing education and related programs.

Casanave's (1998) interview study is the only research conducted with Japanese HSS scholars. The investigation focuses on the complexity faced by four U.S. trained NNES academics at one university striving to strike a balance between their local and international contributions. This landmark study, which was an inspiration for the second body of research reviewed in Section 2.2, sought to explain how bilingual returnee scholars who are still in the beginning stages of their career are caught between the different publishing demands of Japan and the U.S. According to Casanave(1998), the participants viewed their local Japanese media—mainly book chapters and in-house journal articles—as deficient in academic value, and they complained about the limited time available for their English-medium dissertations or RAs. Nevertheless, when considering where to base themselves, in either Japan or the U.S., they were more motivated to establish dual professional identities in order to comply with the different rules and genre demands of each community. Casanave's (1998) work, like Swales' (1998), highlighted the central role of writing in shaping NNES scholars' career development and socialization into their communities. To expand upon her contribution, it is prudent to address the following points. The participants in Casanave's(1998) study obviously preferred to write in English for international RAs to local media; however, this may not necessarily be the case for other Japanese scholars, and there may be more specific issues with writing among such scholars, as described in the comparable body of research reviewed thus far. Furthermore, in Casanave's (1998) study, the participants' disciplinary backgrounds

varied and are only vaguely described. It may be worthwhile to investigate the practices of scholars who are more advanced in their careers and who are firmly based in Japan, in a specific disciplinary context.

Given the dearth of related studies on NNES professionals in L2 related fields, as discussed in Section 3, one possible area of inquiry would be the writing and researching practices of local university language teaching professionals. Mirroring the situation outside Japan, more than any other disciplines, such professionals' major duties are predominantly education related: serving as models of exemplary language teachers, teacher educators, and test and exam developers (Nagatomo, 2012). Therefore, researchers have actively explored their *teaching* lives (e.g., Simon-Maeda, 2004; Stewart, 2006; Nagatomo, 2012). One of the most representative works exclusively focusing on Japanese language teaching professionals at the tertiary level is Nagamoto's (2012) narrative inquiry. The study examines eight instructors' socialization into professional teacher communities of practice. Nagatomo (2012) mainly focused on exploring how the participants transformed their identities from "scholars" to "teachers" responsible for executing the abovementioned duties through interactions with students and colleagues. Unsurprisingly, because of its research focus, Nagatomo's (2012) study does not extensively examine the participants' writing or publishing endeavors that were likely interspersed with their teaching efforts. As is the case in the other fields, if language professionals at Japanese universities wish to secure full-time positions, they are expected to be Ph. D. holders, active researchers, and writers, before or during the course of service, as Nagatomo(2012) herself points out (see also Casanave, 2010 for a similar explanation of the situation surrounding Japanese language professionals). In light of this situation, it would be valuable to explore the *writing* lives of such professionals behind their *teaching* lives—their diverse, unique, and shared experiences as local members of the globalized fields of applied linguistics, TESOL, and

language education.

5. Conclusion

While limited in space and scope, the selective review of the emerging body of research on the writing experiences of NNES scholars illuminates both educational and sociopolitical issues surrounding the scholars. The body of research shows that although it varies in degree, increasingly globalized scholarship, together with the institutional faculty assessment system, seems to inevitably demand that NNES scholars outside Japan actively learn and exercise the literacy practices of their target English-speaking disciplinary communities. In addition, it can force them into a difficult decision regarding how to balance their international and local publication activities. It is hoped that in the future, more studies will investigate the writing experiences of language teaching professionals in L2 related fields, in order to achieve a better understanding of the realities and challenges of their scholarly lives. Furthermore, although considerable re-contextualization is necessary, it is valuable to apply the abovementioned body of research in Japan, particularly among language teaching professionals, given the implicit yet rising emphasis on writing and research across disciplines.

References

- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(2), 107–128.
- Canagarajah, S. A. (2003). A somewhat legitimate and very peripheral participation. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 197–210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Casanave, C. P. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(2), 175–203.
- Casanave, C. P. (2010). Dovetailing under impossible circumstances. In Claire Aitchison, Barbara Kamler, & Alison Lee (Eds.), *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond* (pp. 47–63). London: Routledge.
- Casanave, C. P., & Vandrick, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 663–688.
- Duff, P.A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 169–192.
- Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English-speaking scientists as a consequence of the social construction of revision. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 8*(1), 33–35.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 243–264.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(1), 127–150.
- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(1), 1–16.
- Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese novices' research writing practices in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(2), 109–128.
- Kubota, R. (2003). Striving for original voice in publication: A critical reflection. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 61–69). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Li, Y. (2002). Writing for international publication: The perception of Chinese doctoral researchers. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 12*, 179–193.
- Li, Y. (2006). A doctoral student of physics writing for publication: A sociopolitically-oriented case study. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(4), 456–478.
- Li, Y. (2007). Apprentice scholarly writing in a community of practice: An intraview of an NNES graduate student writing a research article. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(1), 55–79.
- Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2007). Shaping Chinese novice scientists' manuscripts for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(2), 100–117.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with

- literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication*, 23(1), 3.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context*. London: Routledge.
- Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2008). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 5–32.
- Nagatomo, D. H. (2012). *Exploring Japanese university English teachers' professional identity*. NY: Multilingual Matters.
- National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation. (n.d.). *Higher education reform*. Retrieved August 28, 2013 from <http://www.niad.ac.jp/english/unive/basic/hesystem3.htm>
- Okamura, A. (2006). Two types of strategies used by Japanese scientists, when writing research articles in English. *System*, 34(1), 68–79.
- Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (2009). Situated writing practices in foreign language settings: The role of previous experience and instruction. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 23–48). NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Sasaki, M. (2003). A scholar on the periphery: Standing firm, walking slowly. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 211–221). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sasaki, M. (2009). Changes in English as a foreign language students' writing over 3.5 years: A sociocognitive account. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 49–76). NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Shi, L. (2002). How western-trained Chinese TESOL professionals publish in their home environment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 625–634.
- Shi, L. (2003). Writing in two cultures: Chinese professors return from the west. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(3), 369–392.
- Shimada, T., Okui, M., & Hayashi, T. (2009). Nihon no daigaku ni okeru kyouin hyouka seido no sinchoku to sono kadai [Progresses and problems of faculty evaluation system in Japanese universities]. *Research on Academic Degrees and University Evaluations*, 10, 61–78.
- Simon-Maeda, A. (2004). The complex construction of professional identities: Female EFL educators in Japan speak out. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(3), 405–436.
- Stewart, A. (2006). An inquiry into the social aspects of language teacher expertise. In A. Yoshitomi, T. Umino, & M. Negishi (Eds.), *Readings in second language pedagogy and second language acquisition: In Japanese context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Swales, J. M. (1998). *Other floors, other voices: A textography of a small university building*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Uzuner, S. (2008). Multilingual scholars' participation in core/global academic communities: A literature review. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(4), 250–263.