Complex Journeys behind the Curriculum Vitae: Six Japanese University English Teachers' Reflections on Their Writing and Research Experiences

経歴書の向こうに見る複雑な旅路

――日本人大学英語教員六人が振り返る執筆・研究経験――

A Dissertation Presented to

the Division of Education,

the Graduate School of International Christian University,

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

国際基督教大学　大学院

教育学研究科提出博士論文

Matsuno, Mai

松野まい

April 6, 2017

２０１７年４月６日

ABSTRACT

The study sheds light on the writing and research experiences of six doctorate-holding Japanese university English teachers over the course of their careers, along with their pre-professional backgrounds. The teachers, currently mid-career professors tenured in different Japanse universities, were a generational cohort in their early 40s at the time of the study. They all attended universities in Japan as undergraduates, albeit their age of first exposure to English differed. Three of the participants received their doctoral education in Japan, whereas the remaining three did so in the U.S.

Adopting the narrative inquiry approach (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), the study used as main data two or three in-depth interviews along with one member check interview with each of the participants. The interviews were supplemented by texts, including their responses to biographical questionnaires and their written products, published or unpublished. The study further used a combination of the restorying approach (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002), and cross-narrative analysis in order to describe and explore the shared as well as differing characteristics of the participants' storied experiences.

Through their pre-professional stories, the participants' individually unique language, literacy, and teaching-related backgrounds, particularly against the backdrop of the era of pre-to early Japanese university reformation, came to light. Their shared agentic endeavors to proactively respond to the evolving learning needs that led them to pursue doctoral studies became evident as well. On the other hand, all of the participants, building on their respective personal histories, constructed non-linear and complex journeys, when it came to their main stories on their writing and research experiences. What they

recounted in these stories was their constant move back and forth across the world of academia on the one hand, where knowledge construction through research is the norm, and the world of English teachers on the other, where research is viewed as a “minority activity” (Borg, 2010, p. 391).

At the early stage of their academic career, irrespective of their academic training pathways, all of the particpants were found to be actively engaged in English-medium dissertations and other publications. The Japan-trained teachers, who experienced concurrent engagement in teaching and research from the outset of their doctoral lives, focused on the efficient production of the works across languages and genres. On the other hand, the American-trained teachers, who experienced a focused period of research, valued the intellectual process of the production of the works and used English-dominant genres mainly in the form of research articles. Overall, the respective writing and research practices the teachers adopted at the time seemed to serve as the basis for their present practices. Meanwhile, the majority of the teachers experienced insecure yet labor-intensive job conditions under the effects of increased managerialism in higher education, while they simultaneously gained valuable professional opportunities.

In their stories on their present career phase, in the context of the era of intensified university reform and managerialism, the participants expressed a sense of an institutional mission, as well as personal passion, to contribute to English education at their universities. However, all of them, especially those tenured in private universities, and among them, those trained in the U.S. in particular, seemed to find it challenging to continue their studies the way they liked despite their capacity for knowledge construction. Although they currently seemed to be more fortunate to be in conditions (Xu, 2014) that helped them view themselves as researchers as compared with many of Non-Native English Speaking (NNES) teachers portrayed in the existing literature, they showed ambivalence in being and becoming researchers owing to their personal, institutional, and network constraints.

Nonetheless, they are willing to continue their studies within these constraints.

These findings suggest the importance of recognizing that NNES university English teachers' issues with their career path, disciplinary enculturation through writing, and research engagements in professional contexts are interrelated and should be addressed more holistically. In light of the findings and relevant literature, and considering the negative prospects of the research-related environment in academia, the study concludes with a case for providing not only career-long writing-and-research related training, support, and mentoring but also sustained career education and guidance, including entrepreneurship training, to such teachers.

論文内容の要旨

本研究は　六名の博士号を持つ日本人大学英語教員の、キャリアの過程における執筆・研究経験を、現職に従事する以前の歩みとともに明らかにするものである。六名は現在、異なる日本の大学に専任で勤務する中堅の教授で、いずれも同世代であり、本研究実施時点で四十代前半であった。最初に英語に触れた時期は様々ながら、全員日本の大学で学部時代を過ごした。また、三名が日本で、残りの三名が米国で博士教育を受けている。

研究アプローチとしてはナラティヴ・インクワイアリー (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) を採用し、各々の教員との二回、あるいは三回にわたる深層インタビュー、および一回のメンバーチェック・インタビューを主要データとして用いた。また、本人による伝記的調査票への回答や、公刊・非公刊の著作といったテキストも補足データとして参照した。さらに、語られた経験に見られる共通した、あるいは個々に相違した特徴を記述し、探求するために、リストーリーング・アプローチ (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002) とクロス・ナラティヴ分析を使用した。

参加者の大学教員になる以前についてのストーリーでは、特に日本の大学改革前・あるいは改革黎明期を背景としての、各々に特有の言語、リテラシー、そしてティーチングに関連したバックグラウンドが浮き彫りになった。また、博士課程への進学へとつながる、自身の学習ニーズの進化に積極的に対応する、エージェンティックな努力も共通して明らかになった。一方、インタビューの中心であった執筆・経験についてのストーリーでは、いずれの参加者も、個人史を背景にしつつ非線形的で複雑な旅路を構築した。ここで語られたのは、研究を通しての知識構築を規範とするアカデミアの世界と、研究はあくまで「少数派の活動」(Borg, 2010, p. 391) であるとされる英語教師の世界との間を不断に行き来するさまである。

アカデミック・キャリアの初期においては、学究経歴を問わず、すべての参加者が積極的に英語での博士論文やその他の出版活動に取り組んでいたことがわかった。日本で博士教育を受けた教員は博士の初期の段階からティーチングと研究に同時に取り組んでいたことから、言語やジャンルにこだわらない効率的な研究生産を重視していた。一方、アメリカで博士教育を受けた教員は、一定期間集中した研究生活を送っており、研究生産における知的プロセスを重視し、英語での、主に研究論文という形での発表を中心としていた。総じて、参加者がこの時期に取り入れた各々の執筆・研究プラクティスは、現在のプラクティスの基礎となっているように見受けられた。一方、大半の参加者が、この時期に貴重な職業経験の機会を得ながらも、高等教育における管理主義の高まりの影響下で、不安定かつ労働負荷の高い業務条件を経験していた。

参加者の現在のキャリアステージについてのストーリーでは、さらなる大学改革や管理主義の強化という時代的文脈のなかで、自身の勤務する大学において英語教育に貢献するという個人的な情熱と組織的な使命感が表現されていた。しかしながら、全員が――私立大学で専任を務める教員、中でも米国で博士教育を受けた教員は特に――その知識構築能力にもかかわらず、望むようなかたちで研究を続けることに難しさを感じているようであった。参加者は現在、既存の文献で描かれているノンネイティブの英語教員の多くと比べれば、自らを研究者として見ることのできる条件 (Xu, 2014) に恵まれているが、個人的、組織的、ネットワーク的な制約のために、研究者であること、および研究者になることに対する葛藤を示した。一方こうした制約のなかで、研究を続ける意志もまたそこにあった。

これらの知見は、ノンネイティブの大学英語教員が抱える、キャリアをめぐる問題、ライティングによる学問分野への文化適応をめぐる問題、職業環境における研究活動をめぐる問題が相互に連関しており、より包括的に検討されるべきであることを示唆している。本研究は、最後に、上記の知見と関連する文献に鑑み、そしてアカデミアにおける研究環境に対する悲観的な観測を考慮し、そうした教員に対して、キャリア全体を通じての執筆・研究の訓練、サポート、メンタリングのみならず、起業訓練も含めた持続的なキャリア教育とガイダンスを提供すべきであることを主張する。

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Machiko Tomiyama, for her expert advice, sincere support, and warm encouragement throughout my doctoral career, as well as throughout the process of this work. Always swamped with regular professional duties, my progress was slow, but her guidance, intellectual and moral, at key junctures in the course of my journey, always helped me to stay in track of what I was pursuing. I would also like to thank my doctoral committee, Dr. John Maher and Dr. Yasunori Morishima, for their insightful comments on early endeavors that fed into this study. I would further like to thank some anonymous scholars too for their support and feedback at the early stage of this work.

My gratitude equally goes to the six English teachers who kindly participated in the study, and shared their experiences and written works with me. I profoundly appreciate their generosity and patience in working with me despite time constraints. Without their engaged cooperation, this study would not have been possible.

I am further indebted to my colleagues in the writing department at the university that I work for. Without any cohort members in the doctoral program, chatting about the progress of the study with colleagues, many of whom were also doctoral researchers, was encouraging. I also appreciate the flexibility of the teaching schedules that the department offered to me in support of my research effort.

Last, but not the least, I would like to thank my parents and younger brother for their constant support and trust in me. I acknowledge that my being the daughter of my father, an English educator and linguist who dedicated himself to the betterment of English education and research in higher education, had a special meaning in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The study explores six Japanese university English teachers' writing and research experiences over the course of their academic career along with their pre-professional backgrounds. After introducing the personal and academic rationale for pursuing this inquiry, the chapter will give the overview of the study. It will then go on to introduce research questions and explain the significance of the study. The chapter will end with presenting the organization of the study.

Personal Rationale for the Study

My rationale for investigating the writing and research experiences of NNES university English teachers is partly personal. Research of any kind requires one to position herself in the context of the field. However, I always wondered how I should situate myself in the field. It is because my relationship with the world of writing and research, as well as the field, has been unstable, despite my consistent love for writing as a tool for intellectual self-expression. Specifically, my indecision on my researcher stance stems broadly from the following three interrelated sources:

1. My highly accidental career path prior to engagement in doctoral studies.
2. My locally uncommon disciplinary focus.
3. My institutional conditions causing difficulty in engaging in writing and research.

Here, I will detail the composite circumstance that I went through and explain how

this has led me to consider exploring this theme.

My Highly Accidental Career Path Prior to the Engagement in Doctoral Studies

I hold a master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and I had nine years of career teaching at a Japan-based American university at the time of the study. Thus, I may be broadly categorized as a university English teacher. However, my career path towards academia involved many twists and turns. To begin with, my original field was not English, nor did I have any particular interest in the profession related to English teaching when I was an undergraduate student.

I was born in the early 1970s in the Kansai area, and have lived in Kanto since I was nine years old. Through my childhood to teenage years, I loved drawing cartoons and writing in a variety of genres in my first language (L1). I was attached to putting together my own thoughts and stories in prose and graphic form, in and out of classroom contexts.

My first exposure to English occurred temporarily at around the age of five. My father, currently a retired professor emeritus, had taught English, English education, and phonetics in the undergraduate and graduate programs of a national university, University N (pseudo-initial) in Japan. Although he did not formally teach me English, he helped me learn the basics of phonics. He also occasionally invited English-speaking colleagues and friends to our home, with whom my family and I enjoyed informally interacting. When I was five years old, we had a chance to stay at the home of a local family in London during the half-year sabbatical of my father. Subsequently, continued self-directed exposure to English after returning to Japan allowed me to get used to the language albeit at a basic level, even before I learned English formally in junior high school. I was largely influenced by my father's strategies for independent learning of the language. I enjoyed reading English books, listened to English-speaking TV radio programs, and occasionally participated in conversations with English speakers whom my family invited.

In my junior high school years, while I enjoyed English as a subject, I viewed English mainly as a means of creative self-expression for my own sake. At the time, I was absorbed in playwriting and, as the leader of an English drama club, devoting myself to adapting existing bilingual play scripts for the members of the club to use. I also participated in an English speech contest upon the recommendation of teachers and won a first prize for my performance.

In high school, although I maintained my interest in English, I became attracted to a wider range of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) subjects, including Japanese, Chinese classics, social studies, world history, and ethics. I found myself excelling at English as well as these subjects, and I did apply to and gained admission to the English major program of several universities through the regular entrance examinations. Nevertheless, I was not particularly interested in following my father's footsteps. My unlimited academic interest, coupled with the desire to pursue something different from my father's field, eventually shaped my decision to enter the faculty of letters of a private university that allowed students to postpone their decision on their majors until the beginning of the second year. I looked forward to learning whatever subjects would interest me.

My high intellectual expectation toward university life was not completely satisfied at first. None of the liberal arts classes that I attended in the first year was genuinely stimulating, and almost no professor expected the students to attend their classes regularly. I was surprised at the fact that the majority of my peers showed up only to sit examinations. On the whole, I was depressed by the "all play and no work" feel of the campus, in which any display of academically oriented attitude was dismissed as "uncool" (ださい), and even thought of leaving the university.

The eventual key to resolving my depression was my secret self-study of Chinese, which I loved to learn while fulfilling the curricula's second foreign language requirement.

Over time, one of the Chinese professors observing my rapid acquisition of the language told me that I should consider majoring in Chinese. Her recommendation was encouraging to me and in fact led me to proceed to specialize in the language. As this period was shortly after the Tiananmen massacre, Chinese major was unpopular, but it offered a unique form of rigor. I had only three other peers in the same major, all of whom were either native Chinese speakers or already extremely advanced Chinese users. From the beginning of my foray into the major, I was under extreme pressure to catch up to the level of my peers. I attended Chinese-medium classes, and read and discussed authentic academic literature and articles in Chinese with much verve. I even attended inter-university Chinese speech contests twice, for both of which I was able to win a prize, owing to my efforts and the guidance of Chinese-speaking peers. I was able to acquire the needed Chinese proficiency to attend a short learning program at a prestigious university in Beijing, where I further learned language, linguistics, and literature.

In the course of learning the language during these years, I envisioned a career as a Chinese linguist or professor. At the time, I was continuing to learn English simultaneously, partly because this career also required a high level of English proficiency. In parallel with the extensive listening and reading of materials on my own, I periodically attended a range of discussion and content courses taught in English and offered mainly for English majors and returnees. I also worked hard at reading English translations or commentaries of Chinese works and English-language articles on the Chinese language to deepen my knowledge of the field of Chinese literature and linguistics.

However, I ended up giving up on my planned academic career mainly because of the unexpected death of a Chinese linguist with whom I wanted to work. This incident directed me to an alternative career in the publishing industry in Japan. Here, I worked with a number of Japanese HSS scholars engaged in knowledge construction through writing for publications in Japanese and in English. My responsibilities included the

planning and compilation of books, coordinating and outsourcing editorial teams, public relations, copy writing, editing, and proofreading. Most of the books I edited were in Japanese, but I had opportunities to apply my English skills through working with English-speaking authors and helping Japanese scholars produce Japanese translations of English originals. In my five-year career as an editor, I was able to acquaint myself with ways to facilitate authors' productive endeavors. Nevertheless, this career experience gradually redirected my attention to my long-standing fondness toward writing and rekindled my interest in an academic career. In working with HSS scholars, I became more interested in professions that involved self-expression and education rather than offering support in their efforts. Thus, I decided to pursue a second career in English teaching, and I enrolled in the master's program in TESOL at the Japan-based American university where I currently work, which accepted students who had no prior or ongoing teaching experience.

Learning in the master's program at the American university was my starting point to become immersed in TESOL-related fields, and to envisage further an academic career. The master's program, while based in Tokyo, offered courses in English taught by mainstream TESOL or applied linguistics scholars, most of whom were from the U.S. All of the classes met either in the evening on weekdays or in the afternoon on weekends, geared to the needs of working professionals, which was convenient for me, as I was working as a freelance translator on an on-call basis, despite being almost a full-time student. The extensive coursework opened the door to the joy of writing in itself. I enjoyed writing an array of formal papers ranging from literature reviews and practical curriculum proposals, to synthetic research project reports. It was encouraging that a number of the professors kindly invited me to present my papers at a colloquium co-hosted by the institution and The Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT), and to publish them in in-house peer-reviewed journals. More than anything, however, what I reveled in was

personal writing. As part of some coursework, I had opportunities to write journal entries in response to any given literature in the field. This personal writing was important to me as it allowed me to examine my personal connection and disconnection to the field. Learning the mainstream language learning theories and approaches in Japanese contexts, while practical, inevitably sensitized me to the marginality of language teachers in Japan, relative to the mainstream discourses. I was often frustrated by the gap between what was advocated in literature and the reality of Japanese classroom contexts that I experienced as a student. I was disappointed by the underrepresentation of NNES teachers both as the target of research and as authors themselves. I was dissatisfied with the negatively biased portrayals of these people in the limited literature. I often made it a rule to jot down these feelings, apart from absorbing the practical knowledge that I acquired, envisaging to contribute my peripheral voice to the mainstream discourses.

Nevertheless, I also felt that it was too premature for me to move directly from the master's program to the doctoral program, as I did not have much hands-on experience as a teacher. I thus decided to prioritize establishing my teaching career over my research career, as TESOL-related fields seemed to be encouraging teachers to strike this balance. This decision led me to another phase of my career journey.

In contrast to the cases of language teachers portrayed in fields related to TESOL, I happened to be trained specifically as a writing instructor and at the same American university based in Japan. Writing instruction was not the focus of the master's program; however, I encountered the field of writing and writing instruction through my voluntary participation in an elective practicum project in the academic preparation program that was led by one of my professors. This program was designed to prepare English as a second language (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL) students for undergraduate studies at the same university or overseas. The American instructor in the program, with whom I worked as a teaching assistant, was a student of Vivian Zamel, from whom I learned

extensively about the writing approach to academic literacy instruction, which was prevalently adopted in first-year undergraduate writing programs in the U.S. Helping students grow as authors came intuitively natural to me, given my prior background in publishing. Shortly after graduating from the master's program, I was initially hired as a writing instructor in the same academic preparation program, where I started my career in ESL reading-based writing. The main student body in the particular program was EFL students educated in Japan, most of whom graduated from Japanese institutions.

However, my main career in writing instruction started one year thereafter, in the undergraduate writing program for freshmen, when I was recruited as a writing instructor after the sudden death of an experienced British writing instructor. Although unintentional and daunting at first, I became more involved in the world of writing instruction to a wider range of international students who were highly proficient in English: 70% of the students I taught in the program were non-Japanese students from overseas, whereas many of my Japanese students were graduates of foreign or international high schools or transfer students from American colleges or universities. With the guidance of the director, a famous poet and creative writer, I learned that my main duty as writing instructor was to collectively induct students into academic discourse in English, while also needing to attend to students' individual linguistic and literacy needs.

For seven years, I diligently accumulated teaching experiences. Meanwhile, however, I felt lagging behind as an academic, as I observed many creative and productive colleagues, including my boss, outside of the field of TESOL. My sole output during the seven years was a book-length translation of a famous political commentary by Chomsky (2007), an opportunity that I obtained through the invitation of a friend in the publishing industry. Although it became an Amazon bestseller and extensively featured in popular media outlets, I was not overly proud of the work, given that it was a translation, a Japanese publication, and geared toward the general public, instead of the formal academic

work in English that is generally valued in academia. I thus recognized the need to become an academic like my non-TESOL colleagues through authoring some work, in addition to continuing my main profession as a writing instructor. I also felt the need to become a good writer and researcher myself to thrive as a writing instructor. In addition, at my university, the pay scale was determined in part by degree level held. Therefore, I decided to pursue a doctoral degree for career, intellectual, and financial reasons.

Overall, my career path before pursuing doctoral studies was filled with coincidences and detours, instead of being linear, intentional, and goal oriented, which indeed made it difficult for me to determine how I position myself as a researcher.

My Locally Uncommon Disciplinary Focus

My interest in the field of writing built on my career as a writing instructor at the Japan-based American university is another source of my struggle as a researcher based in Japan. Most critically, although it is not too distant to TESOL, writing is still an emerging field of inquiry derived from a range of disciplinary traditions, including but not limited to English rhetoric and composition and second language studies (Matsuda, 2005). Writing is a well-known field in the American context in part owing to the prevalence of first-year writing programs at the undergraduate level. Indeed, recent leading scholars in the field of TESOL and applied linguistics are writing scholars. However, it is not widely acknowledged in the scene of English education in Japan, with its interest focused on the basic level needs of locally educated English learners.

The first challenge related to my locally marginal disciplinary focus emerged at the beginning of my doctoral career. It was my initial plan to work with a well-known yet singular writing scholar in the doctoral program in the same graduate school at the American university where I work. She kindly recommended me when I applied to the program, and after my acceptance, I was excited to take her courses with my cohorts.

However, when I was about to enroll, I was shocked to receive an e-mail from the professor explaining that she was suddenly replaced by another professor following the unexpected restructuring in the program. I was also informed by the program that my cohorts would not be allowed to work officially with her. I continue to keep in touch with the professor, who has continued to be active in both research and education outside the program. Nevertheless, I was profoundly disheartened back then to lose her in my prospective academic career in the program. I never learned the reason behind the incident, but I acknowledged at least the two facts: the marginality of writing as a disciplinary focus in Japan and the insecurity of academic positions even for mainstream scholars in TESOL-related fields.

After careful consideration, I sought to apply to another program in Japan that would allow me to explore my interest while working at the American university. I chose a graduate school at Japanese University A (pseudo-initial) to pursue my study with my current supportive advisor, whose academic expertise I had known from her research articles (RAs). I had happened to read and present on her work in an applied linguistics course in my master's years. It was fortunate that she showed interest in my study on writing, although her specialty was different from mine. In addition, my Chinese language background helped me fulfill the program's unique requirement for proficiency in a second foreign language other than English.

The marginality of my area of interest and my own profession in the local context nonetheless consistently challenged my doctoral career at the Japanese graduate school as well. I was not particularly concerned with the academic environment at the Japanese graduate school where independence was required. Without cohorts or rigidly structured coursework modules, I made decisions on my study plans almost all on my own. To help compensate for my lack of network, I capitalized on my capacity as a faculty member at the American university to gain access to and review an extensive range of mainstream

academic databases based in the U.S., where I learned the latest disciplinary discourses in the field of writing. In addition, I made independent efforts to seek informal advice and obtained resources from outside scholars, including the writing scholar mentioned above, albeit only occasionally. I also received informal help from my colleagues, including those learning in the doctoral program that I left from or at other universities in learning methodologies and theories. Meanwhile, I realized how challenging it is for local scholars to understand my research focus. One of the episodes that illuminated this situation is my struggle in the process of preparing for my doctoral candidacy examination. As soon as I completed my initial dissertation proposal, I had to move toward the examination conducted by the three members of the self-appointed dissertation committee, comprising my advisor and two other professors. This step involved the submission of three qualifying papers to each, and subsequent interviews. In the middle of the preparatory stage, I faced prolonged difficulty in expounding my research theme pertaining to socio-politically oriented writing study for the understanding of one of the two professors, Professor B, a prominent linguist in Japan.

Selecting the members of the dissertation committee requires in-depth knowledge of the specialty of each prospective member, as well as a careful assessment of the match between the researcher's area of inquiry and the expertise of the proposed committee members. However, in my case, the inclusion of this professor in the committee was inevitable, rather than out of choice, owing to the limited number of faculty specializing in related areas in the program.

The qualifying paper required in the program is complex in nature in that it seems to constitute a borderline genre that falls between the following two categories:

1. The institutional examination paper, intended specifically for the committee members.
2. The basis for a chapter of the dissertation itself, intended for experts in the

specific field within which the research is framed and contextualized.

My advisor interpreted that the paper should be regarded primarily as a project separate from the dissertation, which was specifically intended for the candidacy examinations. Therefore, she advised me not to feel pressured to include the paper as part of the dissertation. In contrast, it turned out that Professor B had a completely different idea of the nature of the paper. Professor B, unlike my advisor, firmly believed that the paper should form a part of my dissertation. Further, she thought I should change the paper topic more to a linguistically oriented and practical classroom research, which she assumed would be more relevant to Japanese audiences.

The constant failure in gaining an understanding of what I was pursuing made me pessimistic, to the extent that I considered vacating the program, or completely changing the dissertation topic to suit Professor B's interests, notwithstanding my own goal. However, either of these actions would virtually disregard all the guidance that had been given by my advisor, who had helped me in the process of writing the dissertation proposal. My advisor urged me to stay focused on the original dissertation topic that she approved. She also generously mediated the replacement of Professor B, and I was able to find another professor whose expertise was closer to my own theme than Professor B's had been. Finally, I was able to gain the new professor's approval for my topic, through my advisor's referral.

This challenging experience with the candidacy examination process further made me aware of the difficulty of pursuing a theme that is not well known in the local context, which is also another cause of my difficulty in constructing myself as a researcher.

My Institutional Conditions Causing Difficulty in Engaging in Writing and Research

Another level of challenge for me to position myself as a researcher concerned daily constraints arising from the very workplace in which I have worked. Whereas Japanese

institutions generally run for 30 weeks per year, my American university has about 52 weeks' worth of curriculum annually, with each semester running for about 14 weeks (except the summer semester that compresses the same volume of curriculum into the eight-week curriculum format by providing long and intensive class meetings). I have enjoyed working as a writing instructor, and teaching students continues to be a top priority. However, I cannot deny that the work involved in writing instruction is time consuming. I have about 50 to 100 pages of student work to comment on and evaluate every day, heavy work on top of engaging in usual course preparation and related work. My responsibilities beyond classroom teaching include, but are not limited to, individual conferences with students, program-level material design, curriculum and policy development, team-grading student portfolios, support for students applying for internships and scholarships, offering class observations for prospective students, emergency drills, liasoning for students with special needs to counselling and disability resource services, and semester-to-semester placement examination gradings. The total work hours generally reach 10 to 12 hours per day, including weekends, and I consistently worry how much sleep I can enjoy before every class meeting. In addition, like the vast majority of my colleagues, my contract is on a semester basis. Thus, although I am proud of the experience, some sense of insecurity and vulnerability never goes away.

As part of the teaching faculty, my performance is evaluated on the basis of quality of teaching and contribution to the writing program; however, research is encouraged as well, and informal institutional research forums are held regularly, where any faculty member in any field is allowed to present their work in front of interested colleagues. Some amount of institutional research funding is provided if applications are accepted. I find myself still failing to adequately capitalize on such research-related supports at the institution.

My advisor suggested that I move to a Japanese university as a part-time instructor

with short teaching hours to focus more on my doctoral study. However, given the generally meager pay scale for such instructors at Japanese universities (Poole, 2010), and considerable conflicts in the Japanese and American academic calendars, I never considered it a realistic choice, particularly because I am single. As will be explained later in the volume, time constraints consistently affected the progress of my doctoral research. I was never able to publish papers except a few articles in English submitted for an in-house journal, with an extremely limited time for working on the dissertation project from the beginning.

Overall, being a latecomer to the profession, the field, and academe after transitioning from a non-teaching industry, and with a focus on a research area not common in Japan, coupled with consistent time constraints arising from intensive institutional duties, I always wondered how I should position myself as a researcher. At the same time, I consistently wondered what career structure I should envisage or whether I should explore other career options. These personal concerns grounded in my own abovementioned career and research experiences compelled me to explore the research lives of other Japanese university teachers in the country in similar fields, with whom I rarely communicated in my daily professional life. What is the career structure of other university English teachers like? Are their careers as non-linear as mine or close to that of regular academics? How do they go about their writing and research? Do they have similar struggles to myself or different ones? How do they envisage their academic future? These questions are part of my motivation to investigate the theme of this study.

Academic Rationale for the Study

A part of my rationale for the study is academic in nature. Despite the emerging interest in writing and research experiences of NNES scholars in general (e.g., Li & Flowerdew, 2007, 2009; Englander, 2009; Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Uzuner, 2008; Li,

2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Li & Flowerdew, 2009), little is known about comparable experiences of NNES university English teachers—who simultaneously are NNES scholars in TESOL related fields —except for the cases of a few established Western-trained "insiders" of the fields (see Kubota, 2003 and Canagarajah, 2003 in Casanave & Vandrick, 2003). A review of the literature made me think that the fields' lack of attention to NNES university English teachers' writing and research lives may pertain to the fact that their career and research journeys are generally invisible and precarious. Thus, the study sought to explore the interface and divide between teaching and research lives in their career contexts as well as on their writing and research practices.

It has been argued that English teachers in general do not have a structured career path (Johnston, 1997), and that TESOL related fields have paid little attention particularly to NNES teachers' careers as well as their lives (Hayes, 2005). Thus, it is understandable that NNES university teachers' careers, let alone their pathways towards a doctorate that mark the beginning of their academic profession, is an under-explored area. While a small body of literature does shed light on key trends in NNES teachers' pre-university, university, and graduate school experiences (Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998; Hayes, 2008; Lin et al., 2005; Trent, 2013; Casanave, 2002; Morita, 2004; Cho, 2009, 2013); how all these stages of experience play out and connect in individual NNES teachers' lives is yet unexplored.

It is thus equally conceivable that NNES university teachers' writing and research engagements, as well as their career at large, have been largely unknown. The literature has not captured the possible cases of NNES university teachers' simultaneous pursuit of studies at their graduate schools and an academic career at another institution at the same time like I have been experiencing. However, what is evident from the limited body of literature is that research related institutional environments surrounding NNES university

teachers are challenging, particularly in the backdrop of the recent rise of managerialism (Henkel, 2010; Schwandt, 2009; Smit & Nyamapfene, 2010; Gordon, 2010).

Managerialism in higher education has had push and pull effects on academics' general engagement in writing and research (Gordon, 2010; Li & Flowerdew, 2007, 2009; Englander, 2009; Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Uzuner, 2008; Li, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Fox, 1992; Gottlieb & Keith, 1997; Griffiths, 2004; Kogan, 1997; Brenan, 2007; Musselin, 2007; Finkelstein, 2007; Benjamin, 2000). While the traditional loyalty of scholars toward the discipline has been challenged (Gordon, 2010), the value of their knowledge contribution through writing and research is still viewed as powerful, particularly in institutional contexts. This is because their intellectual endeavor within their fields has become intimately tied to the major criteria for their entry into and promotion within institutions, as well as to the basis for institutional sources of funding and scholarly reputation. At the same time, there has been a range of factors that affect academics' writing and research engagement. These include the rising demand for quality teaching and education-related administration resulting from the widening access to higher education (Gordon, 2010), and the increasing division of labor among different institutions, and among faculty members at each institution (Kogan, 1997; Brenan, 2007).

This situation in higher education seems to work against university English teachers as members of academia. The literature, while limited, reports that these teachers in general suffer from an inconsistent research culture (Casanave & Vandrick, 2003; Kubota & Sun, 2013; Donato, Tucker & Hendry, 2015; Borg, 2010, 2013; Reis-Jorge, 2007), low disciplinary status (Lorimer & Schulte, 2010; Pennington, 2015), and negative institutional conditions (Pennington, 2015; Allison & Carey, 2007; Borg, 2013; Donato, Tucker & Hendry, 2015). Many of the reports surrounding NNES university English teachers' writing and research engagement are based in China (Bai, Millwater & Hudson,

2012; Borg & Liu, 2013; Xu, 2014), which not only confirm these general trends, but also point to the need for acknowledging local variations in the issues involved. In light of the above insights gained from the literature review, which will be presented in more detail later in the volume, is academic rationale that shapes the motivation for the study.

Overview of the Study

In an attempt to raise awareness about NNES English teachers' realities pertaining to their knowledge construction in a specific national setting, this study holistically explores the interrelated career and research journeys of Japanese university English teachers, drawing on their subjective experiences as told in their stories. Specifically, the present study sought to explore six doctorate-holding Japanese university English teachers' writing and research experiences in their career contexts, along with their pre-professional backgrounds. The six participants, currently mid-career professors tenured in different Japanse universities, were a generational cohort in their early 40s at the time of the study. They all attended universities in Japan as undergraduates, where they began to consider English-related professions, albeit their age of first exposure to the language differed. Three of the participants received their doctoral education in Japan, whereas the remaining three did so in the U.S.

The study is informed by the constructivist paradigm and constructivist career studies. In addition, it draws on the view of writing as a social practice (Street, 1984; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, 2008; Lillis, 2001; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010), and as a key to disciplinary enculturation and professional development (Casanave, 2002). Further, the study rests on the assumption that there are three strands of academic work experience that shape individuals' academic career trajectory and contribute to their development as academics: *intellectual, networking, and institutional* (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010; see also McAlpine, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; McAlpine &

Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine & Turner, 2011).

Methodologically, this study adopts the narrative inquiry approach (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The main data includes two or three in-depth interviews, along with one member check interview with each of the participants. This is supplemented by texts, including their responses to biographical questionnaires, and their written products, including their publications. The study used a combination of the *restorying* approach (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002), which is one type of the *holistic-content* mode of narrative analysis (Lieblich et al., 1998), and cross-narrative analysis in order to describe and explore the shared as well as differing characteristics of the participants' storied experiences.

Research Questions

As typical in qualitative inquiry, my current research focus reflects an outcome of a slight shift in research focus and methodology after I presented my original research proposal. As a writing instructor at an American university, surrounded predominantly by non-Japanese HSS academics outside of TESOL, I was not personally familiar with the research lives of Japanese English instructors despite living in Japan, although I myself experienced a non-linear and precarious research career as described above. At the stage of making my dissertation proposal in 2012, I had been inspired largely by Casanave's (1998) and Lillis and Curry's (2010) studies on writing for publication practices among NNES scholars in the HSS, across languages, at institutions outside of the mainstream context, through a preliminary review of literature. Casanave (1998) illuminated a writing related dilemma experienced by four Japanese Western educated HSS scholars early in their career, working at a prestigious Japanese university in seeking to strike a balance between their knowledge contribution to Anglophone academic communities and to local ones. Similarly, Lillis and Curry (2010; see also Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2006), under the

influence of Casanave (1998) among others, elucidated a similar dilemma in 50 locally trained NNES psychologists in different universities in Spain, Hungary, and Slovakia. At the same time, I had learned about the dearth of writing related studies among Japanese university English teachers. Imagining that Japanese university English teachers who are researchers in TESOL related fields also face similar dilemmas, I was originally interested in exploring how such teachers were engaged in writing and publication practices in their current institutional context using an ethnographically oriented approach.

My decision to make a slight adjustment to my research focus and methodology was made mainly after actual communication with participants at the beginning of the study, and a further review of teacher-related research including that mentioned above. As I got to know them, I came to realize that for Japanese English teaching university faculty seem to have their own struggle not dissimilar to mine. For them, sustained access to research activities in the first place was a challenge, especially after obtaining tenure. Early conversations with them revealed that they were extremely busy with teaching and administrative work in their present institutional contexts, and that they still perceived themselves as novices or junior researchers despite a considerably long career in academia.

The generally precarious career and research journeys documented in the aforementioned literature that I newly reviewed, part of which is shown above, also helped me to confirm that NNES university English teachers' research-related situations considerably differed from NNES scholars in other disciplines. Thus, to make the study more relevant to the participants, and in line with current literature, I made the following adjustments: first, I made up my mind to look more broadly at their writing and research practices, rather than just at their writing for publication practices. Second, I also decided to situate their engagement in writing and research practices over their career paths, rather than only in their current institutional context. With the above experiences with participants, as well as by re-contextualizing research in an augmented body of literature, I

eventually explored the following research questions in the study:

1. What are the pre-professional backgrounds that shaped a group of Japanese university English teachers' pursuit of doctoral studies?
2. What are the characteristics of the Japanese university English teachers' writing and research experiences over the course of their academic careers?

Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the study will contribute to a greater understanding of academically oriented NNES university English teachers' realities, pertaining to their knowledge contribution and the challenges they face. I also hope that the study will lead to discussions towards improving the career and research related conditions for such teachers. In addition, the study is expected to add to a limited number of studies on the lives of Japanese academics that have almost exclusively been conducted by English speakers. Finally, this study will hopefully provide an avenue for development of new research surrounding university English teachers. Previous teacher studies tended to focus only on English teachers' teaching lives in classroom contexts in TESOL, while writing studies has largely focused on either temporary academic settings or on institutional settings. With its focus on the interface and divide between teaching and research lives in holistic career trajectories, as well as on their writing and research practices, the study can potentially bridge the research gap.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 2 explains the present study's paradigm rationale and background assumptions. It will firstly explain the constructivist paradigm and constructivist views on career that have informed the study. It will then discuss the key assumptions of the study, as well as their interconnections and relevance. These assumptions, as mentioned above,

include: writing as a social practice (Street, 1984; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, 2008; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010); writing as a key to disciplinary enculturation and professional development (Casanave, 1998, 2002); and the presence of the three main strands of academic work experience that shape individuals' academic career trajectory and contribute to their development as professional academics (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010; see also McAlpine, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine & Turner, 2011).

Chapter 3 presents literature review, focusing on two interrelated areas relevant to the present study: NNES university English teachers' pre-professional backgrounds, and NNES university English teachers' writing and research experiences in their academic career contexts. This will help contextualize the study. It will then present the research questions of the study.

Chapter 4 introduces the methodology adopted in the study. The chapter starts with an explanation of the characteristics of qualitative research, as well as the process and experience that led me to choose narrative inquiry as the main method after preparing a research proposal. Next, the chapter will explain narrative inquiry and its possible strengths. This will be followed by a description of the participants' backgrounds, timeline for recruitment and main data collection for the study, recruitment procedures, and researcher positionalities. The chapter will then move on to explaining the data sources and data analysis strategies along with the themes that emerged from the data, which will be presented in Chapter 11. It will end with a discussion on the ethical considerations for and potential limitations of the study, as well as attempts to strengthen the trustworthiness of the research.

Chapters 5 through 10 provide the profiles of each of the six participants, in the form of restoried narratives. Each chapter consists of two sections: the first section illuminates their pre-professional backgrounds that shaped their pursuit of doctoral studies.

The second section illustrates their writing and research experiences over the course of their careers.

Chapter 11 summarizes and discusses emerging themes derived from an analysis of individual narratives in relation to the research questions, and then takes up its implications for the study while offering the researcher's reflections. The chapter will end with offering the final summary of the above discussion and revisiting the limitations and significance of the study. At the same time, it will present directions for future research and my own career visions derived from my experience with this study.

CHAPTER 2

PARADIGM RATIONALE AND BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS

In this chapter, the paradigm rationale and background assumptions of the study will be introduced. The chapter first explains the constructivist paradigm and constructivist views on career that have informed the study. It will then discuss the key assumptions of the study as well as their interconnections and relevance. These assumptions include: writing as a social practice (Street, 1984; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, 2008; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010); writing as a key to disciplinary enculturation and professional development (Casanave, 1998, 2002); and the presence of three main strands of academic work experience that shape individuals' academic career trajectory and contribute to their development as academics (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010; see also McAlpine, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine & Turner, 2011).

The Constructivist Paradigm

The present research draws broadly on the constructivist paradigm, including aspects of its recent developments. The constructivist paradigm was developed in the 20th century in psychology as well as in other disciplines (Costantino, 2008; Vianna & Stetsenko, 2006). It is an ever-developing paradigm with increasingly expanding branches, but it generally refutes the positivist paradigm that reality is objective and external to individuals situated in society (Costantino, 2008; Vianna & Stetsenko, 2006). The constructivist paradigm instead posits that realties are "constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds" (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). In other words, it views realities as "multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature …, and

dependent for their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994. pp. 110–111).

According to Mahony and Granvold's (2005) summarization, constructivism generally has five interrelated tenets regarding how individuals construct reality, or the world of experience. First, constructivism views individuals as agents of their own lives, constantly making proactive (or reactive) decisions in the process of living, even facing a range of often uncontrollable circumstances (Mahony & Granvold, 2005). Second, constructivism postulates that individuals, who are endowed with self-organizing capacities, seek order in their worlds by finding, internalizing, and enacting patterns, albeit unconsciously, and that such "ordering processes" (Mahony & Granvold, 2005, p. 75) in their activities reside at the core of their meaning making. Third, constructivism acknowledges that the way in which each individual organizes her experience and maps out her personal history is "self-referent or recursive" (Mahony & Granvold, 2005, p. 74). It thus embraces the uniqueness of "each self-organizing life," viewing the self as "a fluid coherence of perspective from which one experiences" (Mahony & Granvold, 2005, p. 75). Fourth, constructivism values individuals' lives as embedded in networks of relationships and symbolic systems like language (Mahony & Granvold, 2005). Finally, constructivism presumes that each individual goes through a lifelong developmental process wherein changes within and outside of oneself tend to emerge and impact one's "core patterns of activity, including meaning making and both self and social relationships" (Mahony & Granvold, 2005, p. 75).

Constructivist Views on Career

The present study is also informed by insights from constructivist career studies, which have become increasingly common in the field of career studies in general. Constructivist-oriented career studies view career as embedded in an individual's evolving

life process. Chen (1998), drawing on his review of recent career literature in this direction, conceptualized career as “an integral, active and essential component in a person’s life” (p. 439), rather than a “narrowly defined, isolated, work-related aspect only” (p. 439). Chen (1998) further explained that from this constructive perspective, career necessarily involves changes and transitions, entailing the shifting roles individuals adopt. He further noted that looking through the constructivist lens, each individual has her own process of constructing her career as an active agent who seeks to establish a balance between herself and her professional life environment.

Some career scholars have noted that this developmental nature of career experiences has become increasingly complex. Arthur and Rousseau (1996), for example, highlighted the increased normalization of a *boundaryless career* where individuals cross over the boundaries of different occupations or organizations, either out of intention or external factors. Svejenova (2005), agreeing with this observation on the recent rise of the non-linear nature of career patterns, claimed that career-related studies, despite their previous focus on the roles of occupations and organizations themselves, should direct greater attention to individuals as agents of their own careers, who are “capable of enacting their professional lives in weak situations that are ambiguous and provide few salient guides for action” (Svejenova, 2005, pp. 947–948).

Some other career theorists have also emphasized the importance of paying attention to individuals’ subjective careers being intertwined with their evolving social practices, which are situated in the career paths that they construct. Hui and Spurling (2013), based on a review of related literature, claimed that “individuals should be viewed as having a history and future of performances” (p. 2), rather than as “performers in the moment” (p. 2). They also note that “career provides a way of capturing the multiple relationships to practices that individuals have, and that are thus woven together within a life” (Hui & Spurling, p. 2). In support of this conceptualization, they provide an example

of a study conducted by Raisborough (2007) in the Sea Cadet Corps, which reveals how individuals' degree of participation in a given social practice can have an effect on their career. According to Hui and Spurling (2013), Raisborough's study (2007) highlighted the impoverishment of opportunities for female staff to develop work-related skills due to the rule forcing them to be present when same-sex newcomers perform any activity under the guidance of male staff. These circumstances hampered women's career progression relative to their male counterparts, which in turn exacerbated the traditional gender power inequality.

Hui and Spurling (2013) also pointed out the importance of acknowledging the increasingly common yet under-researched instances of where one person is at the intersection of many practices over the course of their career paths, although the way to look at these instances, too, has not been fully theorized. In their explanation, this intersection not only involves work-related and non-work-related duties in negotiation, but also includes individuals' engagement in multiple, concurrent careers, which "interconnect and overlap, sometimes complementing and at other times conflicting with one another" (Hui & Spurling, 2006, p. 50). The implication of this, according to Hui and Spurling (2013), is that careers that involve "participating in one practice regularly affects opportunities to engage in another" (p. 7) and that the negotiation of the balance between conflicting career practices is dependent on one's own decision as agent of one's life. As an example, they introduce Evett's (1994) study on engineering professionals, which shows the different ways of negotiating a balance between work and childcare, when they were offered flexible work arrangements.

In addition, Billet (2006), another constructivist career theorist, argued that individuals' agentic choice as to how and what to engage in, or their decision to opt out of social practices they encounter over the course of their evolving work life contexts, are informed not only by the needs of immediate external social influences, such as networks

of experts, but also by their own idiosyncratic personal histories, or “premediate influences of cultural practices over time” (p. 65) that occur earlier in their lives.

In sum, drawing on the constructivist paradigm, the present study views Japanese university English teachers as agents of their own lives, who construct their own realities with self-organizing capacities. Informed also by constructivist career studies, the study focuses on the subjective aspects of their careers, which are embedded in their life processes and constructed by themselves in exercising their agency. It also assumes that university English teachers and academics in general, like any other professionals in today’s society, are likely to progress through a boundaryless career (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996) across different institutions and career stages, and engage concurrently in multiple, conflicting practices (Hui & Spurling, 2013). In fact, the boundaryless career of academics, including university English teachers, has been confirmed in a small yet emerging body of literature that will be discussed in the next chapter. University English teachers who are employed while simultaneously pursuing doctoral studies exist (Nagatomo, 2012). At the same time, fixed-term employments, and the high demands of teaching and administrative duties, which likely lead to academics’ journeys involving various practices within and across institutions, are increasingly observable in higher education institutions (e.g., Gordon, 2010).

The study further assumes that their decisions regarding engagement in practices are influenced by their personal histories as well as by external forces. Therefore, even with the main focus pertaining to their academic careers lying where their writing and research experiences have occurred, the study also sheds light on their earlier pre-professional lives. The aspects of their lives that the study first explores include their early language, literacy, and teaching-related backgrounds. This first exploration sets the context for the main investigation into their writing and research experiences.

In pursuit of exploring their writing and research experiences in their academic

career contexts, the study further draws on the following assumptions:

1. Writing is a social practice (Street 1984; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, 2008; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010).
2. Writing is a key to disciplinary enculturation and professional development (Casanave, 1998, 2002).
3. There are three strands of academic work experience that shape individuals' academic career trajectory and contribute to their development as academics (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010; see also McAlpine, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine & Turner, 2011).

Writing as a Social Practice

The present study adopts the view of writing, together with reading, as a social practice, a notion originally put forth by New Literacy Studies (NLS) theorists (Street, 1984; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, 2008) and recently further advanced by academic literacies scholars (Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010).

The NLS's view on literacy, in line with the constructivist paradigm, is centered on criticism of the traditional *autonomous* notion of literacy, which reflects the assumption that literacy is "independent of social context, an autonomous variable whose consequences for society and cognition can be derived from its intrinsic character"(Street, 1993, p. 5). One of the scholars who notably put forth such an"autonomous" view of literacy is Ong (1982), who claimed that literacy, including writing, particularly in its Western version and in contrast to oral culture, serves as an essential factor that allows human society and its members to advance from the *primitive* to the *civilized* stage (see also Gee, 2008, p. 50) at both the cultural and cognitive levels. In the words of Ong (1982), literacy "is absolutely necessary for the development not only of science but also of history, philosophy, explicative understanding of literature and of any art, and indeed for the

explanation of language (including oral speech) itself" (p. 14). NLS theorists, particularly Street (1984), criticized this line of assumptions as Western centric as they advocate the value of the Western version of literacy as politically neutral, universally applicable, and practically beneficial for individuals and society in any context. Additionally, Street (1984) felt that such assumptions lacked awareness of the plurality and context sensitivity of literacy, and that it could marginalize other forms of literacy and individuals' lives associated with literacy. In reaction against this model of literacy, Street (1984) advocated the recognition of literacies that exist among people conventionally classified as "illiterate." He argued that literacy, like language in general, is always situated in its social context and that it should be studied with attention to the specificities of those contexts.

In the basic perspective underlying NLS set forth by Street (1984) and further expanded by Gee (1996, 2008) and other theorists (e.g., Barton & Hamilton, 1998), literate activities, which comprise writing, along with reading and other communicative efforts, are a socially situated endeavor. Specifically, these activities are contingent upon space and time and are constructed and regulated through interactions among specific members of communities who share specific values and norms. In the view of NLS theorists, literacy is "always contested, both in its meanings and its practices; hence, particular versions of it are always 'ideological' in that they are always rooted to a particular worldview and there is a desire for that view of literacy to dominate and marginalize others" (Street, 2003 p.78; Gee, 1996; 2008).

As explained in the literature (Lillis, 2001; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010), proponents of classic NLS have applied this view to studying a variety of literacy practices in different social settings, ranging from households to schools, villages, prisons, and workplaces (for a comprehensive review, see Heath & Street, 2008; see also Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanič, 2000).

According to Lillis and Curry (2010), academic literacies scholars, under the

influence of NLS, focus more on “the academic literacy practices associated with academic study and scholarship” (p. 20). Like NLS, academic literacies studies show a move away from the view of academic writing (as well as reading) as a skill, to that as a social practice. Kamler and Thompson (2014) introduced this perspective on academic writing in higher education settings put forth by Lillis (2001) as follows:

> In broad terms, what this entails is that student academic writing, like all writing, is a social act. That is, student writing takes place within a particular institution, which has a particular history, culture, values, and practices. It involves a shift away from thinking of language or writing skills as individual profession, towards the notion of an individual engaged in socially situated action, from an individual student having writing skills, to a student doing writing in specific contexts (Lillis, 2001, p. 31, as quoted in Kamler & Thompson, 2014, p.6).

Similarly, Kamler and Thomson (2014) offered the social practice view on research writing at the doctoral and professional levels. Part of the perspectives of research and writing based on this view include the following. Firstly, research and writing are inseparable, given that writing occurs, albeit informally (e.g., in the form of notes, journals, summaries, and unpublished papers), at any stage of research. Secondly, research writing is situated within a specific discourse, “a particular formation of stories, apparent truths and practices which constructs both knowledge and power relations” (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 11), and thus research writing is a discursive activity whereby individuals construct knowledge. Third, writing is a representation of, not a reflection of, reality. It is a result of the writer’s selection of what to bring into the text to construct her own meaning, “based in our culture, place and time, through prevailing discourses, as well as through our own particular biography” (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 11). Fourth, research writing, including dissertations and RAs, are particular genres “constructed in particular institutional and cultural settings” (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 12) with specific

“patterns and conventions” (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 12). Sixth, writing is directed at a specific audience. For example, while RAs are intended for a disciplinary community of scholars, field notes are written for the writers themselves.

Part of the implication of the social practice perspective of academic writing for the present study is that it is important to understand the local uniqueness of the writing and research practices, despite the existence of the norm that is deemed dominant at the global level. There are indeed prevalent, dominant practices of writing and knowledge construction that are expected as the mainstream. For example, Hyland (2009) introduced a range of such dominant practices of academic writing in the mainstream contexts as follows. England and America, in the undergraduate years, the practices of essay writing, and major-specific writings play a role in helping students to understand the disciplinary epistemologies and rhetoric. Graduate writing practices, through a range of coursework, are characterized by training in developing the ability to conduct independent research in the discipline, with the thesis and dissertation at the culmination. In the professional academic context, which may start during the graduate years, the main practices are writing for publication of RAs for a disciplinary audience. However, in non-mainstream contexts, it is likely that different variations of these mainstream practices are adopted, or that these practices are negotiated with other types of practice. As Lillis and Scott (2007) stated, the present study does not view the dominant practices of writing and knowledge construction as given, but allow for the awareness of other such practices that scholars engage in locally.

Writing as a Key to Disciplinary Enculturation and Professional Development

The present study also adopts the view that writing, as well as reading, is an important means by which individuals become enculturated into disciplinary communities and develop professionally. This idea relates to the above-mentioned concepts of writing as

a social practice, but focuses more on individuals' engagement in such practice and their meanings. Drawing mainly on Lave and Wenger's (1991) and Wenger's (1998) notion of community of practice, which hypothesizes individuals' identity formation through participating in communities of practice, Casanave (2002) explained that writing lies at the core of disciplinary enculturation where individuals become members of a disciplinary community through their engagement in appropriate literacy practices and thereby reconstruct their selfhood. Casanave (2002) explained:

> In order to demonstrate their grasp of a discipline's knowledge and practices, novices need to display their knowledge publicly. Unexpressed, intuitive knowledge does not count. One of the main ways that all participants in a disciplinary community demonstrate their 'legitimacy' (Lave &Wenger, 1991) is thus through the text they write. Written texts embody a disciplinary group's (or subgroup's as is more often the case) intellectual traditions, practices, and values and thus link writers' identities in a particular social group (p. 28)

The most formal disciplinary enculturation takes place through disciplinary apprenticeship at the doctoral level in the scenario in the mainstream context, particularly in America. Donato, Tucker, and Hendry (2015) introduced the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's (CFAT) reports on the critical characteristics of successful doctoral apprenticeship. First, advisors provide their mentees with opportunities to gradually learn the practices of the discipline, intentionally, explicitly, and supportively. Second, "the program offers an environment where doctoral students are able to get connected with multiple scholars and thereby to absorb disciplinary knowledge from various perspectives" (Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015, p. 220). Third, the program ensures that doctoral students and their advisors work together and are mutually held accountable for the success in their mentor-mentee relationships. Fourth, the advisors' mentoring is rightly recognized and rewarded. Fifth, the mentor-mentee relationship is

based on “respect, trust, and reciprocity” (Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015, p. 220). In some doctoral programs, attempts are made to achieve these principles fruitfully. Donato, Tucker, and Hendry (2015) themselves, based on their own practices as doctoral advisors, explained that to achieve the first principle (“intentionality,” p. 220) they provided students with opportunities to work closely with the advisors through research assistantship, and to fulfill the third and fourth principles of “collaborative responsibilities and recognition” (p. 220). They also offered students opportunities for collaborative writing projects and presentations with their advisors.

It is notable, however, that it was also found that the process of disciplinary enculturation may occur at any level of individuals’ academic lives. The process is generally implicit, not as systematized as CFAT’s description, and filled with challenges that are often not textual. Casanave’s work (2002) described below illustrates this point.

In her case study among Japanese novice academic writers and their teachers at a prestigious Japanese university, Casanave (2002) found that with the help of guidance based on a multitude of textual tasks, the students seemed to gain an emergent sense of membership of a “mini-community” (Casanave, 2002, p. 75) of writers, by experientially learning a range of academic writing game strategies, including approaches to interactions with written texts, integrating their own voices as part of a larger academic discourse, exploring their own research themes, expressing their own voices, writing with fluency, and adhering to appropriate conventions. At the same time, Casanave (2002) also found that the students were generally struggling to respond to the tasks at hand without fully understanding what tasks mean in the larger context of academe of which the teachers are part.

Another case study by Casanave (2002) among five master’s students, (including one American, two Japanese, and one Almanian student) in the MA TESOL program at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, similarly reveals that they seemed to develop

an increased identity of “authoritative participants in the diverse community of second language educators” (Casanave, 2002, p. 128), through being guided to fulfill a range of authentic academic demands in the field, including “research and teaching, lesson and curriculum development, test development and analysis, and the building of professional portfolios” (Casanave, 2002, p. 128), as well as through absorbing a disciplinary knowledge base. Yet simultaneously, the participants felt conflicted, because even as they developed a sense of agency and authority, they were still positioned as students.

Yet another of Casanave’s (2002) case studies, on a first-year doctoral student in sociology, shows that not all students can align themselves well to the disciplinary literacy practices. Virginia, a female English speaker with a Hispanic background, was reported to be the one who was faced with a cultural gap between the graduate school’s disciplinary community and her local life world, particularly when she took the core theory course. Virginia, who was originally committed to feminism and minority issues in her local community, entered the program to strengthen her voice to resolve them, but found the course quite irrelevant to her, and ended up dropping out after a year. In Casanave’s (2002) analysis, there were three main reasons for her decision: The perceived foreignness of specialized languages used by scientific sociologists that she was unable to relate to; the perceived distance from the strictly hard science model of knowledge construction promoted in the course and program; and the perceived discomfort with the reality that the scholars in power in the field were those to whom she was unwilling to align herself.

Casanave’s (1998) case study points to the relevance of writing as a means of professional development, and the possibility of academics’ encountering writing-related dilemmas in their professional context. Japanese early career HSS scholars working at a prestigious Japanese university as featured in the study, because of their identification with the Western scholarship in which they were trained and possible career development in English-speaking countries, all showed an obvious preference for international publishing,

aspiring to thrive in mainstream Anglophone academic communities. Simultaneously, however, they never neglected their contribution to Japanese academic communities, also valuing their ongoing professional growth in local contexts. Two of them, who were pursuing a Ph.D. at the same time as working, were reported to have considered their Japanese publications to be as important as their international ones, serving as a tool to demonstrate their allegiance to their colleagues and to gain the recognition of local audiences. They all expected that their co-authorships and editorships of Japanese writing projects would pave their way to establishing networks with their colleagues.

The present study adopts the view from Casanave's (1998, 2002) work that individuals' engagement in academic literacy practices represents a continuous process of disciplinary enculturation and professional development, which often involves challenging non-textual, personal, pragmatic, and political issues. At the same time, in light of insights from the above-mentioned writing as a social practice perspective, the study also acknowledges that the degree and forms of such experiences vary.

Three Main Strands of Academic Work Experience: The Intellectual, Networking, and Institutional Strands

In view of the above-mentioned likelihood of academics' careers being increasingly *boundariless* (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996), the present study further acknowledges the possibility that individuals not only choose their focus areas among different writing practices, but also consider the degree to which they engage in the practices, taking into account emerging priorities among different academic work practices (e.g., whether to focus on writing and research or on teaching) over the course of their career paths.

McAlpine and Akerlind's (2010) conceptualization of three strands of academic work experience as part of their notion of identity trajectory, which reflects the above-mentioned constructivism-oriented career perspectives, is helpful in capturing this complex situation

that academics are likely to go through. Building on their observations on early career academics in various disciplines, McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) suggested that individuals learn to become professional academics through their participation in social practices embedded in multiple contexts as they move along their life course (For some examples of McAlpine's case studies that adopt the concept, see also McAlpine, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine & Turner, 2011).

Specifically, McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) posited that one's academic work experience, which inevitably necessitates one's agentic power, can be viewed as occurring across three distinct strands—*intellectual, networking,* and *institutional strands*—that are developed separately across time and space yet are mutually intertwined and contribute to one's development as an academic. In line with constructivist career researchers, McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) also acknowledged that this set of "academic" strands is inevitably at the interface with the non-academic "personal" sphere, including individuals' autobiographical experiences.

As they traverse the course of their academic careers, academics may prioritize adopting and investing in practices in a certain aspect of their academic lives, be it intellectual, networking, and institutional, or in their personal lives, based on their own decisions as agents of their lives. While originally developed to analyze the experience of early academics, McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) implied that this notion may also be applicable to understanding the mid-career stage of experienced academics. McAlpine herself, as a practitioner turned scholar, reflected, in her own biographical statements, on her own academic career using this lens (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010). In addition, as will be explained, while the Japanese language teachers in the present study were mid-career professionals, they claimed their research careers to be "emergent" (これから), which also indicates the relevance of the concepts.

The Intellectual Strand

McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) defined *the intellectual strand* as being representative of "the contribution an individual has made and is making to a chosen intellectual field through scholarship" (p. 139), which "leaves a trail of artifacts" (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010, p. 139) such as "papers, publications, and presentations, citations, invitations to speak" (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010, p. 139). It is this intellectual strand of experience that entails the engagement in writing as a social practice (Street, 1984; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, 2008; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010), which is a key to disciplinary enculturation and professional development (Casanave, 1998, 2002). At the doctoral level, the intellectual strand of experience has to do with their efforts to become researchers, most centrally by engaging in their dissertation work and other written projects, reflective of the practices of the disciplinary and graduate communities. From the post-doctoral level onward, one is expected to become increasingly independent in one's research endeavor. According to McAlpine and Akerlind (2010), this strand can be both facilitated and constrained in part by the other two strands as explained below.

The Networking Strand

McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) explained that *the networking strand* means the "range of local, national, and international networks an individual has been and is connected with" (p. 141). A portion of one's networks may be research-related, ranging from those with one's peers and advisor in the doctoral program, to those with scholars in one's academic communities within the respective fields, which can have direct effects on the shaping of one's work. These networks also include colleagues in professional, work-related contexts. McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) further pointed out that the onset of the networking strand, especially scholarly-related ones, typically precedes the

development of the intellectual strand, dating back to the time when one starts a master's study or before, when one chooses a field of interest.

The Institutional Strand

By *the institutional strand*, McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) mean one's "relationships, responsibilities, and resources wherever they are physically located" (p. 143). One may take on such roles as a teacher, administrator, committee member, and the like, and thereby obtain income. The individual strand of experience often affects the other two strands. For example, the unavailability of library support at the workplace is likely to affect individuals' intellectual endeavor. Furthermore, academics, regardless of their career stage, are bound to be evaluated on their research productivity and teaching quality by the institutions. The institutional strand, which involves the organization made up of "stakeholders beyond the academic world" (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010, p. 143), have their own expectations that differ from individuals' academic aspirations. McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) noted that institutional resources can be either facilitative or debilitative to the networking and intellectual strands of their lives. For example, McAlpine and Amundsen's (2009) study reported early academics being caught in a dilemma between their wish to publish more and their departmental duties with regard to student supervision.

The present study thus views that Japanese university English teachers' engagement in writing and research as a social practice and as a key to their disciplinary enculturation and professional development is part of their intellectual strand of academic work experience. It also acknowledges the possibility that the other two strands of academic work experience—the networking and institutional strands—as well as autobiographical influences, may affect the way in which they engage in such practices.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the literature pertaining to the present study's research focus will be reviewed. The chapter first discusses the literature pertaining to NNES university English teachers' pre-professional backgrounds. It secondly examines the literature on NNES university English teachers' writing and research experiences in their academic career contexts. In both reviews, global and Japanese contexts are taken into account and emerging trends will be examined. The reviews will also help contextualize the participants' experiences and illuminate research gaps. The chapter ends with the introduction to the research questions for the study.

NNES University English Teachers' Pre-Professional Backgrounds: International and Japanese Trends

Little is known about NNES university English teachers' pre-professional backgrounds that led to their doctoral studies, which in general mark the beginning of their academic career. This situation is understandable because the careers of English teachers are generally invisible, let alone those of university English teachers. Johnston (1997), for example, based on his interview findings from 17 English teachers of various individual and institutional backgrounds based in Poland, concluded that English teachers overall had quite accidental and unstable pathways and did not seem to have any sense of a career or professionalism. In his analysis, English language teaching is hard to interpret as a formal profession with a structured career path in the first place. In addition to murky career

structures for English teachers, TESOL-related fields' lack of interest in the lives of NNES teachers in particular also accounts for the dearth of the studies on the above theme. For example, Hayes (2005), in explaining why he studied the lives of three NNES teachers in Sri Lanka, pointed to "the virtual absence of any research into the lives and careers of nonnative English speaking teachers in countries beyond the west (as well as within it)" (p. 174). A limited body of literature in TESOL and related fields, however, does suggest some possible trends in the backgrounds of NNES English teachers that shape their pursuit of the profession, although their connection to the teachers' pursuit of doctoral studies is unclear. In addition, a supplementary review of the literature focused on the educational contexts of Japan also shows a comparable trend in the backgrounds of Japanese university English teachers and also helps to contextualize the linguistic, educational, and pre-professional pathways of the present study's participants, who were born in the early 1970s, entered university in the early 1990s, and entered their master's and doctoral programs between the late 1990s and early 2000s, while illuminating research gaps.

Pre-University to University Experiences

The relevance of early language and literacy experiences to NNES teachers' choice of their profession.

One important insight that emerges from the literature is the significance of early language and literacy learning experiences as a potential source of NNES language teachers' decisions to enter the profession. The literature that explores NNES language teachers' pre-professional lives outside of Japan, albeit very limited, sheds light on language teachers' key language and literacy experiences, particularly in relation to English, in pre-university contexts. According to the literature, for some language teachers an early classroom encounter with English seemed to have served as an important attraction to the teaching profession. For example, according to Kyriacou and Kobori's

(1998) survey of 95 Slovenian preservice teachers, their enjoyment of English as a subject was most frequently rated as a “very important” (pp. 347–348) reason for becoming teachers. For others, their English instructor at school was their main inspiration to becoming teachers themselves. In Hayes’s (2008) narrative study, five of the seven participating Thai teachers mentioned the enthusiastic teachers they encountered in their primary or secondary schools, coupled with their positive classroom experiences, as some of the factors motivating them to become teachers. Similarly, Akamatsu, one of the four Western-trained NNES university English teachers included in Lin et al. (2005), pointed out in his autographical narrative the significant role that an enthusiastic language tutor played in motivating him to fully engage in learning and acquiring English beyond the level offered in the Japanese school curriculum. He reported that it was this encounter that eventually made him become a teacher himself (Lin et al., 2005). In the case of yet other language teachers, their resistance to the education system that they had passed through was the major driving force causing them to envision becoming a teacher as a way of changing the system. For example, Trent (2013) showed in his study that two Hong Kong based teachers had aspired to become teachers primarily because of their dissatisfaction with their teachers’ teaching approach during their school days. On the other hand, this body of literature does not document language teachers’ experiences with L1 literacies at this stage of their lives.

In comparison with their pre-university experiences, relatively little attention has been paid to their undergraduate experiences, particularly their discipline-related learning. Even less investigated is the connection between such experiences and their subsequent career and academic interests. One rare, brief description in this regard appears in Lin et al.’s (2005) study. Riatz, who also contributed his auto-ethnographic narrative to this study, reported his change of major from engineering to English because of his growth in interest in English following his participation in a well-structured intensive English program in

college (Lin et al., 2005). However, he did not provide details on learning about the field and its connection to his interest in the profession.

Early language and literacy experiences of Japanese teachers based in Japan.

The literature on Japan-based Japanese English teachers' pre-professional lives and early language and literacy experiences more generally is even more limited, let alone that dealing with their connection to their career choice. However, a relevant body of literature does suggest some key trends in such teachers' language and literacy experiences. First, there are broadly two main possible language and literacy learning scenarios that Japanese English teachers are likely to have experienced in their early years as pre-university to undergraduate students: The regular student and returnee scenarios (but see also Okada, 2009).

Locally educated teachers' experiences as students. Like the non-Japanese participants in the work reviewed above, regular students are those who grew up and were educated in environments in which English is not used in daily life but rather "is mainly encountered as an academic subject in school" (Lin et al., 2005, p. 200). They are generally taught English through grammar-based instruction, which has long been the norm. According to Yoshida (2003), the government has emphasized the value of communicative competence in English in the Course of Study since the 1960s, but only started to use the word "communication" explicitly in its 1989 version (Ministry of Education, currently the Ministry of Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology, MEXT, n.d.a) onwards. He explained that the 1989 guidelines stressed the need to cultivate "a positive attitude toward communicating in the foreign language" (Yoshida, 2003, p. 291) in order to develop "their understanding of international society" (Yoshida, 2003, p. 291) and introduced "oral communication subjects" (Yoshida, 2003, p.291; see also MEXT, n.d.a) for the first time. Those who followed the regular student scenario before this

change in particular are likely not to have had the opportunity to encounter authentic English in their secondary school settings except for extra opportunities.

Japanese university English teachers' locally based early language and literacy learning experiences and their potential connection to the decision to enter the teaching profession is briefly touched on in Nagatomo's (2012) narrative study. All the participants of Nagatomo's (2012) work, eight Japanese novice university English teachers, were non-returnees who arguably experienced similar educational systems as students. For them as well, their pre-university school experiences had some relevance to their career choice, though differently than in the cases of teachers described in the above literature based outside Japan. Nagatomo's (2012) work, on the one hand, revealed a case similar to Akamatsu's in Lin et al. (2005)'s work, where a teacher's positive experience with his own teacher shaped his motivation to choose the profession. One of the participants, Taka, expressed respect for his former teachers as important life coaches who had provided lessons beyond the subject matter at hand, although he did not specify their subjects. For Taka, his teachers were his inspiration to major in education and pursue a teaching career (Nagatomo, 2012). However, memories of negative experiences with their teachers predominated in the recollections of other participants, according to Nagatomo (2012). Three of the participants, Kumiko, Kana, and Miwa, were reported to have criticized their former teachers, mainly English instructors, for a range of reasons, including their teaching-to-the-exam approach and low level of English proficiency (Nagatomo, 2012). In addition, in Nagatomo's (2012) report, these participants, their hatred towards their own teachers initially led them to avoid the profession, although they ended up entering it. Their cases are in stark contrast to those of Trent's (2013) participants, who transformed their educational dissatisfaction into their passion to innovate education by becoming teachers.

For the majority of locally educated Japanese English teachers, attending

Japanese universities is a common path. Those who attended such universities in the 1990s are likely to have experienced higher education that was still in the midst of the reformation led by MEXT. As will be explained later in the chapter, many pre-reform Japanese universities were frequently critiqued for their professors' negligence of teaching and its contribution to students' low motivation towards learning and focus on extracurricular activities (Amano & Poole, 2005). Among a series of reforms in many areas of higher education, one particularly relevant at that time to students' language and literacy experiences was a general modernization of curriculums for all universities, following the enactment of the university deregulation law in 1991 (MEXT, n.d.b). Before this reform, language classes at Japanese universities were taught as part of compulsory "general education" subjects focusing on formalities along with other liberal art classes, instead of as skills-based ones, often by faculty using grammar translation methods without any knowledge of TESOL. The change in the curriculum allowed universities to incorporate language-teaching courses more flexibly and effectively in lower division education programs (Morizumi et al., 2010).

Given the transitional phase in higher education in the early 1990s, it is likely that the quality of language and literacy education that students experienced at that time varied considerably depending on the institutions they entered. Some universities, even with the government's directives towards reform, may have preserved the essence of old-fashioned educational approaches. Other universities, especially those with a long tradition of language education or those that were responsive to the tide of university reform, likely offered coherent, coordinated, and standardized English programs to help improve the English proficiency of students early in their undergraduate career (e.g., Hadley, 1999; Poole, 2010). Several such universities published books at this time to demonstrate the effectiveness of their language programs to the public, often grounded in the theory of TESOL and applied linguistics (e.g., Sekiguchi, 1993; Torikai & Shindo, 1996).

When it comes to major-specific curriculums in undergraduate programs in the 1990s, the literature suggests not much change had been implemented in higher education. At Japanese universities, it has been typical that students in their majors are enculturated into their disciplines by the guidance of particular advisors, in the form of seminar classes, (ゼミ, *zemi*), based on his or her research topic (Poole, 2010). However, as with the language and literacy education curriculum, there seems to have been institutional variations in how disciplinary learning was facilitated. According to Poole (2010), the format and intensiveness of seminar classes differ depending on the advisor, as well as on the institution. As is the case in some other countries, graduation theses are traditionally assigned in the upper division programs at many Japanese universities as one of the most challenging writing tasks to mark the culmination of their disciplinary studies (Becker, 1990), but the level of rigor involved in the task differs across institutions and some universities do not require them in the first place (Hirosawa, 2004).

From the brief accounts they give, it is possible to gather that the Japanese university teachers investigated in Nagatomo's (2012) work seem to have gone through a relatively classical, pre-reform style of education in their general education and major-specific courses while undergraduates. Taka, an education major, for example, confessed that he had been mainly absorbed in socializing and extracurricular activities rather than in studies as an undergraduate, under the influence of the non-academic atmosphere on campus (Nagatomo, 2012). In his self-report, Taka did not obtain any job as a result. Furthermore, Kumiko, a literature major, described one of her university English teachers as "scary" (Nagatomo, 2012, p. 88) "screaming at students" (p. 88), although she did not specify the context in which she interacted with the teacher. Kana and Miwa, English majors, explained that they had been quite studious, but their portrayals of the courses they took exemplified the above-mentioned traditional "seminar" style (Poole 2010, p. 10). In their recollection, a typical focus of their courses was the

close reading of classic English literature through grammar translation, which involved rote learning of grammar and lexical rules, although Miwa, having American students as classmates, had a special chance to learn authentic English together with literature (Nagatomo, 2012).

On the other hand, it is also notable that some of the participants independently sought opportunities to learn English without relying on their programs at university. According to Nagatomo (2012), Kumiko gained confidence in her English abilities after participating in a short-term ESL program in America, after which she aspired to become a newscaster. Similarly, Kana was finally able to improve her English proficiency by participating twice in a short-term study-abroad program, joining an English drama club, and networking with non-Japanese students (Nagatomo, 2012).

Returnee teachers' experiences as students. According to the literature, Japanese language teachers with a returnee background typically have different language, literacy, and educational experiences from those with regular backgrounds. Returnees (帰国子女, *kikokushijo*) are defined as "all Japanese children under the age of 20, who, because of one or both of their parents' jobs, have at sometimes in their lives spent at least three months overseas, and have returned to continue their education in the mainstream education system." (Goodman, 1990, p. 15). During their sojourn in a host country, returnees typically lead dual school lives, attending local school on weekdays and supplementary Japanese language school on weekends. After returning to Japan, they are generally encouraged to attend returnee schools (受け入れ校, *ukeireko*), with special entrance systems and curriculum tracks designed for returnees (Goodman, 1990). Some of these schools have quota systems for entry to prestigious universities and offer quite intensive curriculums. For example, one famous returnee high school attached to University A is known for its uniqueness in "the streaming in English" (Goodman, 1990, p. 159), "the provision of some supplementary lessons," (Goodman, 1990, p. 159) such as Japanese, and

“facilities for individual research projects” (Goodman, 1990, p.159).

Partly because of the special entrance systems and curriculums carried over to an increasing number of universities, a considerable proportion of returnee students opt to receive higher education in Japan (Goodman, 1990). According to Kanno (2003), a rise in the number of universities with special quotas for returnees has become evident since the late 1980s as societal attitudes towards returnees have changed for the better (see also Goodman, 1990). Although they were often discriminated against in the past for their alleged “maladjustment” (Kanno, 2003, p.18) to Japanese society, returnees now are respected as “valuable societal resources” (p.18) due to their generally high levels of intercultural competence and proficiency in English. Nagatomo’s (2012) study touched on the possibility that students with oversea experiences stimulate locally educated students to learn English. According to Nagatomo’s study (2012), two participants, Kano and Miwa, engaged in language learning in their university years because of their low self-perceived English proficiency compared to their peers, including those with international experiences. Goodman (1990) suggested that some of the returnee-oriented universities, including University A, are prestigious schools that already had earned reputations for their provisions for international education even before the university reforms of the 1990s. However, Kanno (2003) revealed that returnees, despite the benefits they gain in Japanese society, often struggle with personal issues because of their complex linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

The above literature suggests that Japanese English teachers potentially have experiences that are both similar to and different from the pre-university to university language and literacy experiences of NNES documented in the literature. It is of particular importance to pay attention to possible variations in such experiences between Japanese English teachers who went through the regular or the returnee student pathways. It also suggests accordingly that Japanese English teachers’ initial decision to enter the

profession cannot easily be generalized.

Possible effort to obtain teachers' certificates. Another important trend to note concerning Japanese English teachers' early language and literacy experiences, particularly in their undergraduate years, that can be discerned from the limited literature is that they are likely to make efforts to obtain a teacher's license for secondary education, which may be relevant to their early career considerations. It takes a considerable investment to become a certified teacher and enter the profession. Traditionally, in order for a student at a four-year university to obtain a certificate, she is required to take an institutionally determined number of teacher-education related courses, coupled with major-specific required courses (Ota, 2000). In addition, it is required for a student to participate in a four-week practicum at a school and to pass an extremely competitive recruitment examination held either by the prefectural board (Ota, 2000) or by an individual institution, depending on the type of school.

It is noteworthy that the literature indicates that students do not necessarily obtain such a certificate due to an interest in teaching. According to Saito and Murase (2011), teacher education programs have consistently been popular among students, especially at private universities, primarily because of a belief in the general market value of the teachers' license. Likewise, Nagatomo's (2012) study reported that one of the participants, Kumiko, had joined the teacher education program and obtained a teaching certificate on her parents' recommendation despite her indifference to teaching. Kana, another participant, did the same and sought one simply in the belief that a license was "a good thing to have" (p. 88), only to quit as her study-abroad schedule conflicted with the period of her practicum. It was also suggested that a career in high school may serve as the initial step towards a university position teaching English, although the rationale behind such transitions is unknown. Three other participants, Kumiko, Keiko, and Naomi, worked as high school teachers before teaching at universities, though detailed

descriptions of their pathways are not provided. Thus, whether Japanese university English teachers obtain a teacher's license and the degree to which such effort relates to their subsequent career would be worth exploring.

Master's to Doctoral Experiences

Varied timing and motivation for pursuing master's studies.

While the existing literature modestly hints at how early language and literacy experiences may shape NNES teachers' choice of profession, it does not document how they further their educational and professional career in building on their experiences. Despite this limitation, one may gain insight into their timing and motivation for pursuing graduate studies. A few researchers have explored prospective or current NNES language teachers' decisions and experiences pursuing a master's degree at graduate school, primarily in an English-speaking country. Casanave (2002) observed that irrespective of their disciplines, individuals' decisions to pursue a master's career typically involve "a life and career choice to become a person with a field-specific identity who wishes to practice particular activities in professions that can be identified by name (teaching, engineering, business and so forth)" (p. 82). Although such a generalization may be possible, a limited body of literature, including her own work, suggests that considerable individual differences exist among NNES language teachers in the timing and motivation to pursue a master's degree. Casanave (2002) noted two main patterns in the timing and motivation of their pursuit of master's degree, particularly in English-speaking countries. One of the patterns is of pursuing a disciplinary study after several years of teaching experience to further hone their skills, expertise, and knowledge of the field. In this case, they are likely to continue teaching while pursuing a degree. The other pattern, which she deems more typical, is that in which university graduates first pursue disciplinary study full-time and later search for teaching opportunities. Some of the master's students participating in

Casanave's (2002) study who were cited in the previous chapter followed this pattern. For example, one of the Japanese participants in the study, Kazuko, with no prior experience teaching, joined a program in America in order to become a language teacher. Nagatomo (2012) also identified two similar patterns in the careers of her participants—pursuing a degree later in life or right after undergraduate studies—although she did not explore their motivations. The majority of the participants took the former path. For example, Naomi joined a master's program in American Studies in America after several years of teaching at high school. The relatively younger few took the latter path. Kana, for example, pursued two master's degrees in the UK consecutively, one in children's literature and one in comparative education.

Other researchers suggest that individuals who pursue a master's degree with similar timings can still have different motivations. According to a case study conducted by Morita (2004) of six students in different departments of an MA program in Canada, Lisa, a Japanese former high school teacher, was reported as citing her willingness to "learn about language education and gain access to the research community in the field" (p. 584) as a main motivation for entering the program. In yet another case study, performed by Cho (2013) involving three Korean TESOL master's students, Jae, also a former high school teacher, claimed to have decided to pursue a degree in America primarily for immersion in an English-speaking environment to enhance "authentic English expression" (p. 140).

NNES teachers' pathways to doctoral studies.

Even more under-researched are the circumstances that lead NNES masters' degree holders to pursue a doctoral degree. The existing studies did not investigate whether or how masters' students decide to further their career at the doctoral level. Casanave (2002) explained from her own personal observation that the majority of master's students are practitioner-oriented, not interested in pursuing a doctoral degree. She went on to state that

those who do so are the ones who “find they have had research chips implanted in their brains during their MA experiences” (p. 93). In another work, Casanave (2014) stated that, among her Japanese and non-Japanese doctoral advisees’ at a Japan-based American university, the purpose of seeking a doctorate was not always clear: While some seemed to hold career or financially related goals, others appeared to be more directed towards self-fulfillment.

Challenges faced by NNES graduate students learning in the mainstream context.

Given that the TESOL and neighboring fields are based in English-speaking countries, it is no surprise that the existing literature almost exclusively explores the experience of NNES students who studied in graduate programs in those nations. What this limited body of literature suggests is multiple challenges that affect these students in the process of disciplinary enculturation at the master’s and doctor’s levels alike. Issues with adaptation to language and literacy practices in particular are found to be pronounced for NNES master’s students. Lisa, mentioned in Morita (2004) above, Jae in Cho (2013) and Kazuko in Casanave (2002) may serve as examples typifying the issues. Lisa was challenged by limited linguistic competence coupled with affective problems. She nevertheless overcame these challenges by seizing opportunities in and out of class to enhance her oral proficiency (Morita, 2004). Jae, in contrast, was faced with a more complex combination of problems that seemed difficult to resolve. Jae confessed his struggle to participate fully in oral discussions in English in an attempt to join an academic community of practice in graduate school. Jae also found it hard to obtain desirable teaching internship opportunities because of his NNES status. (For a discussion on this type of disadvantages associated with NNES status regardless of one’s ability, see Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999 and Kamhi-Stein, 1999). Jae also felt conflicted when he realized the theories taught in the program were predominantly geared to the American ESL context

and were not entirely appropriate to the EFL context in his home country, to which he planned to return. Kazuko in Casanave's (2002) study displayed mixed feelings about the master's experience: practical gains versus scholarly isolation. At the completion of the program she commented on her enhanced confidence in teaching through having participated in full teacher training for the first time and on perceived improvements in her writing skills. However, she still felt less competent than her classmates and found herself on the periphery of the discipline: "I am a person who is a teacher related to the field but not in the field, I think" (Casanave, 2002, p. 122).

According to a rare study on NNES TESOL students' disciplinary enculturation experience at the doctoral level, the issues they encounter are less related to language or literacy than to cultural and interpersonal issues. Cho's (2009) case study of five East Asian TESOL doctoral students from China, Japan, and Taiwan studying in different programs points to non-textual challenges they strived to surmount over the course of their doctoral studies. A particularly notable finding was that the networks with academic communities both inside and outside graduate school were observed to be a significant key to their success in writing and research. In general, all of them reported to have benefitted from conference attendance and gaining expert advice and knowledge useful for their own dissertation projects and other publications. They were also found to be able to establish a niche in their research areas by becoming increasingly aware of their positionality as non-natives in the dominant discourse in the disciplines. On the other hand, there were individual differences in terms of how strongly they felt connected to their peers and professors. For two of the students, student-led research communities at their graduate school were also helpful, as they offered egalitarian apprenticeship opportunities. They were able to establish collegial relationships with their professors as well. One of the students at a different graduate program, in contrast, found her peer group network lacking, and the hierarchical and somewhat distant relationships with her advisor made it difficult

for her to make desirable progress in her endeavors.

Japan-based graduate study experiences.

Few existing studies explored Japan-based graduate study experiences among Japanese university English teachers. What the literature does indicate is the general situation and characteristics of graduate education in Japan that are likely to shape the writing and research lives of Japanese university English teachers who chose to base their scholarly training in their home country.

At the same time as promoting university reforms at the undergraduate level, the Japanese government started to place an emphasis on expanding and strengthening graduate programs in the 1990s (MEXT, n.d.c). Part of the rationale behind this move was the nationwide need to increase the number of researchers, especially scientists, to maintain and enhance the level of research productivity in the country at a global level (Maruyama 2008; S.Yamamoto, 2005, 2007). It likewise reflected the need to produce qualified experts with advanced professional knowledge in such practice-oriented fields as law, applied psychology, and business (Maruyama, 2008). Although limited in number, reputable Japanese graduate programs with a focus on TESOL-related fields were established around this time.

Unlike many American systems where master's and doctor's programs are completely separate, the latter often much more research-oriented (Casanave, 2002), many Japanese graduate schools have typically treated master's and doctor's programs as consecutive research-oriented programs (S.Yamamoto, 2007). It has traditionally been the case under this system that master's students are expected to complete required coursework and write a master's thesis as an "intermediate paper" (S.Yamamoto, 2007, p. 190) in preparation for doctoral studies, although MEXT (n.d.d) has recently endorsed a non-thesis option at the master's level. This new ordinance enacted in 2012 allows Japanese graduate

schools to replace the master's thesis requirement with a form of qualifying examinations that assess the requisite skills and knowledge for students pursuing doctoral studies. For doctoral students, coursework is often optional or minimal, and going through the dissertation process after gaining candidacy is their main task (S.Yamamoto, 2007). Thus, while it is possible for master's students to enter a doctoral program at another institution, the most common pattern is to have finished a master's program with a thesis at the same institution (S.Yamamoto, 2007).

While exceptions are to be expected, the literature suggests that Japanese graduate education is generally characterized by its emphasis on professor-led seminar-style instruction on advanced research topics, although there is typically a coursework requirement introducing knowledge of the discipline (S.Yamamoto, 2007). Nevertheless, it also suggests that students' experiences with disciplinary enculturation seem to differ considerably across specializations. Students in the hard sciences or other disciplines with experimental components seem to experience a type of apprenticeship similar to that in American systems as described by Donato, Tucker, and Hendry (2015) (see Chapter 2). According to S.Yamamoto (2007), they are usually supervised by an advisor right from the beginning of their master's career and work closely together as part of a research team led by their advisors, seniors, and peers. S.Yamamoto (2007) adds that students in this category work on research themes close to their professor's. In contrast, the type of apprenticeship that HSS students are placed into seems more implicit. S.Yamamoto (2007) notes that although they are expected to participate in their professor's seminars, HSS students are also often expected to work independently on their own themes. Arguably, the difference in the nature of the apprenticeship they are exposed to causes the completion rate to vary significantly between the hard sciences and HSS students. S.Yamamoto (2007) explained that as of 2004, whereas more than 80% of science students were awarded with doctoral degrees, fewer than 30% of HSS students received doctorates.

Nagatomo's study (2012) offers a glimpse of the fact that there are Japanese university English teachers who choose to go into Japanese graduate studies, although their experiences are not described in detail. Shizuko, Keiko, and Miwa, portrayed in Nagatomo's (2012) study, chose to obtain a master's degree in literature in graduate programs at national universities in Japan. Miwa further proceeded to the doctoral program at the same top-tier Japanese university where she obtained a master's degree, even after noticing that the university "rarely awarded Ph.D.s in literature" (Nagatomo, 2012, p. 126), and went on to earn a doctoral degree in a doctoral program in America while maintaining her enrollment in the original Japanese university in order to impress nationally inclined professors later.

What the literature secondly points to is that Japanese university English teachers are highly likely to be engaged in graduate-level disciplinary studies and professional teaching at the same time. This simultaneous effort is experienced not only by those who attend Japan-based institutions but also by those who choose to attend overseas institutions but return in the middle of their study program. Naomi, a participant in Nagatomo's (2012) work, for example, joined a doctoral program in America after obtaining a master's degree there, came back to Japan, and worked on her doctoral study while teaching English part-time at several Japanese universities. She continued her doctoral studies even after she obtained a full-time position at a prefectural Japanese university and finally earned a degree following one year of an "unpaid leave of absence to fulfill the residency requirements" (Nagatomo, 2012, p. 127) for the American doctoral program. Such cases, though commonly observed in Japan, have yet to be widely acknowledged in the literature in the TESOL-related fields, which are predominantly based in mainstream contexts. Some of these cases of university English teachers simultaneously engaged in teaching and doctoral or professional research will be further discussed later in the chapter.

In summary, it is clear that the holistic exploration of the pre-professional

backgrounds of NNES teachers, particularly those of university teachers, has yet to be made. The existing small body of relevant literature in TESOL-related fields, however, points to the following:

1. The significance of their early language and literacy experiences, particularly in relation to English, as a possible source of NNES English teachers' decision to consider becoming teachers (Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998; Hayes, 2008; Lin et al., 2005; Trent, 2013).
2. Teachers' varied timing and motivations for pursuing master's studies (Casanave, 2002; Morita, 2004; Cho, 2013).
3. Potential challenges they experience in the process of disciplinary enculturation at both the master's and doctoral levels in mainstream settings (Morita, 2004; Cho, 2009; 2013; Casanave, 2002).

On the other hand, still understudied are:

1. NNES English teachers' L1 literacy experiences in general.
2. Their undergraduate experiences, especially in relation to their disciplinary learning and its connection to their academic and career interests.
3. Their pathways to pursuing doctoral studies, the entry to academia.

Investigations into Japanese university teachers' pre-professional backgrounds are even scantier. A supplementary review of the Japan-based literature suggests that in addition to the above insights gained from the literature on NNES teachers in general, the following should also be taken into account in understanding their backgrounds:

1. A potentially considerable variety in language and literacy experiences that exist between individuals, particularly between those with regular, Japan-based backgrounds and those with returnee backgrounds (Yoshida, 2003 MEXT, n.d.a; Amano & Poole, 2005; Nagatomo, 2012; Goodman, 1990; Kanno, 2003).
2. Possible efforts that teachers may make to obtain teachers' certificates (Ota,

2000; Saito & Murase, 2011; Nagatomo, 2012).

3. Different types of disciplinary enculturation experiences in Japanese graduate school settings and the mainstream system (MEXT, n.d.c; S.Yamamoto, 2005; 2007; Maruyama, 2008; Nagatomo, 2012).
4. The possibility of simultaneous engagement in disciplinary studies and professional teaching among Japanese university English teachers based in Japan (Nagatomo, 2012).

Overall, what has not been fully examined, and which the present study seeks to explore, is how all these stages of experiences play out and connect in individual NNES language teachers' lives, particularly in a Japanese setting. The emphasis of the present study is to understand what pre-professional backgrounds shape NNES teachers' pursuit of doctoral studies, the entry to an academic career.

NNES University English Teachers' Writing and Research Experiences in Their Academic Career Contexts: International and Japanese Trends

NNES university English teachers' writing and research experiences, especially in their professional, academic career contexts, are equally as under-researched an area as their pre-professional backgrounds. As briefly touched on above, some NNES university English teachers, particularly those in Japan, may pursue studies at their graduate schools and an academic career at another institution at the same time. However, the existing literature rarely captures such overlapping dimensions, which may again point to TESOL-related fields' lack of interest in NNES teachers' career. What does emerge from a review of another body of limited literature focused mainly on higher education studies and teacher studies are the following:

1. The overall trends in higher education in the world that both facilitate and constrain the engagement of academics in writing and research practices.

2. Issues that affect university English teachers' engagement in writing and research.
3. NNES university English teachers' writing and research experiences in non-mainstream contexts, with China as the main focus.

Building on insights gained from these three areas, a further review of Japan-focused sources hints at the following:

1. Some trends in higher education and disciplinary situations in Japan.
2. How these may shape Japanese university English teachers' writing and research lives.

The review in this section also seeks to contextualize the writing and research experiences of the participants in the present study over the course of their academic careers, while illuminating research gaps.

General Trends in Global Higher Education Affecting Academics' Engagement in Writing and Research

Experts agree that during the past three decades since the 1980s, universities around the world have increasingly transformed from self-contained autonomous elite institutions into mass-oriented, corporate-like organizations (Henkel, 2010) that value managerialism. Managerialism is "a set of beliefs, attitudes, and activities that support the view that management is essential to good administration and governance" (Schwandt, 2009, p. 27). The values that managerialism emphasizes include "accountability," "efficiency," "effectiveness," and "productivity" (Ozga & Deem, 2000, p. 143, as quoted in Smit & Nyamapfene, 2010, p. 115). While there are various external forces that have driven higher education towards managerialism, its expansion and financial constraints (Johnstone, 2011; Sanyal & Johnston, 2011) are viewed as particularly influential. According to a report by Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbery (2009), "the percentage of the age cohort enrolled in tertiary education has grown from 19% in 2000 to 26% in 2007" (p. vi) and there are more

than 150.6 million students enrolled in higher education worldwide, which is “a 53% increase over 2000” (p. vi). While the expansion is particularly evident in developing countries, developed OECD countries too have maintained expansion, with increased emphasis on attracting diverse groups of students, including mature, mid-career adult and international ones, to compensate for the declining number of college-age students (Vincent-Lancrin, 2008). In pursuit of an effective response to the varied needs of students, the demand for managerial efforts towards assuring standardized high-quality teaching and associated administrative developments have been heightened in higher education institutions across the board (Gordon, 2010).

At the same time, amidst the world economic downturn starting in the early 21st century, a trend towards austerity has been on the rise. The financial resources provided by governments to cover the increased costs partly due to expansion have been continuously declining across the world. In many OECD countries, such as in Europe, where most higher education is offered publicly, and in America, where large universities are public (Asonuma & Urata, 2015), this impact is huge. While they are expected to stand out as competitive centers for human capital formation by providing quality education to diverse students, institutions are simultaneously challenged to achieve this goal efficiently within the limits of their reduced funding.

Under these circumstances, universities around the world have, on the one hand, promoted considerable efforts toward their faculty’s writing and research engagement as a means of enhancing their reputation. While the traditional loyalty of scholars toward the discipline has been challenged (Gordon, 2010), the value of the contribution of their knowledge to the discipline is still viewed as powerful, particularly in institutional contexts. This is because their intellectual endeavor within their fields has become intimately tied to the major criteria of their entry to and promotion within their institutions, as well as to the basis for institutional sources of funding and scholarly reputation. Many of the studies

conducted among NNES academics specializing in fields outside of TESOL at research universities illuminate this trend. Such studies have documented international scholars being pressured by institutional faculty evaluation and promotion systems based largely on the assessment of research productivity through bibliometric indicators. These studies have shed light on experienced NNES hard scientists' increased engagement in international, English medium RAs and the related challenges and coping strategies (Li & Flowerdew, 2007; 2009; Englander, 2009; Hanauer & Englander, 2013; see also Uzuner, 2008 for a related review). Some of them point to the recent trend of institutions to encourage novice doctoral scientists in the graduate program, who may also be staff or faculty at their institutions, to be more productive even while in training (Li, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007). The institutional emphasis on research productivity has been reported as affecting HSS scholars as well, albeit to a lesser degree. The literature has documented scholars' efforts to negotiate pressures toward contributing to the international medium vis-à-vis their interest in committing to a local medium (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Li & Flowerdew, 2009).

What is challenging for academics is that on the other hand universities today also pull them away from their writing and research engagement. One of the forces that might keep scholars from engaging in intellectual endeavors is the aforementioned rising demand for quality teaching and education-related administration resulting from the widening access to higher education (Gordon, 2010). Teaching and research have traditionally been viewed as related activities (e.g., Clark, 1997; Nybom, 2003). However, others observe that teaching, which entails a heavy workload, is not necessarily related to or compatible with research productivity (e.g., Fox, 1992; Gottlieb & Keith, 1997; Griffiths, 2004). Another related force in higher education that seems to discourage academics' writing and research efforts is the increasing division of labor among different institutions and among faculty members at each institution (Kogan, 1997; Brenan, 2007). In line with the

managerial principle, the *differentiation* (Kogan, 1997; Brenan, 2007) of institutions, most typically into research and teaching institutions, has been intensified, where more research-related funding tends to be concentrated in top-tier research-intensive universities (Kogan, 1997), which has the potential of limiting support for the writing research activities of academics at other universities. Furthermore, as Kogan (1997) stated, the casualization and fragmentation of the faculty work force have been more and more common at many institutions as ways of enhancing the cost-effectiveness of their practices. In order to increase the research productivity of the selected few (Kogan, 1997), and in response to the above-mentioned demand of the teaching needs of increasing numbers of students, it has become the norm in higher education to expand fixed-term positions, often requiring narrowly segmented jobs such as teaching-only or research-only positions (Musselin, 2007), while reducing tenured positions (Gordon, 2010; Finkelstein, 2007). For example, Benjamin (2000) explained that nearly two-fifths of the faculty members teaching English in the lower division liberal art programs in America are employed part-time. As a consequence, it has become commonplace for early academics who are pursuing or have just finished their doctoral degrees to start in such contingent positions (Finkelstein, 2007).

Issues Potentially Affecting University English Teachers' Engagement in Writing and Research

The current situation in higher education seems to be especially challenging for university English teachers engaged in writing and research. A body of literature on teachers' lives illuminates several issues potentially affecting the writing and research engagement of English teachers, especially those at the tertiary level: TESOL-related fields' inconsistent research traditions, their low disciplinary status, and institutional constraints on their engagement in writing and research.

Inconsistent research traditions.

The literature indicates that in TESOL and related fields, there is a divide in what writing and research practices language teachers should engage in in their professional context, which may confuse and demotivate them. On the one hand, there is a trend, mainly in the mainstream context that emphasizes formal scholarly research and its outputs as a means of contributing to the discipline and their institution. This effort can be viewed as continued endeavor built on master's and doctoral training, as discussed in the previous chapter. For the most part, in their anthology, Casanave and Vandrick (2003) implied that the main mission of established scholars in TESOL-related fields who work at research universities is publishing international RAs in their disciplines while mentoring emerging scholars. Some NNES TESOL academics featured in the volume, for example, discussed how they have striven to establish a niche as peripheral scholars, negotiated with editors while maintaining their voice, chosen appropriate journals, managed their time, and taken advantage of local research networks and resources in an effort to publish RAs as their contribution to knowledge in their capacity of tenure-track faculty at their institutions (for examples, see the reflective narratives in the volume by Kubota, 2003 and Canagarajah, 2003). Likewise, a rare career introduction book edited by Kubota and Sun (2013) implicitly presupposes full-time doctoral training in the mainstream context as the basis for university-level English teachers' career advancement and emphasizes their contribution to the discipline mainly through international publications, even though teaching and administration are equally important regardless of the type of institutions employing them. Similarly, Donato, Tucker, and Hendry (2015), in a qualitative survey study of ten English teachers graduated from an American doctoral program, support Kubota and Sun's (2013) observation. The university language teachers who participated in the study were employed predominantly as full-time university faculty after doctoral training in America. According to Donato, Tacker, and Hendry (2015), while these teachers recognized the prime

importance of teaching and administrative duties, they acknowledged the high value of formal research in their current professional contexts and reflected on the overall benefits of doctoral research apprenticeship experiences for their current research endeavor, as well as for other professional work. The benefits they mentioned include research networks they forged with scholars from various fields, the entire gamut of the research process they learned, and co-authoring opportunities with their professors (Donato, Tacker, & Hendry, 2015).

On the other hand, TESOL-related fields also embrace the relatively fuzzy concept of *teacher research* that is generally acknowledged as distinct from disciplinary knowledge construction. According to Borg (2010), teacher research is typically defined as the systematic inquiry for knowledge "conducted by teachers in their own professional contexts" (p. 393), and multiple in its traditions. In relation to its different traditions, Reis-Jorge (2007), explained that teacher research is either "an approximation of more traditional university based social science research" (p.403), a "reflective and/or reflexive process" (p. 403), or a "new genre" (p. 403) that falls somewhere in between. It is notable that Reis-Jorge (2007) contends that teachers' engagement in an academic dissertation is not an appropriate practice to be incorporated in their professional lives in spite of its benefits for developing specialized knowledge and research skills, in agreement with Allwright (1995, 1997). According to Reis Jorge, (2007), Allwright (1995, 1997) claimed that for teachers, the engagement in a dissertation can "be too demanding of time and specialized expertise" (as cited in Reis-Jorge, 2007, p. 405), "feed feelings of uncertainty on the part of practitioners about the credibility of their research endeavors" (as cited in Reis-Jorge, 2007, p. 405), or "breed resentment against professional researchers whose purely academic concerns appear irrelevant to classroom practice" (as cited in Reis-Jorge, 2007, p. 405).

The fields' view of teacher research as different from the construction of

disciplinary knowledge is also present in arguments on how research should be disseminated. According to Borg (2013), it is agreed that teacher research should be disseminated to the public and counted as a form of research, for the practical benefit of informing "educational decision making" (p. 9), or of exercising their influence beyond their immediate contexts. However, how formally it should be done is under debate. Those who advocate the approximation of teacher research to the disciplinary research traditions claim that formal RA publications would be desirable (e.g., Nunan 1997; Murray, 1992). Other scholars, including, Borg (2010), cautioned that imposing academic notions of research can be "colonialist" (p. 395) and suggests that teacher research should be disseminated in a wider variety of formats.

This mixed view of research seems to be quite prevalent among English teachers themselves, including those who are not teaching at universities. Borg's (2013) large-scale survey conducted among 1730 English teachers and managers in various types of English teaching institutions, not only universities, all over the world (including Africa, Asia, Oceania, Europe, Middle East, North America, and South Asia) identified "two extremes" (p. 212) in their belief in what constitutes research. The majority held the view that research means "formal academic activity" (Borg, 2013, p. 212) representing "statistics, large samples, and objectivity" (p. 213), yet with the negative assumption that such activity "has no relevance to the classroom" (p.213). In contrast, those with a positive view of research tended to believe that research is "various forms of professional activity" (p. 213), including "informal, individual, and very often private reflections on reaching materials and instructional strategies" (p. 213). According to Borg (2013), this latter view of research as informal and personal was relatively more prevalent among teachers. He found that while 75% of the teachers were found to "read research" (Borg, 2013, p. 212) and 50% of them were found to conduct research "at least sometimes" (Borg, 2013, p. 212), "there was little evidence that teachers engaged with research publications, as opposed to practical and

professional publications" (Borg, 2013, p. 212).

The literature further suggests that there is no consensus in TESOL-related fields on the degree to which university English teachers should engage in research in their workplace, either. Borg (2010, 2013) himself represents the inconsistent attitudes towards English teachers' research that are present in the fields. Borg (2010, 2013) on the one hand implies that the value of research has increasingly been heightened, not only at research universities but also at some teaching-intensive universities and their language-teaching workplaces. Borg (2010, 2013) pointed out that English teachers' teaching activities and administrative efforts are now expected to be made public in the form of reports to ensure that their practice is research-evidence based or show a nexus of teaching with research. However, Borg (2010, 2013) also admitted that research activities are still not the norm for English teachers, and while advocating the importance of teachers' research activities, conceded that "not everyone has to engage in research" (2010, p. 391), and stated that research is still a "minority activity in the field of language teaching" (p. 391). Considering TESOL-related fields made up in part of teachers not working in academia, his observation may be realistic. All these inconsistencies may potentially work against university English teachers' motivations towards engagement in research.

Low disciplinary status.

The literature also implies that the TESOL-related fields' relatively low disciplinary status, which more or less translates to its low recognition in academia, may be disadvantageous for English teachers who aim at earning higher degrees through writing and research and advanced careers in academe. For example, some scholars explain that TESOL's own disciplinary source of identity has historically been weak. On the fundamental level, the basic question remains as to whether TESOL is a discipline even a half century after its instigation. Lorimer and Schulte (2010), based on Nunan's (1999a,

1999b) message given in 1999 in his capacity of past TESOL president, explained that there is a widely held assumption that TESOL, as well as scholarship on teaching in general, is not even a discipline. Pennington (2015) also admitted the field's uncertain status and attributed it in part to its multiple heritages. Pennington (2015), drawing on the traditional disciplinary division categories (Becher, 1989; Becher & Trowler, 2001; Neumann, 2003), explained that TESOL comes from a range of parent disciplines that themselves are amalgamations of different fields of various scientific orientations: linguistics and psychology, which "include both 'pure' ('hard') science and 'applied' social ('soft') science" (p. 20), and education, "generally classified as a 'soft-applied' discipline of the field" (p. 20). As she observed, despite its actual traditions that span the border between "hard" and "applied," the widely-held recognition of TESOL as one of the "soft-applied" disciplines results in its weak status. Pennington (2015) thus concluded, "Like education, the status and position of TESOL is lower than that of other academic fields, and, to a greater extent than education, TESOL does not have a recognized disciplinary status" (p. 21). Furthermore, Pennington (2015) indicated that the low recognition of TESOL as an academic discipline is often manifested in its weak presence in graduate programs, particularly at the doctoral level. Pennington (2015) echoed Casanave (2012) in stating that a master's degree is virtually the terminal degree in the field and explained that doctoral programs in TESOL are rare. This situation may explain the scarcity of studies on doctoral experiences of English teachers, as reviewed above. The scarcity of degree programs that relate to their fields, implying low chances of obtaining a higher degree, may be detrimental to language teachers if they are academically oriented. A related trend, according to Pennington (2015), is that English teachers' disciplinary trainings in TESOL at the doctoral level are likely to be dispersed in a variety of related fields. including "linguistics, applied linguistics, SLA [second language acquisition], or education" (p. 21). This may imply that English teachers' disciplinary enculturation

experiences are considerably diverse, and it may be difficult for them to have a shared discipline-based community of knowledge or practice and thereby establish solidarity with each other.

Institutional constraints for writing and research engagement.

The literature further suggests that regardless of their academic background, university English teachers' engagement in writing and research is likely to be affected also by the institutions that they work for. Penington (2015) explained that whether their department is affiliated with "a recognized academic disciplines" (p. 21) or not affects the degree to which teachers are allowed to engage in research activities. Given that language teaching departments are often not affiliated with specific disciplines, many English teachers with graduate training backgrounds may have difficulty securing the opportunity to continue research. Pennington (2015) said that in such a case, English teachers have to seek their graduate school or external professional bodies as a disciplinary basis. Pennington (2015) further argued that whether their institutions officially recognize research activities as part of university language teachers' duties is also a critical factor for their sustained engagement in such activities. In other words, if research is not viewed as part of their work at their institutions, they will find access to such activities difficult.

There are some studies that illustrate the issue of English teachers' access to research activities in their institutional contexts. Allison and Carey's (2007) case study of 22 teachers at a Canadian university showed that their research efforts were not supported by their institution even though they believed themselves to be researchers as well as teachers. In the study, the teachers were found to be generally interested in research, yet many of them felt discouraged from conducting research as it was not viewed as part of their contract. One of the participants even stated in an interview, "I've been told several times…high ranking members of the university have actually said explicitly—the

university does not want language teachers acting like professors and publishing research" (Allison & Carey, 2007, p. 70). Borg's (2013) aforementioned study also confirmed that the majority of the language teachers who participated in the study viewed their departments or institutions as unsupportive of their research activities. Many of them perceived "a lack of time" (Borg, 2013, p. 212) and "a belief the doing a research was not part of their job" (Borg, 2013, p. 212), as well as their self-evaluated "lack of skills and knowledge" (Borg, 2013, p. 212) as hindering their activities.

Furthermore, it is also notable that even if teachers do have access to research activities in their professions, institutional conditions can affect the way they approach research. According to Donato, Tucker, and Hendry's study (2015), two of the participants, new assistant professors at different institutions, were said to be perplexed by the range of service work that they ended up taking on following their appointments. One participant also worried about a mismatch between her research interests and what her institution expects from faculty.

NNES University English Teachers' Writing and Research Experiences: Cases in China

Alongside these overall negative research-related situations of English teachers, local variations deserve attention. However, literature centrally exploring NNES language teachers' intellectual endeavors in higher education settings at the periphery is also understandably rare. Studies in this line have been predominantly conducted in China. This country stands out for its active implementation of Western-inspired institutionalization of the evaluation of academics on the basis of their research outputs (e.g., Li & Flowerdew, 2009) at research institutions. The research capacity of university English teachers is viewed as particularly critical due to the rising demand for research-based effective English (Xu, 2014). Thus, in the case of China, research is institutionally expected as part of a teacher's mission, rather than an option. The studies that examine this unique

circumstance of Chinese university English teachers reveal a tension between the institutional expectations for research productivity and a challenging reality on the part of teachers who are already highly loaded with educational duties.

Bai, Millwater, and Hudson's (2012) case study of the teaching-intensive department at a research university revealed six Chinese university English teachers' perceived ambivalence over research-related expectations. While the majority of the teachers were found to be generally motivated towards research and acknowledge its value, some of them, especially early academics who taught basic language skills, did not see the intrinsic value of research, as it seemed far removed from their teaching practices. Also, the teachers, five of whom had master's degrees, emphasized their teacher identities and expressed concerns about the overemphasis on research productivity over teaching.

Similarly, Borg and Liu's (2013) mixed-method investigation of 725 teachers at various universities in about 20 provinces showed the teachers' dilemma in responding to institutional research expectations. The respondents who claim that they read research "occasionally or periodically" (Borg & Liu, 2013, p. 291), constituting 66% of the participants, cited primarily professional or pedagogical motivations toward research, but the pressure towards promotion was also significant, forth ranked motivation, and most prominently expressed in interviews. One respondent stated, "We don't have enough time to do research. However, when we need to be promoted or we are going to be promoted in a year or two, we need to read research and write papers. We don't have too much intrinsic motivation to do research. Doing research is mainly for promotion" (Borg & Liu, 2013, p. 285). In addition, the respondents who stated they rarely or never conduct research, who made up 14% of the participants, were concerned about the gap between the types of research that they pursue and that their institution emphasizes. Among the participants, the most predominant reason for their disengagement from research was "the difficulty of getting published" (Borg & Liu, 2013, p. 285). One of the other respondents pointed out

that even though she personally believed in the broad conception of "practice-oriented research" (Borg & Liu, 2013, p. 287), the institutions did not accept it as a legitimate form of research unless it is formally published. Furthermore, while the majority of the respondents (66%) agreed that "the management supports teachers who want to research" (Borg & Liu, 2013, pp. 288–299), they questioned the quality of the support. Also, in line with the results of many of the aforementioned studies, lack of time is found to be a major issue for them. Only a small proportion (30%) of the participants thought that "time for research was built into their workloads" (Borg & Liu, 2013, p. 290). The illustrative comment by one respondent read:

> Some young teachers have around 16 hours teaching, and some take extra teaching outside the campus. How can they have time to do high-quality research? However, we have to do research…and consequently, we just manage to do some research with low quality (Borg & Liu, 2013, p. 290).

Xu's (2014) qualitative study combining a survey and narrative inquiry (2014) equally sheds light on the gap between the institutional expectations and the reality of teachers' research-related practices and experiences. Similar to the other studies, this study reported that despite a reward structure that promotes research, language teachers found it difficult to be research engaged and to publish their work. As barriers to research engagement, the participants not only cited time constraints, lack of research mentorships, and their own low confidence level in research capabilities, but also pointed to the limited availability of textual and network resources. Like some participants in Bai, Millwater, and Hudson's (2012) and Borg and Liu's (2013) studies, Xu's (2014) participants' research engagements, albeit frequent, were found to be predominantly extrinsically motivated. Xu's (2014) study further explored narratives of four of the participants' reflections on their research experience and revealed their difficulty in constructing researcher identities. In the author's analysis, four key factors seem to influence the way the English teachers

position themselves as researchers: self-perceived interest in research, the experience of publishing their research, the availability of collegial and institutional support, and "professional life phases" (Xu, 2014, p. 254).

General Trends in Japanese Higher Education Affecting Academics' Engagement in Writing and Research

Mirroring the worldwide trend, Japanese higher education has been shifting in a managerial direction in its own way since the 1990s. Japanese higher education consists of a minority of national and public universities (about 22%) and a majority of private universities (about 78%) (Bunkyo Kyokai, 2015). While the public sector institutions, notably a small number of national universities, were established in the late 19th century for national elites, most of those in the private sector, except a few founded at the same time as the national universities, were created in the pre-war period to absorb the increasing demand for higher education for the masses (Goodman 2010; Arimoto, 2015). As in the case of other countries, the widening access to higher education has been evident in Japan, especially in the private sector. According to Asonuma and Urata's (2015) analysis of MEXT surveys, the total number of private universities grew from "105 to 274 in 1971" (p. 58) and "to 372 in 1990" (p. 58). It is notable, however, that the impact of the simultaneous issue of shrinking student populations has been particularly pronounced in the country (Goodman, 2010; Arimoto, 2015). Together, these intertwined effects are considered to have contributed to the rise of managerialism in Japanese higher education.

The declining student population and the resultant increase in the opportunities for participating in higher education have posed a significant challenge to Japanese universities. As briefly touched on earlier in the chapter, Japanese universities in general had been reluctant to respond to criticism, particularly over the quality of education, when student enrollment was consistent before the 1990s (Amano & Poole 2005). According to

Amano and Poole (2005), since the 1960s Japanese universities had long ignored students' complaints about professors' preference for research activities over teaching. The still-prevalent apathy of Japanese students towards their studies originated in their reaction against the continued problems with education and resulted in their devotion to extra-curricular activities (Amano & Poole, 2005). Universities also made light of societal criticism against the high-stake, challenging nature of entrance examinations when the fierce competition called "examination hell" (Amano & Poole 2005) was prevalent between the 1960s and 1980s (Amano & Poole, 2005). Universities equally neglected the call from businesses for the development of human resources capable of advancing industry in an increasingly globalized society (Amano & Poole 2005). However, starting in 1992 the number of students started to decline, resulting in lower competition and a growing rate of participation in higher education. Ogata (2015), based on university applicant demographic surveys conducted in 1992 and 2007 as part of a larger study on changes in the academic profession in Japan (Arimoto, 2008), reported that there was a 16% increase in the proportion of university applicants and a 21% increase in those who actually enrolled in universities among new high school graduates over the 15 years between 1992 and 2007. He also noted that the passing rate of the entrance examination drastically rose from 59% to 89%.

As a result, universities finally became aware of the need of reforms not only to attract predictably diverse and underprepared students, but also to genuinely facilitate their learning. The previously mentioned undergraduate general education curriculum reform in the early 1990s (MEXT, n.d.b) was part of this movement. In addition, it has been observed that the expansion of graduate education (MEXT, n.d.c), also touched on previously, is partly related to the problem of undergraduate enrollment. Analysis has shown that graduate education in the HSS at the master's level in particular was developed not only to create professionals but also to appeal to mid-career adults' basic learning

interests and to compensate for the declining number of undergraduate students (K.Yamamoto, 2004).

As well as the issue of expansion, financial constraints have seriously affected Japanese higher education and contributed to its increased managerialism. While Japan had long been known for its low public funding for higher education, this trend has intensified over the past two decades. Private universities, traditionally with much fewer government subsidies, have been further affected by the decreased incomes from tuition fees due to the decrease in incoming students (Asonuma & Urata, 2015). However, financial issues have become pressing for national universities as well. Against the backdrop of the national economic recession starting in the 1990s, the government has proposed a series of policies aiming to create downsized and efficient management systems since the 2000s (K. Yamamoto, 2004). Representative is the policy concerning the reorganization and corporatization of national universities in 2004 (Arimoto, 2009; K.Yamamoto, 2004; Yonezawa, 2008). In the wake of this incorporation, governmental institutional funding for operational costs and budget for faculty salaries decreased (Asonuma & Urata, 2015). Within these financial constraints, however, Japanese higher education institutions, much as their counterparts overseas, are now expected to achieve "quality assurance, quality improvement, and accountability" (Yonezawa, 2008, p. 75). Almost at the same time as the corporatization of national universities, the government demanded that these universities have their performance reviewed by a third party evaluation organization. At the same time, the government started to implement "cyclical certified evaluations" (Yonezawa, 2008, p. 69) for all kinds of universities, including private ones. This demand for cost-effectiveness and efficiency of performance is a major challenge to Japanese higher education, given the long-standing absence of an audit culture.

Like institutions overseas, Japanese universities today do encourage their faculty to engage in writing and research to a degree. One trend that implicitly pressures early

academics in particular to engage in intellectual endeavors is the recent common implicit requirement of holding a doctoral degree from a Japanese or overseas institution as a prerequisite for hiring or promotion to a tenure track or full-time university faculty position (Nagatomo, 2012; see also MEXT, 2006, p. 90). Nagatomo (2012), citing Nagasawa (2004), explained that up to the 1990s in pre-reform Japanese universities, professors' minimum academic qualifications were the obtainment of a bachelors' or master's degree. Drawing on Hada (2005), Nagatomo (2012) further reasoned that the recent upgrade in the standard of required academic qualification of university faculty is a consequence of both the expansion of graduate education in Japan and the increasing number of the existing faculty with Ph.D. degrees from the West. In fact, some studies show that Japanese early academics, irrespective of their backgrounds, are actively engaged in writing and research endeavors as Ph.D. candidates while leading professional lives at their universities. In his case study, Gosden (1996) shows Japanese novice scientists' effort to publish their English language RAs as part of their degree requirements in the doctoral program at a technical university while serving as laboratory research associates at the institution. The participants in Casanave's (1998) previously discussed study, who were Western-trained early-career humanity scholars, were also found to be working closely with mainstream scholars overseas, including their doctoral advisor, and with their colleagues at their Japanese university at the same time.

Another related trend potentially urging them to engage in the intellectual endeavor of academia is the influence of the mandatory quality assessment (K.Yamamoto, 2004; Yonezawa, 2008) mentioned above. 80% of Japanese universities presently include research and publications as part of their institutional faculty assessment criteria (Shimada, Okui, & Hayashi, 2009). Evidently, relative to the global trends in higher education, as explained above, the criteria do not seem to be as stringent or standardized. 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 are matters left to the discretion of individual institutions (Shimada, Okui, & Hayashi, 2009). For many private universities, predominantly those with an emphasis on humanity and social sciences (Huang, 2007), adopting a research assessment approach based mainly on the bibliometric measures common in the hard sciences seems to be viewed as unrealistic. The literature shows a glimpse of still striking disciplinary differences in literacy practices among Japanese scholars. Okamura's case study (2006) showed that 13 Japanese scientists educated and based in research universities, despite their differing careers and writing-related coping strategies, were all engaged in actively publishing their English-medium RAs in peer-reviewed international journals as well as national ones. On the other hand, the aforementioned Western-educated researchers in the humanities at a prestigious private university (which some count as a research institution), featured in Casanve's (1998) study, adopt Japanese-medium non-RA publications common in HSS fields in Japan out of necessity. In many cases, Japanese HSS literacy practices seem to be removed from the globally dominant practices centered on peer-reviewed English-medium RAs. For example, traditional in-house academic journals (紀要, *kiyo*) published by colleges and universities are widely accepted as a legitimate genre that facilitates the demonstration of "affinity and loyalty to the institution" (Cummings & Amano, 1979, p. 128, as cited in Kamada, 2007, p. 378) and "advancement of career" (Cummings & Amano, 1979, p. 128, as cited in Kamada, 2007, p. 378) within the institution. In addition, certain HSS fields value local book publication quite highly. According to Eades (2002, 2005) and Goodman (2004), many Japanese anthropologists put an emphasis on publishing Japanese-language books, which allows them to disseminate their ideas rapidly and communicate them to their audience. However, despite the limitations in its power, the current evaluation system, along with the prevalence of a Ph.D. degree requirement, is likely to stimulate academics into writing and research to some extent.

Simultaneously, the globally prevalent factors that constrain academics' research activities are salient at Japanese universities. The demand for quality teaching and related administrative endeavors has been particularly high in Japan, given that the accumulated problems in these areas have been left unresolved for a long time. Universities have not only striven to develop curriculums and enhancing learning environments for students, but have also endeavored to encourage individual professors to improve their teaching through faculty development initiatives (Goodman 2010; Arimoto, 2015; Kano, 2015). In addition to teaching, the demand for administrative work, including "committee work, department meetings, and paperwork" (Hasegawa, 2015, p. 136) and "services" (Hasegawa, 2015, p. 136) which are "paid or nonpaid consulting, public, or voluntary" (Hasegawa, 2015, p. 136) has increased as well. One of the most burdensome administrative duties for faculty seems to be serving on the task forces for entrance examinations. Universities have also directed their energy to the long-overdue renovation and diversification of the forms of entrance examinations (Aspinall, 2005). According to Aspinall (2005), more and more universities have started to increase the percentage of alternative forms of entrance examinations used, such as "admission on recommendation" (Aspinall, 2005,p. 210) and "admission office systems" (Aspinall, 2005, p. 211), in parallel with the traditional ones. Under these circumstances, the amount of time academics spend on teaching and administrative work has risen. According to Hasegawa's (2015) explanation, based on the Carnegie International Surveys of the Academic Profession (CAP survey) conducted in 1992 (1889 respondents) and 2007 (1100 respondents), Japanese university faculty's weekly teaching preparation hours during no-class periods, service time during teaching periods, and administration time have increased considerably over the last 15 years. He also explained that a significant reduction of research time over the same period is evident:

> Whereas in 1992, one-third of faculty spent more than 35h [hours] per week on research and only one-quarter less than 21 h, by 2007 these proportions had been

inverted: only one-quarter spent more than 35h and well over one-third spent less than 21h (Hasegawa, 2015, p. 141).

Academics are pressured to excel at teaching and administrative work all the more because their performance in these areas, not just in research, is evaluated as part of the institutional faculty assessment (Kano, 2015). Many universities currently adopt the standard faculty evaluation criteria that were first initiated and spread by national universities. The criteria include “teaching,” “regional contribution,” and “administrative operation” along with “research” and are used to assess each academic’s performance as a basis for determining their salary level (Kano, 2015, p. 34). Their pressure to devote themselves to and excel at non-research academic work constitutes a potential barrier to academics’ engagement in intellectual endeavor.

In the case of Japan, the division of labor among institutions of higher education has historically been fixed and consistently added to the challenge faced by Japanese academics engaged in writing and research. According to Asonuma and Urata (2015), the aforementioned disparity in public funding between national and private universities is attributed to the traditionally determined role division between them. In other words, whereas national universities are expected to play the role of research universities for the elites with an emphasis on sciences and technology, graduate training, and research in general, private universities, except certain top-tiered ones which often actively accept returnees, are assumed to serve as teaching universities which absorb the masses. The disparities between national and private universities seem to hold true in research funding as well. Asonuma and Urata (2015) explained that more than 50% of Grants-in-Aid (GIA) for scientific research, one of Japan’s major competitive funds, have consistently been distributed to the top ten national universities and in the hard sciences over the 10 years from 1997 to 2007. It has been reported that controversy over these disparities has been persistent. While some argue that this disproportionate research funding allocation to

national universities reflects the results of fair competition and the superior capabilities of applicants working there, others however insist that this concentration of funding on national universities is disadvantageous and demoralizing to private universities and their faculty and that more support for their research environments is needed ("Disparities in national research funding between national and private universities?", 2007).

In addition, the casualization and segmentation of academic professions have steadily intensified, further hampering the intellectual endeavor of academics. Nagatomo (2012) analyzed Japanese higher education as having long been dependent on part-time teachers for cost-cutting purposes. Drawing on MEXT (2006), she went on to point out that the total number of part-time teachers (162,393) exceeded full-time teachers with assistant professors, associate professors, and professors included (123,467) in 2005. As Nagatomo (2012) also explained, the job security of academics has further worsened since the introduction of the limited tenure system in 1997 (MEXT, 2006, n.d.e). According to Kano (2015), the rationale behind this system was to promote the mobility of and competition among academics and thereby invigorate their teaching and research activities. However, as Kano (2015) also stated, this system, which applies mainly to early career academics across disciplines, has led to the destabilization of their positions. This insecurity in their institutional and social standing has been a major concern for such academics in the midst of their pursuit of writing and research for their future career.

The Writing and Research-Related Circumstances and Experiences of Japanese University English Teachers

The scarcity of studies on Japanese university English teachers in higher education in general is glaring. A limited body of research, notably the aforementioned work of Nagatomo (2012), mainly illuminates the teaching and administrative roles of Japanese university English teachers, which are important and challenging at the same time. In the

context of the government's announcement of the action plan titled "Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities" in 2003 (MEXT, 2003), Nagatomo (2012) made clear that the central missions of Japanese university English teachers are threefold: language teaching, teacher education, and entrance examination development, and her participants were in fact socialized for work in at least part of these areas. However, the body of research does hint at the implicit expectations that they be researchers and at the existence of research-engaged Japanese university English teachers. At the same time, it confirms some constraining factors that have potentially been affecting their intellectual endeavors, similar to those affecting their counterparts outside of Japan.

Japanese university English teachers are expected to fulfill the important mission of serving as "model teachers" (Nagatomo 2012, p. 2). This mission should be challenging, given the gap in governmental expectations and actual reality of the overall English proficiency levels of nationally educated students. The government's action plan (MEXT, 2003) focused mainly on the improvement of locally trained students' English abilities and the English education system at the secondary school level, but also includes several proposals relevant to English education at the tertiary level. The relevant proposals stated in relation to university students included their being able to "use English in their work" (Hashimoto, 2009, p. 33) upon graduation, and their universities setting clear objectives to help them achieve this outcome. However, in many cases it might be difficult to realize this objective, considering the consistently underdeveloped quality of pre-university English education. Yoshida (2003) stated that even after "oral communication subjects" (p. 291) were introduced for the first time in 1989, many high schools have spent considerable portions of the subjects on teaching grammar out of the pressure to better prepare students for entrance examinations. Despite several subsequent updates of the Course of Studies with continued emphasis on communicative competence, culminating in its 2008 version (MEXT, 2008, 2011) implemented in stages over several subsequent

years, it has been confirmed that this situation has not fundamentally greatly changed (Gorsuch, 2000; Stewart, 2009; Tahira, 2012). As a result of this pre-academic learning background, many incoming students may have difficulty improving their English to the level that any given English curriculum expects them to achieve. This may cause Japanese university English teachers to tackle the hard task of finding a best fit between the students' abilities and the demands placed on them by the curriculum. In addition, if the teachers themselves are required to take charge of the development and administration of the program as well, their work would be immense.

Japanese university English teachers are also typically expected to be teacher educators and entrance examination developers (Nagatomo, 2012). The aforementioned 2003 Action Plan also recommended the improvement of "the teaching abilities of English teachers" (Hashimoto, 2009, p. 33; see also MEXT, 2003) and the "teaching system" (Hashimoto, 2009, p. 33), which implicitly pressures Japanese university English teachers to produce their effective successors (Hashimoto, 2009; see also MEXT, 2003). According to Cook (2013), the English section of university entrance examinations had long been the target of criticism due to their "seeming lack of validity and reliability" (p. 9), "their influence on how English is taught in Japan, especially to the detriment of communicative language teaching" (p. 9), and the fact that "they are not constructed by testing experts" (p. 9). Japanese university English teachers are expected to respond to these calls to improve the quality of the sections they lead while catering to the constant trends towards diversification and development.

As compared with their teaching and administrative work, Japanese university English teachers' role as researchers does not seem to be fully acknowledged. This situation is similar to the circumstances facing the majority of the English teachers outside of Japan portrayed in the literature discussed above. However, there is an implicit pressure on Japanese university English teachers towards writing and research

engagement. Reflective of the general trend of higher education as mentioned above, the demand for a higher degree and research career is viewed as a prerequisite for Japanese English teachers if they intend to develop their careers in higher education. McCrostie (2010), based on his review of 133 job advertisements posted on the website of Japanese Association of College English Teachers (JACET), one of the major professional language teacher associations, over a period of three years, generalized that the majority of the tenured positions advertised showed a preference or requirement for a Ph.D. degree and a decent list of research publications. Likewise, in his ethnographic study in the English language program at a private university, Poole (2010) also suggested that such credentials are highly valued for the hiring and promotion of Japanese university English teachers at post-reform universities, although they are simultaneously expected to be loyal to their institutions, for example by devoting long hours to committee meetings.

Unfortunately, from the literature it is also apparent that there are a number of negative circumstances that potentially hinder Japanese university English teachers' engagement in writing and research. Firstly, as is the case in the situation overseas, TESOL-related fields as academic disciplines have not gained much recognition in Japan. In MEXT's classification of academic disciplines used for a GIA application, for example, there is no mention of TESOL-related fields as fields or disciplines, although there does exist a reference to "foreign language education." In addition, this "foreign language education" (MEXT & Japan Society for the Promotion of Science [JSPS], 2015, p. 45), which is apparently the closest field to TESOL, is listed as a sub-area of "linguistics" as part of the "humanities," which is separate from the social sciences. This rough categorization does not reflect the complex interdisciplinary nature of TESOL in the mainstream, as explained by Pennington (2015), nor does this governmental description of disciplinary fields include other neighboring fields, such as SLA or applied linguistics. In addition, while there exist local language teacher associations related to TESOL,

namely the aforementioned JACET and JALT, containing about 2700 and 3000 members, respectively (JACET, n.d.; JALT, n.d.), the members' actual academic disciplinary affiliations are not known and are potentially diverse. In other words, not all English teachers may be affiliated with TESOL-related fields. Five out of the eight Japanese English teachers who participated in Nagatomo's (2012) study were found to have specialized in English or American literature, although three of them also had an interest in English education. In Nagatomo's (2012) study, Miwa deemed herself a "literature nerd" (p. 152) who obviously prefers to lecture about her field to teaching English. According to Nagatomo's (2012) observation of her English class, without background knowledge in teaching Miwa adopted almost the same classic Japanese-medium English teaching approach as her own professor relied on in her undergraduate years, in spite of her current high level of English proficiency.

The literature also suggests that TESOL and related fields' institutional representation is still nascent in Japanese universities as well. There is an argument that the overall recognition of these fields in Japan has been on the rise. For example, Poole (2010) explained that the recent educational trend in Japanese higher education that focuses on the practical aspects of English has heightened the position of academics specializing in TESOL and applied linguistics relative to the traditionally powerful English linguistics and literature disciplines. Poole (2010) further supported this point by observing that a young Western-educated professor with a degree in the former discipline is more respected than a relatively senior professor with a degree in the latter in the department covered by his study. However, the overall institutional positionality of TESOL and related fields in reality is unclear. According to the governments' summary of departmental classification of academic disciplines used in Japanese higher education, where there are departments or majors related to "English education," they are placed either within the faculty of "literature" or "others" (MEXT, n.d.e) at the undergraduate level. On the other hand,

“English education” at the graduate level is classified within the school of education. What is more, as is the case in other countries, it is highly likely that TESOL-related departments are not acknowledged as majors at some institutions but rather fall in separate general education courses in the lower division programs.

Most critically, similar to their counterparts in other countries, Japanese university English teachers’ institutional conditions seem to work against their engagement in writing and research. It is reported that university English teachers’ working and employment conditions in Japan are generally insecure. Many of them fall in the category of part-time faculty or full-time faculty on a limited-tenure contract (Nagatomo, 2012; see also MEXT, 2006). Poole (2010), based on his study, explained that the working conditions for part-time language teaching faculty in particular are extremely harsh. They are underpaid (with a pay scale between 300,000 and 400,000 yen per annual course), excluded from opportunities for stable contract renewal or basic employee benefits, and denied their own offices, despite their teaching hours being equal to or greater than the teaching hours of full-time faculty (Poole, 2010). Japanese university English teachers’ actual experiences with these harsh conditions are briefly described in Nagaomo’s (2012) work. According to this study, relatively older participants, Taeko, Shizuko, Naomi, Keiko, and Kumiko, who started their career in higher education without Ph.D.s, had experienced teaching part time at different universities arguably partly because of the small salary, although the latter three climbed the career ladder to higher positions later, partly through obtaining or working towards a doctoral degree (Nagatomo, 2012). At the same time, from the outset of their careers those with a doctoral degree were also reported as suffering from these conditions. Miwa, who returned to Japan after finishing both master’s and doctoral studies abroad, started out with a limited-tenure contract for three years before obtaining a tenured position at another university (Nagatomo, 2012). Kana, in spite of a similar background to Miwa, initially was not able to secure any position in Japan and had to work in Australia for a few

years before finally being hired at a prefectural university in Japan (Nagatomo, 2012).

Unsurprisingly, Japanese university English teachers working part time do not typically receive any support for research (Poole, 2010). Even those with a full-time or tenured position with relatively secure working conditions apparently have difficulty engaging in research as well. In her case study of 11 mid-career international university English teachers at the Japan-based American university mentioned above, Casanave (2010) cited a written comment by a female Japanese full-time professor lamenting with the impact of her workload on engagement in her writing and research. She was quoted as saying that she was overwhelmed with a range of "non-academic duties" (Casanave, 2010, p. 51), including "weekly homeroom guidance, entrance examination committees, frequent open campus sessions, students' study trips, repeated, meaningless revision of curriculums for no practical purposes, and dozen other committee jobs" (Casanave, 2010, p. 51), along with her family duties, teaching at other institutions, and class preparations. Similarly, Nagaomo's (2012) study treated the case of Kumiko, currently a tenured professor, who reported in her interview that her efforts to earn a doctoral degree (at the same American university as mentioned in Casanave's 2010 study) were discouraged by her seniors, who insisted that her mission was strictly educational.

It is not fully known, however, how Japanese university English teachers actually engage in writing and research despite such conditions. It has been observed that research-unfriendly environments can be demoralizing to some teachers. Poole (2010) explained that many Japanese part-time teachers give up on getting promoted due to a lack of time for research. Nevertheless, it has also been reported that other teachers may strive to be engaged in research to the extent their constraints permit. Nagatomo (2012) reported that Kumiko, mentioned above, decided to secretly continue her doctoral study despite her colleagues' objections. Similarly, according to Casanave (2010), under the rigid working conditions the majority of the participants ended up concentrating on completing their

dissertation without working on additional publications. Casanave (2010) also reported that some of her participants took active steps towards publishing some work in parallel with working on their dissertation project. The type of work they published ranged from first or co-authored "EFL textbooks" (Casanave, 2010, p. 54) or "teaching practice pieces" (Casanave, 2010, p. 54) to journal articles based on early dissertation work. Two of her female participants reported having spent at least two years getting their articles published in English-medium refereed journals in Japan and went through rigorous review processes they had never learned in the doctoral program. From the limited sources, it is understandable that there seem to be individual differences among Japanese university English teachers in their degree of writing and research engagement. Nonetheless, there is room for further investigation of the types of writing and research practices they engage in and how these practices and their degree of engagement may change over the course of their careers.

In summary, the review of limited literature indicates, albeit modestly, the following overall picture of higher education and NNES university teachers' research-related circumstances at the global level. The recent rise in managerialism in global higher education (Henkel, 2010; Schwandt, 2009; Smit & Nyamapfene, 2010; Gordon, 2010) has contributed to both pushing and pulling effects on academics' engagement in writing and research (Gordon, 2010; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; 2009; Englander, 2009; Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Uzuner, 2008; Li, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Li & Flowerdew, 2009; Gordon, 2010; Fox, 1992; Gottlieb & Keith, 1997; Griffiths, 2004; Kogan, 1997; Brenan, 2007; Musselin 2007; Finkelstein, 2007; Benjamin, 2000). This situation especially works against university English teachers as members of academia, as they typically suffer from an inconsistent research culture (Casanave & Vandrick 2003; Kubota & Sun, 2013; Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015; Borg, 2010; Reis-Jorge, 2007; Borg, 2013), low disciplinary

status (Lorimer & Schulte, 2010; Pennington, 2015), and negative institutional conditions (Penington, 2015; Allison & Carey, 2007; Borg, 2013; Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015). Alongside these overall negative research-related situations for English teachers, local variations in the issues merit attention. In contrast to the general picture, NNES university English teachers' circumstances, known mainly from China-based studies, are characterized by high expectations placed on teachers as researchers coupled with extremely labor-intensive working conditions that keep teachers from engaging in research (Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg & Liu, 2013; Xu, 2014).

The review of the literature also illuminates the overall picture of Japanese higher education and Japanese university teachers' research-related situations as follows. Japanese higher education today by and large reflects the global trend towards managerialism coupled with a range of historical Japan-specific issues (Goodman, 2010; Arimoto, 2015; Asonuma & Urata, 2015; Amano & Poole, 2005; Ogata, 2015; MEXT, n.d.b, n.d.c), and there are conflicting forces both facilitating and constraining academics' writing and research engagement (Yonezawa, 2008; Nagatomo, 2012; K.Yamamoto, 2004; Shimada, Okui, & Hayashi, 2009; Goodman, 2010; Arimoto, 2015; Kano, 2015; Hasegawa, 2015; Aspinall, 2005; Asonuma & Urata, 2015; Nagatomo, 2012). With the growth of the value of English education in higher education (MEXT, 2003; Hashimoto, 2009), Japanese university English teachers' mission of serving as model language teachers, teacher educators, and examination developers have been valued (Nagatomo, 2012), yet their roles as researchers seemed to be unacknowledged. Like other academics, university English teachers are implicitly required to be research-engaged, given the heightened necessity of a doctoral degree for them to advance their career (Nagatomo, 2012; McCrostie, 2010; Poole, 2010), yet a number of negative circumstances, including the low recognition of their fields and institutional constraints, potentially hinder their intellectual effort (MEXT & JSPS, 2015; Nagatomo, 2012; Poole, 2010; MEXT, n.d.e, 2006; Poole, 2010; Casanave,

2010).

However, the limited sources shed little light on how individual Japanese English teachers react to these conditions. Even more unknown are the actual practices they engage in as well as how the types of their writing and research practices and the degree of their engagement shift over the course of their careers.

Research Questions

Overall, the literature suggests that both career and research journeys of NNES university teachers are generally invisible and precarious, which may hinder their knowledge contribution. In an attempt to increase the understanding of NNES English teachers' realities related to their knowledge contribution, this study holistically explores such interrelated career and research journeys, drawing on the subjective experiences of Japanese university English teachers as told in their stories. The research questions of the study contextualized within the reviewed literature, and derived from my experiences with the participants, as will be described in the next chapter, are as follows:

1. What are the pre-professional backgrounds that shaped a group of Japanese university English teachers' pursuit of doctoral studies?
2. What are the characteristics of the Japanese university English teachers' writing and research experiences over the course of their academic careers?

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the methodology for the study will be explained. The chapter starts with an explanation of the characteristics of qualitative research as well as the process and experience that led me to choose narrative inquiry as the main method after preparing a research proposal. Next, the chapter will explain narrative inquiry and its possible strengths. This will be followed by the overview of the participants' backgrounds, timeline for recruitment and main data collection method for the study, recruitment procedures, and researcher positionalities. The chapter then moves onto explaining the data sources and data analysis strategies along with the themes that emerged from the data, which will be presented in Chapter 11. It will end with a discussion on ethical considerations for the study and potential limitations of the study as well as efforts to increase trustworthiness. Throughout this chapter, as well as the entire volume of the thesis, pseudonyms are used for participants' names and pseudo-initials for institutions' names to preserve their anonymity.

Qualitative Research and Methodological Considerations

This study employed narrative inquiry as the main methodology to explore Japanese university English instructors' subjective experience with writing and research throughout their academic career as well as their pre-professional backgrounds. As typical of qualitative research, this specific methodological choice was determined in the process of, rather than before, conducting the study.

The main focus of qualitative research in general is "experience as it is 'lived' or 'felt' or 'undergone'" (Sherman and Webb, 1988, quoted in Merriam, 1998, p. 6). In other words, qualitative inquiry seeks to understand individuals' experiences primarily from their own perspectives, called an "emic" perspective (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). To this end, qualitative inquiry relies on the "human instrument" (Merriam, 1998, p. 7), or the researcher, as a data collection tool. Accordingly, it involves the researcher going to the "field" whether it is "the people," "setting," "site," or situation (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). Thus, qualitative inquiry reflects the researcher's own perspectives and biography as well. As one category of qualitative research, narrative inquiry focuses on individuals' lived experience, uses their narratives as the main data source, analyzes the data based on their stories, and then seeks to construct a narrative about the individuals' stories (Creswell, 2013).

The eventual decision to adopt narrative inquiry as the main methodology was made after the submission of the original research proposal that was based on an ethnographically oriented approach in January 2012. Merriam (1998) noted that qualitative research design should be "emergent and flexible, responsive to changing conditions of the study in progress" (p. 8). Maxwell (2005) concurred that "the design of a qualitative study should be able to change in response to the circumstances under which the study is being conducted, rather than simply being a fixed determinant of research practice" (p. 7). He also added that the components of qualitative research, including research goals, conceptual framework, research questions, methodology, and validity considerations, are an "integrated and interacting whole, with each component closely tied to several others rather than being linked in a linear or cyclic sequence" (p. 8). In fact, Maxwell (2005) further revealed a case where a doctoral student adjusted the components of her research after the approval of the proposal, owing to loss of access to the target participants. As these scholars recommended, I attempted to be flexible in the methodological design even after I presented my original research proposal. In response to what actually emerged at the

early stages of research, I realigned my focus and approach. Thus, I selected the narrative inquiry approach over ethnographically oriented inquiry for my research.

As explained in Chapter 1, I am a writing instructor at an American university and am predominantly surrounded by non-Japanese HSS academics outside of TESOL. As such, I had not been personally familiar with the research lives of Japanese university English instructors, although I was struggling in my own research life. At the stage of making my dissertation proposal in 2012, I had been inspired largely by the works of Casanave (1998) and Lillis and Curry (2010) on the writing practices of NNES scholars in the HSS in the contexts of their institutions in non-English speaking countries. Casanave (1998) illuminated the writing-related dilemma experienced by four Japanese early career Western-educated HSS scholars working at a prestigious Japanese university in striking a balance between their knowledge contribution to Anglophone academic communities and local ones. Similarly, Lillis and Curry (2010; see also Curry & Lillis, 2004; 2006), under the influence of Casanave (1998), among others, elucidated a similar dilemma in 50 locally trained NNES psychologists in different universities in Spain, Hungary, and Slovakia. At the same time, I had learned about the dearth of writing related studies among Japanese university English teachers. Imagining that Japanese university English teachers who are researchers in TESOL related fields also face similar dilemmas, I was originally interested in exploring their comparable experiences in their current institutional context. Thus, the main focus was placed on understanding their engagement in writing and publication practices situated in their current institutional settings as well as their language and literacy histories that shape such practices. I intended to draw on a combination of interviews, observations, and other artifacts to illustrate the practices based on the ethnographically oriented approach (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010).

My participant selection criteria, which were unchanged despite the shift in research focus and approach, included Japanese university English instructors at Japanese

universities studying for or holding doctoral degrees, preferably in TESOL-related fields. This decision was motivated by my understanding that formal disciplinary enculturation and professional development start at the doctoral level (Casanave, 2002). Further, I was interested in understanding potentially shared practices among English language instructors in the same discipline. It was also important that the participants had experiences in publication at certain points in their doctoral and professional career to explore their investment and decision making in such efforts. Additionally, I hoped to see variations in their backgrounds to examine potential differences as well as commonalities in their experiences. Specifically, I considered including both locally and Western-educated doctorates to examine the impact of differing types of doctoral training in similar disciplinary contexts. It was also desirable to include participants from different types of institutions—from both national, generally research-oriented universities and private, generally educational universities (Huang, 2007; Newby et al., 2009) —to understand potential institutional impacts on their practices.

In line with this focus, I conducted preliminary interviews with two experienced Japanese university English professors between February and March 2012 before moving onto the present study. One of them was my advisor, an American-trained female professor at University A. The other was a Japanese-trained male professor at another private university. This male professor was an old student of my father, a retired professor emeritus of English education and phonetics in the graduate program at University N. I negotiated this professor's participation in the preliminary interviews through my father's brief introduction and my e-mail, as well as by offering support for his own research. The interviews provided me with opportunities to establish background knowledge on possible language, literacy, and professional experiences that shape their practices related to writing for publication, as well as refine my interview skills, adjust questions, and gain feedback. It was found that, regardless of their differing backgrounds and disciplinary contexts, both

found it hard to be as productive as they wished largely owing to institutional constraints. Further, they noted that they rarely ran into fellow Japanese professors specializing in their fields, unless they attend international conferences. These outcomes indicated the possibility that Japanese English instructors feel challenged in advancing their research career and building or maintaining research networks in local settings. After the interviews, my advisor told me that the career stage of the participants may have considerable effects on their experiences. She also cautioned that I should protect my future participants' privacy carefully, as the interviews with her at times digressed into the personal sphere. Further, through interacting with the male professor, I was made aware of the fact that there may be a case where prospective instructors may not know what qualitative research would be like, given the scarcity of existing research in this direction in Japan. To my surprise, the professor initially assumed that any interview should be in the form of a short "think aloud" interview, as in cognitive studies, and that the brevity of interviews would benefit researchers. Thus, I realized that basic explanations of the purpose and descriptive nature of qualitative research should be clearly provided to future participants.

It was the actual communication with my participants at the beginning of the present study that mainly contributed to the slight shift in my research focus and methodology, albeit with the consistent thematic concern. As will be explained below, the six Japanese university English instructors who graciously agreed to participate in the research were all mid-career doctorates in their early 40s who had taken different pathways to their profession. Early conversations with them reminded me of the significance of acknowledging their career stage, as my advisor pointed out. Although their publicized curricular vitae (CVs) suggested that they were active in research and much more advanced in their career than I was, almost all of them humbly referred to themselves as novice or junior researchers. Indeed, from the challenge of making appointments with them, I realized how busy they were with teaching and administrative work. I recognized that

ethnographic exploration mainly focusing on ongoing research activities in their current situations would be practically difficult. Further, a deeper review of recent research, including the body of work discussed in the previous chapter, suggested that many NNES university English instructors in their home countries go through a more precarious career and research journey compared with NNES scholars in other disciplines. Thus, to make my research more relevant to the participants and in line with what the updated review of literature indicated, I went ahead with the following adjustments to my research. First, I decided to look more broadly at their writing and research practices rather than simply noting their practices in writing for publication. Second, I opted to explore their experience of engaging in such practices throughout their academic career, rather than those in the contexts of their current institutions. Thus, I chose to examine their past language, literacy, and teaching-related backgrounds, mainly as a way of interpreting their pursuit of doctoral studies, instead of merely as a means of understanding current practices. I also started considering how such pursuits related to their career considerations in retrospect. Further, newly inspired by McAlpine and Akerlind (2010; see also McAlpine, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine & Turner, 2011), I decided to frame the types and degrees of their writing and research practices as being influenced by other facets of academic work, as was discussed in Chapter 2.

Narrative Inquiry

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the present study embraces multiple realities constructed by participants themselves through interaction with others (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), in line with the constructivist paradigm. One major way in which individuals construct meanings in their personal and social experiences is through narrative, which is the premise of narrative inquiry adopted in the present study.

Bruner (1986, 1996) contended that individuals' modes of knowing are not limited

to *logico-scientific* (or *paradigmatic*) knowing, or the scientific pursuit of truth through formal logic and experiments in science, but that rather are largely shaped by a *narrative mode* of knowing, or the broad pursuit of "the meaning of experience" (1986, p.11) through establishing a meaningful link between particular events in the form of stories. Polkinghorne (1988), in agreement with Bruner's (1986) contention on narrative as particularly important for "understanding human activity" (p. 18), explained as follows:

> Narrative is a scheme by means of which human beings give meaning to their experience of temporality and personal actions. Narrative meaning functions to give form to the understanding of a purpose to life and to join everyday actions and events into episodic units. It provides a framework for understanding the past event so life and for planning future actions. It is the primary scheme by means of which human existence is rendered meaningful (p. 11).

In the words of Connelly and Clandinin (1990), the pioneers of narrative inquiry in the field of education, "humans are storytelling organisms, who individually and socially, lead storied lives" (p. 2).

Individuals' use of narratives as a meaning making tool is important especially when they seek to demystify the complex situation in which they find themselves. Bruner (1996) stated that "stories worth telling and worth construing are typically born in trouble" (p. 142). Likewise, Riessman (2008) illustrated a similar point based on her own narrative studies among women faced with chronic illness, divorce, and infertility: "When biographical disruptions occur that rupture expectations for continuity, individuals make sense of events through storytelling" (p. 10).

Connelly and Clandinin (1990), as narrative researchers, explained that in narrative inquiry, narrative is viewed not only as "the phenomena of human experience" under study (p. 2) but also as a research methodology itself. They explained the role of narrative researchers in the following way: "People by nature lead storied lives and tell stories of

those lives, whereas narrative researchers describe such lives, collect and tell stories of them, and write narratives of experience" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 2). In other words, narrative inquiry involves two types of narratives woven together: individuals' narratives as data and the researcher's narratives constructed through analyzing the data.

The strengths of narrative inquiry lie in its descriptive power. Bell (2012), based on her own experience of conducting narrative inquiry into L2 literacy, highlighted the following as advantages of this method compared with other research methods:

> Narrative allows researchers to understand experience. People's lives matter, but much research looks at outcomes and disregards the impact of the experience itself … Narrative lets researchers get at information that people do not consciously know themselves. Analysis of people's stories allows deeply hidden assumptions to surface. (p. 209) Narrative illuminates the temporal notion of experience, recognizing that one's understanding of people and events changes …. Other research methods would have captured understandings at certain points, not at the important intervening stages. (p.210)

Many of the key works reviewed in the previous chapters adopt narrative inquiry, similarly valuing the strengths of narratives as a means of understanding individuals' experiences—particularly complex, extended, and fluid ones—the meaning of which the individuals themselves need conscious effort to configure. Stressing the complicated nature of individuals' career experiences, Chen (1998), a constructivist career researcher, acknowledged the role that narrative plays in an individual's quest for "meaningful explanations in understanding what has happened in his or her career path" (Young et al., 1996, as cited in Chen, 1998, p. 454). Likewise, McAlpine and her colleagues (e.g., McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010; McAlpine, 2010; McAlpine, 2012a; McAlpine, 2012b; McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine & Turner, 2011) drew on narratives in exploring the career experiences of individuals in the academe. McAlpine and Turner (2011), based

on their investigations into early academics' career trajectories, contended that individuals' academic career, which they referred to as their "course or progress through life (or a distinct portion of life)" (p. 536), can be "constructed as narrative that connects events in a meaningful way whether looking forward or back" (p. 536). Similarly, Casanave's body of work (1998, 2010, 2012) extensively utilized narrative inquiry to explore scholars' and teachers' engagement in writing and research practices in their career contexts. According to Casanave (1998), individuals' lives related to writing and research that involve the intricate intersection of their "education, life, and experience" (p. 178) is understandable only "by means of the stories that people tell of themselves and [those] that researchers then tell of the people they are investigating" (p. 178).

In view of the potential benefits of narrative inquiry as advocated by the abovementioned constructivist researchers, and considering my renewed focus on enhanced understanding of the writing and research experiences of Japanese university English instructors over the course of their careers and their pre-professionals backgrounds, I deemed it prudent to use narrative inquiry in the study. In adopting the approach, the present study sought to shed light on the complexity of such experiences and the otherwise under-recognized challenges facing them.

Participant Backgrounds

Detailed descriptions and stories of the participants will be provided in the form of profiles in chapters 5 through 10 in the order that is presented in Table 1 on the next page. The table gives an overview of their profiles. They were a generational cohort in their early 40s at the time of the interviews in 2013, and they were all tenured mid-career university instructors. Two of them, Wataru and Shizuka, worked in a national university, whereas Koji, Takeshi, Minami, and Sumire worked in private universities. Except for Minami and Sumire who spent considerable pre-university years in the U.S., all of the participants

attended universities in Japan as undergraduates. Following various educational and professional trajectories thereafter, they all pursued a Ph.D. degree in Japan or the U.S. Their main writing and research stories revolved around their endeavor in their respective academic career contexts, beginning with their doctoral years up to the date of the interview.

Table 1.

Participant Backgrounds

Name	Wataru Hashiguchi	Shizuka Takeuchi	Koji Nozaki	Takeshi Suzuki	Minami Yamamoto	Sumire Wada
Gender/Age	M/early 40s	F/early 40s	M/early 40s	M/early 40s	F/early 40s	F/early 40s
Current Position, Institution	Associate Professor, National University H	Associate Professor, National University H	Associate Professor, Private University M	Associate Professor, Private University J	Assistant Professor, Private University B	Assistant Professor, Private University C
Number of Years at the Institution	4 years	Less than 1 year	2 years	3 years	2 years	4 years
Number of Years Teaching at Japanese universities	13 years	13 years	13 years	8 years	10 years	8 years
Doctoral Education	Japan	Japan	Japan	The U.S.	The U.S.	The U.S.
Master's Education	Japan	Canada	The U.S. and Japan	The U.S.	Japan	Japan
Undergraduate Education	Japan	Japan	Japan	Japan	Japan	Japan
Pre-University Education	Japan	Japan	Japan	Japan	The U.S. and Japan	The U.S. and Japan

Timeline of Participant Recruitment and Data Collection

Table 2 below gives an overview of the chronology of the main research process: participant recruitment and data collection. Participant recruitment and the main interviews took place in parallel. Participant recruitment was carried out between February and August 2013, whereas most of the major interviews were conducted between July and September 2013.

Table 2.

Timeline of Participant Recruitment and Data Collection

Date/Name	Koji Nozaki	Minami Yamamoto	Shizuka Takeuchi	Wataru Hashiguchi	Takeshi Suzuki	Sumire Wada
02/07/2013			E-mailed an invitation			
02/10/2013			Received a reply			
02/12/2013	E-mailed an invitation					
02/13/2013	Received a reply					
02/18/2013		E-mailed an invitation				
02/20/2013		Received a reply				
03/05/2013		Negotiated participation				
03/08/2013			Negotiated participation			
03/11/2013	Negotiated participation					
05/13/2013	Interview#1					

Table 2. (Continued)

Date/Name	Koji Nozaki	Minami Yamamoto	Shizuka Takeuchi	Wataru Hashiguchi	Takeshi Suzuki	Sumire Wada
06/10/2013		Asked for possible other participants	Asked for possible other participants			
07/04/2013				E-mailed an invitation	E-mailed an invitation	
07/05/2013				Received a reply		
07/06/2013					Received a reply	
07/10/2013		Interview#1				
07/24/2013		Interview#2				
07/26/2013				Negotiated participation		
07/30/2013					Negotiated participation	
08/03/2013						E-mailed an invitation
08/06/2013				Interviews#1 and#2		
08/10/2013						Received a reply
08/12/2013						Negotiated participation
08/14/2013			Interview#1			
08/15/2013						Interview#1
08/17/2013		Interview#3	Interview#2			
08/19/2013					Interview#1	
08/22/2013	Interview#2					
08/23/2013					Interview#2	Interview#2
08/27/2013						Interview#3
08/28/2013	Interview#3					
09/04/2013					Interview#3	

Table 2. (Continued)

Date/Name	Koji Nozaki	Minami Yamamoto	Shizuka Takeuchi	Wataru Hashiguchi	Takeshi Suzuki	Sumire Wada
12/19/2014			Member Check Interview	Member Check Interview		
01/05/2015						Member Check Interview
01/06/2015		Member Check Interview				
02/13/2015					Member Check Interview	
02/18/2015	Member Check Interview					

Participant Recruitment

Participant recruitment based on the abovementioned selection criteria was conducted primarily through my personal networks and snowball sampling (Merriam, 1998). My initial recruitment attempt through my professional network around the end of 2012 to early 2013 was not successful. I originally attempted to source potential candidates through the recommendations of one of my Japanese colleagues in another department. She was a British-educated anthropologist and applied linguist who had cooperated with me in my early study, and had a wide network of Japanese instructors teaching English at various Japanese universities. Following a discussion with her on my present study and selection criteria, in December 2012, she introduced me by e-mail to several well-known instructors who were active in research and held a Ph.D. in the fields of applied linguistics and TESOL. However, as expected, given the personal nature of the study and the level of commitment needed for interviews that I explained to them in advance by e-mail, they declined to participate in the study. The fact that they did not personally know me except through this collegial referral was arguably another major reason for their negative

response.

Therefore, I came up with alternative recruiting procedures that would involve more personal networks and snowball sampling (Merriam, 1998) through the participants' own professional networks. As a result, I was able to gain the cooperation of six Japanese university English instructors—Koji, Minami, Shizuka, Wataru, Takeshi, and Sumire. In general, I contacted each participant initially by e-mail either directly or through referrals. In my initial e-mail, I introduced myself, explained the present study in brief, and asked if they were interested in meeting with me for further details. Upon their agreement to meet, I made an appointment for a preliminary meeting, in which I negotiated their participation. In the meeting, I explained the informed consent form (see Appendix A) and ethical considerations and then invited any questions regarding the study. I then obtained the participants' signature on the form.

Koji and Minami were recruited via a network through my father in the spring of 2013. As in the case of my preliminary interviews, I considered choosing potential participants from his previous students at the graduate school of national University N. Koji and Minami, whom my father taught about 20 years before when they were master's students, were the only two who fit my study's selection criteria. Koji had earned a doctorate from the same university and Minami, from an American university. They were working at different private universities at the time of the interviews. Minami had attended University A as an undergraduate and was previously working for the university with my advisor. I was familiar with these instructors' names, as my father often mentioned their well-balanced personalities and professional successes. Further, my family and both of theirs have exchanged New Year's greeting cards every year since they worked with my father. My family's cards, for which I often drew cartoon portraits of my family members, informed the instructors of our updates, including mine. Their cards likewise updated us on their personal and professional lives. Therefore, the instructors and I had shared our

background experiences before meeting in person. Prior to contacting them, I asked my father to inform them that I, his daughter, would e-mail them. The preliminary meeting with each was held at their offices. When I explained the details of the study, each of them showed interest, saying that they had never learned there was such an area of inquiry. At each meeting, our conversations often naturally shifted to personal, family-related topics. For example, it was pleasantly surprising that Minami remembered from my family's greeting cards that I had originally been a book editor. Both of them also told me that our encounter 20 years after they had worked with my father was "a magical tie" (ご縁) that must exist between us.

Shizuka was recruited through my alumni networks at University A, also in the spring of 2013. Several years prior to the study, I had met Shizuka, in 2009, through my advisor's introduction when I sought to learn about the program before starting my doctoral study. Shizuka's kindness and deep engagement in research were vivid in my memory, which made me consider inviting her as a potential participant. Although I had not contacted her for a few years, Shizuka generously responded to my e-mail and agreed to a preliminary meeting with me. She was about to move from a private university in Kanto to a national university in Kansai. The meeting with her was held at a café in Tokyo, the same place where we first met. After I detailed the study, Shizuka not only agreed to participate but also helped me by inviting one of her colleagues.

Wataru was recruited through the introduction of Shizuka in the summer of 2013. I confirmed on the university's website that he was also a graduate of the doctoral program of University A. Shizuka kindly obtained his permission to let me contact him. As we lived far apart, Wataru offered an opportunity for me to explain the study for him on the phone. He further offered to make the call for me, saying that his university would cover the phone bill. After he listened to my detailed explanation in accordance with the consent form that I had sent him previously, Wataru agreed to participate in the study.

Sumire and Takeshi were recruited through Minami's previous professional network at University A, also in the summer of 2013. As the four participants except Minami were Japan-trained doctorates, I hoped to include additional Western-educated doctorates, if possible, through her introduction. Three months after the preliminary meeting, Minami agreed to meet with me briefly at a café near her university to discuss this matter. At the meeting, Minami listed several potential candidates, and kindly introduced me and my study to them by e-mail after the meeting. Out of the five candidates, Sumire and Takeshi, both American-trained doctorates, allowed me to contact them. I then e-mailed the two instructors, following the procedure I used for the other participants. I met with Takeshi at his office. My research topic seemed to be new to him, but as a qualitative researcher himself, he related to my research experience and kindly accepted my invitation. I met with Sumire at another café in Tokyo. Sumire was not only an ex-colleague of Minami but also an old friend of hers from their undergraduate days at University A. As we were of the same age and related to University A, Sumire told me that she felt "very close to me" (すごく親しみがわきます). Intrigued by my study, she expressed her eagerness to join the study. Both Sumire and Takeshi mentioned that there was some "magical tie" (縁) that connected us through Minami's past tie with my family.

Despite their accomplishments, the instructors were generally humble regarding their research career, as mentioned above. For example, Minami stated, "I am still an emergent researcher. Are you okay with me?" (私まだ研究者としてこれからですけど、大丈夫ですか？) Similarly, Takeshi asked me, "Am I really qualified to participate?" (僕なんかでいいんですか？) I assured them that they matched my criteria, and I would appreciate their participation. Our conversations on this topic and subsequent communication helped me adjust the study design to narrative inquiry from ethnographic research.

At first, I considered offering compensation for participating in the study, but I eventually decided not to, as the first two instructors I contacted, Koji and Minami,

declined the offer at their respective meetings. Their basic rationale was that the idea of compensation was counterintuitive to them as they had not received any compensation when conducting their own studies in their doctoral career and thereafter. Instead, I offered all the participants small souvenirs or bought them a tea or coffee after interviews as an informal token of appreciation.

Researcher's Positionalities

Although I made clear to them that their participation was voluntary and that they had the freedom to withdraw at any time, all of them were committed to working with me throughout the research. I speculate that my multiple positionalities were likely to have mediated my access and rapport with them, apart from their general kindness and generosity.

First, my positionalities in power dynamics with the participants should be addressed. My position in relation to the primary informants who introduced me to the participants must have influenced their decision to participate. It is generally advised that "[w]henever possible, it is important to establish access to participants through their peers rather than through people 'above' or 'below' them in their hierarchy" (Seidman, 2006, p. 46). However, I ended up relying on my father's and alumni network, which includes my advisor, in gaining access to them. While there was no ongoing power relationship between my father and Koji and Minami, the latter, being my father's former students, may have felt obligated to work with me to a certain extent. Takeshi and Sumire may have also shared a similar feeling to a certain degree, although they were contacted through their "peer" Minami. Shizuka, too, may also have felt the need to join partly because I was a student of the advisor with whom she used to work, and this fact may have subtly influenced Wataru. Simultaneously, my position as a doctoral researcher, which is lower than theirs in the academic hierarchy, may have contributed to their motivation to "help"

me. I felt that they naturally put themselves in my shoes, as I was undertaking a similar academic journey they had gone through.

Second, my positionalities in relation to their personal histories and experiences should be acknowledged. My positionalities from this perspective fell in the state of "betweenness" (Nast, 1994, quoted in Tarrant, 2014, p. 497), in that I was never fully an "outsider" or "insider" to the participants. I could be interpreted as an "insider" to them because we shared Japanese as our L1, belonged to the same generation, and had experienced undergraduate education in Japan. In addition, I had nearly the same length of career in higher education specializing in an English-related field when I interviewed them. Citing Grenier (2007), Tarrant (2014) explained that age is a factor that affects research relationships, and discussed a case where the researcher was much younger than the participants. She suggested that in the context of this age gap between them, the researcher would be seen by the older participants as inexperienced and their resultant relationship would become an informal one. In the case of the present study, as Sumire mentioned, our being from the same generation created a friendly relationship between us. In fact, they often stated such phrases as "In *our* time…" (私たちの時って) and "I guess you know it, but universities at that time," (ご存じだと思いますけどあのころの大学っていったら), thereby positioning me as part of their group. Our similar career length may also have worked positively to build their trust in me. Our informal conversations before or after the interviews at times drifted to discussion on routine educational issues. Simultaneously, I could also be viewed as an "outsider." I had never taught in Japanese universities at the time of the interviews and was a non-expert in the participants' subfields. I also differed from the participants in the timing of starting a doctoral study. I was about to be in my 40s when starting my doctoral study, whereas the participants did so in their late 20s or early 30s. The majority of the participants were hesitant to describe themselves as completely career- or research-oriented at that time, although they ended up following academic career

paths. This may have potentially contributed to their ambivalence toward the research topic itself. Although it is beyond the scope of the present study to explore the mechanism involved, it is conceivable that my multiple positionalities shaped our relationships, were variously negotiated in the research, and inevitably filtered the research outcomes.

Data Sources

In accordance with the tradition of narrative inquiry, in-depth multiple interviews with the participants were the main set of data sources, but I also drew from a range of textual sources and visits to increase my understanding of their storied experiences and perspectives.

Interviews

I conducted two types of interviews: in-depth and member check interviews. I chose Japanese, our shared L1, as the medium of all the interviews as it appeared to be the most natural and effective language for maintaining rapport and smooth communication. In addition, although the interviews were semi-structured in design (Maxwell, 2005)—based on a general interview guide (see Appendix C), including a set of open-ended questions relevant to the research themes—they left ample room for spontaneous developments. All the interviews were audio-recorded. I also took down reflective notes immediately after the interviews.

In-depth interviews.

As Polkinghorne (2005) stated, a “one shot” (p. 142) interview with a participant does not allow the researcher to achieve a good understanding of the participant’s experience. Therefore, the main set of interviews was based on an adaptation of Seidman’s (1991, 2006) framework of qualitative multiple in-depth interviewing, which Polkinghorne (2005)

recommended and is widely used. Seidman's (1991, 2006) framework involves three thematic units: The first interview probes the participants' "focused life story" (p. 17), which aims at placing the participants' experience in context; the second interview aims to encourage the participants to reconstruct the "details of the experience" (p. 18) in the area under study; the third interview asks the participants to reflect on the experience, building upon the first and second interviews. The third interview may also be future oriented, exploring the participant's future goals (Seidman, 2006). Alternatively, the third interview may be reserved for the researcher to ask "follow-up questions to fill in and to clarify accounts" (Seidman, 1991, cited in Polkinghorne, 2005, p. 143).

In accordance with the basic elements of Seidman's framework, the actual in-depth interviews were designed and conducted as follows. In the first interview, the primary purpose was to understand their "focused life story" (Seidman 1991, 2006) to date, mainly around their language, literacy, and educational and professional experiences. The first purpose of this interview was to contextualize their writing and research practices as well as their experiences over the course of their academic career. The second purpose was to explore the first research question concerning their pre-professional backgrounds that led to their doctoral studies. This could be interpreted as a version of the language and literacy history interview involving "autobiographical accounts of language and academic literacy learning" (Lillis, 2010, p. 43), but it also incorporated a discussion of the participants' pathway to their profession.

The second interview session was mainly organized around a discussion on the participants' specific writing and research experiences over the course of their careers in higher education. The purpose was to explore the writing and research practices they engaged in with respect to their evolving professional circumstances. The interview was an adaptation of Lea and Stierer's (2009) version of text-based interviews conducted with university faculty. It mainly involved a discussion on the participants' experiences

associated with the production of a couple of key written products that they selected. However, whereas Lea and Stierer's (2009) version focused primarily on text-based experiences and the ongoing practices situated in current institutional settings, my interview sought to situate the participants' engagement in writing and research practices in their academic career trajectories amid changing institutional conditions since starting their doctoral years. In this session, I did not restrict our discussion to their experience around their key written products. For example, when she discussed the articles she chose as her representative works, Minami also mentioned a range of experiences around her unpublished dissertation to contextualize the works.

The third interview combined a follow-up and future-oriented reflective session based on the first two interviews. I asked additional questions based on the previous sessions for clarification. I also asked them to discuss how they presently viewed themselves as researchers and what research-related aspirations they held.

Member check interviews.

In addition to the main interviews, member check interviews were conducted with all of the participants. The primary purpose of this type of interview was to obtain feedback from the participants regarding my translation and interpretation of their stories. About one week before the interview, I e-mailed them the researcher-generated restoried accounts of their experiences and portions of the translated interview texts in English for their review (see the section "Data Analysis"). In the interview, I asked if the written stories rang true to them and if there were any changes, deletions, or additions they wanted to make.

Collected Texts

The interview data were supplemented by questionnaire responses, the participants'

self-selected key publications and, other documentary sources.

Biographical questionnaire responses.

Prior to the first interview, I asked all of the participants to respond to a biographical questionnaire that gathered information on their date of birth, linguistic and educational background, focus of study at the undergraduate, master's, and doctoral levels, and current professional and academic situations and activities (see Appendix B). The questionnaires were used as a basis for the first interview, helping contextualize and verify what was actually shared in the interview, as well as cross-check the information provided in their publicized CVs.

Written products.

Prior to the second interview, I asked the participants to select and share with me their key written products, or outputs they deemed important. As the present study was not focused on the text in itself, I did not conduct detailed textual analyses. As explained above, I rather used the texts mainly to elicit their reflections on and gain an in-depth understanding of their writing and research practices and experiences.

Other documents.

In addition to the abovementioned texts, other documents were collected and studied for triangulation purposes, including official CVs containing their profile, publication records, institutional profile, and our e-mail conversations.

Visits

In conducting interviews or on separate occasions, visits were made to the participants' local environments, such as their workplace, campus or their favorite places.

A number of the participants provided me with guided tours of their institutions. In certain cases, we had the opportunity to have lunch. I did not conduct detailed observations but the visits helped me have a better understanding of the current institutional contexts in which they engaged in writing and research practices. Table 3 below is a summary of the data sources for the present study.

Table 3.

Summary of the Data Sources

Name	Interviews	Texts Collected	Visits
Wataru Hashiguchi	Interview#1 (115mins) Interview#2 (110 mins) Member Check Interview (60mins)	Biographical Questionnaire Response Written Products One RA in a national journal (in Japanese) , one RA in an international journal (in English) Other Documents CV, institutional documents, e-mails	His department , His office, Lunch at the campus restaurant
Shizuka Takeuchi	Interview#1 (95mins) Interview#2 (50 mins) Member Check Interview (60mins)	Biographical Questionnaire Response Written Products One essay in a professional journal (in Japanese), two book chapters (in Japanese and English), one RA in a national journal (in Japanese), one RA in an in-house journal (in English) Other Documents CV, institutional documents, e-mails	Her office, Her home, Lunch at the campus restaurant, Lunch at the near restaurant
Koji Nozaki	Interview#1 (100 mins) Interview#2 (80 mins) Interview#3 (100 mins) Member Check Interview (60 mins)	Biographical Questionnaire Response Written Products One RA in an in-house journal (in English), The dissertation (in English), one book chapter (in Japanese) Other Documents CV, institutional documents, e-mails	His office

Table 3. (Continued)

Takeshi Suzuki	Interview#1 (150 mins) Interview#2 (135mins) Interview#3 (60mins) Member Check Interview (60 mins)	Biographical Questionnaire Response Written Products The dissertation (in English), three RAs in national and international journals (in English) Other Documents CV, institutional documents, e-mails	His office, A café close to his home
Minami Yamamoto	Interview#1 (120 mins) Interview#2 (60 mins) Interview#3 (105mins) Member Check Interview (60 mins)	Biographical Questionnaire Response Written Products One book chapter (in English), one RA in an international journal (in English), one draft of a RA submitted for an international journal (in English) Other Documents CV, institutional documents, e-mails	Her office, A café close to her university
Sumire Wada	Interview#1 (135mins) Interview#2 (105 mins) Interview#3 (75 mins) Member Check Interview (60 mins)	Biographical Questionnaire Response Written Products The dissertation (in English), one RA in an international journal (in English), one report in an in-house journal (in Japanese), one book chapter (in English) Other Documents CV, institutional documents, e-mails	Her office, A café close to her home, Her department

As the participants and I were equally busy with our professional duties almost throughout the academic year, flexibility was essential in scheduling the interviews. According to Seidman (1991, 2006), the ideal length of each interview is approximately 90 minutes, spaced over at least several weeks. However, in this study, the length, number, and spacing of the interviews were primarily adjusted to the participants' schedules, although I adhered to the basic sequence of the Seidman-inspired framework. The participants were generally available only during their term breaks. In addition, as my

teaching schedule was regularly tight (see Chapter 1), my own availability was limited. Thus, the interviews varied in length and occurred at relatively small or irregular intervals. Sudden meetings or administrative duties on both sides had led to the rescheduling of sessions. In addition, as it took me more than a year to finish the data analyses, the timing of the member check interviews was delayed (see Table 2).

Data Analysis

In line with the characteristics of qualitative research in general (e.g., Merriam, 1998; Maxwell, 2005), data analysis for the present study was cyclical, non-linear, and time consuming. However, it generally involved the following interrelated procedures: transcription and translation, *restorying* (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Ollerenshaw & Creswell 2002), member checking, and cross-narrative comparison.

Transcription and Translation

All the in-depth interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder, transcribed verbatim, including pauses, false starts, fillers, and the like, in Japanese, by myself. With the time constraints and tight interview schedules, however, I was not able to transcribe fully each interview immediately afterwards as often advised. Thus, in preparation for the second (and third) session of the interview with each participant, I listened to the recording of the preceding interview, while I took notes on my initial impressions and questions on it. This approach was combined with a review of my notes taken after the interview and the interview guide. After all the in-depth interviews were completed, I re-listened to all of the recordings and transcribed them verbatim while I prepared additional notes in English on my impressions. I then further developed insights into the overall experiences that the participants constructed with me. This initial cursory analysis, albeit extremely time consuming, helped me gain a good grasp of their stories and prepared me to conduct the

later main analysis (see the section “Restorying”). The member check interviews were documented in the same way, except that I was unable to record Minami’s owing to technical problems. Thus, I relied on my notes taken afterwards when reviewing Minami’s comments. Further, I relied on professional transcribers in transcribing most of the member check interviews owing to lack of time.

My approach to translation was adapted from a synthesis of approaches and suggestions by Gentil (2005), Halai (2007), and Pavlenko (2007). In the English-dominant research world, there are no systematic guidelines on the English translation of data from the interviews conducted in a non-English L1. Different researchers have taken different approaches. For example, in Xu’s narrative study (2014, see Chapter 3), the interviews were conducted in Chinese, the L1 of the researcher and the participants, and then fully translated into English for later analysis. In a similar study by French-speaking researcher Gentil (2005), the originally French interview data were only selectively translated when being quoted in the report. Halai (2007), based on Rossman and Rallis (1998), cautioned on the extra workload involved in translating the entire interview data as well as the difficulty of demonstrating the accuracy of such translation; she thus argued for selective translation. In view of the likelihood that “some meaning (would be) lost in translation” (Halai, 2007, p. 351), she emphasized the importance of aiming to “convey the essential meaning” (Halai, 2007, p. 351) of the original texts, rather than produce “exact equivalence” (Halai, 2007, p. 351), based on her own interview study in Urdu with Urdu-speaking teachers. Further, she proposed basic criteria for assessing the quality of interview translations: whether it was “(a) making sense, (b) conveying the spirit and manner of the original, and (c) having a natural and easy form of expression” (Halai, 2007, p. 351). Pavlenko (2007) suggested that “all narratives should be analyzed in the language in which they were told and not in translation” (p. 173), based on the observation that “[including] textual analysis of translated data as part of the analysis of discursive events”

is “a procedure [that] is open to serious objection” (Fairclough, 1995, as cited in pp. 173 - 174).

Although I had initially considered following the full translation approach of Xu (2014), I eventually followed Gentil (2005) for the procedure, with reference to the recommendations of Halai (2007) and Pavlenko (2007). This decision was made primarily in light of the study’s purpose of a holistic understanding of the participants’ experiences rather than linguistic or textual analyses. However, as with the case of the other phases of the research, the issue with time constraints, too, was an equally compelling factor for the decision. After transcribing the in-depth interviews in Japanese, I proceeded to analyzing the Japanese interview transcriptions without translating them. I then moved on to translating portions of the interview texts I found potentially important and relevant for further analysis. When translating the selected portions of the Japanese texts, I made a “clean-up version” (Nagatomo, 2012, p. 74) of the texts, eliminating false starts and fillers. Then, I sought feedback on the English translations and the corresponding Japanese transcripts from the participants, as well as on the restoried accounts, in the member check interviews.

I have some professional experience in translating journalistic and academic texts both from English to Japanese and Japanese to English in the publishing industry. Moreover, all the participants were highly advanced bilinguals who were able to review the quality of the translations. However, there were many compromises involved in the final production of the translations. Thus, in accordance with Gentil’s (2005) approach and Pavlenko’s (2007) advice, I presented the quoted words both in English translation and in Japanese orthography, for the benefit of the reader who understands both languages.

Restorying

In analyzing the data, I drew on Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) narrative inquiry

in its essence and adapted Ollerenshaw and Creswell's (2002) application of Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) restorying process in such a way that it could be fitted with the focus of the present research. As explained above, narrative inquiry, particularly Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) approach, seeks to achieve a holistic understanding of the stories of the participants' experiences obtained from data sources, which she called *field texts*. This approach to narrative inquiry, according to Ollerenshow and Creswell (2002), reflects a type of the *holistic-content* perspective of narrative analysis (Lieblich et al., 1998). Lieblich et al. (1998) explained that the holistic-content mode of analysis, commonly used in case studies, generally aims to shed light on the content of the individual's story as a whole and interpret "sections of the text" not in isolation but "in the context of other parts of the narrative" (p. 12). What is unique about Clandinin and Connelly's (2002) version of holistic-content analysis is that it involves the process of *retelling* based on her concept of *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space*.

Inspired by Dewey's (1938) theory of experience, Clandinin and Connelly (2000) conceptualized three-dimensional narrative inquiry space as a lens through which narrative inquirers should make sense of individuals' subjective experiences. According to Clandinin and Connelly (2000), Dewey (1938) posited that, human experiences, being both personal and social, are continuously developing from the past and fed into the future, while also being under the influence of their changing environment and certain situations. In short, he suggested that *continuity* and *interaction* as operated in *situations* are key interrelated aspects of human experience. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) argued that individuals' storied experiences occur at the intersection of these three dimensions. Based on Dewey's (1938) notion of "continuity," Clandinin and Connelly (2000) proposed that individuals' experiential stories should not only be viewed as a reflection of their current lives at the moment but as a manifestation of their past life histories and imagined future. They explained that individuals' storied experience should be understood as reflective of their

evolving interaction with their "internal conditions" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 50), including their "feelings, hopes aesthetic reactions, and moral dispositions" and with their "existential conditions" or their "environment" consisting of other people, in accordance with Dewey's (1938) notion of interaction. As for Dewey's notion of situations, they further insisted that it is equally important to acknowledge the "specific places or sequences of places" (p. 50) where their storied experience occurred.

Narrative inquiry expects the researcher to pay attention to situating the field texts into the three-dimensional space from the initial stage of analysis (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Thus, they encouraged the researcher to read and organize repeatedly the data sources while seeking to understand where the participants and the researcher "are placed at any particular moment—temporally, spatially, and in terms of the personal and the social" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 95). Clandinin and Connelly (2000) further explained that this process is important "to construct a chronicled or summarized account of what is contained" (p. 131) in the sources.

Ollerenshaw and Creswell (2002) proposed the *three-dimensional approach* to restorying building on the abovementioned holistic-content analytical scheme; they defined restorying as "the process of gathering stories, analyzing them for key elements of the story (e.g., time, place, plot, and scene), and then rewriting the story to place it within a chronological sequence" (p. 332). Restoried accounts, according to Ollerenshaw and Creswell (2002), should include "rich details about the setting or context of the participants' experiences" (p. 332). In the process of restorying data, the researcher should focus on analyzing each of the three dimensions as revealed by the data in depth. In analyzing the dimension of continuity, which is "central to narrative research" (Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002, p. 339), the researcher should look at "remembered experiences, feelings, and stories from earlier times" (p. 340), "current experiences, feelings, and stories relating to actions of event," and "implied and possible experiences and plot lines" (p. 340). The dimension of

interactions should be seen on both the "personal and social" levels, which means that not only the "intentions, purposes, and points of view" (Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002, p. 339) of the storyteller herself but also those of other people that the individual interacts with should be analyzed. When analyzing the dimension of situations, the focus should be on understanding "context, time, and place situated in a physical landscape or setting with topological and spatial boundaries with characters' intentions, purposes, and different points of view" (Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002, p. 340). These multiple foci allow the researcher to capture the subject experience of the participant in a holistic, descriptive manner.

In the present study, the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space of Clandinin and Connelly (2000) was adapted, incorporating the concept of the three strands of academic work experience based on the notion of identity-trajectory (McAlpine & Alkerlind, 2010) (see Chapter 2) to analyze Japanese English university instructors' reflections on writing and research experiences throughout their academic career. I focused mainly on exploring their past and continuous writing and research endeavors embedded in their lives. I also took notes of their feelings, intentions, desires, and decisions in relation to shifting external conditions. When analyzing the continuity dimension, I firstly analyzed their early language, literacy, teaching-related background and circumstances, which shaped their later academic career and practices in writing and research. I then focused on analyzing their *intellectual strand* of experience (McAlpine'& Alkerlind, 2010), or their engagement in the practices in the contexts of their academic career paths. I also attended to how their "old and new interrelationships" with others—their *networking strand* of experience (McAlpine & Alkerlind, 2010) in the dimension of interaction (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000)—and their shifting places —their institutional strand of experience (McAlpine & Alkerlind, 2010) —where their educational and work experiences were enacted in the dimension of *space* (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000).

As the first step, the transcriptions and translations, along with the other data, were organized into six data packets under the names of the participants. I began by reading each data packet carefully so that I could understand the big picture of each participant's subjective experience. I took notes on tentative themes and patterns. Based on this initial analysis, I moved on to creating individuals' profiles by applying the restorying technique introduced by Ollerenshaw and Creswell (2002) using the abovementioned focus.

Developing a form of template is important in organizing and reducing data and creating tentative individual profiles, as well as in the comparative analysis of the profiles that serve as the basis of discussion on the research questions. Gentil (2002), in his dissertation that was developed into his 2005 work, created a template containing headings that addressed key aspects of the participants' experience and documented relevant characteristics of his participants' accounts there.

Thus, I created a template in the form of a table, consisting of a list of headings relevant to the research focus outlined above and reflective of the inquiry space. The headings include the following:

Pre-professoinal background to the pursuit of doctoral studies

- Pre-university to university experiences
- Master's studies and early teaching experiences

Writing and research experiences over the course of their academic careers

- Writing and research experiences in the early academic career phase
    - Academic environment
    - Institutional environment
    - Networks
    - Writing and research practices and their perceived values
- Writing and research experiences in the current academic career phase
    - Institutional environment

- Networks
- Writing and research practices and their perceived values
- On being a researcher

I then created tentative individual profiles for the six participants in the following process. I started out with analyzing the dimension of continuity in each of the participants' accounts to understand their overall career progression and trajectories with respect to practices in writing and research they adopted along the way. I then grouped the data into two major sections corresponding to the research questions: "pre-professional background to the pursuit of doctoral studies" and "writing and research experiences over the course of the academic career."

I went on to classify the data concerning the former section into two segments with the headings "pre-university to university experiences" and "master's studies and early teaching experiences." After entering relevant quotes, notes, and summaries under each heading in the table, I sought to explore the participants' early language and literacy histories, educational backgrounds, and early teaching experiences before starting their doctoral studies and academic profession. I then considered how these elements are connected with one another and related with past desires and intentions in relation to their career and pursuit of doctoral studies and academic career.

I similarly divided the data concerning "writing and research experiences over the course of the academic career" into two segments, namely, "the early academic career phase" and "the current academic career phase." I assigned the subheadings "writing and research practices and their perceived values," "academic environment," "institutional environment," and "networks" to each segment. The heading "on being a researcher" recorded their comments on being a researcher and their research-related aspirations.

When examining this part of the data in light of the continuity dimension, the main focus was on capturing the overall characteristics of their writing and research experiences

in their evolving career contexts as expressed in their stories. In other words, I analyzed the intellectual strand (McAlpine & Alkerlind, 2010) of the participants' experience of academic work built on their prior life experiences. I entered their accounts on their participation in certain writing and research practices that they chose to discuss as well as the values attached to these practices. I also sought to compare their accounts against their written products and CVs. I took note of their expressed feelings and intentions in relation to their experience with these practices.

My analysis of the interaction and space dimensions of their accounts was mainly directed at understanding how their career contexts evolved and influenced the type and degree of engagement in their writing and research practices, along with the corresponding values assigned to these at each career stage. To record their accounts concerning the space-related institutional strand (McAlpine & Alkerlind, 2010) of their experience, I created the headings "academic environment" and "institutional environment" and included both in the section "early academic career phase", and only "institutional environment" in the section "current academic career phase". I also added the heading "networks" for their accounts related to the aspects of interaction in their experience. I specifically entered their data on the networking strand (McAlpine & Alkerlind, 2010) of their experience, which revolved around their connection with their disciplinary, professional, and institutional networks forged throughout their academic career.

Member Checking

As explained above, member checking, where the researcher invites the participants to assess the findings, is an important process to improve the credibility of qualitative research. It is viewed as important particularly in narrative inquiry. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) emphasized the significance of the collaboration between the researcher and participants in the restorying. However, they also stated that the degree to which the

participants are involved in this process depends on the situation (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). I conducted member check interviews to share with them my drafts of their tentative profiles and the selected translations so that they could understand how I made sense of their stories and then check if my interpretation was correct and convincing to them. I also asked them if I represented them in an ethically sound manner. After I received their feedback, I further re-analyzed their experiences, revised the tentative profiles, and constructed six restored narratives that are presented in Chapters 5 to 10. I then moved on to cross-narrative analysis.

Cross-Narrative Analysis

I conducted the cross-narrative analysis to establish the connection between the individual narratives and themes related to the research questions. The rationale for this approach was articulated by several qualitative researchers, including Gentil (2002, 2005). Stake (1995), a case study researcher, argued that researchers should capitalize not only on "direct interpretation of the individual instance" (p. 74) but also on "aggregation of instances until something that can be said about them as a class" (p. 74) to reach new meanings on instances. Beal (2013), a narrative inquiry researcher, also argued that presenting a group of individual accounts, despite its descriptive potential, is not sufficient, and stressed the importance of illuminating a "more general understanding of the topic under study" (p. 697) . In this study, although I retained the focus on the uniqueness of the participants' subjective experiences at each stage of their lives, I explored shared themes that emerged from their accounts. I firstly read and reread the entire summary profiles to gain tentative observations and then analyzed the similarities and differences in their experiences. I noted the tentative themes and then analyzed these in light of the background assumptions and existing literature, including those cited in the previous chapters. These final versions of the themes, as shown in Table 4 below will be discussed

in Chapter 11.

Table 4.

List of Themes

Pre-Professional Backgrounds to the Pursuit of Doctoral Studies	Pre-University to Undergraduate Experiences
	Being Late Bilinguals: Conscientious Engagement in English Language and Literacy Learning
	Being Early Bilinguals: Conscientious Engagement in Bilingual and Bicultural Development
	Emerging Disciplinary Interests
	English Teaching as a Potential Future Career Option
	Decision to Pursue Master's Studies External Influences Desires to Fulfill Their Learning Needs Professional Considerations
	Master's Studies and Early Teaching Experiences
	Being Trained in America: Engagement in English Language, Literacy, and Disciplinary Learning along with Semi-Professional Teaching
	Being Trained in Japan: Engagement in Disciplinary Learning and Research along with Preliminary Professional Teaching
	Additional Investment in Japan after Finishing a Master's Program
	Emerging Pre-Doctoral Networks
	Increasingly Focused Disciplinary Interests
	Decision to Pursue Doctoral Studies External Influences Career-Oriented Motivation Scholarly-Oriented Motivation Personally-Focused Motivation

Table 4. (Continued)

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career	Writing and Research Experiences in The Early Academic Career Phase	
	Being Trained in Japan: Engagement in Bilingual Writing and Research Practices while Committing to Teaching and Other Works	
	Academic Environments	
	Institutional Environments	Self-directed Apprenticeship
	Networks	Insecure Job Conditions and Increasingly Wide-Ranging Professional Duties Invisible Research Culture and Distant Disciplinary Affiliation
	Writing and Research Practices and Their Perceived Values	Networks based in Japan: Graduate School Peers or Professional and General Academic Communities
	Being Trained in America: Shift from Focused Engagement in English-medium Writing and Research Practices to Increased Emphasis on Teaching	Engagement in an English-medium Dissertation as a Necessary Hurdle Engagement in Various Bilingual Works for Career Advancement and Recognition
	Academic Environments	
	Institutional Environments	Varying Degrees and Patterns of Mentor-led Apprenticeship
	Networks	Insecure Job Conditions and Teaching-Focused Duties Visible Research Culture and Close Disciplinary Affiliation
	Writing and Research Practices and Their Perceived Values	Networks Based in America: Advisors and Graduate School Peers Networks Based in Japan: Long-standing Academic Networks, Current Institutional Colleagues, and Others

Table 4. (Continued)

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career (Continued)	Writing and Research Experiences in The Early Academic Career Phase	
	Being Trained in Japan: Engagement in Bilingual Writing and Research Practices while Committing to Teaching and Other Works	
	Academic Environments	
	Institutional Environments	Self-directed Apprenticeship
	Networks	Insecure Job Conditions and Increasingly Wide-Ranging Professional Duties Invisible Research Culture and Distant Disciplinary Affiliation
	Writing and Research Practices and Their Perceived Values	Networks based in Japan: Graduate School Peers or Professional and General Academic Communities
	Being Trained in America: Shift from Focused Engagement in English-medium Writing and Research Practices to Increased Emphasis on Teaching	Engagement in an English-medium Dissertation as a Necessary Hurdle Engagement in Various Bilingual Works for Career Advancement and Recognition
	Academic Environments	
	Institutional Environments	Varying Degrees and Patterns of Mentor-led Apprenticeship
	Networks	Insecure Job Conditions and Teaching-Focused Duties Visible Research Culture and Close Disciplinary Affiliation
	Writing and Research Practices and Their Perceived Values	Networks Based in America: Advisors and Graduate School Peers Networks Based in Japan: Long-standing Academic Networks, Current Institutional Colleagues, and Others

Table 4. (Continued)

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career (Continued)	Writing and Research Experiences in The Current Academic Career Phase	
	Being Tenured in a National University: Slowly Advancing from Previous Writing and Research Practices while Committing to More Focused Professional Duties	
	Institutional Environments	Secure Job Conditions and Focused Professional Duties Visible Research Culture and Close Disciplinary Affiliation
	Networks	Networks Based in Japan: Institutional Colleagues Networks Emerging Overseas: International Scholars
	Writing and Research Practices and Their Perceived Values	Building on and Adapting Previous Practices for Acknowledgement and Self-Achievement
	Being Tenured in Private Universities: Slowly Advancing from their Previous Writing and Research Practices while Committing to Increased Professional Duties	
	Institutional Environments	Secure Job Conditions and Expanding Professional Duties Implicit Research Culture and Distant Disciplinary Affiliation
	Networks	Networks Based in Japan: Current Institutional Colleagues, Previous Institutional Colleagues, and Long-standing Academic Networks Networks Based in America: Advisors and Graduate School Peers
	Writing and Research Practices and Their Perceived Values	Building on and Adapting Previous Practices for Professional Development and Intellectual Fulfillment
	On Being Researchers	Ambivalence of Being and Becoming a Researcher Personal Constraints Institutional Constraints Network Constraints Willingness to Continue Research

Ethical Considerations

Although the research objectives are positive ones, I am aware of the need to adhere to human subject rules that ensure the privacy, welfare, and confidentiality of

individuals and institutions (Maxwell, 2005). The participants were asked to provide their informed consent on the basis of the following points (Maxwell, 2005):

1. Purpose of the research and manner of data presentation.
2. Principle of voluntary participation.
3. Protection of the anonymity of individuals and sites when reporting the research.
4. Benefits of participation.
5. Expected duration of the research.

In accordance with ethical standards, data collected were kept confidential, and pseudonyms were used in written reports to protect the anonymity of the participants and their institutions.

Caring about the privacy concerns of the participants was critical even while conducting interviews with them. In the interviews, the participants overtly or covertly requested me to remove details of their stories from the data for their sensitive nature. They indicated such intentions by saying such words as "This is just between you and me" (ここだけの話ですけど), "I can't say it openly, but…" (大きな声じゃ言えないんですけれども), "Oh, I didn't mean to say this" (あっ、余計なこと言っちゃった), and "This is off the record" (ここはオフレコでお願いします). Thus, although I transcribed and studied the interviews verbatim at first, I eliminated not only identifying details but also sensitive information based on their stated or implied request and on my own ethical judgment when I constructed restoried profiles.

Moreover, as explained above, the anonymity, ethical adherence, and truthfulness of the reports were evaluated by the participants through the member check interviews. Although all of the participants generally agreed to what was represented in general, there were those who made minor corrections on certain details of their stories. Thus, I incorporated their feedback. I further reduced the use of quotes in light of their comments. With ethical integrity being the priority of the study, specific portrayals and descriptions

were inevitably compromised.

Trustworthiness and Limitations

As simply applying the traditional positivist concepts of validity standards is not sufficient to ensure the quality of qualitative research, qualitative researchers should strive to achieve the trustworthiness of the study in a number of ways (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998). Among a range of recommended strategies, I adopted triangulation (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998), reflexivity (Guillemin & Gilliam, 2004), member checking (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998), and rich description (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998) to make the study as trustworthy as possible.

Triangulation is an approach whereby the researcher uses multiple sources of data and methods to support the findings and improve credibility (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998). Connelly and Clandinin (1990) also encouraged narrative researchers to include sources other than narratives, such as participant-generated and institutional documents (see also Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). As described above, interview data were triangulated with information from the participants' written texts and institutional documents, among others. The interview data were obtained from multiple interviews instead of one-shot interviews to gain an in-depth understanding of the experiences of the participants as well as confirm the consistency and connection between the storied experiences.

Reflexivity is the researcher's "critical reflection of how the researcher constructs knowledge from the research process" (Gullemin & Gilliam, 2004, p. 275), which is another way to ensure credibility. According to Atkinson (2005), as opposed to the positivist "strong science" (p. 51) that assumed "absolute scientific objectivity" (p. 51), qualitative research, including narrative inquiry, as "weak science" (p. 51), should acknowledge its "situatedness and partiality" (p. 51), as "individual researchers are always

already somewhere in particular when doing their research" (p. 51). Given that it is impossible to free the qualitative research from the researcher's own perspectives, the researcher should clarify any potential influences that shaped her construction of knowledge in the process of research, such as her background assumptions, experiences, and worldviews. Thus, I have provided the researcher's background when introducing the personal rationale of the study in Chapter 1 and the researcher's assumptions in Chapter 2. Moreover, in this chapter, I identified the other contextual details that inevitably affected the process and outcomes of the study.

Member checking is an approach to invite participants to confirm and validate the research findings (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998). I solicited the participants' cooperation in assessing my preliminary versions of partial English translations of their interviews in Japanese and their profiles, which I constructed in English based on their interviews.

Rich, thick description is the researcher's effort to provide details of the participants or settings to ensure transferability of the study (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998). In other words, such description can give the reader the chance to see if the findings can be transferrable to other contexts, if not generalizable. The present study sought to achieve rich description of the participants' experiences as well as the research process to the extent possible.

However, despite the above efforts to improve trustworthiness, there were factors that affected the efforts to a certain degree, which may have contributed to the limitations of the study. As explained above, I relied on snowball sampling (Merriam, 1998), resulting in the recruitment of participants with similar backgrounds, who were virtually limited to those afflilated with University A and University N. If I had been able to adopt maximum variation sampling (Creswell, 2013) among a more diverse population of Japanese university English teachers, the results would have captured heightened variations in experiences and perspectives. In addition, as also explained above, my multiple

positionalities in the power dynamics with the participants and with their personal histories and experiences, while beneficial in building rapport with the participants, inevitably influenced the research process and outcomes. Furthermore, there were considerable individual differences in the degree to which the participants related themselves to the research topic. For example, as will be shown in the later chapters, Wataru, who took pride in an extensive publication list and his overall career-building efforts, seemed to have naturally taken research endeavors as integral to his life and kept telling many related episodes, even when not being asked questions by the researcher. In contrast, Koji, whose interest was consistently centered on education rather than research and who had difficulty in consistent engagement in writing and research owing to a range of institutional duties he took on even at his early career stage, was reluctant to imagine himself as a researcher and did not remember much about his writing experiences. This aspect made it challenging to achieve equal depth of description and analyses of their storied experiences. Moreover, I did not conduct focus group interviews (Creswell, 2013) among the participants, or supplementary interviews with their advisors, colleagues, or peers because of feasibility issues. These additional strategies would have strengthened not only the description but also the triangulation of the data. Rich description was further compromised in an effort to protect the anonymity of the participants. Finally, issues of time constraints, particularly on my part, contributed to the prolonged research process after collecting data. Due to my long work hours, it was difficult for me to conduct data processing and analysis in a concentrated, timely manner.

Despite these limitations, I hope the following findings provide a better understanding of the interrelated career and research journeys of Japanese university English teachers, which have been rarely explored.

CHAPTER 5

PARTICIPANT PROFILE 1: WATARU HASHIGUCHI

In this and the following five chapters, the six participants' profiles are presented in order to describe their subjective experiences in writing and research over the course of their careers, as well as their pre-professional backgrounds. The profiles were constructed by means of a *three-dimensional approach* to *restorying*, which Ollerenshow and Creswell (2002) proposed based on Clandinin and Connelly's (2002) notion of the *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space*. In organizing and reducing the data, I used the template shown in Chapter 4 (p. 32), emulating Gentil (2002, 2005). The profiles of Wataru and Shizuka, who work for a national university, are presented in the following two chapters, respectively, followed by those of Koji, Takeshi, Minami, and Sumire, who work at various private universities, as set out in the subsequent four chapters. While three of the participants, Wataru, Shizuka, and Koji, received their doctoral education in Japan, the remaining three, Takeshi, Minami, and Sumire, did so in America. Whereas Minami and Sumire were returnees, the others were non-returnees.

Wataru Hashiguchi is presently an associate professor at a national university. He was consistently a conscientious English learner, not only in his school days, but also in his university years, despite the laid-back atmosphere surrounding him, partly because he was offered an intensive English program with English proficient peers. However, toward the end of his undergraduate program, in the midst of the economic recession, he was unsure what the future might hold, and plunged into a Japanese graduate school without much consideration. His interest in research emerged through his work at the time as a

contractual full-time high school English teacher. In addition, the imminent need to obtain a job in academe upon the end of the contract led him to pursue his doctoral study following a one-year preparation period as a special student.

During his doctoral years, Wataru directed far more energy into writing and publishing as many RAs as possible across languages, mainly for a local audience, aiming to expand his CV for future use, rather than focusing on the dissertation itself. At the same time, he advanced his career as a teacher from a part-time instructor at different universities to a full-time instructor at a private university, where he took on a range of institutional duties in addition to teaching. In the current institutional context, Wataru's main mission remains teaching and administrating the coordinated English language program for first year students of all disciplines. Wataru feels that the amount of time available for research has increased in comparison to his previous institution, but his primary role as an educator makes the relative amount of teaching enormous. Within such constraints, Wataru strives to keep writing and conducting research targeting a range of audiences across institutional and national boundaries, building on his doctoral training years.

Pre-Professional Background to the Pursuit of Doctoral Studies

Pre-University to University Experiences

Born and raised in the suburban Kanto area, Japan, Wataru Hashiguchi was an active boy who enjoyed practicing kendo. As he was primarily absorbed in sports rather than academics, Wataru did not like reading or writing very much. Wataru was not particularly interested in learning English either at first. As he recalled, many of his peers attended cram school as elementary school students to learn English as a subject in preparation for excelling in junior high school; Wataru himself was among the few not

inclined to join them. In junior high, Wataru continued to lead a kendo-centered life to the extent that he planned to seek admission based on sports. Therefore, other than kendo, Wataru did not feel the need to devote his energy to anything else. However, from the second year forward, Wataru remembers that he began to feel a vague sense of societal pressure to learn English. Wataru explained that he consistently heard the buzzword "internationalization" (国際化) frequently at the time, which mildly pressured him to study English.

Due to this pressure, at the end of the second year Wataru accepted an invitation to join another cram school that one of his friends attended, which was led by a junior college professor. Through the detailed tutorials and extensive exercises she provided, Wataru was able to build confidence in his knowledge of basic English grammar, which was the school's major subject focus.

With his well-balanced performance in academics and extra-curricular activities, Wataru chose to attend a high school with a special emphasis on English education based on recommendations. The number of the English classes offered appeared to be greater than those offered at regular high schools. With a predominantly female student population, Wataru felt that the entire school atmosphere was quite relaxed, with no explicit impetus for competition and hard work. However, he remained motivated to work hard throughout, especially in English.

This was in part because Wataru had an opportunity to participate in a one-month study abroad program in Australia with dozens of other volunteer first year students. Wataru still vividly recalls the day of their arrival. Wataru had trouble explaining the presence of vitamin pills that he happened to have in his jacket pockets. The inspector questioned him regarding the pills, and Wataru responded using the improper words, "I have a drug." Naturally, Wataru was detained for further inspection, and thus it took him longer to get past the gate. Overall, Wataru enjoyed the opportunity to put the English he

had learned to practical use during this homestay-based program, yet it was this first issue in which he had difficulty in explaining himself that further motivated him to learn English.

Throughout his junior high school years, Wataru's academic interests were strictly focused on English and he never considered other majors when he applied to the university: "English was pretty much the only choice that I had" (もう英語しかなかったのでもうねえ). Based on his interest in English, coupled with his dream of an urban life, Wataru proceeded to attend a private university in Tokyo.

According to Wataru, the university, like the many other Japanese universities at the time, was filled with a laid back atmosphere in which the students' main focus was club activities and get-togethers. Wataru also followed this trend, and became deeply involved in the activities of the tennis club which he co-founded with his friends. Nevertheless, his interest in English remained consistent.

While modest, the university's intensive English program offered Wataru a more extensive exposure to authentic English taught by English-speaking instructors than he had previously had. Wataru found it particularly stimulating to work for the first time with returnees who spoke English quite fluently. Wataru still remembers how overwhelmed he felt at first by such students while attending English classes taught by an English-speaking instructor:

> Of course, I was able to do reasonable well on the 'English for the entrance exam,' but when I was in high school, I had little opportunity to interact with [English speaking] foreigners, except during the short homestay in the first year and weekly conversations with Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs). Therefore, the gap that I felt [in that environment as compared to that in high school] was huge. You know, when practicing discussions, I could not say a word. While working with these students rattling on in English to me, I always stammered and was wondering, like,

‘Uhh, how do I say [such and such] in English?

多少そのね、受験勉強はできますよそれは。でも話すなんて機会はそんなにないわけですよね。で海外行ったのは高校一年生の時の一ヶ月だけなのでそれ以外外国の人に触れるっていったら一週間にいっぺん高校にいる ALT　と話すくらいですからね。だから行ったときはすごいギャップを感じましたよね。ディスカッションの練習だとかいって、何も言えないわけですよ。ただこうね、まくしたてられて言われて、ええとーみたいな、なんて英語で言うんだろう、みたいな。

What encouraged Wataru was learning that he was better in statistics than the students in another class, which helped him to overcome the sense of inadequacy relative to them in the English classes. As he discovered that they did not know formulas generally taught in Japanese high schools, Wataru came to accept that English fluency was not always equated with academic excellence. This motivated him to work harder at his own pace, and thus Wataru’s development of English was evident in his continual effort. He was able to have discussions using supporting ideas and write short term papers.

Another significant literacy experience that Wataru underwent at this stage was his encounter with the discipline of applied linguistics as his concentration; His selection of this concentration was unplanned, as the choice was limited to a few disciplines. However, the Western-educated applied linguist who happened to be his advisor was knowledgeable in the field’s comprehensive list of basic introductory texts. This provided Wataru with a general knowledge of the discipline while he worked on a graduate thesis, even though he wrote the thesis in Japanese. On the other hand, he was not clear about his career directions. Although he obtained a teacher certificate as everyone else in his major did, Wataru was not particularly interested in becoming a teacher.

Despite his interest in English, Wataru’s choice to attend the master’s program in the Kansai area did not come as a decision. Observing his English proficient peers’ job hunting struggles in the midst of an unprecedented recession, Wataru almost lost hope in his professional future:

Friends of mine were reasonably good at English. Yet when I asked where they got hired, they answered that they ended up going to such companies as Yoshinoya (a fast food chain) and consumer finance companies that we saw in TV commercials. When I learned that even such excellent guys were barely hired for those kinds of jobs, I completely gave up on everything. I even envisioned myself getting hired as contractual staff for the restaurant I was working for part time. There was no hope at all.

友達は英語はみんなできるんですよ、そこそこね。でその子たちがどこ就職したのかって聞いたら、吉野家とかサラ金のなんとかっていうテレビでコマーシャルしてるようなとことか聞いてても、そんな優秀な子でそういうとこだろう、と思って、けっこうもう、無理だなあ、と思って。なんかもう完全に投げてて。で当時バイトをしていたレストランとかそういうところに、契約とかでなるのかなあとかって思って、もはやもう、だから希望はなかったですよね。

Thus, Wataru decided to focus only on completing the rest of the course work so that he could graduate anyway, and tentatively opted to go to a graduate school upon his instructor's recommendation. Considering his knowledge base in applied linguistics, Wataru applied to a newly established master's program in language education for language teaching professionals.

Master's Studies and Early Teaching Experiences

Wataru's major experiences during his master's studies revolved around his first professional training as a full-time contractual English teacher at a high school. As a non-teaching student at the beginning, Wataru wondered what he would focus on during the day while taking classes in the evening with employed teachers. He was inspired by the kind advice of one of his professors to apply for the above-mentioned position in order to accumulate hands-on teaching experience. Following this advice, Wataru successfully passed the examination and obtained the position. His duties involved not only teaching

but also engaging in a range of non-teaching works including overseeing students' club activities. During those two years, Wataru not only established his foundation as a teacher, but also discovered the basic thematic interests that later became one of his central research focuses.While he developed his professional skills, Wataru had the opportunity to gain insights into some aspects of students' learning needs. Wataru's academic interests in the area further grew in tandem with his professional experiences. On the other hand, his investment in teaching did not leave Wataru sufficient time to study this theme:

> After teaching [full time] during the day and taking various courses, all while resisting drowsiness, I would often think that I was interested in this and that, and wanted to read books on [these subjects], but there was no such time.
>
> もう昼間教えて夜帰ってきて、眠い中いろいろ授業受けてて、なんかこういうことも興味あるし、こういう本も読みたいけども、そんな時間ないんですよね。

Even after Wataru completed a master's thesis on the related theme for the first time in English, based on the data he collected at the high school for which he worked, Wataru still felt a further need to investigate the theme.

Wataru pursued his doctoral studies in Japan with a clear goal of becoming qualified as a language professional at the tertiary level and due to financial considerations. His determination came after careful contemplation of the continually grave job prospects in the field of English education in general. As he simultaneously completed the master's program and his contract with the high school ended, Wataru remained indecisive about his professional future. The high school teaching job market appeared highly competitive, even for master's professional applicants like Wataru. He then considered studying abroad to prepare for an academic position at a university. However, Wataru's observation of his seniors at the graduate school returning from abroad forced him to reconsider this option. At the time, Wataru critically questioned the cost-effectiveness of the doctoral studies abroad. He learned from those over 30 who had attended school overseas that there were

only a couple of part-time positions available to them after they returned to Japan with a doctoral degree following at least six years of intensive study. Wataru was also aware that he would need extra preparation time if he were to seek a doctoral degree abroad. As a mature student nearing the age 30, he made a final calculated decision to invest the savings he earned from teaching thus far into studying at University A's graduate school, the academic reputation of which was known among teachers in Japan.

To properly prepare for the doctoral studies, Wataru chose to start by enrolling in the graduate school as a "special student," a unique status that allows him take whatever master's courses offered on campus in pursuit of his area of interest. Wataru's decision to devote his energy to studying for his academic career was resolute:

> I thought, if I screwed up here, you know, there would probably be no other chance for me to get any job, so I really restricted my potential [to an academic career]. At this time I realized this is the only thing that I should focus on.
>
> ここでつぶれたらもうたぶん、ほんとに、ねえ、何に就職するんだろうっていうのがあったので、少し自分のこう、可能性をぎゅーっとせばめて、これしかないなって思った時代ですね。

Wataru's year as a special student at University A was a crucial preparation period for his following doctoral studies. As there was no set quota in the number of the courses, he decided to attend a range of disciplinary courses in the master's program, as he believed they would help prepare for him for his career at the university. As many of the courses were taught in English, Wataru found himself greatly improving his English skills while building his knowledge base in his field of interest. Wataru explained a range of self-learning endeavors:

> When I attended a psychology course taught by an English-speaking professor, I was trained quite hard [in the language], as I had to say everything in English as there were (Japanese) returnees and international students in the class. To learn what conversational expressions to use for questions or statements [to properly prepare for

the class discussion], I would deliberately watch videos on campus life. I also secretly dictated the expressions that my classmates used in their remarks and later practiced them orally. Plus, there were a bunch of required readings [to work on]. There were a lot of assignments that required readings, which was the toughest part.

ネイティブの先生の授業だったりすると、ねえ、当時でも帰国子女の子とか、留学生も入ってたんで、英語で言わなきゃいけないから、かなり鍛えられましたよね。で、こういろいろとわざと学園もののビデオ見ながらとかね、どういう英会話表現使って質問したり、言ってんのか、あるいはほかの子たちが、ねえ、発言したりしたときの表現とかこそこそっと書いたりして。で発音練習したりとか、ね、やってましたからね。あとそれプラスリーディングですよね。宿題がいっぱい出るから読まなきゃいけないし。それが一番ですかね。

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career

Writing and Research Experiences in the Early Academic Career Phase

Wataru remembers that the graduate program at University A expected students to work independently, although it provided a range of courses from which students could freely choose. Without any particular publication requirement, there was no visibly established writing or research culture or related apprenticeship. Each student pursued his or her own writing career, depending on his or her individual professional and academic goals.

In that context, albeit only for a limited period, Wataru initiated an informal interdisciplinary study group with one of his linguistics professors, who emphasized the importance of engaging in writing early in a graduate career. Regular paper presentation sessions with the group members helped stimulate mainly his fellow doctoral students, including his friend, Seishiro, who aspired for academic careers at university. However, in general, Wataru's writing career, including his dissertation writing, was an independent effort, rather than part of the socialization process initiated by the professors. In the time

between his special student status and his early doctoral years Wataru taught a couple of days per week at universities as a part-time instructor, while placing a basic priority on writing and research.

Wataru's years as a special student also brought him a clear sense of purpose as to what to focus on in the doctoral program. After building a knowledge base, Wataru began to explore strategies for securing a future academic career with his similarly academic-oriented friend, Seishiro, a master's student in educational science. Their discussions led them to decide on a simple path, writing:

> The course of our conversations reached conclusions, like, 'In order to obtain a position [at a university] after finishing the graduate school, we should write RAs.' So we decided to focus on writing articles and presenting them at various conferences.
>
> あのこのまま就職するにはどうしたらいいかっていったら研究論文書かなきゃだめだよなとかっていう話になって、だから博士課程入ってからもう、あれですね、論文を書くことに専念して、いろんな学会で発表したりしようと。

In setting goals for his productivity, Wataru regularly performed an on-line search of Japanese university English teachers' publication lists posted on the various universities' websites. He would look at the CVs of faculty who taught in English and specialized in applied linguistics, and then he would roughly estimate the minimal number of publications. He would look at their CVs also to find where to give presentations. Following their practices, he started to give presentations at various places, almost at his own expense. He also had a chance to look at a mainstream scholars' publication list and was surprised at its length. This heightened his motivation to write more. Further, Wataru also pushed himself to meet the publication quota he decided on with Seishiro:

> We aimed at putting together one paper after each of our several oral presentations. So, we agreed, 'Let's reach two digits of publications annually,' meaning that we

decided to list up to ten articles at least, combined with conference presentations and actual writings.

口頭発表数回やったらそれをまとめて論文にするとかっていう目標で、はい。年間、だから二人で決めてたのは年間二けたいこうぜ、みたいななんかその、十個は、うん、口頭発表と論文併せて十本くらいいくことを目安にやろうぜみたいな感じでやったので。

Based on his healthy rivalry with Seishiro, Wataru enjoyed the effort to expand his publication list. When they discovered their articles cited in a national journal for the first time, they would go out for a drink to celebrate their success.

Given his specialty in applied linguistics, Wataru strived to deliver as many presentations as possible primarily in English, for various conferences, and then to write papers based on them. The topics for his writing were not limited to his research areas, but spanned a broad array of related sub-areas in the field. The writings were geared to both practitioners and scholars. The major genres of his English publications were thus peer-reviewed conference proceedings and local English language journals. In his general approach to writing, Wataru sought to emulate experts' writing styles at both the global and local levels. He read various articles after which he would model, and grasped the generic organization of an RA. He also learned a range of expressions often used in specific sections of an article. He strived to apply these organizational and linguistic models. When he felt compelled to polish his writing in response to the reviewer's comments, however, he had only limited opportunities gather feedback from his advisor, professors, or English-speaking peers. Thus, he continued with his own efforts to overcome the problems.

From a certain point of the time, Wataru also started to write for Japanese journals that required relatively shorter writing times and review periods in order to expedite the expansion of his publication list. When asked if he valued Japanese language journals equally with English speaking journals, Wataru responded:

When you look at your CV, if your publication list is too short, the impression it

leaves is going to be somewhat mediocre. [In other words], it would be fine [to have Japanese publications] as long as the list is long anyway. I thought it would be alright, as long as the list included many English articles published in respectable journals.

まず業績を見たときに、ラインが少なかったらやっぱりあれですよね、印象としてとにかくたくさんあれば、いいわけで。そんなかで英語で書かれたのがいくつもあって、でちゃんとしてたとこに出してるのがあればいいかなと思って。

However, Wataru also admitted that it was more difficult to write in Japanese than he had expected:

I realized I did not actually know as much Japanese. I thought I could write an article in Japanese as well, given that I could write one in English, yet I realized that it was harder than writing in English.

日本語意外と知らないなってことに気づくんですね。あの英語で書けるんだから日本語でも書けるだろうと思うと実際日本語で論文書くとこれは英語で書くよりも意外と大変だなっていうのに気づきますね。

After having conducted and published many related studies in earlier years, Wataru did not see his dissertation project as a special, independent study. He did have a plan for the core research that he wished to include in the dissertation, but it was not exclusively distinct from his earlier studies at that point. Thus, he was not interested in the traditional image of a dissertation as a coherent academic book shared by the institution, as well as by many of the HSS fields, including applied linguistics. He differentiated himself from his peers who were attempting to make their dissertations a single masterpiece, as he thought it was just a means towards his career advancement:

I thought it would be enough as long as I could make the dissertation convincing to my advisor and get a Ph.D. [as a result]. I did not have a strong feeling about it [as a single volume].

先生がわかってくれてドクターがもらえればいいって思ってたんで。あまりドクター論文にこう執着がなくて。

Wataru believed an article-based dissertation as often adopted by the natural science disciplines better suited him. He primarily planned to create his dissertation by following the practices he observed used by educational scientists at prestigious national universities. He said:

> Like the practices that people at other universities, like University N and S (prestigious research universities in Japan) follow, [I believed that] a doctoral thesis, in principle, is supposed to be a composite of three or four published peer-reviewed journal articles, rather than one complete volume. So, I did not have an idea of creating one coherent doctoral thesis.
>
> 他大学のたとえば N 大にしろ、S 大にしろそうなんですけれども、ドクター論文っていうのは基本的にドクター論文っていうものがあるんではなくて、こういうジャーナルに、三本四本のったやつの集合体がドクター論文みたいなところがあるので、だからドクター論文ひとつとしてつくるっていうイメージが僕のなかにはなかったので。

In the midst of his doctoral career, Wataru, experienced a tension between his institutional duties and his research endeavor. After he obtained his Ph.D. candidacy, Wataru was able to begin a full-time lecturer position at a private university. While the teaching load was not as heavy, the administrative duties involving student support services and the departmental tasks were immense at the university. His knowledge base worked perfectly for this situation, but as he was overwhelmed with non-academic duties and focused on his future, the desire to maintain his scholarly effort also became stronger. Within time constraints, Wataru continued to write extensively in order to “maintain[his] identity” (自分のアイデンティティを保つため) [as a researcher] while preparing to complete his dissertation.

In preparation for writing this article as well as other related pieces, Wataru

extensively read over 20 years' worth of applied linguistics and related articles from major international journals in which his topic was covered; his goal was to explore potential theories and methodologies that he may have been able to incorporate into his university context. Through the review of the literature and discussions with his friends, Wataru decided to use a new concept that had just emerged in the field, which was well-integrated with his concerns. In addition, Wataru used supplementary reading to independently further his knowledge of advanced statistical data analyses.

Further, Wataru also used a range of prestigious Japanese language journals, particularly Journal A, the most famous one in his research area as references to explain the context of his study. He stated:

> Of course, the number of Japanese professors who publish in English has increased today, and so it has become much easier to refer to [English language articles on] significant research conducted by Japanese participants. At that time, many [Japan-focused] studies in this area were written in Japanese, mainly by Japanese scholars at University N and their associates in this journal (Journal A), so I definitely needed to quote them.
>
> 今でこそね、あの英語で論文を発表される先生も増えてきたので、だいぶ日本人を被験者とした、しかもあの結構意義のある研究ってのは増えてきたので、リファーやすいんですけども、[当時] あのとくにこの分野だったらあの N 大の先生たちとかそこの手下たちが書いたような論文っていうのはほとんど日本語で、この雑誌に書かれたりすることが多かったので、どうしてもそれ引用するためにはっていうのがあったので。

Most of his non-teaching hours were spent reviewing literature, analyzing data, and writing. In addition, it was important for Wataru to publish his core research during his dissertation writing as a means of validating his own expertise to his advisor, an English speaking mainstream scholar who was a not an expert in Wataru's area of specialty:

The professor seemed to find it difficult to understand the idea, and wanted to know

whether my idea was valid, so it occurred to me that writing it [an article] in Japanese first, and then getting it published in the most prestigious one (Journal A) in the field would solve the problem.

先生がなかなか理解してくれなかったので、とにかくこれ、この考えがあってるのかどうかを知りたいっていうことがあったので。じゃあまず日本語で書いて、そのなかでまさに最高峰の、それを専門としているところに自分のアイデアが通るならば問題ないだろうと思って。

Despite his prior experience in publishing Japanese articles, the piece for Journal A was particularly difficult to Wataru. His first draft was rejected with harsh comments made by the reviewer. The comments reflected the viewpoint of national scholars in his research area, rather than applied linguists, and pointed to multiple areas ranging from methodological underpinnings and the data analyses quality, to the very expressions he used in Japanese. He turned his frustration in the condescending comments such as, “This is not even an article!”(こんなん論文じゃない！) into constructive revisions and corrections, and incorporated all of the feedback in his quest to gain acceptance for his argument. His six-month devotion to completing the revisions resulted in his second version being positively accepted:

I received various comments from the reviewers saying that [the research] was good, so I thought, ‘Ok, my idea was not wrong, not theoretically incorrect at all, given the article is being published in it (the journal).’ This gave me confidence, you know. What I wanted to pursue was accepted [by the experts].

いろいろ査読者から、評価が、いいってふうなことが書かれてたので、ああアイデアとしては間違ってないな、そこに載っかったっていうことは、ぜんぜん、その理論的にもおかしくないし。と思ってそれで自信がついたっていうのありますよね。自分のやりたいなって思ったことがちゃんとね。

Wataru believes that the very fact that his article was published in Journal A, he was able to convince the advisor of his argument. He also believes that the publication of the article in the journal had a more realistic impact on his reputation and career advancement

than the dissertation itself. He proudly said: “To be honest, thanks to my article getting published in the journal, I became recognized by various professors” (これに載ったおかげでいろんな先生に知られたっていうのが実はあるんです).

Writing and Research Experiences in the Current Academic Career Phase

Wataru has been working for national university, University H, for four years, where his main mission is teaching and administering the coordinated English language program for first year students from all disciplines. The number of class meetings is between six and seven, which is relatively small as compared to that of part-time teachers that he oversees. However, with a vast number of students enrolled in the program, of which he is responsible for many of them annually, he is required to spend considerable time in preparing for classes and conducting tutorials. He also assumes the departmental duties including coordinating the program at the institution and the affiliated short-term programs abroad that are offered during breaks.

Wataru explained that time constraints often limited his time for research in the current institutional context. During the semester, he cannot concentrate on his research, as he focuses primarily on classroom matters, including teaching, marking, preparing homework assignments, and uploading them onto the online courseware. He can work on his articles only during the break.

When explaining his current writing and research practices, Wataru expressed his teaching not only something at odds with but also as in line with his research. In other words, Wataru seems to believe that he needs to write a research in the capacity of a teacher as well, in pursuit of gaining recognition in his institutional and local professional communities.

However, there seems to be some elements that facilitate Wataru’s writing and research engagements in the context. The university’s faculty development policy clearly

advises faculty to report their prospective ratios of teaching, research, administration, and social contribution to the department. This helps faculty, including Wataru, to set balanced professional goals. Although his institutional mission largely pertains to education and he does not feel institutional pressure toward research, Wataru believes that "education and research are equally important" (教育と研究は等価), and strives to keep writing and researching, while targeting various audiences across the institutional and national boundaries. Wataru also benefits from working with his colleagues most of whom share the same disciplinary backgrounds with him.

Specifically, Wataru explained to me his effort to regularly write in-house journal articles to inform to the entire faculty of the record of his educational contributions. Wataru rationalizes that in-house journal articles function as reference sources for the whole faculty to consider the educational endeavor of the university. According to him, this kind of outlet allows him to be accountable for the principled activities that his department is offering, and thereby maintain and strengthen "the validity of its presence" (存在意義). In this regard, Wataru wishes to update it at least once a year if possible. Describing typical writing in this outlet he states:

> This kind of report is a quite miscellaneous stuff (genre). Still I should try to write it in a well-organized article form that is understandable to the audience [at the university]. For example, I write reports such as, 'this effort made in this and this classes led to these changes, so we want to improve these aspects and try these approaches [from the next time on].
>
> 報告書っていうのはもうほんとに、雑多なあれですけども、いちおう論文のような、きちっと人が見たときにわかりやすいかたちでまとめて、こういう取組をこのクラスとこのクラスとこのクラスでしたら、こういうことになりました。次回からこう改善したいとか。で、こう取り組みをしたいとか。

Wataru writes this kind of reports mainly in Japanese, except when he was coauthoring with English speaking colleagues. Further, Wataru finds it important to present

his educational contributions to a broader community of university English teaching professionals in Japan, in order to “modestly” (うっすらと) demonstrate his presence in the field.

At the same time, Wataru has continued to actively research in the area of his expertise, building upon the knowledge he developed during his core dissertation project. The availability of a larger number of students at the university as well as its affiliated national universities allows him to collect more statistically powerful data. He often leads collaborative studies with his colleagues as well as through a network of scholars that formed during his graduate years, including Seishiro. Whenever he coauthors a paper with other professors, Wataru often serves as the first author and writes the basic manuscripts; he then invites the rest of the coauthors to provide feedback on the manuscripts from their expert viewpoints.

As an example of his effort in this direction, Wataru shared with me a recently published peer reviewed international journal he coauthored with the colleagues. In the process of publication, he has found that the research orientation that he originally pursued for the representative work in Journal A in his specialism is not always suitable for other journals. He and colleagues submitted one of their coauthored English language articles for a peer reviewed English-medium journal and faced multiple rejections. As a solution, Wataru and his colleagues decided to simplify the analysis for a wider audience, and changed the target journal to another international peer-reviewed journal of which the reviewer board consisted of famous experts in the field that he recognized. This eventual publication success led Wataru to become more conscious of the need to choose the appropriate target journal.

Wataru also attempts to be active as in the mainstream context, too. Wataru attends mainstream conferences in his field at least annually “to keep abreast of the most current research trends” (研究の最新情報を知るため). At such conferences he has come in contact with

mainstream scholars, though not always intentionally. Wataru stated that he once happened to be a chair of a conference attended by a famous scholar and helped her with an equipment issue, without realizing that she was one of the authorities that he frequently referred to in his articles. When he came back from Japan and verified her name, Wataru regretted that he had failed to exchange contact information with her. Wataru believes that it is hard to forge and maintain contacts with such scholars. However, part of the informal network he formed has led to a new collaborative writing project on which he has been working.

While maintaining his interests in his original research focus, Wataru has also initiated his efforts to contribute more practically to Japanese society at large. His constant approach to observing other professors' research activities inspired him to move in this new direction. For example, Wataru is currently working to enhance some aspects of English education in settings beyond the confines of the tertiary classroom. He offered an alternative evaluation of the aforementioned representative work of which he was proud and demonstrates his passion in his new strand of research:

> I guess I get stressed out if I do this type of [pure, scholarly] study only. I wouldn't feel right if I continued to write this kind of [specialist] articles only and indulge in self-satisfaction. Looking at various researchers' home pages, hearing about what they do, and then learning about how much they contribute, I have become compelled to make that kind of contribution. But then, I cannot do something immediately, so I take a step-by-step approach. You know, I guess this sort of project needs to be done carefully. Hasty attempts won't be any good to anybody. Therefore, I am going to do it slowly and steadily.
>
> たぶんこれだけやったらストレスになるのかな、逆にね。こういう論文ばっかり書いてて、自己満足だけだとたぶん違うなあと思う。実際いろんな研究者の人たちのホームページとか、あるいはやってる人たちのこう、見聞きして、役に立ってることしてるなこの人は、とかって思うと自分もなんかそういう

のに貢献したいと。だからといって何かすぐにできるってわけではないからまあ徐々に？丁寧にやらないとそういうのってたぶん、ねえ、付け焼刃で何かやったところで人の役には立たないっていうのはあるんで、ゆっくりやるっていうところですかね。

As a researcher, Wataru currently views himself as one constantly gauging the balance between teaching, research, and social contribution. He differentiates his current practices with increasing focus on education and socially-oriented projects from those of his friends with whom he used to align himself and whose projects are more scholarly oriented:

> I am not making an assumption here, but I imagine that other scholars may aim higher, stop devoting to education at the reasonable level, and write more articles and aim higher [as researchers]. Also I am often told by my friends, 'Why did you start out that kind of research [the aforementioned project]'.
>
> まあたぶんほかの人だったら、なんか想定するわけではないんですけども、もっとたぶん教育なんかある程度のところで手をとめてたくさん論文書いて、高みをこう行ってしまおうってやるのかなあとは思いますね。なんでまたそんなのやりだしたんとかいうふうに友達から言われたりするので。

Wataru understands their claims, but he finds himself "wanting to contribute more to society" (もうちょっと社会貢献したい) , and thus would like to have time for that, too. However, Wataru would not be satisfied with just working hard on teaching and social contributions at a given institution, and not writing any RAs. "I am kind of betwixt and between. It's difficult to strike that balance [between teaching, research, and social contribution]" (中途半端っちゃ中途半端ですけどね。難しいですねそこらへんのバランスが).

In his career thus far, Wataru has gained a degree of confidence in his written contribution. He does not feel the need to expand the publication list very much, now that he has many articles written in English and a couple of representative articles referred to by other scholars. As a way of checking out his "impact factor," he occasionally checks who cites his Japanese articles. He finds it pleasurable when he finds his pieces included in

their references.

In the long term, Wataru aspires to contribute his local knowledge more to a community of mainstream international experts. However, Wataru referred back to his heavy work load as a teacher preventing him from writing as extensively and expertly as his prolific mainstream counterparts in the field who often appear in the top-tier journals. Wataru therefore said:

> [Given this situation], what I currently desire is at least being able to publish articles once every several years that are impactful enough to make those scholars [at the mainstream institutions known as the 'center' of scholarship] feel like working with me, or at least acknowledge, 'Oh there is a guy named Hashiguchi.'
>
> そういうところ(自分の分野で主流の大学)で働いてる先生からこう、あのたまにね、一緒に研究してくれ、とか言われるぐらいな影響を持つ論文を四、五年に一本出して、あ、橋口っていうのがいるな、って知ってもらえるように、なれればいいかなあ、っていうくらいですかね、今。

In an effort to publish in prestigious journals, Wataru finds it challenging to describe the context of the study due to the ongoing dearth of English language RAs based in Japan.

> So, in the first place, I need to write an article that offers details on Japanese educational context. That's the thing! I would be able to skip that part, if more and more articles on Japanese situations were published in the field.
>
> だからまず日本の状況ってのを説明を丁寧に書いた論文を書かなきゃいけないから。そこがね！日本の状況を書いた論文がどんどん増えてくればたぶんそのへんは端折れるようにはなってくるとは思うんですけどね。

Wataru's inner aspiration to write for a global audience is also strengthened in part by the external pressure from his Western-educated counterparts in the field, including Japanese, who often he encounters at international conferences**.** Some of his rivals are from Asia, which has become as increasingly prolific and visible in the field: "When I go to conferences in America and see many scholars with Chinese or Korean backgrounds, who

are coauthoring with mainstream scholars, I feel defeated" (学会に行くと中国系の人とかね韓国系の人とか結構多くて、そういう人たちがそのね、その有名な先生と共著になっていたりするとこ見ると、あ、負けてるな、と思うんで). The other source of pressure comes from scholars with Japanese origins who were trained at the mainstream institutions: "Also, I am pressured by the younger generation …. I don't like to be defeated by the young [Japanese] scholars returning from [graduate school] overseas, who are fluent in English and have a reasonable number of publications. (あとは下からの突き上げっていうかね… 。若い子で、海外から帰ってきて英語ペラペラで、論文もそこそこ持ってたりしてる子に、負けたらやだな、と思ってね) . Driven by both intrinsic and extrinsic pressures to write and research, and negotiating the pressures with his institutional duties as an educator, Wataru is poised to thrive as a researcher at his own pace.

CHAPTER 6

PARTICIPANT PROFILE 2: SHIZUKA TAKEUCHI

As in the case of Wataru, Shizuka Takeuchi is currently an associate professor at a national university. Young Shizuka had a natural inclination towards writing in Japanese. At the same time, she developed fascination with the English speaking world portrayed in movies. While she envisioned going abroad since her early teenage years in the future, Shizuka focused mainly on studying English as a subject during her junior and senior school years, which formed the basis of her self-esteem as a hard worker. She also enjoyed writing in Japanese. After temporary disillusionment by the lack of intellectual stimulation at the university in which she was enrolled, Shizuka regained her self-esteem by improving her English skills, firstly through self-study and by attending conversational school, and ultimately by independently pursuing study abroad opportunities. Her evolving love for English eventually led her to engage in teaching at a conversational school in Japan, which in turn led to her decision to proceed to a master's program in America to study English further and accumulate professional expertise. However, while she valued academic literacy skills and developed an interest in a specific research area during the master's study, her decision to pursue her doctoral study in Japan resulted mainly from peer pressure and financial considerations.

Shizuka divided her doctoral and post-doctoral life between extensive teaching and professional duties, her dissertation project, and her effort to publish whatever she could regardless of language or genre, drawing on a range of networks in Japan, within extreme time constraints. During these years, like Wataru, she sought to advance her career

from a part-time teacher at various universities to a full-time instructor at a university at which she took on a range of administrative work. While she is proud of the co-authored works she produced at the time, Shizuka would now prefer to focus on pursuing what she is truly interested in with the support of new networks available in her current institution. Although she is not ambitious about contributing to the international research community, Shizuka wishes to make her work public by the end of her career.

Pre-Professoinal Background to the Pursuit of Doctoral Studies

Pre-University to University Experiences

Shizuka, born in a small city in a regional part of Kansai, she attended school with the same community of students from kindergarten through secondary school, and thus did not experience much competition. Young Shizuka had a natural inclination toward writing in Japanese. She described her engagement with Japanese writing while in primary school:

> When journals were assigned during summer break, for example, I made it a rule to write a lot anyway. I guess I wanted to be praised (laughs), so I remember that I just wrote a great deal (laughs). I also wrote a novel-like book on my own.
>
> 夏休みの日記とかをなんかとにかくたくさん書くみたいなのがなんか、自分のなかであって、なんかたぶん書いてほめられたいっていうのがあったと思うんだけど（笑）。すっごい量だけ。めちゃくちゃ書いたのは（笑）、覚えてます。あとなんか自分でちょっと小説じゃないですけど、本書いたりとか。

In junior high school, Shizuka discovered that her writing skills surpassed those of her mother, and with these skills, she regularly accepted various extra-curricular writing assignments that represented her class: “You know, there were typical classroom writing projects every after the school event. I was often one of those in charge of writing them” (学校でなんかあるときちょっといろいろ書くのとかありますよね。ああいうのを書く担当とかよくやってま

した).

On the other hand, Shizuka's fascination towards English as well as towards the English speaking world developed mainly after junior high school, which led her to dream of studying abroad. Her exposure to English was primarily limited to classroom grammar-based instruction at junior high school. However, beginning her teen years, Shizuka became an avid lover of American movies and music, and started to dream of living in an English-speaking country. Her adoration of the film world even led Shizuka to write fan letters to one of the famous film stars of the time, Jon Lone. Following a template she studied in a movie magazine, Shizuka was able to write the letters using her new English skills and was overjoyed when she received a reply.

In pursuit of the dream of immersing herself in the English-speaking world, Shizuka began to envision attending an American high school; nevertheless, her parents refused to accept her intention out of fear due to the shooting death of a Japanese exchange student. Shizuka reluctantly agreed to her mother and opted to attend a Japanese high school affiliated with a university, while continuing to keep her dream alive.

Apart from the desire to study abroad in the future, Shizuka was still unclear of her immediate goals during high school. One imminent plan that Shizuka had in mind starting her second year was to be successfully accepted into the university, without experiencing the excessive pressure that she would face from the prospective entrance examinations. Thus, Shizuka always strived to work hard in order to maintain grades high enough for her to be eligible for a recommendation to any of the affiliated universities. Despite her prior attempts to write a fan letter in English and authentic English, the exam-laden high school life naturally drew her to focus on the language as a school subject in order to increase her grade point average:

> I would not say that I was extremely studious, but I regularly studied very hard for midterms and finals in preparation for entrance exams. Above all, I particularly loved

and was good at English, as well as Japanese history. I was one of the typical ‘arts and humanity’ students who was fond of memorizing and focusing on these subjects.

すごく勉強したっていう感じではないんですけど、ただなんか受験に関しては日々のそういう中間とか期末とかは結構勉強しました。なかでもやっぱり英語が好きで、英語とあと日本史がすごく得意だったので、どっちかっていうとほんとにばりばり「文系」っていうか、覚えたりとか、そういうのはすごい好きで、結構勉強してましたね。

Shizuka soon became well qualified as a special applicant ready to be recommended to one of the few affiliated universities in a department predetermined by the high school. Among her limited options, Shizuka decided to join the university’s social science department, primarily because it was in Tokyo, a city that she had adored, and the major appeared to be “good for job hunting” (就職いい). Shizuka presently believes that her choice back then was quite casual, and in part stems from the lack of advice from the school and her parents regarding her future visions.

At first, Shizuka was excited with the campus life in Tokyo. However, she soon noticed that she was not particularly interested in the subjects taught in her major, and was disappointed by the lack of intellectual stimulation permeating the university.

With decreasing chances for her to work hard like she did in high school, Shizuka found her self-esteem declining:

I did not find my life meaningful enough. I really felt like it was waste of time. Back in high school, I was always diligently studying, praised as a relatively ‘hard working’ student. Once I entered the university, I wondered for the first time if I could go on in this way. I thought I had to work harder (laughs).

やっぱりやりがいがないっていうか、 無駄に時間を過ごしてるんじゃないかっていうのをすごく[感じました] 。で、高校のときとかわりとこうこつこつやっていたというか、どっちかっていったらよく「頑張り屋さん」って言われてやってきたのに、大学に入ってはじめてこう、これでいいのかなっていうのを思って。もうちょっと頑張らなきゃいけないなって（笑)。

Particularly worrisome was her perceived loss of English knowledge, the foundation of “hard-working” (頑張り屋さん) Shizuka. At the university, there were only limited exposures to authentic English for non-foreign language major students, other than the short texts that she read and translated once or twice a week as part of her core required English class. It was in the classroom that Shizuka first noticed the occasional warning signs that she was losing her English grammar skills. To regain her grammatical knowledge, Shizuka constantly visited the library and procured time to solve a number of questions contained in test-taking textbooks in preparation for the EIKEN (Test in Practical English Proficiency).

Once she started reviewing her grammar and preparing for the listening and speaking sections of the exam, Shizuka gradually grew aware of the need to refresh her English for more practical purposes. This self-awareness was again accidentally sharply boosted in the classroom context. When she read an English passage aloud in class, one of her friends needled her about her accent. This incidence made her realize that she should pay more attention to phonetic aspects of the language. This classroom awareness, coupled with her preparation for the test, led her to attend one of the most famous conversational schools, of which during her sophomore years were on the rise. Although the class offered her only weekly interactions with English speakers, the school was an initial gateway for her to familiarize herself with authentic English.

The most critical period for Shizuka to acquire the language, however, was during her two consecutive study abroad experiences in an ESL program at a Canadian university, which she voluntarily pursued during her junior and senior years. Even at this stage, her parents were still worried about sending their daughter abroad, and for security reasons, recommended that Shizuka opt to attend another ESL program affiliated with her university, along with her fellow students. However, Shizuka rejected that option, as she would rather go to a place where no other Japanese students were around. Fortunately, Shizuka gained

support from her high school teacher who kindly referred her to an acquaintance in Canada; this acquaintance of the teacher and her family agreed to become Shizuka's host family. Further, the host family had an acquaintance who operated an ESL program. This supportive environment, which Shizuka sought on her own, profoundly relieved her parents, and Shizuka finally gained permission to study abroad.

Shizuka's first stay was only for two months, yet it was significant as she could immerse herself in the real English-speaking environment she had dreamed of for so long. Her enjoyment from the first short stay led her to participate in an extended version of the same program during her senior year, including staying with the same host family that she became good friends with during her first visit. Her efforts to earn all of the required credits for graduation during the preceding year at her Japanese university allowed her to focus on the program in Canada. She believed that the second longer stay in particular offered her a gratifying and remarkable language learning opportunity:

> It was so much fun, and looking back, my second year-long study in Canada, as well as the first two month stay, was quite significant for me to learn English pronunciation and sounds, and to improve listening skills. This real experience of being there and feeling the English rhythm allowed me for the first time to acquire it reasonably well.
>
> ほんとに楽しくて、今思えば、ほんとにその発音とか音とか、耳もそうですし、最初のもちろん二か月もそうですけど、やっぱりカナダでの一年間ていうのがやっぱり大きかったですかね。はじめて英語らしいリズムっていうのが、こうやっぱり体感して肌で感じてっていう経験を通して、多少身に付いたんじゃないかなと思います。

At this stage, Shizuka mainly focused on improving her English skills for communicative purposes, rather than for academic purposes. The one-year ESL program Shizuka attended during her second stay in Canada was designed to equip students with general English skills. Through the skills-based components, Shizuka became accustomed

to general writing in English, but not necessarily in an academic style. However, with her confidence in improved spoken English, Shizuka began to consider exploring a profession that would allow her to utilize these skills.

Master's Studies and Early Teaching Experiences

After she graduated from the university, Shizuka returned to Japan and experienced a clerical job. Yet, as the job offered her only limited opportunities to use English, Shizuka decided to pursue a more rewarding career that allowed her to fully exercise her English skills. She finally landed a position as a part-time instructor at the type of a conversational school that she attended while at the university. Many of her Japanese-speaking colleagues were, like Shizuka, college graduates in their early 20s, and also had experience studying abroad. She remembers participating in a professional training camp with the instructors at the pre-service stage. As a pre-service teacher, she felt that the training was very effective for further enhancing her English skills at that time.

Through numerous training opportunities that followed the camp, Shizuka acquired the ability to teach a range of oral conversational courses for beginning English learners of various ages. However, the accumulation of experiences made her feel pressured to learn even more English. Shizuka felt the need for further professional development, especially when she was assigned to teach business professionals who had an advanced level of vocabulary. There were occasions when she could not effectively answer to their questions. Although she struggled to teach them, Shizuka enjoyed the learning process through teaching, and started to find herself "wanting to study in earnest"(本格的に勉強したい).

In pursuit of fulfilling her learning needs, Shizuka considered attending a graduate school that would help her grow professionally as an English teacher. As one of her options, she contemplated attending a Japanese graduate school. However, graduate schools in an

English speaking country appeared much more attractive to her, not only because of the prospective exposure to the language, but also the education-related professional programs which were offered to any student, regardless of his or her prior disciplines. Shizuka reflected on her decision by reviewing study abroad guide books:

> When I looked ahead to my future, I thought it would be great to consider a field that would be useful for my career. I found it interesting to teach English conversations, and teaching suited me well, which is why I chose TESOL, the field that I learned about through research. Also, I learned that they would allow me to apply despite my background in a non-education major at a Japanese university. So I thought, Okay, this is precisely the only option that I should consider.
>
> やっぱり将来考えたら、将来の仕事につながるようなものっていうことで、英会話教えたこともあって結構面白かったし、あってるかなって思うとやっぱり TESOL にしようっていうふうに、あのいろいろ調べて、あっこういうのがあるんだって知ったっていうことと、日本で教育学部卒とかじゃないけれどもとってもらえるっていうのがわかったので、あ、もうここしかないなっていうふうに思いました。

In preparation for applying to graduate school, Shizuka attended a study abroad prep school for adults while teaching at the conversational school. At the prep school, she learned the basics of academic writing by training for the writing section of the TOEFL test. Further, she also trained herself in academic writing through the short-term composition courses for freshmen undergraduates that were offered at an American university affiliated with the prep school.

At the American graduate school she attended, Shizuka was formerly introduced to discipline-specific academic writing for the first time. Although she was overwhelmed by the number of the graduate level requirements in English, Shizuka was able to overcome this challenge by utilizing the learning support services the school offered. One such support service took the form of a research writing course for ESL graduate students that

she attended along with the other discipline-specific specialized courses:

> What I was taught there was extremely invaluable. It started out with an introduction to APA style, how to conduct research, and the way to formulate a paper. You know, in the field of English education, the structure of a paper is kind of fixed: the introduction, method, analysis, and result. It was good to learn that structure.
>
> そこで教えてもらったのはほんとすごく本当に参考になって、あの APA から始まって、その、リサーチの仕方、あと結構英語教育だとほんとにもうイントロがあってメソッドがあってアナリシスがあってリザルトがあってっていうかもう、パターンが決まっていたので、そういう書き方とか、教えてもらったのは、すごくよかったですね。

The other support service was the learning center, which offered free tutoring sessions. To better accomplish the course requirements, Shizuka often sought help from tutors, especially during the first couple of semesters:

> There, I had them (tutors) review and correct all my papers. Also, I had them listen to my practice presentations. Tutoring was free, so I visited there quite frequently. The first half year was quite tough.
>
> そこで、全部見てもらって、直してもらったりとか、発表聞いてもらったりとか、そこにはあの無料だったので、すごく通いましたね。最初の半年はやっぱりすごく大変でした。

Shizuka's improvement in her academic literacy after this challenging time was rapid. As a result, she successfully accomplished a series of requirements that culminated in her final project, which involved teaching practicum opportunities with beginner level immigrants. However, Shizuka was not confident enough to continue pursuing a higher degree after she finished the master's program. Even near the end of the program, Shizuka did not believe that she fully grasped the full picture of the field and how the sub-areas that she learned were related. On the other hand, despite her perceived limited knowledge of the field, it was certain that Shizuka had grown interested in a particular area of TESOL, and she continued research and writing.

Shizuka's eventual decision to apply to a Ph.D. program resulted primarily from a then-trend among her Asian and American classmates at the graduate school. She originally had not considered the option as she believed a Ph.D. was something only exceptional individuals should pursue. She changed her mind when she observed many of her classmates with backgrounds similar to hers seeking a degree without hesitation. Inspired by her peers, Shizuka considered investigating her area of interests and her application to a prestigious graduate school in Canada was accepted. However, despite her eligibility to be a doctoral student in the country, her financial conditions eventually forced Shizuka to return to Japan. As an alternative, Shizuka decided to pursue her degree at University A instead, while continuing her teaching career.

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career

Writing and Research Experiences in the Early Academic Career Phase

Shizuka attended the same doctoral program as Wataru, where there were no strict requirements for writing and publication or for structured research apprenticeship activities. In the context, she devoted considerable time to teaching from an early stage of her doctoral career. Her devotion to the profession helped her to establish trust and multiple collegial relationships, which further helped her develop as a teacher. At the same time, she was aware of the need to write and publish in order to develop an academic career in Japan. Shizuka learned from her advisor, dissertation committee members, and senior students about the importance of publication lists. Thus, she simultaneously pursued opportunities to engage in various writing projects while working on her dissertation.

Shizuka resumed her teaching career at the conversational school at which she used to work, but gradually shifted her focus to teaching a range of English courses at multiple universities. There were times when she taught as many as 10 or more courses in total. Within the limited time resulting from the intensive teaching schedule, she adopted an

efficient and locally realistic approach to writing and research. Shizuka decided to explore the same theme in which she became interested while in America. As part of her initial study, she extensively reviewed what she had learned back then, drawing on Japanese sources as well as English ones, to enhance her understanding of the entire picture of the TESOL related fields. In addition, heeding one of her professors' advice, Shizuka made it a rule to publish anything in print at least once annually, regardless of the genre and language of the medium. She wrote her dissertation and other independent research projects for submissions to conference papers and local journals in English, utilizing the data she gathered from the various institutions for which she worked. Conversely, the local collegial relationships that she forged professionally resulted in various presentations and writing projects mainly in Japanese, which constituted most of her representative publications over the period.

Shizuka routinely strived to write English articles for in-house journals. The content was primarily based on small-scale classroom projects with the data collected from the various universities at which she was teaching. She did not plan each piece to be integrated into the future dissertation project. Rather, she focused on publishing as many independent pieces as possible to build her CV.

On the other hand, after she became accustomed to writing in English through the training in the master's program in America, it became difficult at times for Shizuka to write on a topic related to her fields in Japanese. One of her early writing was a Japanese short article, which she was invited to write through her network of colleagues at a university for which she worked. As she recalls, despite the relatively short time she spent writing, Shizuka had several thoughts when negotiating the accuracy of the original meaning of a certain concept in English and the readability of its translation in Japanese.

> Even if you understand something in English, once you directly translate it into Japanese, it does not necessarily make sense, you know. Also, it was expected to be

natural Japanese, so I cared about the quality of my writing in the language. But then, once I wrote the Japanese translations, various concerns would come up. I would wonder about things such as whether 'this part of the original concept [in English] is fully translated' or 'this part of my translation communicates the right meaning'. But writing in Japanese allowed me to understand the concept [more].

やっぱり英語でわかってることでも直訳してしまうと、あんまり、ね、通じなかったりするので。やっぱり日本語らしい日本語っていうか日本語としてどうなのかっていうことで。でも日本語だと、こうだよなあと思って日本語で書くとほんとにちょっとここ訳してないかなとか、ほんとにこういうこと言ってるのかな、とかいろんなことが（笑）気にはなりましたけど。でもまあ日本語で書くことによって、自分も理解できたかなとは思います。

In her fifth year of doctoral study Shizuka attained a full-time position at an education and service-intensive private university. Her duties involved not only teaching but also coordinating a standardized English language program. Shizuka felt her time was extremely limited due to engagements for her dissertation and other projects, as well her professional duties at the university. Reflecting on the time, Shizuka said, "I was always somewhat hard-pressed, feeling restless. I was like, 'Oh, this one is almost due. Oh, this one as well (laughs). I need to get these done now, before the summer break ends!' I was always like that" (とにかくいつもなんか追われてるっていう気がしました。落ち着かないというか。あ、あれもまた締切、ああ、なんかまた（笑）、今やらないと夏休み終わる、とかなんか、そういう感じだったと思います).

Albeit with the above-mentioned challenge involved, Shizuka's approach to writing and publishing in Japanese as well as English remained consistent even in the new institutional context. As part of her purpose for writing in Japanese at the time, Shizuka cited advice given by one of her seniors at the university who noted that Japanese universities place importance on the inclusion of Japanese publications in a CV:

He said, 'When you write your research for an academic journal in your own field,

everyone writes in English as part of the effort to show an international knowledge contribution, in order to step up the career ladder in Japan. But, [it is important to write in Japanese. This is because] the evaluators [of your academic performance] are Japanese professors of various disciplines, so your writing should be something that is readable to them. Therefore, as part of the tactics or strategy, you should have some Japanese written pieces. That will be helpful'. This was quite a kind piece of advice.

その専門誌とかになってくるともちろんみんな英語で書いて、それはもう国外発信っていうことでその分野のことで、というとこはあると思うんですけど、ただまああの、日本のなかでいろいろこうステップアップしていくにはやっぱりいろんなその審査する方っていうのはその学校のいろんな分野の先生だったりしていくので、やっぱり読んでもらわないとそのわからないっていうことで。なんかそういうまあタクティクスじゃないんですけど、ストラテジーとして、日本語の文があったほうがいいよ、きっと役に立つよっていう、結構良心的なアドバイスだったんですけど。

This consciousness of general Japanese academic audiences, which Shizuka learned from her senior, was also reflected in her endeavors to present her work to a local interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal. Shizuka occasionally participated in an interdisciplinary community that consisted of not only her fellow English teachers, but also hard scientists and humanity experts entirely outside of her field, each of whom intended to invigorate their respective fields. Shizuka was appreciative of the number of rigorous comments she received on her word usage and definitions of the terms when submitting an article for review in the journal edited by the community. She learned from "the comments that were probably not available from [scholars] in the same fields" (たぶん同じ分野だったら、もらわないようなコメント) .

In reflecting on her engagement in her dissertation, Shizuka was particularly modest. Although she worked hard on the dissertation project, Shizuka felt that her professional duties kept her from spending sufficient time on writing it. She did have a

wealth of literature available from her institution, model dissertations that she could emulate, and regular feedback from her advisor during the final write-up stage, all of which allowed her to successfully finish it on time. However, she felt that the project was not truly her own, as rather than a fully creative knowledge contribution, she chose to write it as a near replication of existing mainstream studies re-contextualized in the local setting. She further felt that the quality of her project was not satisfactory.

However, apart from her critical self-evaluation of the dissertation, the degree she earned helped her gain recognition at her institution, eventually leading her to be qualified for a position instructing future English teachers, as well as organizing a seminar on the subject. Although her administrative duties evidently further increased, Shizuka found it "greatly a plus" (すごく自分にプラス) for her to be able to gain the position to deliver discipline-related lectures 30 times per year to future educators, thus allowing her to become an expert in the field as well as a teacher. Shizuka did not consider publishing from her dissertation, so that several of her major works after its completion were not directly related to it. Rather, they revolved around more practical issues for local students and practitioners.

One of Shizuka's representative projects at this stage was a textbook that she coauthored with other teachers. Filled with skilled based exercises accompanied with visuals using authentic materials, the text was designed for equipping university students with integrated skills in content-based settings. Following the format for the chapter overviews determined by the group members and publisher, Shizuka's contribution was to offer her own lessons based on a couple of pieces of the material and related commentaries. The work was laborious, particularly when the team needed to shorten the original material on which they created exercises to respond to the leader's and editors' direction. In collaboration with the other teachers, Shizuka had to revise the corresponding portions of the exercises and commentaries all over again and ensure that they all matched. However,

Shizuka found the process enjoyable, partly due to the collegial atmosphere and shared expert knowledge of the team, even though she herself had not had the chance to use the book in her own classes.

Another important work Shizuka valued in collaboration with other language teachers was a Japanese academic book project directly related to her fields. By chance, this work led her to develop an idea for one of the new research projects she wanted to pursue following the dissertation. In the chapter she was asked to write for this book, Shizuka had the opportunity to review and introduce a representative range of mainstream literature in the fields which was available at the time for students and practitioners in Japan. She found staying current with the constantly emerging literature was challenging, yet the very process of reading extensively benefitted Shizuka as she decided on her new research direction:

> This project required me to introduce various literature. Usually, I don't read as much, and tend to be lazy catching up, but being offered to take on this kind of project, I realized that many new bodies of research are constantly emerging (laughs), and I had to read many of them, so I had to study a lot. By doing this job, I discovered various things, like what was currently being argued in the field. This actually led me to come up with ideas for my new project, and think 'This may be good'.
>
> やっぱりそのいろいろ文献紹介しなきゃいけないので。なんかどうしてもね、日頃あまり読まなかったりとか、さぼっちゃったりするんですけど、こういうのがあると、次々出てきてるのが（笑)。いろいろ読んでいかなきゃいけなかったので、とにかくやっぱり自分自身も勉強したし、うん、よかったなとは思ってます。でやっぱいろいろ読むと、結局ほんとにこういうの通して思ったんですけども、いろんなアイデアっていうか、これはこういうこと今言われているのかとかいろんな発見があって、で結局その今のとかも，あ、ちょっといいなって、こうつながっていく部分もあるので。

A few years later, Shizuka presented and published a small-scale pilot study of this

new project in the above-mentioned local interdisciplinary journal as a record to test her hypothesis. Even though she was somewhat hesitant to make an interim report in public, based on her graduate senior's advice, Shizuka decided to publish it in preparation to apply for governmental funding for a future study based on this pilot. He convinced her that it was important not only to inform the reviewers of the future research plans for which funding was needed, but also to provide them with the records of the ongoing related pilot studies in order to validate the significance and potential of the research. Thus, she recognized this article as an important step towards the application process. Further, recording the pilot study itself allowed Shizuka to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the study's design. After publishing this piece, she continued to conduct another round of the pilot study in a slightly different setting at the university in order to further refine it.

Writing and Research Experiences in the Current Academic Career Phase

Shizuka has been in the first year of her appointment at the national university, University H. Similar to Wataru, Shizuka's teaching duties are quite intense. The number of class meetings is six to seven per week, which requires a great amount of preparation and tutorial time. She also takes on departmental duties of coordinating the program at the institution and its affiliated short-term programs abroad which are held during breaks. Shizuka has strived to adapt to the new teaching environment with much larger classes that requires considerably more standardized approaches, which was remarkably different from the small-sized and intimate setting that she was used to at her previous institution.

Even though her main mission continues to be centered on education, Shizuka feels encouraged to more actively conduct research than she previously did. While she feels somewhat pressured by such encouragement, Shizuka is grateful. She is appreciative of the university faculty development policy that advises faculty members to report their planned contribution, not only in the areas of teaching and administration, but also in research. In

addition, the university regularly offers departmental meetings that facilitate research-related communication among the language-teaching faculty. Information on research funding and conferences is often circulated among the faculty by email.

Right after her appointment, Shizuka was particularly nervous about delivering a presentation at a departmental research forum in which she would discuss the above-mentioned ongoing research project she initiated at her previous institution. Unexpectedly, the project that she shared with her colleagues attracted profound interest and support from one of her seniors. Her experienced senior, despite his disciplinary background in literature, offered her detailed advice grounded in his professional knowledge in order to develop the project:

> When we had a meeting to exchange further ideas about this research, he gave me many suggestions. His advice was so helpful that I feel humbled to have a Ph. D. in TESOL [on my CV] (laughs): 'Why don't you make it this way? If you were to do this, why don't you consider this instead?' So, I learned a lot from him.
>
> なんかそのアイデアとかお互い出してこう、打ち合わせするときもすごいいろいろ指摘されて、私自分が英語教育学で博士って書いてるのがもう恥ずかしいくらいな (笑) すごく、こここうじゃない？とか、これだったらあれなんじゃない？とか、すごく勉強にはなりましたね。

Through his advice, Shizuka decided to re-formulate her original research ideas into a larger scale setting, preferably with funding, after solving some of problems in the pilot study.

Apart from her independent research project, Shizuka was assigned by the colleagues to write a report in English on an educational endeavor in the department. She was concerned about the extra time needed to prepare the manuscript, but appreciated the opportunity:

> What I am grateful for is that the writing will be regarded as part of my professional achievements. It is not just about being forced to write it [without any purposes], but

about formally publicizing it [as a record of my and the department's achievement]. Therefore, I gratefully took on the job.

ありがたいのが、業績にもなるので、ただこうやってって言われるのではなくて、ちゃんと出せっていうことなので、ありがたくやりましょうと。

Shizuka feels that the current teaching areas, too, is suitable for her to advance her research. Comparing the past and current institutional contexts, she said:

> [Back at the previous university], it was great to have opportunities to teach on my specialty and organize a seminar on it. And now I am primarily back to teaching the English language. However, come to think of it, the current teaching areas best suit my research. Also, I can gain a wealth of data [here] (laughs). As my research area is really strongly related to practical issues, I would like to keep working hard a little more [in this environment].

専門を教えられてゼミを持つっていうところは、いい点はあったんですけど、今回でもまあ英語の科目を教えるってことにはなったんですが、でも結局よく考えると自分の研究に一番合致してるのが今のフィールドなので、結構データもとれるし（笑）結局自分が研究してることって、ほんと実践とばっと結びついたところなので、まあこれからからちょっと頑張りたいな、っていうか。

While being blessed with the environment, Shizuka feels that she is still a researcher-in-progress. Reflecting on her career thus far, she described herself as a person who just "stumbled upon the current job"(成り行きできてる) rather than aimed at earning it in the first place. She feels that at any given moment she invested time and money to attain what she pursued in an efficient manner, yet she is not confident in what she actually gained over the course. She humbly said:

> If I were to be asked, 'What exactly did you do?', then I would have to answer, 'Well, nothing yet.' I am thankful for the offers to be involved in various projects so far, but I have not done anything substantial on my own. I don't have anything to show.

中身を問われると、なんかすごく、えっなんか何もっていうのがすごくあって、なんかお話し、声かけ

ていただいて参加させてもらってっていうのはあるんですけど、自分の研究何をしてきたって、言えないっていうか、これって見せられるものが何もなくて。

To adjust herself to the title of researcher, Shizuka feels the need to accomplish her own study for the rest of her career, yet at her own pace. Unlike Wataru, she is not interested in the idea of emulating someone else's expert research practices. At the current institution, she had a chance to speak with a group of female science researchers who were working toward emulating certain mainstream researcher role models to enhance their research activities. However, Shizuka was not convinced by their stance:

> If you consider aiming at reaching somebody, or model yourself after her, it is going to be a lot of pressure. So, I don't like to follow anybody, or to be conscious of anybody. Doing so makes me feel stressed, you know (laughs), so I would like to go slowly, at my own pace.
>
> なんか誰かを目標っていうか、誰かをロールモデルにしようと思ったらもうそれだけでなんかこう、プレッシャーがかかりそうで、なんかあんまり真似したくないっていうか、あんまり気にしたくないっていうのがあるので、そういうのちょっとなんか、ちょっと、ね、つらくなってくるので、(笑)もうちょっとなんかこうのんびりっていうか、自分のペースでやりたいと思います。

As part of "her own studies," Shizuka places much importance in the above mentioned study that she initiated as a starting point and on her hopes to develop it into a larger research contribution. Shizuka is not interested in publishing her research for international audiences, but she would like to make it known at least to local audiences through major mediums. She stated her long-term goal that she would like to achieve by the time of her retirement, implicitly referring back to her love for Japanese:

> Now that I have the current job that I stumbled upon, I would like to leave the proof of my accomplishments. From now on, I will work toward doing a 'this-is-what-I-did' kind of research [that is ongoing], research that I'd lead, and based on my own idea, rather than toward these kinds of coauthoring projects.

Then, I would like to publish it in national peer-reviewed journals [in English], although it would be great if I could do it internationally as well. Once I can accomplish a number of such studies, I hope to put them together into a book, if possible a Japanese one.

成り行きできた今となってはやっぱりちょっと形として残したいので、ほんとにそういう、これからあの私はこういうことをやったっていう、こんな共著とかではなくって、自分が主になって自分がやってきた自分のアイデアの研究で。で、その日本の学会誌とかに、まあ海外でもしできたらうれしいんですけども、出せたらと思ってます。で、なんかそういう研究が何年かたまったら、一冊自分の本にしてまとめて、出したいなっていう希望はあります。それは日本語がいいなと思ってます。

CHAPTER 7

PARTICIPANT PROFILE 3: KOJI NOGUCHI

Koji Noguchi is presently an associate professor at a private university. Like Shizuka, Koji dreamt of going abroad since his childhood. He worked hard studying English as a subject, initially envisioning his future as an international office worker. His turning point came after his enrollment at university, where he became dissatisfied with his English skills in comparison to those of his English proficient peers, and he began to question the quality of English education he had received. This led him to consider becoming a teacher educator in order to improve the quality of the system. With this goal in mind, immediately after his graduation, he pursued a master's degree in America, during which time he strived to acquire language and professional skills, as well as knowledge of the discipline. Furthermore, back in Japan, after teaching at high school for one year, during which time he developed his research interests, Koji proceeded to a Japanese graduate program where he earned a second master's and began to pursue doctoral studies.

To Koji, his doctoral years were extremely challenging, particularly after he advanced from a part-time position at multiple universities to a full-time position at one university, where he took on not only highly intensive teaching demands but also a range of committee and task force work, including on an interdepartmental scale. Under the circumstances, and under the influence of his seniors who had followed a similar career path, Koji's writing and research activities at the time were almost exclusively devoted to dissertation writing. In his current institutional context, he teaches at both undergraduate and graduate levels, including topics related to his field, as he had long desired. While

deeply engaged with rewarding work to help professionalize future teachers, and being a full-fledged faculty member at the institution, Koji now feels the need to engage more with his family duties, as a father, than he did during the time of writing his dissertation. Due to continued time constraints arising from his professional and family duties, he still finds it difficult to engage in writing and research as much as he would like. Although his main desire is to contribute practically to society as a practitioner, he aspires to resume and advance his study.

Pre-Professional Background to the Pursuit of Doctoral Studies

Pre-University to University Experiences

Growing up in a small village in a regional area of Kansai, Koji had a peaceful childhood, engaging in both sports and literature. He was a very active boy who regularly played outside, in the river, or in the mountains. He was also a member of a swimming school and a softball team. However, when he was not playing, he enjoyed reading Japanese. Influenced by his sister, Koji was fond of reading from the collection of translated traditional, international fiction that was stored on the bookshelves of his home. As he matured, his literary interests expanded into the genre of history, and he began to enjoy the graphic novels featuring historical facts and characters available in the school library. Naturally, his strongest subject in school was consistently Japanese, although he did not like writing in the language very much.

Although he fully enjoyed life in his hometown, Koji developed a degree of fondness for foreign countries that he often saw on television in English-language movies dubbed into Japanese. His interest in English originated from this media inspired adoration of the world outside of Japan: “With my mild adoration of foreign countries, I had a positive impression of English, believing that if I studied the language it might allow me to

travel abroad” (外国には漠然とした憧れみたいなものがあって、英語を勉強すればこういう外国に行けるのかな、というような、そういうポジティブな印象は持ってました) .

Koji’s formal exposure to English began in junior high school, when the language was introduced as a school subject. While he continued to be active in sport and his main passion lay with his volleyball club activities, his love for English, initially as a subject, constantly matured, because he excelled at it in class. Furthermore, during his second year, Koji began to acknowledge the benefits of English as a communication tool. He gained a valuable opportunity to correspond with American students, through participating in an international correspondence project organized by one of his teachers. Koji invested a considerable amount of time and energy in writing each letter, and when he sent the letter to his pen pal and received a response after a couple of months, he was profoundly pleased. Unfortunately, the session lasted for the duration of the academic year only and involved just several exchanges of letters. However, despite these limitations, Koji learned the practical value of English and gained further motivation to improve his skills in the language.

In high school, although his life remained primarily focused on volleyball, Koji continued to maintain his interest and confidence in English. Despite his limited exposure to the language, he kept working diligently to improve his skills and began to associate English with his vision for his future international career. Reviewing his career aspirations at that time, Koji stated:

> My adoration [of the foreign world] eventually inspired in me a desire to see the world. So, honestly, I wanted to travel overseas in the future. I mean, I had a desire to visit and actively work in some foreign countries shown on television that I had dreamed about for a long time. Then, I thought that English was a necessity for that purpose. When I was in high school, I had an ambition, albeit a vague one, to become a businessperson who traveled all over the world.

憧れみたいなものが、最終的には、こう世界を見たいなっていう気持ちにつながって、正直だから将来は世界に出たい、なんとなく昔から憧れてた。テレビにとかに出てくる外国に行って活躍したいな、と。で、そのためには、ツールとして英語が必要だろうと。僕、あのビジネスマンになりたかったんです。世界をまたにかけるビジネスマンに。高校のときは漠然とですけど。

According to his explanation, this career objective promoted him to apply for an English major at university and consider studying abroad in the future.

While attending university, Koji found himself exposed to a "complete leisure land" (完全なレジャーランド) culture shared among students. Koji naturally became deeply involved in the activities of the volleyball club, which he co-founded with his seniors. In addition, the English department that Koji joined was predominantly literature-focused, with the majority of the classes that were offered in Japanese based on literature analyses, which did not particularly interest him. Nevertheless, he maintained and strengthened his engagement in learning English.

Koji found the skills-focused ESL classes, which were held in conjunction with the lecture-based classes valuable, as they afforded him a chance to assess his own level of English. Attending classes with English-proficient peers, including returnees, he felt his confidence in English diminishing, although he still loved the language:

> To be honest, once I began to attend university, I never thought of myself as being good at English at all. As it was the English department, everyone else was, of course, reasonably good at English, and there was a considerable number of returnees. My feelings of inadequacy, like, 'Oh, I am not at all good at English', occurred more frequently [than feelings of confidence] .

正直、大学に入ってしまえば、自分は英語できるな、なんて思ったことがまるでなくて。英文科なんでみんなある程当然度英語ができて、なかには帰国子女とかも結構いましたし、あれ自分英語ぜんぜんできないな、と思うことのほうが、むしろ多かった。

According to his own analysis, this change in the self-evaluation of Koji's English

skills was critical in two ways. Firstly, it allowed Koji to develop a critical awareness of English education in Japan and an interest in contributing to its improvement in the future. Secondly, it also gave him even greater motivation to study the language more diligently.

Reflecting on the experiences that revealed the ineffectiveness of English education in Japan to him, Koji stated:

> I had assumed that I was reasonably good at English, and that was the reason why I enrolled in the English department, but [when I was there] I felt that I really could not speak English or comprehend spoken English. This caused me think, 'Oh, for six long years I have studied English quite diligently, I have loved the language and believed in my ability, but this is the result. Is this (the system of English education that I received at junior and high school) the correct process? Are schools offering sufficient English classes today?' That is when I began to have questions [concerning the quality of English education in Japan].
>
> いちおうある程度英語が得意だと思ってたし、だから英文科に来たのに、なんか会話とかまるでできないとか、ぜんぜん聞き取りができないとか、そういういうところから、あれ、なんか自分六年も自分なりに一生懸命英語やってきて、英語好きだったし得意だと思ってたけども、なんかちょっとこれ、いいのかな、英語の授業、これで、大丈夫なのかな、ていうようなところから、問題意識を持って。

While exploring these questions, Koji changed his career objective from becoming a businessperson to becoming an educator. As a first step toward pursuing this goal, he strived to obtain a teaching certificate for junior and senior high school and was trained in his alma mater, which gave him the confidence to choose education as a profession. However, his ultimate goal was to emerge as a university professor:

> When I began to investigate English language education in Japan, I wanted to do something to improve it. Then, I thought, to achieve this goal, while one option would be to become an English teacher at a junior or senior high school, it may be more effective if I became a teacher of English teachers [at university].

教育に関して問題意識を持ち始めたときに、日本の英語教育に、なんかこう、変えるようなことができたらいいなと、で、そうするのには、中高の先生になるっていうのがひとつの手だけども、それよりは、先生の先生になったほうが影響力があるのかな、ということを漠然と考えました。

This objective, coupled with his earlier dream of studying abroad, transformed into the pursuit of graduate studies in TESOL, the field that he heard from one of his professors, in an English-speaking country after finishing his undergraduate career. Thus, his final two years of undergraduate studies were devoted to preparing himself to study abroad as well as to working on his graduate thesis.

While motivating himself to improve his English and fulfill his future goal, Koji attempted to fully utilize available resources in his environment before going abroad. For example, in order to remove himself from his language learning comfort zone in his final two years, Koji chose the only seminar on English literature led by an English-speaking professor in the department. He stated:

I knew that it would be difficult if I joined the seminar, as the classes would all be in English and the graduate thesis would also have to be written in English… but I dared to challenge myself and immersed myself in the situation.

その先生のゼミをやればぜんぶ授業英語で大変だし、あの、卒論も英語で書かなければいけなくなるのはわかってたんだけれども、なんか、あえてそれにこう、挑んだっていう感じです。

In his third year, assisted by the guidance of his professor, Koji became accustomed to writing basic term papers in English. Building on this foundation, he successfully accomplished the task of writing a graduate thesis in English focused on English literature. Koji, however does not fully remember if it was here that he learned the basics of academic writing. Koji received only occasional feedback on his content and language use in the process of writing his thesis. What Koji acknowledged to be most valuable was the sense of achievement he felt at completing the thesis on time.

Master's Studies and Early Teaching Experiences

With the strong motivation to improve his English and become a university English teacher in the future, Koji firstly attended a graduate school in America. As he recalls, his experience studying abroad for the master's program was rife with difficulties. By making a conscious effort to avoid Japanese communities and engage in active communication with English speakers, for example, through joining a sport club activity on campus, he noticed a rapid improvement in his general English communication skills. The challenges he experienced however, were primarily related to the academic requirements of the graduate program.

At the graduate school, the majority of the students were experienced teachers attempting to improve their own teaching methods. Koji, without prior knowledge of the field, at first found it quite challenging to keep pace with the curriculum:

> I went there with this great vision (laughs), but did not have sufficient preparation and background knowledge of the field. My first class concerned theory, dealing with this book by [Rod] Ellis (1994), which I could not follow at all. Of course, at the graduate level, courses such as these are discussion-based, which I also found difficult to catch up with. All I remember is the difficulty. I had difficulty writing papers and I had difficulty with readings. All of these difficulties concerned issues with [academic] English and special knowledge.
>
> その、想いだけで行っちゃったんで。（笑）しっかりと準備とかを、専門的な知識とかはまるでないまま、行っちゃったんで、向こうに行って、一番最初の授業とかで、なんか、理論の授業だったんですけど、エリスのこれだったんです。さっぱりついていけなくて。当然院レベルなんでディスカッションとかがメインなんで、やっぱついていけないとか。そういう苦労ばっかり覚えてますね。ペーパーで苦労したりとか。リーディングで苦労したとか。だから英語の面と、専門的な知識の部分で、苦労したなっていう。

However, thanks to a supplementary writing course offered for international

students, using Swale and Feak's (1994) text, Koji became accustomed to the basics of academic writing. Also, he was able to strengthen his understanding of the contents of the courses by joining a study group formed by his classmates and by checking his acquired knowledge against that of Japanese senior students. Once he established the basics, he gradually got used to the rigorous demands of the coursework. He eagerly absorbed the foundational knowledge of TESOL and related fields, including linguistic theories, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)-based methods and materials, and curriculum design and assessments.

While studying at the graduate school, Koji began his teaching career as a part-time instructor at a supplementary Japanese language school in order to earn a living. This position involved teaching Japanese and mathematics at weekends to Japanese students living in America. It was a rewarding and enjoyable job as Koji was able to combine his teacher training foundation from Japanese junior high school with his educational knowledge. However, he felt slightly challenged to act as an expert teacher at the school outside Japan and while he was a graduate student. There were certain classes that were difficult to manage, arguably because the classes met only on weekends. Also, he suspected that some students may have regarded him and other teachers as simply graduate students, although they did not openly say so. Thus, the psychological burden associated with his professional duty at the time added another challenge to his academic life in America. However, this transitional experience, coupled with the freshly acquired knowledge from the graduate program, further strengthened his motivation to become a fully-fledged educator back in Japan.

After successful completion of the master's program in America, Koji originally planned to immediately apply for a doctoral program at the same institution. However, for both financial and career-oriented reasons, he elected instead to return to Japan:

I thought, as a result of the weak value of the yen following the economic crisis in

Korea, I could not really afford it (the doctoral program). Also, with my goal of becoming a university professor in Japan, I thought it would be beneficial to enroll in a Japanese graduate school, as I believed this would likely allow me to make connections and acquire an understanding of graduate education and academic communities in Japan. It was a kind of strategic, calculated decision.

やっぱお金、ちょっとしんどいなと。ちょうど円がものすごい安く、韓国が経済危機だったこともあって、ちょっと大変だったんで、そのことと、あと、自分将来的に日本の大学の教員になりたかったので、日本の大学院にすすんだほうが、その、ま、人間的なつながりとか、あと、日本の大学院のことがわかったりとか、学会のことがわかったりとかそういう意味でメリットがあるのかなと、いう、ちょっと戦略的な、打算的な。

In the process of applying for several doctoral programs in Japan, however, Koji realized that most of these required a master's thesis, which he had not written while in America. Therefore, he decided to once more prepare to join a master's program while accumulating additional professional experience.

The one year preparation period for master's program was critical in that Koji gained a hand on professional experience teaching as a part-time instructor at high school in his hometown in Kansai, where he developed his basic professional and research interest. At the school, Koji found out the reality of high school English education that he had never realized when he was a teacher trainee—He was particularly concerned about the teaching guidelines and student attitudes toward learning English. As a teacher of "oral communication" in English, Koji was often troubled by the restrictions of the materials and methods required by the department that ran counter to his intention:

I really wanted to teach 'oral communication' [in its real sense], yet there was a direction in the English department that required me to use pre-fabricated materials, which are grammar-based books, and there were fixed, standardized approaches to tests based on the materials. If I neglected them I would be going to be called into

question ‘Why don’t you do the same things as the other teachers?’ so I basically needed to adhere to the guidelines. So within the scope of the guidelines, I tried to occasionally incorporate the best activities that I could think of, such as pair works, to the extent that it was possible, but pretty much what I actually did ended up being about grammar, which I was not satisfied with at all. This experience clearly informed me of the situation in Japanese high school for my future reference. That’s why it does not work.

自分ではすごいオーラルコミュニケーションやりたかったんですけど、英語科の、命令ですね。オーラルコミュニケーションという科目では、これやってください、という、教材決まっていて、僕、完全にグラマーっていうか。文法の本を。だから、それを、もうテストも、それでこう決まったテストをやっていくんで、それをおろそかにしてると、僕のクラスだけってなっちゃうんで、基本的にちゃんとやらなきゃいけない。そんなかで、できるだけなんかペアワークやったりとか、ちょこちょこできるかぎりのことをやりましたけど、やってたことは、文法。でそれはものすごく不本意でしたけど。日本の高校の現状というのをほんとうによくわかりましたね。結局こういうことやってるからあかんのや、っていうような。

During the period, in addition to the inevitable restriction in the teaching method, Koji gained an increased insight into some aspects of student learning issues. After struggling to teach students despite his hard work in the environment, he realized that it is critical to solve these issues in order to bring about a positive change in English instruction in Japan. This awareness led Koji to find out a potential area that he wanted to explore in a Japanese graduate school.

Unlike the professionally oriented design of the American TESOL master’s program, Koji found that the graduate school he subsequently attended at University N was more scholarly. In addition to course work, there were regular meetings of a study group, which consisted of several professors and master’s and doctoral students specializing in linguistics and English education. Through regular meetings, students presented their

research progress and mutually critiqued each other. Asked about the differences here compared with the program in America, Koji stated:

> Compared with the graduate school in America, there were more students at University N who aimed to become researchers, although there were also school teachers, of course. Therefore, there was more of a culture that encouraged academic meetings or writing papers there. Everyone [at University N] engaged in what was required for their own future [academic] career. So, I felt some form of pressure from them, although other students than myself at the previous graduate school may also have felt similar pressure.
>
> N 大では現場の先生ていうのもちろんいましたけれども、どっちかというと学問の、なんかそういう将来は研究者にすすむ、という感じの人が、まあ、アメリカの大学院と比べると多かった。なので、研究会とか、論文を書きましょうとか、なんかそういう雰囲気が、N大のほうがあったと思う。自分のキャリアにつながるようなことをみんな一生懸命やっている。だから、そういう意味で、ちょっとこう、プレッシャーみたいなものはありました。まあ前の大学院も僕以外の人はそういうふうに感じてたのかもしれないですけど。

Overall, Koji now believes that enrolling in two different master's programs was important:

> Given that American graduate school mainly concerned practice and University N mainly concerned theories and research, I was able to create a balance within myself. Indeed, while I was attending University N, I used to wonder, 'Why should I bother to repeat a master's program?'(laughs) but I now feel that that time was not wasted at the end of the day.
>
> アメリカの大学院では実践中心、N大では理論、研究重視だったので、ちょうど二つ行ったことによって、なんとなく自分のなかでバランスがとれたというか。行ってる途中は、なんで二回も行かなあかんねん（笑）と思ったけど、結果的には、人生無駄ないなと。

At University N, Koji learned a range of research methodologies, both independently,

from both existing literature and texts on statistics, and from occasional guidance from senior students. Based on this foundation, Koji, for the first time, experienced a classroom-based experimental study at the high school he worked for. With increased proficiency in English, Koji was now able to write a master's thesis without considerable difficulty.

In addition, from this period onward, Koji started his academic career as a part-time English teacher at several universities, teaching various skilled-based courses according to the respective institutional needs, and applying what he learned in America. Seeking a doctorate degree at the same university in Japan at this juncture was a natural step in Koji's plan to develop an academic career in the country. His ultimate professional goal was to obtain a teaching position in the field of language education that directly involved teacher education, and he believed that earning a doctorate was a necessary qualification to achieve that goal.

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career

Writing and Research Experiences in the Early Academic Career Phase

In Koji's description, like the case of the program at University A that Wataru and Shizuka attended, there was no visibly established writing and research culture, nor were there particular opportunities for research apprenticeship in the doctoral program at University N. However, there were institutional publication requirements and occasional invitations to publication projects and career advice from seniors, of which Koji was appreciative.

What was particularly worrisome to Koji was the perceived rarity of graduates of the program. Although the program was over 10 years old, few graduates had been conferred with a doctoral degree at University N, giving the impression that a successful dissertation was almost impossible to achieve. Reflecting on the nervousness and pressure that he felt

concerning the dissertation, Koji stated:

> Once I entered the program I received the data showing the limited number of graduates from the department thus far. When l studied the data (laughs), I thought that it would be impossible for me to obtain a degree. When I compared the number of students who had joined the program with those who had earned a degree, it obviously appeared [difficult to finish the program] (laughs). I felt that I would never be able to earn a degree unless I worked really hard. So, I raised the bar too high before actually working toward getting the degree.
>
> 博士課程に入るやいなや、あの、この、その今まで専攻で、博士課程は何人しか出てません とかいう、まあデータがこう入ってきますよね。それを見てると（笑）、とても自分にできそうにないっていうふうに思えてきてしまって。今までのその入学者と、取得者の数がどう考えても（笑）。これはもうそうとう頑張らんと絶対無理やなっていう、取る前からもう自分でもうハードル上げてしまっていて博士に関しては。

Koji felt even more pressured when he looked at a then-rare completed dissertation in English shared by one of his seniors. Koji told me that he was overwhelmed by the volume and quality of the dissertation:

> Seeing the volume of the doctoral dissertation that one of my seniors had completed, which was several times as thick as a master's thesis, I set an unduly higher goal than I actually should have, making the dissertation unnecessarily cumbersome, all because of my assumptions. Also, the contents of the seniors' dissertations were so different [from their masters' theses], I thought I could not get a degree if I produced something like my master's thesis. So, I was under a lot of pressure.
>
> 論文とか先輩に見せてもらってもやっぱり修論の何個分 っていうイメージの中身でしたし、これは大変やなっていうふうに思っていたので、まずその目標地点を自分で、ちょっと違った感じに設定してしまって、必要以上に、大変なものに、自分で、してしまっていたというか、思い込みみたいなのがあって。あとまあ実際に、その、先輩たちのを見ても、内容的には違っていたし、自分としても、あの修論のあ

んな方面ではほんと無理だろうなと思っていたので、とかなんかそういうふうに、プレッシャーというのはすごくありました。

Aiming to produce high-quality research, Koji worked diligently to conduct an extensive literature review of international journals in the field of applied linguistics in order to acquire further knowledge of the field. In addition, in an effort to refine his methodological knowledge, he even joined an academic association of a parent field of TESOL in Japan to learn of the latest experiments and analytical frameworks that could potentially be applicable to his study. He also conducted two years of pilot studies to enhance the quality of his project. However, Koji did not have as much time to concentrate on the project as he wished. This was mainly because of time constraints resulting from his continued teaching duties as a part-time instructor at multiple universities.

Within these constraints, Koji managed to obtain candidacy status by publishing several papers in in-house journals. One of these representative works, which was the first he had produced in English, featured a literature review that discussed possible existing theoretical frameworks that he had considered using for his dissertation. As the journal was intended as an institutional review for the graduate faculty, Koji did not have any particular technical difficulties writing it. From the existing literature, he had learned the discipline, specific terminologies, and generic format of RA in the field. He also sought linguistic support from an English-speaking colleague at one of his universities he worked for.

However, the institutionally oriented genre came with its own challenges. The major difficulty concerned the space limitation. Unlike regular journal articles consisting of approximately 6000-10000 words, an in-house journal article, particularly in Koji's department, limited the quota to about 5000 words:

> Due to the shortage of space, it was very hard to include an in-depth discussion within these constraints. I guess that I could not do it well, so, I later thought that I should have spent more time planning it.

量が限られてるので、内容的に、その量のなかでその深いディスカッションをしないといけないっていうのがすごく難しかったですかね。それがちゃんとできてないと思うので。もう少しこう時間をかけてじっくり書いたほうがよかったかのかなあなんてあとでは思いましたけど

Further, while the review board mainly consisted of professors within the department, not all of them specialized in his field, and his writing had to follow the institutionally designated citation style rather than the usual APA style of the field.

After obtaining a doctoral candidacy following the fulfillment of his publication requirements, Koji then sought advice from his seniors on how to advance his career. The suggestion they offered was that he should firstly obtain a full-time job at any university, complete a dissertation, and then switch to another university if necessary afterwards. In accordance with this suggestion, Koji, while working on pilot studies, applied for several positions and was successfully awarded a full-time contractual position in the coordinated English program at a private university. Soon afterwards, he married and started a family.

Additionally, following his seniors' advice, Koji, at the time, concentrated primarily on writing his dissertation, rather than developing a distinct writing career. He stated that it was partly because a short-term, focused approach to dissertation writing without being involved in other projects, was common practice among his seniors at his graduate school. Concurrently, within his department at the university where he started working, he was not under extreme pressure to write and research beyond the dissertation. As the department consisted of primarily educationally oriented staff, it was considered to be sufficient to submit annual reports on overall professional accomplishments to the university. Yet, the very completion of the dissertation in this demanding professional context was much harder than he had imagined.

As a teacher, Koji fully enjoyed his position, drawing on his expertise and experience. He was responsible for teaching eight standardized skill-based courses per semester. He also taught one elective course in his field, although there were few students

who were interested in language teaching professions. However, the non-teaching duties that he began to undertake in addition to teaching as a full-time faculty member were unexpectedly time-consuming, often affecting the progress of his dissertation project. From the second year of appointment onward, in addition to his teaching duties, Koji undertook a wide array of committee work at both intra- and inter-departmental levels. The multiple committee work he engaged in ranged from entrance examinations to curriculum renovation. One of the most challenging jobs involved the design of a program-wide English language skills test to assess the performance of existing students:

> I had to develop a decent set of tests each semester, for which I created listening questions, asking native speakers to record the materials every time. I had to create as many as seventy such questions [for the listening section]. I also created as many questions for the reading section. That was quite time-consuming too. This kind of job was completely different from what I was doing for my own research, but I thought that that was the way things were supposed to be.
>
> もう毎学期毎学期こう、ちゃんとしたもの を作って、ネイティブスピーカーに吹き込んでもらってとかいうようなテスト作ってたんです。それも 70 問かな　だから、それほんと時間とられてました。で、リーディングも同じように 70 問で、それも結構時間とられてました。研究内容とは違うんだけれども、まあ、それはまあ違うもんだとして。

. Even in these circumstances, there was a special occasion where Koji was invited to publish his work. Through his network at University N, Koji was asked to contribute to a bilingual book proposed by seniors. Primarily occupied with his dissertation, teaching, and administrative duties, however, Koji did not have sufficient time to consider a suitable subject in depth. Therefore, because of the tight publication schedule required, he decided to include a summary of his preliminary research for his dissertation. This was written in Japanese in order to avoid the considerable writing time that would have been involved if he had written in English. Although it was his debut publication for an external audience,

Koji did not feel any strong attachment to the work.

As the due date for the submission of the dissertation draft approached, Koji found himself under considerable mental strain. Reflecting on the period of time, he stated:

> I was always extremely pressured to write such-and-such a section for my advisor's review by such-and-such a date (laughs), and in the meantime a surge of committee work mercilessly came in, so it was very difficult to manage all of these [research and work tasks].
>
> とにかくもういついつまでにここまで終えて先生に見せないといけないとか（笑）すごいプレッシャーが、あるわけですね。でそのあいだでやっぱり委員会活動 とかあの一容赦なく来るわけで。だからそのへんの折り合いをつけるのとかは、大変でしたね。

Koji always wanted to assist his wife with any household matters. Nevertheless, in the year when the first dissertation draft was due, he had to limit his family duties to concentrate on his own dissertation. As he recalled, during the drafting stage in the summer, Koji resorted to confining himself in his office at the university on a regular basis, leaving his family at home.

> I stayed in my office on many nights, asking my wife to handle the household matters alone (laughs). After everyone had left the campus, I would stay there, change into a jersey, and continue writing. When the guard came in, I would tell him, 'I must stay here [overnight]'…and then would go to the the public bath nearby. Then, after a sleep, I would wash my face before students entered in the morning.
>
> もうあの、妻に、ちょっと家のことはまかすって言って（笑）。研究室で、もうほんと何日も泊まって、みんな帰った後、こうジャージに着替えて、こう研究室でずっとやって、守衛さんとか回ってくるんですけど、あっちょっと今日泊まりなんですけどって言って…で近所の銭湯まあ行って。で朝に学生が来る前に洗面所で顔洗って。

During the course of Koji's solitary stay on campus, there were times when the air conditioner was switched off early in the evening and he was in danger of suffering from

heat stroke. He had constant back pains from sitting for such long periods without a break. He currently describes that period as, “probably the hardest time in my life thus far” (人生で、今までで一番大変だったかもしれない) mentally and physically, although he overcame these difficulties by recognizing his sense of progress. In several month thereafter, through constant chapter-by-chapter feedback on the content from his advisor and occasional language-related advice from his English-speaking colleagues, Koji successfully finished his dissertation on time. Reflecting on his feelings of liberation after the completion, he stated, “When I finished it, I felt, ‘Oh, I am finally free. I am finally a researcher from now on! Yes!’” (博論が終わったときに、あ、なんかやっと自由になったっていうこっからようやく研究者だ、わーい、みたいな思いがありました).

Although Koji eventually presented a portion of his dissertation at an international conference, and published the related paper in a succeeding journal, his self-evaluation of the dissertation itself was quite modest, and he is not interested in furthering the theme of his dissertation for the remainder of his career. Reflecting on his feelings and experiences after completing the dissertation, Koji stated:

> I do not want to look at my master’s thesis or dissertation ever again. Don’t you feel the same about yours? I was ashamed of it and did not want to publish it. There was a recommendation that I should publish the dissertation in its entirety [through his network at University N, from a Japanese publisher], yet I do not think of it as something worth being made public, and I wanted to forget it as soon as possible. So, I did not do anything about it for a while. But, over time, I thought it may be a waste [not to do anything about it], so I gave a presentation on my work at an international conference and wrote an article based on a section of the thesis, so that was enough for me.
>
> 修論も博論もう二度と見たくないっていう（笑） ありませんかそういうの? なんか恥ずかしすぎて、こんなもの世に出したくないって。だから、まあこれをまるごと出版したらとかいう話もなんかあった

りもしたんですけど、そんなんとてもできるような内容じゃないし、早く忘れたいと。なんかそういうのがあったりとかで発表も出版もせずにずるずるきてしまってこのままじゃもったいないな、と思って。それで海外の学会でまあとりあえず発表はして、でこのなかの、そのベース、なんか関連したものでも一個論文も書いたし、まあいいのかなって思ってるんですけど。

For him, the dissertation's foremost value was as a catalyst for achieving his career goal and as source of confidence. When describing its significance he stated:

> I made many compromises and there are a number of shortcomings to the dissertation …yet I guess it was a set of the stairs that I had to climb, and now that I have finished climbing it I would like to make it a basis for my confidence. I mean, I gained confidence from finishing it, although I don't have confidence in its content, so, it was not a waste.
>
> なんかやっぱり妥協っていうのがすごくありますしあの欠点もいっぱいあるんで…ただそれはそれでもうひとつ上るべき階段だったのかなと。もうそれ登り切ったんで、ひとつの自信にして、これからやっていこうかなっていう自分の自信にはなるものではありますね。やったということが、中身はまったく自信ないんですけど。 だから、無駄ではなかったと思います。

Writing and Research Experiences in the Current Academic Career Phase

Two years has passed since Koji successfully obtained a full-time position in the English department at another private university, University M. Koji, as one of the few faculty members specializing in TESOL, not only teaches in and coordinates a general language program, but is also in a position to introduce students to his own field and offer teacher-education-related courses that he had wanted to become involved with for a long time.

Koji feels that the "atmosphere"(雰囲気) at University M is slightly more motivated towards research than that of the previous institution. According to Koji, although there is no required number of publications, senior colleagues around him regularly publish books,

which inspires him more than before. Also, his CV is now open to the public at University M, which also places a degree of pressure on him. However, Koji also adds that his time for research is limited to the summer break, as duties concerning entrance examinations dominate the spring break and “research days” (研究日) during the terms in session are often devoted to committee work.

Even under mild pressure, given his current life stage, Koji still finds himself unprepared to actively engage in research, despite his willingness to do so:

> I am currently at a difficult stage in life. Before becoming a tenured professor I was completely involved in my work, but once I finished that war-like process [of dissertation writing in the midst of professional duties], as a father of three children, my work-life balance got relatively tilted to the ‘life’ side.
>
> 今、自分の人生の中で 、ちょっと難しいステージに入っていて、専任の仕事をやる前はがむしゃらだったんですけどなんかこうある程度戦場の時期をこう終えて、自分の家庭のほうで、子供が三人いるんですけど、ちょっと時間的にそっち、そのライフワークバランスのわりとライフのほうにちょっと向いちゃったところもあって。

Koji continues to state that it would still be difficult to shift his focus to research, partly due to the unavailability of time at home:

> Basically, I cannot work at home on weekends. But then, when I stayed late in my office and returned home at night, I often found my house like a battleground (laughs) with all the children crying, so I now feel the need to return home reasonably early. Also, I must regularly pick up and drop off my children at their preschool. So it is presently difficult [to focus on research at home] from my perspective. You know, there were frequent episodes like this, when I worked at the PC, all of a sudden one of my children would burst into my room and start rampantly hitting the keyboard, making “FFFFFF” appear on the display (laughs), so I came to the opinion that I can never work at home.

基本的に土日とかはもうほとんど家では仕事はできないっていう感じなんですよ。かといってあんまり遅くまで大学にいると夜家に帰るとこう家が闘いのようになってたりするんで（笑）三人（子供が）号泣してて、とか（笑）だからそこそこ早めに帰らなくちゃいけない。まあ送り迎えもそうなんですけど。だから結構今難しい。自分の中では。家でこうパソコンとかやってるじゃないですか。そうすると、ばーって（子供が）入ってきてキーボードのボタンを連打とかして画面に FFFF って（笑）とかしょっちゅうあったんですね。家ではやれないって思って。

At this juncture, Koji confesses to having had ambivalent feelings concerning writing and research. On one hand, he feels that, given the professional and family commitments that occupy his time, it is inevitable that he ends up giving research the lowest priority:

> My current objective for the year is to give one presentation at some conference and publish at least one article. This is the least I should do, but given my time constraints, it is the maximum, the limit that I can achieve.
>
> 今はとりあえず、あのまあ、どっかの学会でこう発表するのを。今年の目標はですね 発表一個となんか論文一本かなあっていうふうには思ってるんですけど。それぐらいがもう最低限やらないといけないですし、だけど時間的なことを考えたらそれが最大で、限界かなとは思いますけど。

On the other hand, Koji has also found himself dissatisfied with his current situation, and is willing to invest more time in research:

> To be honest, I would like do it more…I cannot really work at all on weekends, when I take my children to the park. This situation makes me a little uneasy; am I really okay just living this way? However, I convince myself that this is my current stage in life…I am determined that I will switch my focus [to research] when the youngest child becomes older. At this stage, however, there is no other choice.
>
> ほんとうはやりたいです。やっぱり週末はずっと子供を公園に連れて行ったりとか、ぜんぜん仕事できないので。そうするとそういうあせりみたいなものがちょっと少しあるんですねああいいのかな、こんなのしていてって。だけどやっぱり今はまあそういうステージだというふうに納得して。最近は、もう少しだから、子供一番下のちっちゃいのが大きくなったらスイッチを切り替えようっていうふう

に自分のなかで決めてるんですけど、だから今は仕方ないのかなっていうふうに思ってます。

Koji feels that he has just become a researcher, and therefore, has yet to develop a particular self-perception as such. He would rather regard himself as a teacher, and is willing to bring his expertise as a researcher to his teaching, as he had envisaged in the past. Clarifying the application of his expertise in teaching, he stated:

> Even in regular classes, I often consciously incorporate the latest research results [as part of course content] so that the students can get an academic flavor in class a little. I also try to help them have a clear sense of purpose, I mean, I let them understand why they do what they do. I also try to allow them to have confidence. Even when they make mistakes, I try to perceive them positively….I try to do various things to avoid demotivating them.

担当の英語の授業でも、最新の研究成果とかそのアカデミックな香りをちょっと感じてもらえるようなことをちょっと取り入れてるとかそういうことはわりと意識してますし、あと目的意識を明確にさせることとか。なんで今この授業、でこんな勉強してるのっていうのをこう、わからせるとか自信をもたせるっていうか、間違ってもこう肯定的にそれをこう受け止めるというか。…できるだけそのやる気をそがないようにいろんなことを工夫するようにはしているんですけど。

Considering the current situation surrounding English education in Japan, Koji feels that the change he had wanted to make when he was a student has yet to come. In his opinion, this is largely due to fact that the Japanese school curriculum is focused on the university entrance examination. With the challenge of directly changing the status quo of English education, Koji, in his capacity as a university English teacher, finds it critical to provide high-quality teaching education to prospective instructors, in order to fulfill his dream from his university days:

> If I gain more power and become, for example (laughs), a member of the Central Council of Education, join its foreign language education working group, and become involved in the educational policy making, I could consider ways of changing

fundamental policies quite drastically. However, I obviously do not have the power. Therefore, the only thing that I can do for English education in Japan at the moment is help future English teachers to study professional topics, or provide them with specific suggestions as to how to improve their teaching. For example, 'Okay, here is another way of conducting a composition class.' I mean, all I can do for now is provide some inspiration or stimulation for them, so that is what I have been doing.

僕がもっともっと偉くなって、たとえば（笑）将来、あの中央教育審議会のメンバーになったりとか外国語教育部のなんかそういう部会に入ったりとか、そういう政策的に考えることにもしなったとしたら結構ドラマチックに根本的なことを変えられるとは思うんですよね。ただもちろんそんな力今ないですし、だから今この瞬間に僕が日本の英語教育のためにできることが何かといえば、将来英語の先生に、将来なろうとしている子たちに、そういう専門的なこと勉強してもらうとか、たとえばコンポジションの作文の授業でもこういう授業展開あるよって具体例を示すこととか。だからそういう未来の先生たちになんかうったえかけるというか。なにか刺激を与えるっていうことしかできないと思うんですよ今は。だからそれをやってるっていうことですね。

In the future, now that his field has become increasingly prominent in global scholarship, Koji aspires to become "a researcher who is capable of proudly having a discussion with English-speaking scholars" (堂々と英語母語話者と議論できるような研究者). In addition, he would like to attempt to write for an international publication "once [he is] free of daily lunch-box preparation" (毎日のお弁当作りから解放されたら).

However, because of the perceived importance of networking as a means of scholarly advancement in Japan, Koji finds it equally critical to be a locally active researcher:

I believe that in my field, the mainstream scholars are those outside Japan, and I think it would be beneficial to seek contact with them. Also, it is enjoyable to simply go overseas …. However, it is also true that expanding my networks in Japan can lead to offers of, for example, publication projects, lectures, teacher education plans, and projects related to the MEXT. Therefore, I believe that local connections and

networks in Japan are extremely important.

自分の分野でその第一人者とされてるような人たちっていうのは海外の研究者ですし、でそういう人たちと接触をもとめるとかそういうのはすごく自分にとってプラスになると思うし自分自身いろんな外国に飛び回って行くのは楽しいですし…。だけど、日本で、たとえばその、人脈をこう広げていく、たとえば それが出版につながるとか、それが講演につながるとか、たとえばそれが教員研修につながるとか、そういう文科省のなんかにつながるとか、なんかそういう意味では、日本の国内でのつながりとかネットワークっていうのがすごく大事だろうとは思ってますね。

Describing his vision as a researcher, he reveals a practitioner-oriented interest in becoming more visible in the local professional communities, through the recognition that is to be gained through research rather than through research in its own right:

Of course, I must write articles and attend conferences, but I would like to expand the scope of my jobs to various other tasks. So, the fact is if you develop an academic career, you are offered opportunities to give a lecture or maybe even publish some work. Therefore, I would like to improve my networking and enter the mainstream (laughs) [in the field of English education in Japan].

論文書くこととか学会に行くこととか、あのもちろんなんですけど、もう少しこう、広げていきたいですね。そのだから結局学会とか論文とかである程度こう業績を積んでいけば、まあいろんなこう仕事が来ますね講演とか、出版の話もあるかもしれないし。だからそういう感じでどんどんこういろんなつながりを広げて表舞台にこう（笑）打って出たいなっていうのがありますね。

CHAPTER 8

PARTICIPANT PROFILE 4: TAKESHI SUZUKI

Takeshi Suzuki is presently an associate professor at a private university. Unlike the other participants introduced above, Takeshi came to be interested in English mainly through bilingual reading outside of the classroom during high school. His linguistic interest in English led him to proceed to university education, which he had initially considered unnecessary. However, at university, Takeshi became dissatisfied with the learning environment and decided to focus his own self-study on furthering his English knowledge and skills. His pursuit of a master's degree came mainly from his desire to be exposed to an English speaking environment and thereby become proficient in the language. Thus, although his master's study provided him with both advanced language skills and knowledge of the discipline, Takeshi was indecisive regarding his specific career options. It was after his engagement with teaching at a conversational school back in Japan that he became interested in a particular research theme, leading him to join a doctoral program in America.

Takeshi places great value on his focused experience during his full-time doctoral study, and his personal intellectual curiosity gave him profound enjoyment of his writing and research. In contrast to his doctoral study, during which he felt a sense of fulfillment, Takeshi was not particularly satisfied with the work he subsequently produced in professional contexts back in Japan. Over the course of the job search, he started to publish RAs in English for the first time, building on the coursework of his doctoral years out of a sense of obligation rather than passion. Once he acknowledged the need to write for

publication for CV purposes. After successfully procuring a position as a full-time contractual instructor, he became socialized into teaching and teaching studies, enjoying his institutional context. While he profoundly enjoyed these endeavors and even took leadership in a number of projects, he felt that he was unable to focus on his own research in the way he had in his doctoral days. In the present context, Takeshi's sense of commitment as a teacher has intensified as he is one of the few faculty members with a TESOL background. However, a range of non-teaching professional duties constantly overwhelm him. Having many research ideas and being confident in his expertise, he wishes for more focused time for advancing his research, mainly to satisfy his personal need for intellectual pursuit.

Pre-Professional Background to the Pursuit of Doctoral Studies

Pre-University to University Experiences

Born in a rural city in the Kanto region of Japan, Takeshi never knew of any English speakers in his neighborhood. Early in his childhood, he was absorbed in swimming and baseball—never interested in the academic or the literal world in general. Takeshi defined himself back then as a typical "sports nut" (スポーツばか) who "even wondered, 'Why should we bother to go to junior high school or high school?' " (中学校、高校もなんで行くのっていうくらい)

In junior high school, his athletic interest shifted to volleyball, as he vaguely envisioned pursuing an athletic career. When English was introduced as a school subject, it attracted him as "novel," (新鮮) evoking the image of Hollywood stars seen on TV; however, his interest did not transcend the boundaries of the classroom. Takeshi's authentic interest in English intensified mainly after the unexpected transformation from an athletic lifestyle to a literal one due to an injury.

In the second year of junior high school, Takeshi hurt his lower back during a volleyball game, and the injury increasingly aggravated his condition as a player. Although he attempted to continue his volleyball activities in the first year of high school, the damage was serious enough to force him to give up the sport that year. It was in the midst of self-exploration during this challenging time that his absorption with reading began. Initially finding himself at a loss of directions, Takeshi chose to read books to kill his time. Fortunately, his frequent visitation to the library thereafter drew him to a new community of book lovers, with whom he was previously unfamiliar. These friends guided him to read one interesting book after another, enriching his inner world.

In the course of reading extensively in Japanese following his friends' recommendations, Takeshi stumbled upon a bilingual book series. The series, still popular in Japan, is a collection of famous English literature with accompanying Japanese translations. With the original passage of authentic text in English presented alongside Japanese translations, each volume was designed to cater to the needs of English language learners in Japan. The first volume of interest that Takeshi came across was *Kwaidan: Stories and Studies of Strange Things* by Lafcadio Hearn. Looking at the English text with the help of the corresponding Japanese translation, not only did he increase his understanding of the book's content, but also became amused by the contrasting analysis of the structures of the two languages:

> Apart from what I learned in English classes, what I found interesting was trying to compare the grammatical structure [of both the English text and its Japanese translation]. After finishing it (the first book), I read more of the volumes and became able to understand [the content of] them as well. Then, I went ahead to reach for more difficult pieces, like philosophical ones, to get the feel of an anxious literary guy. I was consumed with the 'I-am-a-useless-person-no-more-able-to-play-sports' feeling. Then—how do I put it—the more I read the books, the more I

became intoxicated with narcissistic decadence, with this feeling that life doesn't mean anything; but, the reason why I was able to enjoy the feelings was because those pieces that I happened to read were so interesting.

まあ英語のクラスはありましたけど、その文法的なこととかも、.こう比べてみるのがなんか面白くて、なんか、それを読んだら、だんだんわかってきたりして。で、もっとこう、難しい内容の、ちょっとこうフィロソフィー的な、そういう系の(を読んで)、ちょっとこういう悩んでる感じの文学青年チックな気分に、なんかもう運動もできないしなんか俺はだめだ、そういう感じにひたってたっていう感じですかね。でもう、なんつったらいいんですかね、自己陶酔っていうか、なんかね、人生なんて、みたいな。でまあどんどんっていう感じで、でもそれでもついでに読んでたら結構面白かったっていうことでっていうのはあるんです。

In the second year, his heightened interest in English led Takeshi to study the language in more depth on his own; additionally, he considered pursuing further studies at the university level. He stated:

I was really curious about the structure of the English language. To start out with, the word order [of the language] was different [from that of Japanese]. Why does the language work this way? It was like a puzzle to me. That was my observation from Japanese translations of English text; so, a flurry of thoughts sprang to my mind, purely out of curiosity—I would really like to figure out this language that is so different from Japanese. What's the structure of the language? What are the speakers' lives like? Then I wondered, 'How can I study this more?' This [question] in turn led me to hit on the idea: 'It might be good to going to a university.

英語の仕組みとかすごく気になったんですよね。やっぱこうまず語順も違うし、なんでこれ、こうなるのっていうまあパズルみたいな感じというか、対訳とかよく見てるとこうわかるので、まあ好奇心っていうかね、ピュアな意味で、こんだけ違う言語っていうのを、すごく解明していきたい。どういう仕組みなんだ、これをしゃべって生きてる人ってそれこそどういうことだっていうのが勝手に考えてでてきて、もっとこう勉強するにはどうしたらいいんだっていうことで、そこでパチッとだから、

大学行けばいいんじゃないっていう。

From then on, as he recollects, Takeshi went ahead and tried out various approaches to studying English on his own, including training himself in the skill of comprehending English newspapers, which also served as a preparation for the entrance examination.

Takeshi emphasized that he did not have any career considerations behind the decision to attend a university. His teacher's general academic advice to students at that time was the encouragement to apply at several high-ranking universities, given the potential social benefits in the future. Yet, Takeshi was not convinced of this advice, as his goal was purely a personal intellectual pursuit. He stated:

> I really did not have any concern about choosing a high-ranking university. All that I wanted was to have time to study on my own. My English teacher, too, would tell me, 'Why don't you apply to various universities? Why don't you go to what is called a prestigious university?' To me, though, such advice was irrelevant. I really did not care about the name of the university as long as it allowed me to study English.
>
> いい大学っていう感覚が ちょっと.なかったので、とにかく行ければいいって、時間がほしかったんで。自分で勉強する時間っていうのが。だからまあ英語の先生とかにも、いろんなところ受ければいいじゃないかっていうか、なんかこう、いい大学って言われてる大学に行けばいいじゃないかって、でも逆に私に言わせればどこでもいいので。大学で英語勉強できるとこであればどこでもいいっていうのがあって。

Thus, following his own plan to achieve the goal as soon as possible, Takeshi enrolled in the English department of a private university which was affiliated with the high school; he received special early admission based on recommendation.

Soon after he entered the university, Takeshi was shocked at the lack of classes that could truly help him learn English, both practically and academically. He vividly remembers the disillusionment with the academic environment that he found himself in:

Well, I remember that at first, I was really prepared to study with a lot of hope, and attended classes, full of motivation, for about three months. In time, however, I thought, it was useless; I mean, the university itself was useless …Professors did not have any interest in teaching whatsoever. It did not make sense. They just lectured on their specialties, assuming that students must know their area. Their courses were not even courses at all.

いやはじめは私あのほんとに期待にね、胸をふくらましてほんとに勉強するつもりで、三か月くらいはまあいろいろとね、授業にも出て、やる気満々でやった記憶があるんですけど、なんかね、だめだこりゃって思ったんですよね、大学自体が…。先生たち、ぜんぜん教える気ゼロじゃないか、なんかね意味わかんないっていうか。なんか自分の研究のことをやるんですけど、でそれを知らないとだめだな、みたいなぜんぜん授業じゃないじゃんみたいな。

His disappointment with course offerings, however, gave Takeshi an opportunity to return to and expand on his approach to self-learning that he had begun to develop back in high school. He explained how he motivated himself:

Okay, I will study by myself, then. There are books out there, and I can understand [English] if I read them. That's what I thought. I took a minimal number of required [language] courses, but I decided to study areas beyond what the classes covered without hesitation, believing that it would be efficient for me to study linguistics or other things (English-related subjects) on my own. Then, I started to devour various books. That's how things went, as I remember.

もう、あの自分で勉強すりゃあいいと、本あるし、読めばわかる。なんかそう思ったんですね。最低限の必修の授業はとったんですけど、語学のね。でもそれ以外のことは自分でもじゃんじゃんやろうと、言語学にしても何にしても、自分で勉強したほうが早いだろうと思って、それからいろいろ本をあさって読みはじめた、そういう感じになった記憶がありますね。

After the decision to focus on self-study, Takeshi followed his own intuitive syllabus not only to learn the structure of the English language but also to develop the knowledge

base of language-related fields. As the university did not require any discipline-related seminars and graduate theses in the second and third years, there was no explicit professor-led socialization process into any discipline through writing. His exposure to language-related fields was attainable almost solely through his independent learning endeavors, mainly through reading.

Though he adapted himself to the laid-back student culture and participated in club activities with his peers, Takeshi regularly used his private time at home to immerse himself in books. As his studies progressed, the joy of intellectual fulfillment overpowered his initial frustration with the university. In fact, he came to value the secret learning time apart from that provided by the university's curriculum, which attracted him originally to the school. According to Takehshi, there was a time when he slept in the daytime, worked part-time in the evening, and studied English from night till morning, ending up not attending classes on campus. Still, he found it pleasurable to be given several years to study English without relying on any particular assignments or people. He read books on linguistics, sociology, and communication, among others, without being seen by his peers:

> You know, there is this nerdy linguistics section [in the library]. I mean, for no particular reason, I would feel like, 'Ok, I will read all' [of the books in the shelves in the section], but I would not really like to tell this to others. I was not the type of guy who appeared bookish, so I almost never read openly in the library in the daytime.
>
> なんかオタッキーな感じの、あるじゃないですか英語のコーナーみたいなのが。ねえ、なんかこう、これ全部読んだろ、みたいな気持ちに、なんか要はなるわけですよ。…でもあんまりそれを人には言いたくないんですよね。勉強をしているっていうタイプじゃなかったし、なのでまあ、昼間からね学校で図書館で読むっていうことはほとんどなかったです。

During his second year at the university, Takeshi began to plan to study abroad in an English-speaking country after graduation. Part of the motivation behind the decision was his emerging self-doubt about the meaning of his focus on the linguistic aspects of English.

Over the course of his solitary reading journey, Takeshi increasingly felt the need to simultaneously improve his English communication skills. Takeshi tried out various independent methods to improve his English skills. In addition to regular language classes, some of which were taught by English-speaking professors, he watched movies, went to the language laboratory, took special courses on interpreting, and volunteered as a tour guide for foreign visitors. Yet, he still felt limited in applying his self-learning approach to enhancing his English skills in the environment.

In addition to this evolving awareness, Takeshi's long-standing personal curiosity in immersing himself in an English-speaking country was a source of motivation. This curiosity intensified as he considered his future profession in a more realistic way than in the past. With his consistent love of English, he envisioned a range of career options, including translation, interpretation, and teaching at the high school level, for which he earned a certificate. However, Takeshi never thought of going straight into any of these professions without actually visiting a country at least once to observe how English was used there. Thus, he planned and studied diligently in preparation for achieving his goal without aligning himself with the job-hunting activities that his peers engaged in during his senior year.

Takeshi, however, did not have any idea of institutional destinations or disciplinary concentration at the time. Takeshi emphasized that the choice to attend the master's program in America from which he later graduated did not come as a decision, but rather because of the suggestion from one of his English-speaking teachers in charge of the study-abroad advisory board. According to Takeshi, he originally did not think of attending graduate school and assumed that even an English language program would suffice, as he "just wanted to see people speaking English" (ちょっと英語を話してる人たちを見に行きたいだけだった). However, the teacher suggested that he should take the opportunity to apply to a graduate school, given that he finished the undergraduate program. The graduate school

was one among the choices that the teacher offered to him that was particularly cheap and was the first to accept him. He almost casually chose the concentrate on TESOL, as it sounded similar to his original major and as he was interested in linguistics.

Master's Studies and Early Teaching Experiences

Because the master's program was intended primarily for English-speaking language teaching professionals, the beginning of Takeshi's life there was marked by struggle. Fresh out of a Japanese university without extensive prior exposure to English for communicative or academic purposes, he was initially overwhelmed with a multitude of language and literacy learning challenges. Along with the struggles associated with adapting to daily life as one of the few Japanese students in the city during this period, the first encounters with formal academic literacy tasks affected Takeshi in the first semester of the program. Directions regarding basic assignments, such as summarizing texts, preparing for presentations, and writing term papers, were not clear to him. He had never engaged in such tasks even in his L1. As he did during his high school and university years, he turned to books as a main resource for learning. To understand his assignments, Takeshi read books on academic writing and related areas that he located independently at the library. Even after understanding the assignments, tackling them was challenging. He was so troubled for about three months that he even thought of going back to Japan.

His endurance for the first semester brought Takeshi a well-deserved breakthrough both linguistically and academically. In addition to getting used to the workings of the program, increased levels of listening and speaking skills contributed to a sense of well-being in his daily life. He joined a circle of American professional peers of various ages. He became particularly good friends with one of the local mature male students, and they often shared drinks as they discussed a variety of topics. Academically, Takeshi developed the ability to comprehend the lectures fully and become genuinely interested in

them. He continued to work hard without missing any classes. Now feeling no pressure to hide his bookish self, Takeshi frequently visited the library, sometimes with friends, and stayed well into the night to study.

In his reflections, Takeshi described several critical moments that bolstered his confidence as an advanced language learner in classroom contexts during the pursuit of his master's degree. His success stories pertained to the recognition of prior knowledge acquired through self-learning as a resource to keep him on par with English-speaking peers. One such memorable occasion happened when he noticed his familiarity with the content of linguistics courses. He realized that the level of the content was almost similar to what he read as an undergraduate back in Japan. Therefore, he felt that he had a little advantage over the others for the first time. Other confidence-building moments occurred when he switched his papers with those of his English-speaking friends through informal peer review sessions in and out of classes. The sessions allowed Takeshi not only to learn from his peers but also to confirm the accuracy of the way he actually applied the generic academic essay structure he had struggled to model from books.

Takeshi's confidence in his English abilities was further strengthened in the context of pre-service professional training offered through the program. The major part of his practicum requirements involved teaching as an assistant instructor in an intensive English program, incorporating what he learned from TESOL coursework. As he remembers, Takeshi found it enjoyable to teach beginning ESL students, particularly from the viewpoint of an advanced user of English. It was exciting for him to find himself being able to teach English *in English*. In addition, he did not feel pressured as in the class with American peers. He also was involved in various program activities, such as going on field trips with students.

Simultaneously, Takeshi still had some reservations as to whether he loved teaching at the time: "In my recollection, if I was asked if I really loved teaching [at the time], I would

say that I was not sure, although it was fun" (でも教えることがそんなにめちゃくちゃ好きかって言われるとそうでもないような気もしてたような記憶があるんですよね、でも楽しいは楽しい). Evaluating his teaching endeavors back then, he stated:

> Of course, I learned methods in the program, so I tried out various things in class, but although it was interesting to do that, I did not fully understand what the best approach was. At that time, I went to graduate school without any particular sense of purpose or willingness to become a teacher; so, I may not have been ready for it in that sense. I did not [have the motivation] to apply the practicum experience to my future career…If I had taught somewhere and come here to develop my skills further, the training would have made more sense, but it was my very first time, you know. Therefore, I did not have a foundation to build upon. I was just doing what I was asked to do, without much awareness.
>
> もちろんそのなんか教授法とかいうのは授業でやるので、そういうのを実践してみようっていうことでいろいろ試してはやるんですけど、どれがいいのかわからないし、そのやってること自体は面白かったですけどね、そのいろんなやり方を試してみたっていう意味では。もともとは大学院入ったのもなんとなく入ったし、先生になろうって強く意識して入ってるわけではないので、そういう意味では微妙ですよねなんかね…何かどっかで教えてて、じゃあこれをさらに？こうもっといいものにっていうのならわかるんですけど、もう一番はじめですよね、はじめてそんなことをなんか、やるような感じだったんで、何をもとに考えていいかわからない。あんまり意識してっていうかもうやれと言われてやってたっていう感じですね。

Thus, for Takeshi, training in teaching back then was primarily a catalyst for his evolving confidence in English skills as a learner, rather than for his professional development. Yet, his later recognition of his ability to teach English speakers, as well as ESL students, gave him a sense of achievement as a potential foundation for his professional future. As an extra assignment that was outside the regular practicum requirements, Takeshi was offered the chance to fill in for a professor and provide a series

of lectures for a linguistics course in the undergraduate program. He was asked to cover the introduction to phonology, a topic with which he was knowledgeable. Despite the initial nervousness regarding his perceived awkward moments, Takeshi's well-prepared lecture in his own words eventually garnered positive responses from students:

> Although I was not able to fully detail on the topic well, I was able to lecture on it by explaining with examples and focusing on the simplicity of the underlying idea. And they (students) told me later that, my plain English, within the capacity of my language skills at the time, rendered the lecture easy to understand; so, I thought I may able to do this kind of thing, you know.
>
> あんまり言葉を尽くしていろいろ説明はできないけど、言ってることは簡単なんだっていうことをね、意識して、 例をあげたりしていけば、それはできると。で簡単な英語でしゃべるので逆にそれがわかりがよかったってあとで言ってくれて。そういう意味では、そういうのだったらできるんじゃないかっていうのはちょっと、ねえ。

By the time he successfully finished the program, Takeshi came to value the English that he had struggled to acquire as a resource to draw on in any professional context. Thus, Takeshi's career plan upon graduation was not limited entirely to teaching, even at the university level. Rather, he was poised to take on whatever language-related career was available back in Japan.

According to Takeshi, it was after he started a career as a full-time instructor at a conversational school back in Japan that his professional awareness actually developed. As he was engaged in teaching six conversational English courses for adults from morning until evening every day, Takeshi, now an employed teacher, was faced with teaching-related issues that had been dealt with in the master's program in a Japanese setting. The issues included the effectiveness of teaching, conflicts between institutional policy and realities of the classroom, room for creativity in teaching approaches, and most importantly, specific learning needs of students at hand. He stated:

At the school, I for the first time thought about various things on my own. For example, I wondered whether my teaching was working or not. In addition, I thought about the institutional policy that dictated the way teachers ought to teach, which I often disagreed with [given what happened in the classroom]; so, there were various levels of internal conflict … On top of that, there were issues with students who were not very proficient in English. For the first time in the real teaching context [of this kind of students], lots of questions were coming to my mind, like 'What about using this approach?' [and] 'How can I help them advance their learning?' I kind of came to recognize these questions.

それでそこで、まあいろいろ初めて自分で考えたっていうんですかね。あの教えてきたことが生きてるか生きてないかっていうか、でその会社の方針っていうんですかね、ここはこうしなくちゃいけないっていうか、それは違うでしょっていろいろなまあ葛藤があるわけですよね。…あとはそれこそどうしてもやっぱしゃべりが苦手な生徒さんとか、なんかいろいろ疑問がわいてくるわけです。はじめてだからこう教えるなかで、この教え方でどうだろうとか、あとはどうやったらもうちょっとね、学習が進むだろうかとか、そういうことにちょっとね、こう気がついて。

Takeshi's motivation to apply to a doctoral program at another graduate school in America, came directly from his desire to resolve his questions, that emerged from his English teaching experience, as well as from his own language and literacy learning history. Takeshi stated, "[As opposed to the case with my first visit to America to attend the master's program], my second visit [to enroll in the doctoral program] was really my proactive decision, with these clear questions to explore" (二回目に行ったときはほんと自発的に大学院に行こうと思って、ちゃんとこう疑問があってそれを追求したいっていう意味で、あの行ったんですよね).

Nevertheless, Takeshi stressed that he did not have any pragmatic career related concerns when deciding on the institution to attend. Although he cared that an academic department offered curriculum related to TESOL and reasonable tuition rates, the existence

of famous mainstream scholars in the field was not of much concern. He was not interested in becoming socialized into a network of experts in the field. Rather, he wanted to keep a reasonable distance from such experts to achieve his goals. Thus, consistent with his stance to this point, he wanted to prioritize as a selection criterion the procurement of an extended period to focus independently on research. He explained this rationale based on a negative example set by an acquaintance struggling in a Japanese graduate school saying that he had to study the area related to his professor's expertise:

> It would not mean anything if that happened when I went [to America]. I mean, with these questions that I definitely wanted to pursue, I really hated to follow a professor's preference; so, I tried to find a graduate school that allowed students to study as freely as possible. Thinking back now, I would have given a little more thoughts on it (institution selection), though (laughs).
>
> そういうので行くんだったらねえ、もう、要は自分のこの疑問っていうのをなんとか研究したいのに、そういうその先生の気に入ったことじゃないとみたいな、それをやるのはね、ほんといやだったので、できるだけこう自由にやらせてくれるような？ところを探したんですね。今考えればもうちょっとそういうのは（笑）もうちょっと考えますけどね。

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career

Writing and Research Experiences in the Early Academic Career Phase

The American doctoral program at the university Takeshi attended was designed primarily for professionals in teaching positions inside and outside the country. The course work helped students expand their knowledge of TESOL, linguistics, and related fields and thereby develop their expertise academically and professionally. With a relatively light course load and an understated culture for research apprenticeship, the program allowed for ample time for students' independent dissertation projects, which suited Takeshi's objective. Although writing was encouraged, there were no publication requirements for

students.

With clear research purposes in mind, Takeshi selected coursework to suit his original interests and research purposes. Thus, he built on and expanded his knowledge of linguistics and issues related to TESOL that he had acquired during his master's program. He studied a range of research methods that he could choose from for application to his dissertation project. With this advanced linguistic level and accumulated professional experiences, Takeshi's progress in his coursework was smooth, and he felt prepared for his dissertation project in the second year. A research method that was particularly inspiring to Takeshi was qualitative inquiry, which many graduate faculty members in the institution actively pursued. Partly under their influence, he decided to use the method in a potential pilot interview study among ESL students in the language program. When he conducted the actual study, Takeshi's interest in the approach intensified profoundly.

His advisor, Professor T, whom he met through the research method professor's recommendation, took a facilitative, rather than directive, approach to advising Takeshi. Since the research interests were different from Takeshi's, Professor T did not engage him in the apprenticeship hierarchy. Rather, he respected Takeshi's research focus and methodology. For independent-oriented Takeshi, the acceptance of his dissertation proposal by the committee—led by the professor—was reassuring.

On the other hand, coupled with the absence of an institutional requirement regarding publication, his still open-ended career prospects kept Takeshi from considering making his written coursework projects known to a wider audience, despite their excellence. For example, a paper Takeshi produced in a course was regarded highly by his instructor as publishable in a certain journal, yet he was not enthusiastic about attempting to follow this suggestion:

> To be honest with you, I did not think of what would come after graduate school even at that stage. I had not quite thought of teaching at the university level, so I

had never thought of accumulating publications in graduate school.

実はけっこうそのあと大学で教えるなんてこともあまり考えてないです。その時点でも。なので、パブリケーション重ねようとか大学院のうちにとか、あんまりね私ね実はね考えてなかったんですよ。

Takeshi's main intellectual focus during the doctoral years was thus naturally placed on his dissertation. Takeshi described his dissertation writing experience as a generally positive one, despite challenges involved at each stage of the research and writing process. He clearly remembers the general shift in his emotions over the course of the process. The first wave of enjoyment came at the early stage, when he collected, processed, and analyzed data for the first time. The second wave of enjoyment came when he reached the stage of interim data analysis. The third wave of enjoyment came at the stage of final data analysis and write-up.

Takeshi admitted that, especially in the writing process, he experienced a degree of frustration with second language (L2) issues, albeit in the midst of enjoyment. He explained:

Given that I am not a native speaker, it was quite hard to make my writing articulate enough to convey all the complexity that was beyond simple description, and I am not sure if I was actually able to do it. … I did enjoy the writing process… but I felt kind of conflicted as I did this project, in spite of the uncertainty about whether I was using correct or understandable expressions. I even came to the point where I wondered if it was okay for me to do this kind of thing. But I ended up getting it done anyway (laughs)

それこそネイティブじゃないし、どうやってそのなんていうんですかね、一言では言えないいろんな絡みっていうのをもう全部これ読んでもらうとなんとなく伝わるよっていうぐらいの 感じにするにはなかなかこう難しいなあっていうね、感じがするんですよね。まあそのへん実際自分ができてるかどうかが。… 書いてて楽しいんですけど、でもやっぱり、言語的にやっぱそのいい言い方っていうか、伝わる言い方かどうかっていうのもわからないなかでやるっていうのは、まあ葛藤っていうんですか

ね、これこんなことしていいのかっていうぐらいな、っていうのはありましたけど。まあでもほんとにそれはやってしまったっていう感じの（笑）。

In completing the project as a L2 writer, Takeshi was appreciative of Professor T's respectful stance toward his work as his own creative endeavor. Professor T did not openly critique the main component of the dissertation, nor did he make grammatical corrections, although he checked the quality of the sections on the rationale and methodology for the study. Takeshi stated:

> Many of what he gave me were his personal comments, like 'Okay, this is what you found'. I guess that he probably had believed that he was not in a position to give me specific directions …So, in this regard, I was grateful. He was so generous, and nice to work with.
>
> あ、そうなんだっていうぐらいな、パーソナルなコメントていうのが多くて、その先生もたぶんそういう考え方なんだと思うんですけど、別に何かこうしなさいっていうのはたぶん踏み込むべきじゃないってちょっと思ってたと思うんですよね。…そういう意味ではありがたかったですけどね。ものすごく寛容なっていうか…。そういう意味ではすごくやりやすかったですね。

When asked about the meaning of the dissertation, Takeshi emphasized its personal, rather than professional or scholarly, significance. To him, the dissertation was "one stone that can kill four birds" (一石四鳥), a catalyst for multiple benefits. First and foremost, Takeshi valued his work as a culminating achievement of his own intellectual pursuit that started in Japan. Takeshi also emphasized the effects of the dissertation on his personal growth, as he learned lessons about human interaction in the research process.

Takeshi also referred to the importance of the dissertation as a medium for learning how to write in English. As an outcome of his learning experience, Takeshi acknowledged the growth of a distinct identity within himself as a writer, citing his advisor's final comments on his dissertation as a defense---"There is something unique about your writing" (君の文章はなんか独特のものがある). Takeshi conceded that "uniqueness"(独特のもの) comes

with many meanings, but he agreed with his advisor's evaluation, stating:

> I have a sense that something [unique] as a writer might have exuded in my dissertation, even only in my L2. I'm not sure if it was a good thing or bad, nor am I sure if it had anything to do with 'readability' in a general sense, but I have the feeling that I was able to express some element of my own style. It was great that I got to recognize it.
>
> それってことは、L2 だけでもライターとしてのなんかこうものが？何か出たんじゃないかっていう感覚はあるんですよね。それがいいか悪いのかはわからないし、そのあのいわゆる一般的な意味での読みやすさとかそういうことにつながってるかっていったらそうではないかもしれないけど、ひとつの何か、あの私の形っていうものが、出たんじゃないかなっていう気はするんですよね、それをまあ認識するっていう意味ではすごくよかったと思うんですよね。

Takeshi also feels that the impact of his training in dissertation writing is long-standing. From looking at a variety of RAs written by other scholars, Takeshi currently notices that his own writing style is positively unique, which he feels is the outcome of his writing endeavors over the past years, beginning with dissertation writing.

Unlike the other participants, Takeshi's conscious publishing endeavors started after he earned his doctorate. After returning to Japan, without concerns about the social meanings associated with earning a Ph.D., Takeshi engaged in a job search, which was not limited to the field of higher education. As was the case with his previous job search, he was prepared to accept any position available in any sector, as long as he could use his English. However, over the course of his search, Takeshi recognized the need for some publications to enhance his CV for university positions. Thus he begain his initial experience in writing for publication. To create his publication list, he looked for whatever was publishable from his well-received term papers produced years before in graduate school. Even after successfully obtaining a full-time contractual position at University A, his efforts to publish from his previous work continued for about a year as he endeavored

to update his qualifications.

During this beginning stage of his writing career, Takeshi submitted a couple of articles to English-language professional peer-reviewed journals, as they were known for relatively short review periods. As expected, Takeshi was able to publish them following a smooth editorial process, thereby fulfilling the pragmatic need for CV development. Looking back at these early publications, however, Takeshi expressed a degree of dissatisfaction. In some cases, he felt that the articles reconstructed from his old work did not represent his true expertise or perspective. Referring to one of the articles, based on the above mentioned highly regarded term paper, Takeshi humbly commented, “I truly wondered whether it was okay to publish this ‘I-am-sorry-but-there-was-no-other-choice -than-to-publish’ kind of paper” (ほんとはなんかこんなん出していいのかっていうくらいな感じで、あの申し訳ないんですけどとりあえずしかたないので出してるっていう感じで). In other cases, he confessed that length requirements for the journals did not allow him to express his arguments fully. Evaluating an article reconstructed from one of his studies that led to his dissertation, Takeshi stated, “It does have many pages, but even so, I could not say anything substantial [in the argument]. I feel sorry about this” (これでも結構な枚数とってて。でもこれではほんとにね、何も言えてないっていうかね、ほんと申し訳なくて) .

With his developing professional life in the English language program, Takeshi’s dedication naturally revolved around teaching. At first, he was not specific about his stance towards the continuation of writing and research in the professional context, partly because of the uncertainty of his professional outlook and his self-perceived mission as a teacher. Nevertheless, as he got socialized into the teacher community in the English program, Takeshi came to enjoy teaching highly motivated students using his expert knowledge of his field. In collaboration with similarly engaged fellow teachers, Takeshi worked diligently also to improve the program and further cater to the needs of the students.

Furthermore, there was a low-key collaborative research culture in the program in

which faculty members worked together to present and produce teacher research. Takeshi became socialized into this culture as well, synthesizing expertise developed in his doctoral years with his increasing professional knowledge gained in the institutional setting. Due to the heavy teaching load involving about ten class meetings per week along with related educational duties, it was difficult for him to allocate adequate time for writing and research. Thus, Takeshi made it a rule to engage in "whatever possible as the best [he could do] " (できるだけやれることをやる) at least annually.

Takeshi was greatly appreciative of a range of opportunities offered by his colleagues to co-present or coauthor institutional projects. Takeshi remembers that within time constraints, he and his coauthors often started each project with setting goals of presenting the proposal at a certain conference; thus, they adjusted the research schedule with conference dates as targets. Describing this typical routine of collaborative research engagements, Takeshi explained:

> Usually, you were supposed to submit your proposal after the completion of the research, but in our cases, it was the other way around. Supposing that we would complete the research, we started with a meeting after submission of the proposal to discuss what should be done by the time of the presentation. We would talk with each other like this: 'Okay, we've got this proposal due by this conference of this association, so let's [submit the proposal and] work together [toward the presentation at the conference]'. That's how it went.
>
> 本来はね、ちゃんとできてからね、出すんですけど、そこらへんはやるっていうふうに想定して、そのあとにあの、それがあるからその間に、じゃあこういうことを、ちょっとやりましょうっていうまあ打ち合わせをしたり。まあ先生どうしで、「今後こういう学会の大会あるから、じゃあその、みんなで、やりましょうか」って言ったり。そんな感じですね。

Naturally, the major period for collecting data often occurred right before summer vacation, so they worked on the rest of the project thereafter. Despite many challenges, Takeshi

enjoyed the research, particularly among those students who he was now teaching. A close relationship with his students developed from the frequent contacts the program facilitated, and he collected rich data from them, which further helped Takeshi develop as an educator.

Takeshi was not only involved in institutional research initiated by other teachers, but he also took the lead in studies using knowledge developed through his dissertation project. His research orientation gradually attracted the interest of one of his colleagues, who was initially indifferent to the approach. Consequently, a series of collaborative projects with a unified thematic focus resulted. Working together with his colleagues was beneficial for Takeshi in further developing his research expertise. In addition, building on his writing style developed through dissertation writing, Takeshi played a leading role in the actual documentation of the research as well. For example, in one of the papers he coauthored, Takeshi wrote the main components of the work—the literature review, discussion, and conclusion—with his colleagues providing additional information regarding the data. Takeshi felt fortunate to be able to combine his past engagement and his ongoing professional experiences through this set of projects, thereby contributing to professional communities.

On the other hand, Takeshi admitted that he also desired to pursue independently the theme from his dissertation. For example, Takeshi attempted to publish international journal articles from his dissertation several times. For some of these articles, he received an “acceptance after revision” instead of a complete rejection; thus, he was entitled to proceed. Yet, at the same time, he was not sure how to go about revising the articles. He humbly said that he did not have sufficient knowledge in choosing the right journal or strong confidence in moving forward to navigate through the review process to ensure that the articles would be published. While mulling over this dilemma, immediate deadlines on collaborative projects as described above were overwhelming, and he did not revise or resubmit the articles. In his reflections, Takeshi revealed mixed feelings about negotiating

between his individual work and collaborative work conducted with his colleagues. Despite the synergy between these two types of work, Takeshi still considered them to be separate, stating:

> Once I worked together with other teachers, I couldn't actually manage to do my own research. Those collaborative projects came in and had to be worked on before I actually was done with my own research, including my must-do dissertation-related research, so I would end up putting it off. Well, it was supposed to be done in parallel with the work with the collaborative projects, but they were also fun in their own right, although time consuming. It was difficult [to strike a balance].
>
> 結局ほかの先生たちと共同でやると、自分のやつになかなか手が回らなくなるっていうのは実際あったんですよね、その博論とか自分のね、やるべきであるその研究のほうを、やる前にほかのが入ってきてそっちにっていうことで延ばし延ばしになってるのはあるんですよね。だから本来はまあそれも並行してやればいいんですけど、なかなかそっちもそっちで時間とられて、でもこっちはこっちで楽しかったりするっていうんですかね、その辺が難しいあれですよね。

Writing and Research Experiences in the Current Academic Career Phase

Takeshi obtained a full-time tenured position in the English department at University J and has been working there for three years. Like Koji, Takeshi presently not only teaches in and coordinates an English language program in his department, but also is in charge of courses and seminars on his specialty. Although class meetings are fewer than before, particularly since he has been one of the few language education specialists at the institution, Takeshi's strong sense of commitment as a teacher has intensified. As an English teacher, Takeshi continues to be devoted to helping students learn language skills, building upon his prior experiences.

What is new to Takeshi as a tenured university teacher is the range of administrative work that pertains mainly to the entire functioning of the university and

student affairs, often requiring a large amount of paperwork in Japanese. Though rewarding, the wide-ranging mission naturally eats up his time, including weekends and term breaks, when he could be focusing on research. Takeshi explained the issue despite his main priority of teaching:

> There was part of me thinking that I might be able to work on my own research, given fewer class meetings and more chances to read on my field, but …there are various miscellaneous duties coming in, so it may be that I am busier than before.
>
> コマも少なくなるし、専門のね、その本とかもまあ読むことになるから、やっぱり自分のねえ研究も進められるんじゃないかっていう思いもあったんですが。まあでもそれはそれで…雑務が、いろんなものがね、入ってくるので。まあどっちが忙しくなったかっていったら実はもしかしたらこっちのほうが忙しいかもしれないっていうぐらいなもんですよね。

With the quantity and variety of work, Takeshi sometimes wonders, “What is my job?”(私の仕事なんだっけ？)

Although the educational university does not encourage research explicitly, Takeshi has been observing extremely prolific professors in other disciplines, unlike any he had encountered in the English language program at University A. Takeshi feels “subtle pressure”(なんとなくのプレッシャー) regarding the constant need to publicize his CV to external audiences periodically; furthermore, the CV’s relevance to promotion opportunities represents another such pressure.

Takeshi’s ongoing research engagements currently revolve around other collaborative research projects that he initiated with his previous colleagues. Though he enjoys the projects, Takeshi feels dissatisfied with the progress of his own research associated with his dissertation. Because he consistently values time to concentrate on his intellectual pursuits, Takeshi is not satisfied with the pressing conditions. Despite sufficient access to major journals, Takeshi has found it difficult to read them to keep abreast of current discourses in the field to frame his work. With only a short chunk of

available time, Takeshi has kept struggling to write articles for potential submission to international journals.

Yet, Takeshi's perceived need to engage in research seems to be intrinsic, rooted in his personal language and literacy learning history and writing experiences rather than in the pressure towards external recognition. In clarifying the motivation for publishing work stemming from his dissertation, Takeshi emphasized his fundamental pursuit to express himself rather than a drive to be acknowledged as a researcher:

> There seem to be some people who …aim at the research to come to prominence as a scholar …but I guess I am not that kind of person. It has nothing to do with a wish for fame. Rather, it is more about me—I have not fully let it out—I feel constipated, I feel constipated all the time. It is somewhat [frustrating]. I really wanted to publish my dissertation-related work and get down to a new thing, but I have not got it done …. I guess that's the thing.
>
> なかには、…学者とかね、世に出るとか、そういうことを目指してる方もいないことはないんです。…でもね私そういうのじゃない気がしますね、別にね有名になりたいとかそういうことではなくて、なんか自分のなんかこう、出し切れてないっていうか、便秘状態ですよね。万年の便秘状態です。なんかこう、すっきりしないっていうか、どうもね。全部一度ね博士論文の出して、もう新しいことをやりたいんですけど、まだ出せてないっていうそういうところがねえ…あるような気がして。

Analyzing his own pathway to becoming a university English teacher, Takeshi feels that his learner self is most integral. He stated:

> I still feel really awkward about the label "researcher" even now ..., although I have not done that much research. I have not had the perspective of living as a researcher in the first place…. I have not lived that way. In a way, I just loved learning English and that's where I came from…Basically, my English is still not adequate. I mean, I realize I have a lot of room for improvement in the language. Whether spoken or written, I still would like to improve my abilities. I tell this to students when I teach

languages and content courses in my field. Some of them may become teachers, but what I would like to tell them is the basic comes down to being a learner. Some of them may become teachers, but [what I would like to tell them is] the basic comes down to being a learner.

ほんと「研究者」っていうのは今でも違和感を覚えるっていうか…、まだね、そんなにやってるわけではないんですが。研究者として生きていくっていう視点っていうのがやっぱり、もともとねえ…。そういう感じで生きてきたわけではないので。ある意味、英語が好きで、そうやってきただけなんですけど…やっぱね、英語ができてないんですよ。… あの、まだまだだなっていうところがすごくあるんですね。そのしゃべるのにしても読むのにしても、やっぱりもっとそれをこうやりたいなっていうところがあって、学生にも、語学の科目でも、まあ専門のなかでも、言うんですけど、やっぱり、学習者っていうか、 あの、先生になる人もいるかもしれないけど、基本はあの学習者っていうのは、あるんですよね。

Looking ahead, however, Takeshi feels the need to grow as a researcher, albeit not intrinsically. He explained:

Among many of my identities, I exercised those as a learner and teacher, always feeling the need to work hard, but a part of me realizes that I am not working hard as a researcher. It's not my priority, but I guess I cannot neglect that part. As I am aging, I understand the argument that one needs to contribute [what he has learned] to some extent. It's high time to start working in earnest putting together my experiences, my writing, and research, which I do not hate at all. Part of me has not got to do it fully, but I really feel the need to enrich this side of myself.

そのいろんなアイデンティティがあるなかで、学習者としてとか教育者としてとか、まあ常にそれはね、頑張ろうっていうのはあるんですけど、その研究者として頑張ってないっていうのがあるのは自分でもわかるんですよね。もちろんそれが自分のなかで一番大事だとは思ってはいないんですが、でもそこも、やっぱりおろそかにはやっぱりできないなっていうのも。ある程度まあ年をとって、それは還元しなさいっていうか、その気持ちはわかるんですよね。その経験なり、あるいはそのことをま

とめたなり、ある程度その物を書いたり研究っていうことの、そろそろ着手っていうかね、本格的にやらなきゃいけないなっていうのは、ぜんぜん嫌いなわけではないんでね。その活動自体が、そのへんがやれてない自分っていうのがまだあって、でも充実させていかなくちゃいけないなっていうのを、あの感じてますね、すごく。

Despite his hesitance to see himself as a researcher, his future research directions seemed to be clear and focused. Fortunately, Takeshi continues to find synergy between his research interests and his ongoing teaching experiences. He revealed that he habitually records interesting themes worth investigating every time he teaches, although he humbly conceded that those ideas have yet to materialize. In explaining his potential research directions, he reemphasized his consistent interest in the same areas he studied during his doctoral years.

CHAPTER 9

PARTICIPANT PROFILE 5: MINAMI YAMAMOTO

Minami Yamamoto is an assistant professor at a private university. Having lived in America until the end of her first year of high school, Minami was educated predominantly in English while using Japanese at home. Her main language related concern back in Japan centered on her Japanese, although she enjoyed her university campus life. Although she did not initially consider pursuing a career in Japan, Minami later decided to base herself in her home country and engage in English education. The decision was based on her study abroad experience, during which she not only developed her knowledge of the discipline and academic literacy, but also acknowledged herself as being regarded as Japanese, and discovered the value of her competence in English. Thus, she taught at a Japanese high school while simultaneously pursuing master's studies at a Japanese graduate school, both of which she enjoyed. Her pursuit of doctoral studies followed naturally. After narrowly missing out on several job opportunities outside of academia, she became convinced that she should focus on the fondness for research that she had been cultivating, and her professors' recommendation compelled her to study in America.

In the two years of her doctoral life in America, Minami thoroughly enjoyed being trained in research under the guidance of her powerful advisor and her research team and presented and published a number of works mainly in collaboration with them. After coming back to Japan to get married and being awarded a full-time job as a contractual instructor in English, however, her professional engagement as a teacher and her personal commitment as a wife became her top priorities, although she continued her dissertation

project with the distant support of her advisor and one of her peers. Immediately after completing her dissertation, Minami made a life-altering decision to withdraw from her full-time teaching for maternity leave, but, her advisor and peers pulled her back to the world of scholarship by engaging her in certain writing projects, and her old Japanese graduate school community helped her to join a local writing project, which she found to be important to her career in Japan. In her current institutional context, Minami feels an increasing responsibility as one of the few professors specializing in language education. This professional mission at times comes into conflict with her continued engagement in writing and research, mainly with her American graduate school research team. However, Minami has taken on multiple research projects with the team, despite a range of constraints. Minami is seeking ways to harmonize her research expertise, local teaching context, and available research networks, all the while remaining devoted to her role as a mother.

Pre-Professional Background to the Pursuit of Doctoral Studies

Pre-University to University Experiences

Born into a Japanese family on the west coast of America, Minami became an English-dominant bilingual at an early age. Minami acquired English skills after extensive exposure to the language in her school as well as in her local neighborhood. In her English-speaking environment, Minami started playing the piano at the age of five. The world of music that she found herself in expanded in parallel with her English studies, and music remained a core passion well into her high school years. Minami often attended music camps and was nominated to be a piano contestant a number of times.

Similar to her love of music, Minami's love for reading in English was cultivated at an early age. She remembers that her mother put particular emphasis on the importance of

developing literacy skills:

> My mother was really concerned that our home did not offer children a sufficient amount of English language input, particularly that of grown-ups' language. She understood that children of American families develop vocabulary and logical communication through conversations with their parents.
>
> 家庭で十分な英語のインプット,とくにその大人の言葉に接してない、っていうことで、あのやっぱりアメリカ人の家庭ってすごくその親との会話を通して語彙力もそうだし論理的な物事のあのコミュニケーション力っていうものをすごくその家庭で大事にしているので、そういうことを母はすごく気にしていて。

Encouraged by her mother, Minami learned reading and writing well before enrolling in primary school, which naturally developed her attention to literacy. She received private tutoring in writing and enjoyed regular free-writing exercises. She also immersed herself in a range of books with the guidance of librarians from a nearby children's library.

Building on this foundation, Minami's literacy development was further nurtured in school. In her English classes, in addition to regular textbook work, sessions often included a traditional Science Research Associate (SRA) lab, a block of time dedicated predominantly to independent reading, followed by individualized comprehension exercises. Her writing experience, on the other hand, was built up through daily homework assignments. As her grade level progressed, the rhetorical focus moved from personal narratives to expository prose; the typical genres at the former stage were graphic journal entries and stories while the latter stage featured short, factual report essays such as those on one president, one state out of the fifty, or one of the countries in southern America that synthesized information from multiple sources.

During her secondary school education, Minami became further accustomed to the regular cycle of reading, discussion, and writing across subjects in English. In a typical module of the English class at the elite private high school she attended, students would

discuss 30 to 50 pages of literary masterpieces (e.g., work by Shakespeare) and respond to the materials in an essay. The school emphasized writing across all subjects, so all of the examinations Minami took were essay-based. In her memory, one of the examinations from a history class read: “We have read various arguments about the French Revolution. Build on the arguments and discuss your own observations about why the revolution happened” (フランス革命はいろんな説を読んできたけれどもなんで起こったのかというのを自分なりに書きなさい).Minami excelled in her studies and enjoyed the full range of the subjects she was exposed to.

At the same time, Minami maintained and improved Japanese skills not only through daily interaction with her family but also through periodic short academic stays in Japan. Like the majority of returning students, Minami’s Japanese literacy was facilitated in part by her attendance of a Japanese school, where she described herself as “kind of a very weak student”(すごく劣等生って感じ). Minami recalls, “I really hated to go there. There was a ‘reading aloud’ session in turns, and when I tried to read a passage I sometimes had to stop, as I did not know how to read some Kanji” (行くのがもうほんとうにいやで、朗読とかあるんです、順番に。で読もうと思うと、わからない漢字があったりして、時々詰まっちゃったりとか). Despite her struggles learning Japanese, Minami faithfully followed her mother’s encouragement to experience school life in Japan. Minami’s mother asked a Japanese private school in her hometown to enroll her for two months during the summer break of her fourth-and fifth-grade years. Thanks to the opportunities, she was able to advance her Kanji and literacy skills through informal assignments. She also attended the same school after her seventh grade year, after which she remembers her overall Japanese skills improving remarkably. With these occasional academic stays, Minami was able to adjust smoothly when she transferred to the eleventh grade of a private school when she moved to Japan from America.

Toward her final year of high school, Minami concentrated on practicing piano in

preparation for entering a music college. However, she increasingly became willing to break out of the prolonged solitude of practicing the piano all day. After much deliberation, Minami decided to apply to University A, which her mother had recommended, because there was a quota for returnees and a variety of disciplines to choose from. Minami was not particular about her future career at the time, but she had promised her parents that she would graduate from a Japanese university and establish ties with communities in the country.

In Minami's impression, University A was a Japanese-dominant school where returnees and non-Japanese students were minorities. For her English proficiency and many overseas experiences, Minami was the target of envy. She was often seen as "American" (アメリカン) by her Japanese peers, and she herself tended to adopt an identity as such. Minami would hang out most frequently with friends from similar backgrounds, but at the same time she felt obliged to assimilate to her new environment. Although she joined a musical group purely out of self-interest—she enjoyed membership as a violinist and external relations officer—Minami strived to learn the rules of the game in a society with a clear hierarchy.

At that time, literacy experiences related to Japanese had mildly negative effects on Minami's perceived self-esteem. Aiming to equalize the L1 and L2 ability of each student, the university's literacy education program for long-term returnees like Minami put prime emphasis on Japanese skills development rather than English skills maintenance and advancement. Thus, exempted from the English courses, Minami was put into the intermediate level of special Japanese courses. Minami reflected on a tacitly remedial nature of the program that she sensed:

> [There was an atmosphere saying that] 'it's wonderful to be fluent in English, as long as you can behave Japanese and speak Japanese well, but if you are good only at English, you can't survive in this society'. So, I felt somewhat inferior.

> その日本人としてちゃんとふるまえて日本語もできたうえで英語ができたら、すごくいいけれども、英語だけだったらそんな日本社会ではやってけないよねっていうことなので、やっぱりこうコンプレックスみたいなのが結構あって。.

In the Japanese-dominant environment of the university, Minami felt that she was not fully realizing her potential. In principle, Minami was deeply engaged in her studies. Starting as an English literature major, Minami later switched to a comparative education major after being inspired by courses in education and deciding that she wanted to learn a practical skill that could contribute to society. She worked professionally in educational settings in an English language school, utilizing her English proficiency and taking credits to earn a high school teacher certificate. Yet, for all her academic and professional interest in education, Minami felt a mild sense of inadequacy. Years after graduation, Minami came to view this feeling as stemming from her English-dominant background. When reading course texts in Japanese, she did understand the contents but not at the deep level. On the other hand, she still clearly remembers and loves what she read in English.

Minami's perceived self-image at the time was declining, to the extent that she was almost to the point of giving up a bright professional future in Japan:

> I thought at the time, "I don't have anything particular that I am proud of (laughs). I was not depressed, but I kind of thought that I would not be able to get a job, or be of any use in Japanese society.
>
> 私って別にそのとりえもないなあって（笑)、でも落ち込んだわけではないんですけど、でもなんとなく私ってたぶん就職とかできないだろうなあとか、日本の社会では、なんかこう、役にたたないんだろうな、みたいなのは、漠然と思っていて。

Thus, in her third year, she envisioned a future career overseas without hunting for a job in Japan, and she decided to study abroad as a step toward this vision. She chose to go to Britain, another English- speaking country that she had never visited.

One-year study abroad opportunity in Britain was a critical turning point that allowed Minami to explore her identity as Japanese. Minami's stay in the country was a "quite shocking" (すごく衝撃的), eye-opening experience. For the first time, she faced the reality that she was not "American" in the eyes of the locals. This realization directed her attention to learn more about Japan:

> When I was at University A, I identified myself as a returnee or an American because everyone saw me that way. Yet, once I came to Britain, nobody viewed me that way. I was viewed as a study-abroad student from Japan. However, I knew very little about Japan. I did not have any confidence in my Japanese, nor did I have competence in Kanji. I thought that this was not the way it should be.
>
> A 大にいたときにはやっぱりみんなからも、すごく帰国子女とかアメリカンとかそういうふうに見られていたのでそこがそういうアイデンティティがあったんですけれども、イギリスに行ったとき誰一人そういうふうに思わなかったっていうか。日本からの留学生っていうふうに思われていたので、なのに日本のこと 何も知らないし、日本語もぜんぜん自信ないし、漢字も自信なかったし、そういうのじゃだめだなっていうふうにも思って。

The study abroad experience also allowed her to reassess the value of English as a discipline. Minami took a variety of humanities courses, but the linguistics courses that the university emphasized were particularly fascinating. Building on the basics that she learned at University A, Minami was accepted in advanced-level classes, which took the form of daily seminars in phonology, syntax, and language history. Minami enjoyed the courses and believes that the seminars eventually served as an important foundation for graduate-level studies.

On a practical level, Minami had the chance to reevaluate her English skills by interacting with locals who had different linguistic expectations than Americans. She remembers that the mother of a local friend of hers said to her , "Oh, your English is so good, but it's a pity that it's American-accented" (英語こんなに上手なのに、アメリカなまりで、ち

ょっとお気の毒). Also, through tutorials that she took at the university, she felt there was room for further sophistication in her written academic English: “I had the chance to have my papers reviewed by graduate tutors. The feedback they gave made me aware that my English writing was still at the high school level.” (大学院生が、こう英語の宿題を見てくれて。そのチューターが、あの英語のライティングのアドバイスをくださったりとか、でやっぱり私の英語も高校生の英語なんだなあっていうのもわかったりとかして).

Further, Minami began to acknowledge English as a global language, which led her to consider teaching English as a profession:

> I felt English was powerful. The school was very international, where students from all parts of Europe were studying, and I was able to meet and interact naturally with various people in English. So, I felt that any contributions that I could make in the future would be related to English education [in Japan].
>
> 英語ってすごいなと思って。そこってやっぱりすごく国際的でもうほんとに、あのヨーロッパのいろんな留学生が来てて、そういういろんな人と出会って、ふつうにこう英語で交流できたので、でまあ私のできることは英語教育かもしれない、と思って。

Minami’s decision to focus on English education, along with her interest in linguistics, led her to switch majors again from comparative education to language education once she returned to Japan. She wrote a graduate thesis in English that had implications for English education studies. She further thought to proceed to a master’s program at a Japanese university to learn more about Japan in order to prepare for a teaching career in the country. In agreement with her plan, her advisor recommended that she go to a then brand-new master’s program at University N.

Master’s Studies and Early Teaching Experiences

Minami, found the master’s program “so stimulating”(とても刺激的). Many of her peers were mature, experienced English teachers who took good care of her. In addition,

there were a couple of diligent students of her age engaged in linguistic studies. Furthermore, as the program had just been founded, the professors were very enthusiastic.

Soon after she joined the graduate school, Minami started her teaching career as a part-time English teacher at a prestigious private high school. In spite of the routine, grammar-based curriculum for large-sized classes that did not require her to utilize her full potential of English language ability that she hired for, Minami found the experience extremely positive being able to teach for the first time in the authentic Japanese school system that she had never encountered before.

Minami appreciated the warmth of the community as well as the insights the students and professors provided. In addition to regular coursework, Minami attended program-wide study group meetings that facilitated not only language-related research but also friendship among the members. The members, including Minami, regularly gave informal presentations where they practiced interim reports and conference presentations, often followed by a casual drink party to interact and connect with each other. Particularly memorable were the frequent discussions that Minami had about bilingualism with senior students and professors at the drink parties, which helped her reconcile with her own experience as a bilingual student. Unlike the perceived negativity that Minami felt during her undergraduate years, her professors had a positive view of bilingualism. One senior, an experienced high school teacher, in particular, was interested in identity issues in the course of his quest to understand bicultural students that he happened to be in charge of, and he often asked her a lot of questions. Discussions with him as well as the other members on the topic allowed her to re-construct her self-concept in a positive manner. To her, talks with them about language were of personal as well as professional and academic significance. Minami still cherishes the warm relationships among the professors and students she developed at the time.

Academically, building on the linguistics foundation she developed in Britain,

Minami was able to further her original interest in language. She found that her writing and research at the master's level was quite smooth. The data collection process itself was challenging, yet she overcame problems following each step one by one. She was able to gain a sufficient number of research study participants by patiently contacting various groups of people. Likewise, she was able to learn how to process the data she wanted to use by consulting staff at the lab. Minami conferred with the staff members, senior students, and her professors in the study group whenever she had questions about the data analysis process or methods. When it came to the writing stage itself, Minami felt that she was well prepared:

> It was simply about writing and about reporting. The style of writing in my field is relatively technical, not so descriptive; it does not require a very high level of writing abilities.
>
> それは書くだけだから。あとはその報告だったり。割合とあの私のやってる分野ってたぶん文章が結構テクニカルというか。そんなにこう描写的じゃないというか。その文章力がそんなに問われないというか。

On the other hand, the master's program did not ask students to write extensively beyond the thesis, so Minami was not pressured to produce publishable paper. Reflecting back, Minami feels that she could have done more:

> I always tend to miss a subsequent step [after writing a thesis]. So my thesis at the undergraduate level was quite nicely done, and could have been published in some small in-house journal, but I didn't pursue that path. Nor did I look to publicize my master's thesis either, although that was partly because I stopped exploring the area later on after joining the doctoral program at University P [in America]. I did present data from the thesis at an international conference later on, but I should have formally submitted it to a journal.
>
> 私いつもそうなんですけれども、その次のステップしないんですね。だから学部の卒論もそれなり

の研究ではあったんですけれども、ほんとにちっちゃなどっかの紀要にも出せたと思うんですけれども、何にもしなかったし、もうその修士の論文も、もうそのままになってしまったんですね。まあその分野、あの P 大の博士課程に行ってその分野をやめてしまったっていうのもあったんですけれども、博士課程に入学してすぐ？その論文をなんとか、まあ国際学会では発表したんですけれども、あのそれどっかにちゃんとした形で投稿すればよかったんですけれども、しなかったんですね。

Minami interprets that her decision to pursue doctoral studies in America came "naturally"(自然に) out of the situation she was in. Upon graduating with a master's degree, Minami considered several career options. One option was to further pursue her career as an English teacher at another high school with a special program for returnees; the hope was to bring together her personal, academic, and teaching experiences thus far. Another possible path that she contemplated was to become an interpreter. She missed both opportunities by a scant margin, and thus she decided to pursue a doctoral program at the same university. At that juncture, she felt her choice was "destiny" (運命) and would lead her to take a fresh look at the fondness for research that she had been cultivating. However, while her love for study never waned, she did not have a vision for her doctoral studies at the time. With no senior doctoral students around who had experienced an oral defense, Minami did not have a clear idea of what the dissertation would be like or what she should do to earn it. It was then that one of her professors suggested an option that she never thought of:

> The professors said to me, 'You should go [abroad] as you are still young (laughs). You should study abroad, learn many things, and then bring them back to Japan.' So, I thought, 'Hmmm this might be a good idea, given this kind of encouragement' (laughs).
>
> 言われたんですよ、先生方に。まだ若いんだからもう行ってきなさいって。（笑）留学して、向こうで、いろいろ学んで、日本に持って帰ってきなさいって言うので、うーんまあじゃあそうおっしゃってくださるならそうしようかな（笑）って。

Following her professor's advice, Minami decided to leave University N and enroll in a doctoral program at University P in America. She was determined to embrace her chance to reconnect with the country, although the time limit of a two-year stay was agreed upon with her fiancé.

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career

Writing and Research Experiences in the Early Academic Career Phase

According to Minami's descriptions, the doctoral program at University P that she attended was research oriented, where research apprenticeships were common. Minami's academic life sped up during her first semester after she was recruited by her powerful advisor, Professor X to be a research assistant. In addition to gaining knowledge in applied linguistics through a multitude of intensive coursework, Minami worked hard to apply her knowledge to various research projects led by Professor X. Other than occasionally teaching introductory undergraduate courses, her life at the university was marked mainly by her devotion to research assistant duties.

Under Professor X's guidance, Minami worked with her research team members who were knowledgeable about the literature and well trained in the research methodology needed to support the professor's projects. Minami's main role at the time was to collect, process, and code the primary data that played a crucial role in the projects. Professor X's directives also entailed making minute corrections to her written reports:

> She corrected each and every word in my writing that I handed in, impatiently (laughs) saying, 'Your English is awful.' But she would say this not because I am a non-native speaker—she would often say the same thing to native speakers. I mean, she complained about the quality of our writing styles …. I tended to offer ideas based on my personal assumptions, which Professor X always criticized. She would say, 'Where's your evidence? How can you say that?' She is endowed with an extremely

good memory, and would refer me to various sources with comments like, 'That is said in this article'. She trained me rigorously [in writing].

もうそれこそ何か書いて出すと、もう一語一句 直してくるんですね、もう我慢できない、みたいな感じで（笑）「もうあなたの英語はひどい」とか言って。でもそれはノンネイティブだから、というんじゃなくて、ネイティブスピーカーにも言うんです。だから、要するにこんな文章はなんですかっていう。…で私、思いつきで物を言うところがあって、そういうのも徹底的に毎回 「Where is your evidence?」とか「Why can you say that?」とか。先生すごく記憶力よくって、だから、どの論文にそう書いてある、とか、すごく厳しく訓練されました。

Under her apprenticeship, Minami co-authored and co-presented a number of papers, mainly in the area of the professor's expertise. Before a conference presentation for the first project that she worked on, Minami remembers going to her office at midnight to practice. This and other conference presentations were transformed into publications, to which Minami usually contributed the methodology and literature review sections.

In this context, despite her interest in areas of inquiry derived from her coursework, it was primarily out of the hands-on experience of supporting her advisor's research that Minami's own dissertation theme eventually emerged. Minami's exposure to data from L2 speakers naturally drew her into further study of the complex linguistic phenomena. Furthermore, the data-collecting procedures and coding methods she learned as she supported Professor X's projects formed the basis for her own work.

After a two-year stay in the doctoral program, Minami returned to Japan for her marriage and secured a full-time contractual English teacher in the English language program at her alma mater, University A. Her professional engagement as a teacher, along with her personal commitment as a wife, became her top priority at the time. Like Takeshi, who joined the program a few years later than she did, Minami taught four or more English courses each meeting twice a week, and engaged in additional educational duties. As a university English teacher, Minami was excited to learn from her Japanese colleagues:

You know, I didn't have experiences 'learning' English, so I had no trouble giving feedback to students in English or providing them chances to interact in English as a 'model'. However, I guess I had no real awareness of the previous steps the students had gone through to improve their English until then. Good Japanese teachers definitely had that sort of awareness.

やっぱり私は、英語を「学んで」きてないので、だからその、学生に、英語でフィードバックをするとか、英語を使う機会を「モデル」として提供ことにはもう、何も困ることはないけれども、こうしたらうまくなるよというそこの配慮がまったく見えてなかったと思うんですねそれまでは。でやっぱり優秀な日本人の先生ってすごくそこが見えてて。

Like the case of Takeshi, Minami often collaborated with the teachers in research projects. In Minami's reflections, the program was "education first"(教育一番) and there was an implicit encouragement from the program to write and research as teachers. For the annual contract renewal evaluation, Minami made it a rule to regularly conduct teaching-related projects that demonstrated her professional development:

[To qualify for contract renewal], it was important to show that you are 'active' [as a teacher]. There probably was a half-tacit understanding that it's okay to do research, but the research should be something that contributes to the operation of the program.

やっぱ[先生として]active っていうのが大事。リサーチもしてたほうがいいけどやっぱりそのプログラムに還元するようなリサーチをしたほうがいいっていうような半分暗黙の了解があったと思う。

When writing with Japanese colleagues, she also contributed as a "native checker" of their text. The increased devotion to teaching and teaching-related projects forced Minami to slow down progress on her own dissertation project, although she kept in close touch with Professor X:

I half gave up on completing the doctoral program and my dissertation. I didn't care about it so much anymore. Just teaching was quite demanding and fun, and I did not

feel the need to get a Ph.D. degree that much. Still, I thought that I should be doing something to advance my career, so I moved forward with data collection—I did not move along smoothly, but rather continued on slowly in a somewhat half-hearted manner.

もう半分博士課程あきらめてたんです。あの論文も。わりとどうでもよくなって。やっぱ忙しいし、まあそれだけで楽しいし、そんなに Ph.D.の必要性も感じなかったし…でもなんかやんなきゃとは思って、データとるところまでは細々とやったんですよね。そこからあんまり進んでなくて、でもまあ細々とはやってたんですね。でも気持ちはちょっとこう半分そんなに入ってなくって。

Minami's momentum toward completing her dissertation was reinvigorated when Professor X demanded that she defend her dissertation on the same date as Helen, one of her American friends. Helen was on Minami's research team and had just obtained a position at another prestigious university in America. Minami and her friend were also required to review each other's chapters in detail before submitting their work to the professor for review. Minami was suddenly pressured into a collaborative peer-review task with Helen, who was in desperate need of her degree because she had a tenure-track job at stake.

During the drafting process with Helen, the high-paced writing life that Minami had led in America re-emerged. After returning home from work, Minami would work on her dissertation until 2:00 or 3:00 A.M. and then went back to work, snatching only a few hours of sleep in between. Describing a typical day close to the deadline, Minami said:

It was like, 'Okay, I will write chapter two, section two and send it to you, and I will read your [Helen's] material and send it back to you'. Our fields were very close, so we worked together really hard, correcting each and every sentence of each other's text. But, our editing was not just about language. We also made suggestions to each other: 'You should include this information here,' or 'You may consider using this reference.' In this way, we both managed to [finish our dissertations.]

だからもう、今晩、私チャプター2 のセクション 2 書くから送るね、とか、あなたのも読むから送るね、とか、もう、分野がすごくまた近かった。だからとにかく二人で頑張って、あの一語一句治しましたお互い。でそのもう英語だけじゃなくって、ここはこういうこと書いたほうがいいんじゃない、とか、こういう reference があるよね、とか。で、まあなんとか。

Even after completing her dissertation, however, Minami faced the challenge of making herself physically available for her defense at University P in America, due to time constraints resulting from her teaching duties:

> I barely got to purchase the plane ticket at the very last minute, just three days before the defense at graduate school. I managed to finish packing only a few hours before leaving home. It was so last minute.
>
> 飛行機の券をとったのもディフェンスの三日前ぐらいとかでもう荷造りはもうもちろんでかける数時間前もうほんと行けるかどうかもわからなかった。もうほんとにぎりぎりで。

Minami was able to attend the defense interview on the exact same day as Helen and successfully earn her doctorate. Reflecting on her time as a remote doctoral student while being an English teacher, she expressed mixed feelings. It was a common practice at University P to have a remote mentorship via e-mail or phone, even for students on campus. Nevertheless, Minami felt that distance was a strong issue:

> To be honest, I don’t think that situation [remote mentorship] was ideal, and it profoundly affected the quality of my dissertation. I was not able to go back there [to University P] very often, primarily because of the teaching schedule at my program [at University A]. In a normal scenario, I guess, I was supposed to stay much longer at University P and get involved in more projects with Professor X, develop more pilot studies for my own project, work hard with the team members, attend more conferences, and forge more professional connections.
>
> でもほんとはあんまりよくなかったんですね。だからやっぱり博士論文の質にすごく影響したと思います。で、あの、ま A 大のスケジュール的に行きにくかったっていうのが一番の理由だったんですね。

なんですけれどもほんとはもっと長いことP大にいて、でそこでもっと、いろんなプロジェクトにX先生と一緒に関わって、もっと自分もパイロットスタディーを重ねたりして、もっとみんなで切磋琢磨して学会もいっぱい出て、いろんなコネクションを作って、っていうのがまあ本来、だったと思います。

However, at the same time she also emphasized that she attained a sense of professional and personal fulfillment during her time in the program:

> The time I spent in the EFL program at University A was priceless in terms of other [non-research–related] aspects of my life. It may not have been a very good time for my research, but I learned a lot about English education and I had a lot of good personal experiences.
>
> A 大での時間はほかの意味でかけがいのない時間だったと思うんですね。研究、としてはいい時間じゃなかったかもしれないけれどもその、いろんな英語教育っていう面ではいっぱい勉強になったとかあの私生活の面で楽しい時期があったので。

After completing her dissertation, Minami decided to withdraw from full-time teaching at University A. Mothering was the prime priority for several years that followed, although she took on part-time teaching jobs at several universities. Her personal life was full of happiness—she was deeply engaged in motherhood—but she felt increasingly pressured by her peers in America to be more research active:

> So, everyone—what I mean by everyone is those in the community [her peers on her research team]—was in or around their seventh year of service, right before tenure review, so they felt pressured to fulfill publication requirements to write such-and-such number of articles and books. I thought, ‘Oh, I have not done anything [laughs]. I need to do something’.
>
> やっぱりそのみなさんは——みなさんっていうのはそのコミュニティなんですよね——みなさんはテニュアクロックがあってもう七年目でテニュアの審査があるとか、なのでそれまでにもうアーティクルいくつとか本いくつとかもうすごく細かい基準があって、それを満たすために必死なわけですよね。だ

からそうするともうみんなばんばん論文出してて学会もどんどん行ってて、あー私って何にもしてないなあって思って（笑）あーやんなきゃあって。

She observed her peers' e-mail conversations about what to publish from their dissertations and in which medium, and how to reframe data to qualify for publication. Minami, as a near full-time mother at the time, did not know how she would catch up with her peers' momentum. Environmental constraints, such as the lack of an office, and the loss of access to University P's library database further restricted her research activity. At the same time, in light of her professor's insider knowledge about what type of research best matched the needs of certain journals, Minami felt even more cautious about publishing her work.

Fortunately, Minami gained a chance to publish from her dissertation through her networks. As she mulled over what publication to target, Minami had the chance to reconnect with her seniors in the master's program at University N. She was invited to contribute a chapter to a book proposed by them. Minami felt that the core part of her dissertation results should appear in a major international forum, so there was a need to refrain from featuring this work in the invited book chapter. Instead, she thought to focus on some minor yet interesting results of the study—results that were neither fully relevant to her original research questions nor statistically significant, yet were of profound personal interest to her. The decision to bring light to this particular portion of her project was encouraged by her remembrance of Helen's positive comments in the course of the peer editing for her dissertation. Once Minami decided where to focus, the pace of completing the work was rather fast, partly because of the limited page quota and the relatively less rigorous review process compared to that of Western publishers. The process involved adjusting her research questions to the particular results she wanted to highlight, incorporating a new introduction and conclusion, and shortening the methodology section that was built upon during her dissertation.

As a potential audience, she envisioned mainly Japanese teachers of English. For

this local purpose, Minami was not excessively concerned about the scholarly style that characterized published work in the discipline. Despite the perceived ease of publication and small volume, however, Minami loved representing her work, and felt that the language also had educational possibilities.

Almost at the same time as publishing the chapter, Minami was blessed with another opportunity to produce work based on her dissertation. Professor X proposed to co-author with Minami in submitting a featured article for a peer-reviewed international journal. With the support of an insider of the field, it was an ideal start for Minami to contribute her knowledge to the "center" of her community. Professor X provided Minami with specific advice at key junctures in the writing process.

The first key area of Professor X's advice pertained to how to refocus a particular portion of the results to suit the purpose and scope of the field and align the data within an appropriate conceptual framework. Following her suggestions, Minami re-analyzed her data from a fresh perspective, in part with the help of graduate students who were trained in the same manner as herself. Once the professor approved an outline of the article and writing timeline, the collaborative writing process went smoothly—although Minami felt the need to be more attentive to language as compared with the book chapter mentioned above. Fully familiar with the stylistic conventions that she learned during her doctoral years, Minami was now in equal partnership with the professor during the editing process. Another point that required the Professor's advice concerned what specific results to feature, how to adjust the research questions, and what terminology to use according to the results. Minami used the opportunity to learn from the Professor how to respond to, or even counter, editors' critiques. Eventually, the article was successfully published with Minami as first author.

Writing and Research Experiences in the Current Academic Career Phase

Minami landed a full-time tenured position in the English department at University B and has been working there for two years. She found herself facing the next challenge, with multiple forces vying for her attention. Minami's role as a mother began to occupy an increasingly significant part of daily life. In support of her child's well-being, Minami always kept herself busy, picking up and dropping her off at various places, assisting with homework, or attending after-school activities.

Even though mothering was a top priority for her, Minami now teaches not only general English classes, but also content areas in the field that she specializes in mainly for future English teachers. Minami, as the only teacher teaching subject matter for junior and senior high school certificates at the university, feels obligated to be knowledgeable in this area. She has attended local professional meetings focusing on this area, mainly through the invitation of her senior at her Japanese graduate school. At the same time, the amount of administrative duties and student affairs work has increased.

Despite a range of constraints, Minami found the time to work on multiple research agendas, longstanding and new, independent and collaborative, international and local. Minami senses that there is an implicit "atmosphere"(雰囲気) within her university that values the importance of research. A more palpable, consistent pressure toward writing and research, however, mainly comes from her research team in America.

Minami has continued to conduct her research at an international level. In working with her research team at this stage of her career, new hurdles came into view. Part of the challenge Minami has recently perceived is about writing in new areas unrelated to Professor X's area of expertise. Minami felt confident writing RAs in her advisor's areas of inquiry; she was familiar with the literature, the big picture of the field (i.e., the existing research, ongoing arguments and counterarguments), and how to create a research agenda by formulating research questions and developing methodologies. However, Minami found

it challenging to develop a voice in an entirely new field. Her co-authored article submitted to another international journal was rejected by reviewers, who commented that it was questionable how the research contributed to “the field.” Pointing to a previous article, Minami stated:

> You know, this is where I was at the same stage of Professor X’s study, which I could continue on with forever…but once I pursued my own field and initiated my own study, it became very difficult—at least for me.
>
> ここ（先生と共著の記事）はまだ X 先生の研究を続けてるっていう段 階なので、そのままずっと行くこともできるんですけれども、ちょっと自分のことをやりたいとやりたいと思ったらすごく難しいっていう。もう私にとっては。

According to Minami, other challenges in conducting her research at an international level with her peers are not only related to her new area of inquiry but also with her current institutional circumstance. For an example, Minami pointed out the availability of research assistants. She explained that her prolific peers in America often worked with their assistants. Minami further expressed the difficulty of simultaneous commitment to language teaching and research. Due to time constraints resulting from the duties, Minami felt it was challenging to work with mainstream scholars, who tend to focus on the researcher role. Her peers encouraged her to secure at least one “research day” per week to focus more on a research-related project. However, the engaged “foreign language teacher” part of her would not easily allow for this opportunity. Her attempt to secure such “research days” was not fully successful. On non-teaching days, she often spends a large amount of time commenting on student papers. During recess, on the other hand, she would rather prioritize her mothering duties:

> I really feel the need to take good care of my students, so maybe I need to spend my time on research during the vacation periods. However, when I am not working, that’s the time that should be allocated for family, so I also need to consider that balance.

やっぱり学生のこともちゃんとしてあげたいし、じゃ研究をほんとにお休みのときに力入れるとなると、そこは家庭で過ごせるときだったりするんで、そこらへんのバランスもありますし

With multiple professional duties and research agendas, Minami still has not formulated her own self-view as a researcher. Yet it is clear that she values the English-dominant bilingualism that is at the core of her research writing skills:

> I can read English fast, and have no particular difficulty writing English nor do I feel the need to get help from 'native speaker' checkers. So, if the situation allows, it is possible for me to submit articles to international journals. That could be what I can do on my own. Also, I hope to incorporate and utilize what I learned from my overseas studies in Japan.
>
> 英語で文献読むのは速い。あとは、英語で書くのも。内容は別として、英語自体がそんなに苦にならないし、ネイティブチェックとかもしなくてもいいので、私はやっぱりその国際社会に日本のことを発信したりすることはできるはずだと思うんですね。だからその、海外のジャーナルの投稿するのは、内容は別として、本来だったら、わりと、その、簡単にできるはずなので、そういうことは自分でできるかなっていうふうに思ってます。あとはそういう海外のことを取り入れて日本で生かしていくっていう。

Further, as the majority of her peers focus on research, Minami feels her current multiplicity of professional roles may be an asset in a global context:

> I don't think there are many people with doctorates teaching English in Asian EFL contexts [on a global scale]. I have that unique qualification, although many Japanese language professionals could fall under this category.
>
> その Ph.D を持っていて、かつ英語を教えていて、かつそれがアジアの EFL の環境でやってる人ってそんなに多くないという風に思っていて。ま、そこが私の特徴かなと思うけれども、でも日本にいる人はほとんどみんなそうだけど。

When asked about her research-related future aspiration, Minami stated, "I wish to continue research. That's the only thing that is certain. I would like to enhance the quality

of my research, though”(やっぱり研究は続けていきたいっていう、それだけはわかります。だたもっとこう質を高めたいです).

Further, referring back to her self-view as a bilingual playing the role of teacher and researcher in an EFL context, she revealed her emerging aspiration to serve as a liaison between the mainstream academic network and local practitioners:

> If it is a fact that there are not many Ph.D. holders here in Japan, I could, maybe play the role of helping manage what the local practitioners looking to study. For example, if they are doing a research and wish to understand the effectiveness of teaching approaches, I then could work with them. And in so doing, I could provide ideas of such and such methodology and assessments. If I earned some research funding, I could also provide some man power [drawing on my international research network] … Then I could formulate such projects into a research project, and write it up as a research paper [in English] and present it…. That would be great.
>
> もし Ph. D.をとってる人が少ないとしたら、現場の先生のいろんな、知りたいと思うようなことを少し私がまとめる役目をできるかなと思ったりはするんですねだから。たとえば現場の先生がこういうことで研究していて、こういう教え方をしたら、ほんとによくなったかとか知りたい、っていうことだったらそういう人と共同研究とかして、じゃあこういう方法、あのこういうテストを使って。たとえば私が研究資金をとっていたら、それを分析するあの、マンパワーも提供できるし、それちょっと夢かもしれないですね。だから理想的にはそういう人も大学院に来てていつも現場で結構いろんな新しい取り組みをその取り組みを私が研究にして、書き上げて発表できたら、いいなあと思うんですけれども。

Although she concedes that she has “currently too much restrictions in [her] life” (今ちょっと生活に制約がありすぎて) to realize this, her dream of synthesizing and orchestrating all her international, local and institutional networks as a bilingual researcher remains present.

CHAPTER 10

PARTICIPANT PROFILE 6: SUMIRE WADA

Sumire Wada is an assistant professor at a private university. Educated in America from the third grade at elementary school to the end of the first year of middle school, Sumire learned English smoothly and maintained her original love for Japanese. After two years of junior high school in Japan, her conscientious study of academic English formally started at a high school targeted at returnees. At university, she dedicated herself to extra-curricular activities while developing academic literacy skills and knowledge of the discipline in class and advancing her Japanese skills through a part-time job as a Japanese material developer at a cram school. Although she was interested in the English teaching profession, her thirst for intellectual stimulation during her undergraduate years led her to pursue a doctoral study in America. She worked toward this goal both in and outside of a master's program in Japan, while working as a part-time high school teacher.

In her doctoral program, Sumire thoroughly enjoyed her research in her area of interest, namely linguistics, and worked not only with American academic communities and her advisor but also with her networks back in Japan. Upon her return to Japan in her fifth doctoral year, Sumire began to work at two universities as a part-time teacher while finalizing her dissertation. While she was satisfied with her teaching life, Sumire actively pursued new research communities with whom she wished to share her research. In her current institutional context, Sumire's job is primarily administrative, but she also teaches language courses regularly. She finds herself spending considerable amounts of time as a coordinator and, accordingly, her writing has become increasingly thematically centered on the English teaching upon which her institution focuses. Under the circumstances, Sumire feels that her research life ahead remains open-ended. Through writing and research

collaboration with colleagues specializing in English education, Sumire currently feels a heightened professional and scholarly need to learn more about the field. At the same time, she strives to maintain her passion for her original research area.

Pre-Professional Background to the Pursuit of Doctoral Studies

Pre-University to University Experiences

With the exception of a short stay on the west coast in America when she was two year old, Sumire lived in the Kanto area of Japan where she was born until she finished the second grade. She then arrived in the same region in America again and lived there for five years. As she recollects, Sumire acquired English "without noticing it, and almost without effort"(無意識のうちに覚えていってほとんど努力してない感じ) in America. Sumire steadily transitioned into an English-only school life, with the help of supportive teachers. She was consistently successful in her mainstream classes, owing in part to the ESL pull-out program in which she was initially placed. Although she did not read extensively, Sumire enjoyed her literacy experiences from her third through seventh grade years. She feels that she was blessed with good, supportive teachers. She remembers particularly a female ESL teacher, whom she frequently visited and talked with, and who she believes played an important role in her positive experiences at school at the time.

During the course of her education, Sumire appreciated the value of both her individual and collaborative work. She was encouraged by the school's flexible ability based placement system, as the academic foundation she had developed in Japan was advantageous. Sumire's language awareness translated well in her language art class, consistently allowing her to excel at her grammatical analysis. As a result of her hard work, her spelling skills quickly developed from a basic to an advanced level. Regarding mathematics, Sumire skipped grades, and took courses with students two years ahead of

her. She said this was “the most encouraging” (一番励みになった) aspect of school life for her.

Not only did she find herself engaged as an individual learner, Sumire took pleasure in collaborative endeavors. Although she was assigned regular independent writing tasks, such as individual research projects, book reports, and journals, the most memorable aspects of such projects was working collaboratively on projects with her friends. As part of history class, the pair worked together to create a fictional newspaper from 18th century America.

Even as her English skills improved, Sumire’s love for Japanese never ceased to develop. For her, Japanese classes in supplementary Japanese language school were a pleasure. Every academic year, she eagerly anticipated receiving a new Japanese textbook. She remembers how she burst into laughter at the very sound of the Japanese equivalent of the phrase “as can be expected”(案の定), which appeared in one textbook. She read that passage together with her friend while she was staying over in her home. Sumire also desired additional exposure to the Japanese language through non-academic sources. She was excited to read *Ribbon* and *Nakayoshi* (the two most popular Japanese comic magazines for girls) once a month which her mother had subscribed her to. She even read her parents’ Japanese weekly magazines.

Sumire’s entry into the second grade of Japanese junior high school was as smooth as her entry to America, owing in part to one of her friends. Despite the fact that she was the only incoming returnee that year, Sumire remembers her early days of school as peaceful, thanks to the help of that friend. Sumire believes that her English teacher also assisted her positive adaptation to school. He was not the typical Japanese English teacher of the time, who would treat returnees differently, partly due to a fear of their proficiency in English. The teacher respectfully welcomed Sumire’s honest questions about English, which were based on her knowledge of the language beyond the level of the textbook. Sumire said:

For example, when I came to him insisting that 'there is this alternative answer' to a problem in the quiz, which I should not have done, the teacher was quite generous about that (my attitude). He was an open-minded, veteran male teacher, and was very kind.

あのテストのね、答えが、ちょっと別の、「こういう答えもあるんじゃないか」ってわざわざ言いに行っちゃったりして。,そういうことしないほうがいいと思うんですけど。でもその先生はほんとにおおらかな、ベテランの男性であのすごくやさしかったんで。

However, in English classes at the school, Sumire did not focus her energy on improving her English, but mainly on adapting her English to the level of the majority of the class:

I tried to make my English pronunciation Japanese-like, for example, when reading aloud to the class. Instead of making myself sound openly American, I consciously tried to read with a Katakana accent.

そのクラスで読むときとか、日本風な発音にしようとしてましたね。そんなに大げさにアメリカンにしないで、 わりとカタカナ英語風に。

Except for the classroom English she learned in school, overall, Sumire's exposure to authentic English language and literacy was limited. She was "satisfied" (満足してた) with the level of the advanced English classes, which were designed to prepare students for entrance exams and taught by tutors at a special cram school for returnees.

Sumire's literacy experiences drastically changed in high school. She feels that her English language and literacy skills rapidly improved during these years, when she was trained in academic writing for the first time. The high school she attended was known for its special program for returnees, who composed two-thirds of the entire student population. English classes, conducted entirely through English and valued at 20% of the entire curriculum, were designed to improve academic literacy in students to a level almost comparable to the mainstream classes in American high schools. Here, Sumire's literacy

experiences included vocabulary quizzes and thematic essay writing assignments in response to authentic readings such as *1984* by George Orwell. Sumire believes that these literacy experiences formed the foundation of her later academic and professional life. She said that the basic essay forms introduced to her by her teachers are "still very useful even now, such as when I teach students academic writing" (すごく役に立ってるっていうか、いまだに学生に論文指導する時もそれを教えてるっていう) .

The words Sumire studied for the quizzes remain "pretty much the basis" (結構基礎になっている) of her vocabulary, which she greatly appreciates. Also, through these experiences, Sumire was reminded of the value of making a continuous effort to learn English, even after leaving an English-speaking environment:

> When I returned from America, my English was at the level of a primary school student. So, [through the training I received at high school] I found it really important to develop my English skills after my return.
>
> アメリカから、ほんと小学校英語みたいな感じで帰ってきたんですけど、日本帰ってから英語のばすの大事なんだなって、すごく思いました。

However, Sumire does not remember receiving similar training in Japanese academic writing. Although the majority of the courses were taught in Japanese, and a great number of writing assignments were given, there were no clear guidelines regarding how to write them:

> I once got a C on a Japanese exam. I wondered how to write academically in Japanese. For example, I had no idea how to write about a Japanese novel.
>
> 日本語の論文はあんまり書き方教われなくって、国語もあの、C をもらったときもあります。日本語の論文ってどうやって書くんだろうっていう。だからたとえばなんか小説について書くとか、それは、わからなかったですね、書き方が。

Unlike during her high school days, Sumire found her academic environment relatively unchallenging at University A. Sumire devoted herself more to the activities of

the Nagauta club. With the support of professional instructors, Sumire fully engaged with the other members in practicing and developing their skills of Nagauta shamisen to almost professional levels. They also obtained regular opportunities to perform at the national theater.

Even in this situation, there were some key literacy experiences that helped Sumire to prepare for a future language-related career. She continued to be a hard worker, engaging with the offered coursework and further improving her English language skills. In electively taken English classes in her first year, she diligently continued to learn English. Through endeavors such as writing research papers, Sumire worked to refine and improve the academic writing skills that she had developed in her high school years, although she does not remember exactly what she learned. A lover of language, Sumire began to consider teaching English as a career option, and undertook a range of coursework to obtain a teaching certificate. Her parents' recommendations also made her consider this career.

When she was preparing for a teaching career, Sumire was exposed to the field of linguistics for the first time. This was mainly under the guidance of the mainstream linguist Professor W, who she chose as her thesis advisor in her senior year. As will be explained later, her connection with Professor W continued into Sumire's doctoral years. As a result of her prior training in academic writing and Professor W's consistent chapter-by-chapter feedback, she completed her graduate thesis in English without considerable difficulty. However, a paper she wrote for Professor W's linguistic course in her sophomore year was more stimulating and memorable for her than her graduate thesis. As part of this assignment, students were required to transcribe their own recorded comments in English. The task of performing a linguistic analysis of her own English utterances profoundly intrigued Sumire, both personally and academically.

For Sumire, her exposure to academic Japanese literacy during her part-time job

was also of importance. She initially applied for a position as an English teacher at the cram school she had previously attended in her junior high school years. Yet, as the only available position at the time was that of a material editor for Japanese texts, she decided to accept that job instead. This seemingly disappointing job assignment, however, worked positively for her as it re-ignited her childhood love for Japanese. Her main job was to compile materials taken from past entrance examinations in Japanese. She got trained in typing for the first time, and was exposed to numerous Japanese academic texts written by famous essayists and scholars, which were used for the examinations. As her skills advanced, Sumire also selected and developed the materials and graded student answers. She is appreciative of the effects that this experience had on advancing her Japanese skills. Sumire feels that, through this experience, her Japanese receptive skills greatly improved.

Despite her enjoyment of the university classes and other learning opportunities, Sumire did not find them sufficiently stimulating. Thus, in order to compensate for her unchallenging undergraduate years, she considered undertaking a long academic journey in further pursuit of intellectual and personal self-growth. Setting an American graduate school as her goal, Sumire decided to apply for a master's program at the university first. Looking back at her decision, Sumire explained:

> The reason I wanted to pursue a master's was partly because I did not study very much in my undergraduate years (laughs) … I was not [intellectually] satisfied …Also, I may have thought that I wanted to eventually return to America …But, I was not ready to attend an American graduate school right after finishing my senior year …So, to me, a master's at University A was kind of a preparatory year before going to American graduate school.

修士に進みたかったのは、大学であんまり勉強しなかったから（笑）…なんか物足りなさを感じて。あとまあいずれアメリカに行きたいっていうのもそのときからあったのかもしれないですね。…でも突然その四年生を終えてアメリカの大学院っていう準備はできてなかったのでなんとなく A 大のマスタ

ーっていうのは自分にとってはアメリカの大学院に行く準備期間っていうか。

For Sumire, her experience in the master's program at University A was a transitional phase. At this stage, her early teaching experience and her scholarly pursuits did not necessarily converge. During the course of her master's study, while continuing her job at the cram school as a Japanese material developer, Sumire began her teaching career as a part-time English teacher at a prestigious high school, mainly in charge of grammar instruction. Sumire enjoyed teaching there because of the students' positive attitude. In spite of the enjoyment she experienced as a teacher, Sumire felt that her academic interest was not necessarily focused on English education per se. In the master's program, although she was taking some courses in that area, Sumire was consistently in search for her true area of interest. She was not attracted by any course content officially offered in the program. Eventually, additional opportunities that she independently discovered led her to her true field of interest in theoretical linguistics.

One such opportunity was a student "reading circle" held by her seniors, which opened Sumire's eyes to the latest trends in theoretical linguistics at the time. Under the senior students' guidance, the circle gathered to discuss reading portions of key books of interest. Another opportunity was a special summer workshop designed for teachers. This was offered by the American University P, and organized by a renowned preparatory school. Albeit with a focus on applied linguistics, Sumire was attracted by the courses on theoretical linguistics on which the professors based their discussions. After taking two courses in the session, Sumire decided to apply to the doctoral program of University P. In this special workshop, Sumire met Professor O, the mainstream applied linguist she later chose as her advisor at the university.

With the goal of exploring the area of theoretical linguistics at the doctoral level, Sumire chose to focus on a safer practical topic for her master's thesis concerning English education, and considering the scope of the content of the courses offered at the university.

At this stage Sumire did not feel the need to produce anything on paper. Neither did she attend any academic conferences.

Writing and Research Experiences over the Course of the Academic Career

Writing and Research Experiences in the Early Academic Career Phase

In the doctoral program at University P, which Minami also attended a few years earlier, Sumire enjoyed her academic life. From the beginning of her doctoral career, Sumire worked closely with Professor O as a research assistant. Although theoretical linguistics was outside of her expertise, Professor O's increased interest in the area encouraged her. However, Sumire's interest was not limited to the particular area. Sumire's motivation to pursue a doctoral study was to satisfy her intellectual curiosity to the fullest. Thus, at first she he was "open-ended "(オープンエンドの状態) about the topics she would want to pursue and enjoyed taking a wide range of courses. Professor O's support, the courses, and her own networking efforts offered ample opportunities for Sumire to be trained as a researcher in the field of linguistics.

Through her coursework on linguistics, Sumire sharpened her awareness of her L1, because, as a native Japanese-speaking informant, she was often asked to offer explanations. She also became more interested in the linguistic comparison between Japanese and English, and fascinated with deepening her understanding of both. Sumire also had the opportunity to teach Japanese at various levels, firstly with a non-profit organization and subsequently at her university. By teaching using the textbooks created by American universities, Sumire was able to better understand the subtle rules of the Japanese language.

As part of, and outside of the coursework, Sumire consistently wrote and published papers in collaboration with her peers and professors. Writing qualifying papers was a graduate requirement, but Sumire was not pressured to fulfill this prerequisite, as

such opportunities naturally occurred as a result of invitations from her networks. She stated:

> I really didn't have to think [about publication and presentations] on my own. There are many other people who worked hard independently. But it was always the case that seniors or a professor asked me to collaborate.
>
> あんまり自分で考える必要がなかったんですね。なんかまあ自分でもっとねえ、しっかりやってる人もいっぱいいたんですけどまあ先輩が声かけてくださったり先生が一緒に研究しようって言ってくださったりして。

As she reflects on the collaborative coursework projects she undertook with her peers, Sumire reconfirms their benefits:

> I guess co-authoring suits me well …. I am not so good at planning ahead, so working together with some organized person tended to work well .... Even if my coauthor was not like that, if two people worked together, [it worked well] as the process necessarily involved keeping 'Ok, let's-do-this-by-this-day' kinds of promises.
>
> 共同論文合ってるのかなっていうのがあったんですけど … 私結構あんまり計画性がないので、なんかすごくちゃんとこう計画的な人と一緒にやるとうまくいくことが（笑）そうじゃなくても、やっぱり二人でやるといろいろこう、ああじゃあいつまでにっていうのはきちんと守るので。

Whenever she worked with her peers, she performed a sequence of brainstorming, topic-selection, outlining, and decision-making steps in order to ascertain which parts to address. She always found it helpful to divide the labor according to the strengths of each member.

One of Sumire's major papers featured a collaborative study with her undergraduate advisor and one of her peers at University P, Professor W. Sumire not only utilized her linguistic knowledge, but also used her abilities as a Japanese informant to process and analyze the data that the professor provided. The professor led the write-up

process, and Sumire mainly managed the data analysis section. As a result of this collaboration, the paper was published in a prestigious peer-reviewed international journal. For the first time, she also had the opportunity to present the paper at an international conference, which further developed her confidence.

Thus, Sumire's breadth of interests and the versatility of her writing lent itself to the production of various papers in the course of her doctoral career. However, she was also uniquely passionate about her dissertation, which was, according to her, the only project she instigated completely on her own initiative. Although she undertook a range of coursework, the original topic of interest that she had developed in Japan always remained in her mind. While she was attending a semester-long seminar that was presented by a visiting professor, Professor J, who was an emerging scholar in the area at that time, Sumire's attraction to a particular theme in the area was encouraged yet again, and thus she decided to pursue this topic.

In investigating this theme for her dissertation, Sumire was faced with a series of challenge. Firstly, Sumire realized that the university did not offer any additional advanced courses in this area that would further prepare her for in-depth investigation. In search of further opportunities to research this area, Sumire applied for a special summer workshop, organized by a major academic society related to the topic. Fortunately, she was awarded with a residential scholarship and, seizing this opportunity, Sumire traveled to another university to attend a six-week workshop, preparing her for dissertation writing on the topic.

Secondly, once she began work on the project, Sumire soon discovered that the true pursuit of her theme required a knowledge base that went beyond the realm of linguistics. As she realized, this area turned out to encompass various fields. She reflected on the difficulties encountered when reviewing literature:

So, in the process of writing my dissertation, I became confused concerning the

locations of my citations. I felt like the entire collection of books in the library seemed somewhat relevant! (laughs) I just wondered where to stop.

だからほんとにこう迷ったというか、書いてる最中に、ほんとにどこに、何を入れていいのかわかんなくなって、もう図書館にある本すべてなんか関係してる!（笑）みたいになってきて。どこで終わればいいのかとか。

Thirdly, the actual data collection methods were as time-consuming as the literature review. Experimental design was rare in the field of theoretical linguistics where, at that time, textual analyses dominated. Without many precedents, Sumire patiently proceeded with the design and data collection through constant self-study and considerable extra consultancy outside of the dissertation committee. Sumire spent a year and a half collecting materials for a series of experiments, and conducting these experiments with informants. Even while analyzing this vast amount of data, Sumire often visited the library to continue reading extensively, and attended the scientific lectures that were offered in different departments.

Fourthly, there were other important engagements in parallel with the doctoral project. At one point, Sumire undertook in collaboration with Professor O, conference coordination. As the major international linguistics conference that Professor O organized centered upon her area of investigation, Sumire invested the majority of time and energy into her coordination job on a full-time basis, which included logistics work before the conference, and editorial work on the subsequent proceedings. The editorial work in particular continued throughout the dissertation write-up period, and Sumire was continually occupied. While she profoundly appreciated these opportunities, Sumire continued to find the progress of her own dissertation slow, and felt the need to further accelerate the write-up process. Discussing this situation with her mother, Sumire decided to change her environment and return to Japan with the status of “All But Dissertation” (ABD) in her fifth year.

Back in Japan, Sumire began a career as a part-time university English teacher at University A. Sumire also had the opportunity to teach on another, less coordinated, program, and this helped her to explore different approaches to teaching English for pleasure. She had a chance to coauthor an in-house journal article on English education with other teachers at this latter university. For Sumire, teaching had a positive impact on her writing life. It gave her a “rhythm in life”(生活のリズム). While she was busy teaching on weekdays, Sumire found the “writing-while-teaching” lifestyle enjoyable, and worked effectively to complete her dissertation. In addition, despite the distance, Professor P continued to be helpful by giving regular feedback on a chapter-by-chapter basis, even making corrections to her sentences, and helping her to complete the dissertation over several months.

Evaluating her dissertation, Sumire jokingly feels that the work was a little beyond her ability:

> I feel envious of those who can publish their entire dissertation, but you know [in my case] precedents were so scarce, and it did not contribute to the field. That was a shame. If I had wanted to contribute to the field only, I would have done more solid research, like replicating the existing research and narrowing down the theme … You know, when you look at the published dissertations you will see the themes are more focused, instead of moving across various disciplines. Probably, you can only perform such research after becoming more of an authority (laughs).
>
> 博士論文をそのまま出版できる人はうらやましいんですけど、なかなかねえあのやっぱり先行研究が少なかったし。その分野にそのままうまく貢献できる結論になってないのでそういうのは残念だと思いますね…。分野だけに貢献するんだったらもうちょっとこうかっちりしたね。ちゃんと先行研究を replicate するとかやれば。もうちょっと絞ってテーマを…出版されてるものとか見るとかなりテーマ絞ってますよね。もっとこんないろんなとこ行くんじゃなくて。いろんなとこ行くのはたぶん偉くなってからのほうがいいと思うんですけど（笑）。

At the same time, Sumire explained that she was profoundly thankful to her advisor who generously allowed her to explore her topic of interest and for the kind support she received despite the time constraints:

> Professor O was really generous and never rejected prospective advisees. On top of that, as I was close to her [as her research assistant], she enjoyed working with me in general. When I said, 'This is what I would like to write about [in my dissertation],' she encouraged me to give it a try. On the other hand, she was really busy. But she was a warm-hearted person who gives a great deal of help to those in desperate need.
>
> O 先生はすごく心広い人なので、ぜんぜん来るものは拒まずという感じで私もねえ最初からわりと先生に近いところにいたので気に入ってもらえて。[博論]で書く内容に関してはぜんぜん私がこれやりたいっていったら書いてみたらっていう感じで。その代わり[先生は]いろんな面ですごく忙しかったんですね。でもそのぶんなんかもうどうしても助けが必要な人に対してはものすごく助けてくれる、暖かい先生で。

It is notable that her renewed engagement in teaching did not weaken Sumire's scholarly passion for researching theoretical linguistics. While teaching English, Sumire actively explored new research communities in Japan. With the extensive publication list she developed in her doctoral years, Sumire's effort in this direction was a purely scholarly one, rather than career oriented.

It seemed to be challenging for Sumire to find a suitable research community. At first, at a meeting of a Japanese society for the field of linguistics, she attempted to present her research in Japan for the first time. However, here Sumire was faced with a mild culture gap. At that time, presentations in Japanese were common in the association, and Sumire's English presentations seemed to come as a surprise to the established members. She received comments such as "Oh, I assumed that you would present in Japanese" (なんだ日本語でやるのかと思った). Disappointed, in order to seek the acceptance of the association,

Sumire later attempted to present her paper in Japanese. More importantly, Sumire also noticed the contrast in the society's different research foci compared to her own, and she found she was not interested in their topics. For example, the proposal she submitted to the association in Japanese was rejected, but the same proposal in English to an international association was accepted. Sumire thus concluded, "My research seems to attract overseas audiences" (海外の人のほうがちょっと興味持ってくれるんですよね、私の研究には) .

Sumire eventually found an informal research circle she joined on the invitation of one of her seniors from University P suited her needs. She "feels most at home with" (親しみを感じる) the topics discussed here. This research circle is composed of scholars from various institutions, who are predominantly Western educated, with a wide array of sub-disciplinary backgrounds in linguistics and other human and social sciences. They regularly convene, study, and present their topics of interests within this supportive egalitarian environment. Sumire enjoys learning from the like-minded seniors who are active professionally in both the international and local academic scenes. This research circle has also acted as a support network, where even novices are welcome to contribute and grow, both as academics and professionals, through open interactions. Sumire believes this is a rare opportunity as regards academic associations.

Writing and Research Experiences in the Current Academic Career Phase

Sumire has been working for a private university, University C, for five years. Her main job is primarily administrative, although she also teaches language courses regularly. She finds herself spending considerable time as a coordinator. Sumire coordinates a cross-departmental English program along with regularly teaching language courses. With the main English program consisting of a vast number of students ranging in proficiency, the coordinators, including Sumire, work together to liaison with individual teachers, the staff, teaching assistants, and students, concerning material preparation,

equipment management, and troubleshooting. Sumire also oversees academic advisory services, where she regularly monitors and provides feedback on the performance of individual advisors, and thereby controls the quality of these services. Further, she has also been engaged in promotional efforts to advertise these services to students, directing the distribution of promotional pamphlets and videos.

At the university, which consisted predominantly of the humanity and social sciences faculties, Sumire said that there was not much institutional pressure placed on research productivity. Although research is encouraged, "the atmosphere suggests that one article per year would be sufficient" (年間一本書いてればいいような雰囲気). Sumire observed that her situation is considerably different from that of the HSS professors working for more research oriented scientific universities, where the majority of the faculty are prolific scientists, typically producing more than 10 articles per year.

When beginning her job at the university, Sumire was further sensitized to the need to demonstrate her identity as an English education specialist, rather than a linguist. Upon joining the university, Sumire's extensive publications list largely consisted of works related to linguistics, but when making the list public for the internal audience, the university recommended that she should include more educationally oriented pieces, regardless of their medium. Following this advice, Sumire included one of the few pieces that had appeared in the in-house journal that was published by one of the previous Japanese universities in which she had taught. Furthermore, a few years after her appointment at the university, Sumire was invited to be part of an internal research community that focused on language education, and has since been engaged in independent and collaborative efforts to study English education-related research and co-host various educational events and symposiums.

Devoting most of her time to her administrative tasks, Sumire's topic of interest naturally shifted from scholarly articles on linguistics to practical case reports on English

education in local institutional contexts. She stated:

> Since I have become a tenured professor, I have continued to think about the meaning of continuing these case reports, and I have been writing them with awareness of the need to perform studies that are relatively practical and contribute more to society.
>
> 専任になって、実践報告を続けていて、それはそれを続ける意味とか、どっちかというと実用的というか、もうちょっと社会に貢献できるような研究をしたほうがいいなっていう意識で書いてきて。

One of Sumire's main works was a Japanese case report on one of her elective language classes. This was a new course on which she was the first, and only, instructor assigned to teach. Sumire developed the course from the ground up, drawing on the knowledge she had obtained in her previous teaching experience at University A. She felt the need to inform other language instructors about her course material, and chose to describe the details of her teaching "for the record"(記録として), from design to procedure, and from material selection to explanations, in Japanese. Sumire explained that such an effort was meaningful, as she was able to use her record as a teacher's guide when a new faculty later came to teach another section of the same course. Further, through the process of writing in Japanese, Sumire gained a great deal of instrumental advice from the institutional review committee, and was able to successfully disseminate her activities in detail to the entire faculty. This form of advice was unavailable from her English teaching colleagues.

On another occasion, Sumire's writing, originally directed at the internal audience "for the record," eventually transcended institutional and national boundaries. After they presented their initial report at an international conference held in Japan, Sumire, her boss, and one of her colleagues, both English education specialists, received the opportunity to coauthor a case report in English on the advisory services she was coordinating. Their presentation was well received, and they were eventually invited by the conference

organizer to formally publish their work as a paper in part of a book for an international audience. Overjoyed, Sumire and her coauthors proceeded to work diligently to polish their work for publication. When finalizing her writing, Sumire and her coauthors were attentive to the profound practical interest in the advisory services that she had sensed from the audience, particularly from local Japanese professionals:

> It (this kind of service) is still rare in Japan, so Japanese professors asked us a number of questions, including quite administrative ones like, 'How do you organize the staff?', 'To what extent do professors need to be involved in the service?', and 'How do you budget it?'. So we aimed at writing something that serves as a reference for them.
>
> こういうのって日本にまだ少ないので、興味ある人はたくさんいるんですよだから。ポスターやったときでも日本人の先生からもいろんな質問受けて。結構こうアドミニ的な質問もあるんですね。だからどういう事務の職員の体制でできるのかとか、どのくらい教員がやんなきゃいけないのかとか、予算はどうするのかとか、だからそういうことを参考になるように書こうっていう趣旨があって。

As the other teacher was equally proficient in English and specialized in the topic, Sumire found the collaborative process quite smooth, just as it was in her work with her graduate school professors or peers, with each person responsible for separate sections and mutually editing their writing. Sumire found it pleasurable to be able to present this work both to local and international professional communities.

While engaged with her written projects, which are focused on English education, Sumire has found that the linguist side of her is, at times, compelled to explore methods of advancing the case reports in more linguistic directions. She explained a potential project that could be separated from the above second case report:

> To be honest, what I would like to write about is [a study using] the recordings of students' advisory sessions. If I were to perform research [in the context of linguistics], what would be most achievable is [an in-depth analysis of] the

interactions between the student and advisor. Yet, this involves privacy issues and obtaining approval would require me to plan the topic of the article in advance. I have not reached that level, and the paper has ultimately become limited to an administrative area.

ほんとうはね、一番書きたいのは学生の相談を録音するっていうのを。言語学でやるとしたらそれが一番やりやすいんですよね。学生とアドバイザーのコミュニケーション。だけどねえまあプライバシーもあるので、それも許可をとるとしたらどういう論文にするか最初に決めなきゃいけない。まだそこまで行ってなくてだアドミニ的なところで終わってるっていう。

Nevertheless, with teaching and administrative duties as main concerns, research on Sumire's specialism necessarily comes low in her list of priorities:

When I ask myself why I was hired and why I am doing this job, research on linguistics is not placed as a top priority. I would say, my commitment to improving the program holds the most value [for the university]. This can be achieved by managing it and communicating well with part-time teachers. Also, I have to perform well in committee-based tasks in the department. This situation necessarily makes me place research last in the order of business.

私がなんで採用されたのかとか、何のため、この仕事やってるかって考えた時に、言語学の研究っていうのは、そんなにこうトップにないので。やっぱりそのプログラムをよくするっていうこと、運営とか、非常勤講師の先生とのコミュニケーションとか、そういうのが重視されていて、あと学部内の委員会もきちんとやってって考えると、やっぱりどうしても、一番後回しになってしまう。

Sumire spends a considerable part of the limited time available to her for research on English education-related institutional research activities. These include the duties of organizing monthly educational events that cater mainly to local English teaching communities and participation in internal study presentation sessions. Therefore, Sumire is not persistent about furthering her dissertation work, although she still finds it enjoyable.

Still, Sumire is fortunate in that she stays in contact with the field of linguistics

through teaching. In addition to regularly teaching English at her own university, Sumire has been teaching linguistics at several other universities, including University A, as a visiting professor. She is often excited at having interested students in her class. These sometimes include American students from her graduate school at University P. As some of these students are willing to pursue graduate degrees, Sumire actively engages them in the literacy practices of the field. By teaching young future linguists, she also discovers information related to the field in the process. Furthermore, Sumire finds it inspirational to discover the students' areas of interests, which are revealed through their comments on her course content and, at times, in their presentations. She feels that the teaching experience gives her a good opportunity to take her original dissertation theme to the next level:

> So, in an effort to pass on what used to be the source of my personal enjoyment to the students, I always talk about my own experiments [conducted as part of my dissertation project] in every class. Every time I talk about it, I find the students are really interested. I have been continuing to listen to their reactions as they arise in the context of the class.
>
> やっぱり授業でやってることの学生の反応とか学生のプレゼンとか見ててもああ、こういうこと興味あるんだとか。いろんな発想が生まれてくるのでそれはすごくいい経験になりますね。だからその、自己満足で終わってたものを今度はこう還元するために、やっぱりそういう学生が理解できるように、毎回どの授業でも必ず自分自身の実験のことについて話すんですね、それやるたんびに学生はすごく面白がってくれてまでそれでてくる反応とかを聞いたりっていうのは続けてますね。

Although these experiences have "yet to bear fruit in the form of output"(ちょっとアウトプットまでは行ってなくて), Sumire values them as profoundly pleasurable opportunities for her growth in scholarly terms, as well as educational.

When asked about her self-view as a researcher, Sumire firstly emphasized her English proficiency as a writer. In general, she is proud of her English writing skills and especially fond of writing short pieces. She loves the everyday miscellaneous writing that

is required in the workplace, such as reports, cover letters, essays, and proposals. She always remembers the positive comments made about her writing by her teachers in her undergraduate years and by seniors in her graduate years. She uses these as encouragement to maintain her skills at a high level:

> I still remember being praised for my writing by my English professor. I cherish my senior's comment that I write better than Americans. As I am a returnee, I am not so pleased to be praised for my speaking skills, but I am glad when people say that my writing is good. So, I have taken it as an encouragement, and have been working hard at it. A researcher's job is all about writing, so I guess that I can continue to do this job throughout my life.
>
> ライティングの英語の先生にね英語をほめられたことずっと覚えてたりとか、院にいたときに、先輩の、すごいアメリカ人よりきれいな英語を書くねってほめられたこととかずっと覚えてて、別に、帰国子女なので、話すのうまいねって言われてもあんまりうれしくないんですけど、あの、書くのがほめられるとやっぱりうれしいので。やっぱりそれをずっとこう糧に、頑張ってる。だから書くときはしっかり書きたいなっていう。研究者っていうのは書くことが仕事なのでそういう意味では、あの、一生続けられるのかなっていう。

As a researcher, however, she is modest. Mainly due to time constraints, Sumire finds it relatively difficult to work on research, particularly in the area of English education she feels the need to explore:

> As a researcher, I really have not been able to find time for research. [In internal publications,] I often find my name under the title of 'researcher' [of foreign language education at my institution] and I always feel the need to do sufficient work to meet the expectations given by the title.
>
> 研究者としては、ほんとに研究の時間とれてないので。なんか「研究者」としていつも肩書が出るんですけど、それにちゃうんと見合う仕事をね、しなきゃいけないなっていつも反省してるぐらいで。

Given the lack of time, Sumire finds it takes additional energy and effort to work on formal

writing, such as RAs. Sumire hears other professors say that they make it a rule not to do any other jobs but research on their research days. Sumire feels that she is not as determined as they are.

In this current institutional context, Sumire feels that she is still open-ended about her future research engagements ahead. Referring to her personal stance towards life, Sumire stated:

> I'm not sure what I will be doing in a decade. I am not that certain about what I would like to do. I would like to cherish each encounter, such as the one with Ms. Matsuno...All the hardships are meant to be. If you devote yourself to the moment-by-moment tasks, some good opportunities will eventually emerge. I mean, nothing is visible from the beginning.
>
> ほんとに 10 年後何してるとかわからないんですよ。こうしたいっていうのもそんなになくて。なんかそのときどきの出会いとか、松野さんもそうなんですけど、そういうの大事にしたいなと思ってるので。自分で試練に合ってもそれは意味があって与えられてることなんだっていう考え方なので、その時々のこう一生懸命務めを果たしていれば、何か方向性が見えてくるとか。最初からは見えてはなくて。

Although she does not have specific aspirations concerning research, Sumire is clear about her perceived professional need to continue to pursue practical studies, such as the projects she has been engaged with in collaboration with her colleagues in English education. Sumire feels that it takes additional effort for her to be fully prepared to study in the area of English education, as her major academic training at doctoral level was focused on linguistics:

> I still awkwardly feel as if I am a 'customer' in English education. Even though I claim to specialize in English education, I have not studied the area in depth. I did not study it in coursework [very much], although I learned about it generally. To be honest, I wish I could [really] say that this (English education) is my specialty.
>
> 英語教育ってまだ私はちょっとお客様的な、違和感があって。英語教育が自分の専門でって言いつつも、

ちゃんと勉強してないなっていう。コースワークでも英語教育についてあまり勉強してないですし。いちおうはやりましたけど。だからこれが私の専門ですって言えることがほんとはできたらいいなって思ってるんですけど。

Sumire recognizes her passion for theoretical linguistics has yet to fade. She still constantly checks the themes of the international conference in the field, although she missed the opportunity to attend when she was accepted some years ago. Further, Sumire is occasionally stimulated by unexpected reunions with linguists from University P in America. One such opportunity materialized one year before the interview when her Japanese senior linguist invited Professor J, Sumire's major inspiration for her dissertation, to visit, and asked Sumire to assist him during his stay. Learning of his current endeavors over the course of the reunion, Sumire feels that she is still willing to pursue something in theoretical linguistics.

At the same time, Sumire recognizes a challenge in maintaining her motivation, as she is currently removed from the community of scholars in that field. Whenever she had a chance to see people from University P, she became motivated to do research in theoretical lingiusitcs. Meanwhile, she felt that it was difficult to maintain such motivation as she was "isolated" (孤立してる) in that she was "in a situation where there [were] no linguists around" (言語学の人が周りにいない状態).

In an effort to obtain an interested audience that maintains her motivation, Sumire is determined to continue to participate in the research circle of academics who understand her field, although they do not have exactly the same disciplinary backgrounds. It is very difficult for her to participate in the group as the meeting is held on weekends, but she would like to keep securing the rare opportunity to interact with an interested audience.

CHAPTER 11
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

In an attempt to raise awareness about NNES university English teachers' realities pertaining to their knowledge contribution, the study explored six Japanese university English teachers' writing and research experiences over the course of their academic career along with their pre-professional backgrounds through narrative inquiry. In so doing, the study followed the tradition of constructivist paradigm and constructivist career studies and drew on three assumptions:

1. Writing is a social practice (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996; 2008; Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Street 1984)
2. Writing is the key to disciplinary enculturation and professional development (Casanave, 1998, 2002)
3. There are three strands of academic work experience that shape individuals' academic career trajectory and contribute to their development as academics (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010; see also McAlpine & Amundsen, 2009; McAlpine, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; McAlpine & Turner, 2011).

In this chapter, based on a comparative analysis of the individual participants' narratives, emerging themes will be summarized and discussed in relation to the research questions and with reference to the existing literature. In addition, my own reflections in relation to the findings will also be given. The chapter will then address the implications of the study by proposing potential ways to help NNES university English teachers improve their quality of writing and research experiences in light of relevant existing proposals and

the further worsening writing and research related conditions for academics. The chapter will end with offering the final summary of the above discussion and revisiting the limitations and significance of the study. At the same time, it will present directions for future research and my own career visions derived from my experience with this study.

Summary and Discussion

Research Question 1: What are the pre-professional backgrounds that shaped a group of Japanese university English teachers' pursuit of doctoral studies?

This study first focused on investigating the pre-professional backgrounds that shaped the Japanese university teachers' pursuit of doctoral studies. The review of the existing literature in the first section of Chapter 3 suggests that little is known about the pre-professional backgrounds of NNES English teachers at the tertiary level. What the small body of literature did shed light on was some snapshots of the key trends in various NNES teachers' pre-university, university, and graduate school experiences. The trends included the following:

1. The significance of their early language and literacy experiences, particularly in relation to English, as a possible source of NNES English teachers' decision to consider becoming teachers (Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998; Hayes, 2008; Lin et al., 2005; Trent, 2013).
2. Varied timings and motivations for teachers to pursue master's studies (Casanave, 2002; Cho, 2013; Morita, 2004).
3. The potential challenges teachers experience in the process of disciplinary enculturation at both the master's and doctor's levels in mainstream settings (Casanave, 2002; Cho, 2009, 2013; Morita, 2004).

Additionally, the Japan-focused literature indicated the following trends:

1. A potentially considerable variety in language and literacy experiences that exist between individuals, particularly between those with regular, Japan-based backgrounds and those with returnee backgrounds (Amano & Poole, 2005; Goodman, 1990; Kanno, 2003; MEXT, n.d.a; Nagatomo, 2012; Yoshida, 2003).
2. Possible effort that teachers may make to obtain teachers' certificates (Ota, 2000; Saito & Murase, 2011; Nagatomo, 2012).
3. Different types of disciplinary enculturation experiences in Japanese graduate school settings from the mainstream system (Maruyama, 2008; MEXT, n.d.c.; Nagatomo, 2012; S.Yamamoto, 2005, 2007)
4. The possibility of simultaneous engagement in disciplinary studies and professional teaching among Japanese university English teachers based in Japan (Nagatomo, 2012).

However, the body of literature pertained to the circumstances and experiences of different groups of individuals in different contexts. Therefore, it was hard to capture the degree to which these trends may manifest and how they may connect and shape individual NNES university English teachers' pursuit of doctoral studies and entry into academia.

Even with limitations, the present study, by analyzing the teachers' storied experiences, was able to illuminate NNES teachers' pre-professional backgrounds in a holistic manner. Specifically, it was able to capture the Japanese university English teachers' individually unique progression regarding their language, literacy, and teaching-related experiences that led to their pursuit of doctoral studies, thus adding to the insights gained from the above literature. This study also was able to contextualize the teachers' writing and research experiences over the course of their academic career, starting from their doctoral training to their current professional lives.

Individual differences, particularly the age and setting of their first exposure to English—or more broadly, whether they followed the regular student or returnee student

scenarios (Yoshida, 2003; MEXT, n.d.a; Amano & Poole, 2005; Nagatomo, 2012; Goodman, 1990; Kanno, 2003)—seemed to be influential in the teachers' differing learning focuses that they decided to pursue over the course of their lives. The present research showed that their pathways to doctoral studies were not linear but emergent, grounded in their desire to fulfill their evolving needs and goals in the areas of language learning, teaching-related learning, and disciplinary learning.

In the pre-university to undergraduate years, they developed an interest in English as the focus of their study and profession, and many of them attended master's programs in continued pursuit of their learning needs from their undergraduate years. The choice of their graduate programs reflected the needs, albeit with some exceptions. In many cases, their career and disciplinary interests took shape mainly through their master's years and their semi-professional experiences as teachers around the period. Their decision to proceed to doctoral pursuits seemed to have been driven by one or a combination of the following: external influences, career-oriented motivation, scholarly-oriented motivation, and personally-focused motivation.

Pre-University to University Experiences

The literature suggested that NNES teachers' early language and literacy experiences, particularly in their pre-university years, are relevant to their decision to become English teachers (Hayes, 2008; Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998; Lin et al., 2005; Trent, 2013). This held partially true for the participants' cases. According to the participants' reflections on their lives at this stage, their evolving interest in English and their focus of study were intertwined with their consideration of language teaching as one of their career options.

In addition, many of the participants valued Japanese undergraduate experiences as important key turning points that prompted them to consider English-related professions,

although their specific career focus was still nascent. This finding potentially supplements an understanding of NNES teachers' undergraduate language and literacy experiences in relation to their career that have yet to be fully documented in the literature except a few studies (Kanno, 2003; Nagatomo, 2012; Goodman, 1990; Ota, 2000; Saito & Murase, 2011).

As the Japan-focused literature (Kanno, 2003; Nagatomo, 2012, Goodman, 1990; Ota, 2000; Saito & Murase, 2011) implied, the way the participants engaged in language and literacies in their pre-university to university years differed according to the age and setting of their first exposure to English—or on whether they went through regular students or returnee students scenarios—as well as other circumstances. At this stage, whereas the four participants who were non-returnees, Wataru, Shizuka, Koji, and Takeshi, were mainly engaged in English and literacy learning, the two returnees, Minami and Sumire were engaged in bilingual and bicultural development focused on balancing their naturally acquired English and maintenance and development of Japanese. However, all of the participants seemed to have noticed renewed language or literacy learning needs at the respective Japanese universities they attended in the era of pre-to early university reformation, and they drew on available resources inside or outside the institutions to compensate for or fulfill their needs and thereby proactively enhance the quality of their experiences. In Nagatomo's (2012) study, this tendency was explained only in relation to non-returnees; the present study indicated that those with returnee backgrounds too had to make efforts to maximize their learning.

The literature did not touch on discipline-related learning and its connection to the teachers' career interests. The findings of the present study suggested that the participants' disciplinary and career interests were still nascent back then. None of them explicitly cited these aspects when they shared their pre-university to university experiences, and only one of them, Koji, explicitly indicated his consideration of an academic career at that stage. In

their retrospective observations, their decision to pursue master's studies was interpreted as one or a combination of the following: external influences, desires to fulfill their learning needs, and professional considerations.

Being late bilinguals: Conscientious engagement in English language and literacy learning.

Four of the participants, Wataru, Shizuka, Koji, and Takeshi, followed the regular non-returnee students' scenario. They had been born and educated primarily in Japan, although Wataru experienced a short homestay program in high school in Australia, and Shizuka studied abroad twice in Canada when in university. Their reported experiences indicated their conscientious language learning despite their limited exposure to English. According to Baetens Beardsmore (1986), late bilinguals are those who acquire a L2 after they reach the age of about 11 years. These four teachers' journey, particularly from the school to university years, showed an initial endeavor towards learning English and thereby towards becoming late bilinguals. All of them happened to be from rural or suburban areas in Japan and some of them touched on their rare encounters with non-Japanese people in their neighborhoods. In addition, media information and images of English speaking cultures were the main inputs for them. In such contexts, they attached positive meanings to the English language. Shizuka and Koji, particularly under the perceived influences of the media, reported to have interpreted the language as symbolizing a window to a wider world. Wataru remembered being inspired by a societal trend that valued the pragmatic function of language. Takeshi was enchanted by the structural wonder of language itself, which increased his curiosity about the world in which it was spoken.

Naturally, all of the four constructed themselves as steady language learners as they reflected on their pre-university years. Unlike Nagatomo's (2002) participants with similar

Japan-based backgrounds, the participants in the present study did not explicitly criticize the grammar-based traditional instruction and curriculum in Japanese public school that they went through when they reflected on their experiences in school as students. For Wataru, Shizuka, and Koji, their performance in English as a subject seemed to have been their source of self-confidence. Takeshi, purely out of curiosity, brought his learned grammatical knowledge to a level beyond what he had learned in the classroom.

These participants' reported remarkably proactive and positive engagement in English learning as they recounted their experiences at pre-reform Japanese universities in the 1990s. In spite of considerably different learning environments, they seemed to have been similarly self-regulated in their learning. Wataru and Koji, then English majors, were blessed with then relatively rare opportunities to join coordinated English language programs, arguably designed both for non-returnee and returnee students. Books that their universities published at the time showed that their programs generally offered English-medium, skills-based courses, similar to then innovative programs in other Japanese universities in the 1990s (Sekiguchi, 1993; Torikai & Shindo, 1996). While the two did report their full commitment to extra-curricular activities, they presented themselves as continuously engaged learners of English particularly in relation to perceived peer pressure from their returnee classmates. Their reflections further indicated the relevance of Goodman's (1990) explanation and Nagatomo's (2012) observation of the possibility of internationally educated students as a potential stimulator of Japan-based students' motivation to improve their English. By attending English classes where communicative skills were emphasized with returnee peers, the two teachers reassessed their language abilities, in which they used to gain confidence, and make efforts to go out of their comfort zone.

Takeshi, then an English major, and Shizuka, then a social science major, suggested that they were considerably dissatisfied with the learning environments that their

universities offered. The type of English education they were provided in their general education programs arguably represented the classic grammar translation method that was described by the participants in Nagatomo's (2012) study. Nagatomo's (2012) participants who experienced such an environment reportedly resorted to a variety of measures, including attending English-related classes, gaining extra opportunities to network with English speaking peers, and studying abroad. Takeshi and Shizuka tried out at least some of these kinds of approaches—Takeshi utilized many English-medium and English specialist courses at university and sought extra opportunities to use English outside of campus. Shizuka went to Canada to attend ESL programs twice. Particularly unique to these two as compared to Nagatomo's (2012) participants was their adoption of extensive self-learning in the library, which strengthened the metalinguistic foundations they established in their school years. Overall, all of the four participants showed respect for the basic language skills they developed in their traditional Japan-based education rather than denying them.

While topics pertaining to their L1 literacies were largely absent in the literature in NNES teachers' experiences and was not the major focus of the present study, the findings did indicate some relevant experiences among the non-returnee teachers. The non-returnee teachers' engagement in Japanese literacies from their pre-university to university days seemed to be relatively modest as compared with that in English, except in the case of Shizuka. Shizuka seemed to be the only one who openly expressed her love for Japanese, especially Japanese writing, in her school days. Although he boasted of his good grades in Japanese language arts, Koji reported he did not like writing in the language very much. Takeshi's absorption in reading and linguistic analysis in his high school to university years was largely performed in Japanese, but he reported that he did not have extensive experience writing in Japanese. Wataru suggested that he did not develop any interest in reading or writing in Japanese until he began writing in the language in his doctoral years.

Being early bilinguals: Conscientious engagement in bilingual and bicultural development.

Two of the participants, Minami and Sumire, who had varying lengths of American schooling experiences, followed the returnee scenario. Consistent with the typical cases shown in the relevant literature (Kanno, 2003; Goodman, 1990), they both went through dual schooling lives while in America, took part in a special track of the secondary education system back in Japan, and attended a returnee-oriented bilingual university thereafter. They fell in the category of early bilinguals who acquire an additional language before puberty (Baetens Beardsmore, 1986). Despite considerable individual differences, their reflections on their language and literacy experiences in pre-university to undergraduate years were centered on their sincere engagement in bilingual and bicultural development.

Kanno (2003) suggested that for returnees, parental involvement in education plays an important role. She also suggested that returnees have complex attitudes towards both languages. Minami's and Sumire' stories confirmed her observations. They frequently mentioned their appreciation for their parents' considerate support for their respective educational pathways. Both indicated their own unique mixture of confidence in their naturally acquired English language and literacies and relative humility about their Japanese ones. They both demonstrated a conscious endeavor to improve their Japanese language and literacies and learn about Japanese culture while advancing their literacy skills in English further, albeit at different points in their lives, until they joined graduate school.

According to their reflection on their pre-university years, Sumire and Minami constructed themselves as returnees engaging in learning not only languages and literacies but also cultures. Because of her relatively late acquisition of the English language and early return to Japan, Sumire's consciousness as a learner of both languages and literacies

was consistently explicit. Sumire had a positive attitude towards developing her bilingual competencies and valued all the types of education that she had taken in Japan and America that facilitated such processes, although her fondness for English-medium education seemed relatively stronger. Minami did not present herself as a language learner as explicitly as Sumire when describing her pre-university years. Educated predominantly in America in the mainstream setting, Minami did not experience ESL learning in America or in Japan. She developed her love for a range of subjects through the medium of English. Her experience of formal language learning was focused on Japanese.

In their stories, these participants' sincere endeavors in English and Japanese learning continued into their university years. Both Sumire and Minami attended University A, a bilingual university known for its acceptance of returnees and its provision of both English and Japanese medium courses (Goodman, 1990). Thus, the university may be interpreted as exceptional among Japanese universities in the 1990s. Yet, it was notable that Sumire and Minami's stories indicated that such special universities also shared characteristics with other Japanese institutions. Extra-curricular activities among students seemed prevalent. Both Sumire and Minami participated in such activities and actively learned Japanese culture and values. Additionally, like in the cases of other universities with the coordinated English education program, they seemed to be designed primarily for non-returnee students. The programs did not seem to provide English literacy education for students with native level English proficiency (like Minami) equivalent to the native speaker sections of first year writing programs and subsequent major specific writing intensive courses in American institutions (see Leki, 2007, for a review of reports on such programs and courses).

While both were fully committed to their extra-curricular activities and even acknowledged their social and cultural values, Sumire and Miami seemed to have felt that their learning environment was not as linguistically or academically challenging as they

would have liked. Thus, as in the case of the above-mentioned non-returnee participants, Sumire and Minami also made independent efforts on and off campus to make their language and literacy lives fulfilling. Sumire utilized opportunities to further hone her skills in academic writing in the advanced level of English academic literacy courses in the above-mentioned English program and actively took English medium courses in her majors. She also developed her skills in academic Japanese through her part-time job at the cram school she used to attend. Minami gained opportunities to strengthen her relatively less dominant language, Japanese, in Japanese as a second language (JSL) and Japanese-medium courses. However, it was only through studying abroad in Britain that she was able to focus on her stronger language, English. With a renewed self-concept as a Japanese and acknowledgment of English as her strength, she was finally able to motivate herself to base in Japan.

Emerging disciplinary interests.

In their stories, all the six participants reflected on their emerging interest in their disciplines, although it did not seem to be their central concern. The four late bilingual teachers, Wataru, Shizuka, Koji, and Takeshi, indicated that their choice of majors before entering their universities or thereafter was quite casual, and yet three of them proceeded to English-related majors based on their interest in the language they had developed in their secondary school settings. Among them, Wataru was the only one who happened to be aware of the introductory knowledge of TESOL-related fields at the time. None of the participants extensively touched on disciplinary enculturation through writing in the way that Casanave (2012) described. Yet, some of them discussed the relevant experiences surrounding their emerging disciplinary interests. Among the four, Koji and Wataru mentioned their experience with academic writing through a graduate thesis requirement, although they did not remember many details except regarding their on-time completion of

their papers. Takeshi did not have opportunities to write academically in his field but was committed to his self-learning of linguistics, the parent field of TESOL.

The two early bilingual teachers were not specific about their majors while entering the university, arguably partly because the institution allowed students to decide their majors later in their academic lives. Through different routes, both of them, like the majority of the late bilingual teachers, came to be attracted to English-related fields, and like Wataru, they eventually focused on the key fields related to TESOL—linguistics and English education. Going through a series of change in her interest, Minami finally became interested in these fields mainly as a result of her study abroad experience in Britain. Sumire particularly mentioned her interest in theoretical linguistics in relation to her specific coursework on her linguistic analysis of her own utterances. McAlpine and Akerlind (2010) stated that discipline-related networks, which form important parts of *the networking strand* in academic work experience, may be forged even at the master's level or before. This applied to Sumire, who was the only person who established such a network early at the undergraduate level with her professor that continued on later in her academic career. For these returnee participants who had experienced comparable tasks in their earlier lives and were free from the pressure imposed by writing intensive courses as in American universities, academic writing through a graduate thesis requirement itself did not seem to be particularly notable, and neither did they relate the experience in relation to a sense of disciplinary communities. However, their encounter with the aforementioned key fields seemed to have served as a foundation for their later careers.

English teaching as a potential future career option.

In their retrospective analysis, most of the participants indicated that they considered language teaching to be one of their future career options. However, many of them still seemed to be largely open about how they would narrow their focus. While five

of the participants obtained teacher certificates in their undergraduate careers, supporting the popularity of the qualifications among undergraduates in the literature (Saito & Murase, 2011; Nagatomo, 2012), school teaching did not seem to be their ultimate career destination at the time. Wataru explained that his acquisition of the certificate was a customary practice and was not necessarily related to his desire to become a teacher. Takeshi considered teaching as one of many English-related careers. For Koji, with his desire to change English education as a whole, becoming a schoolteacher itself was one step toward his ultimate goal of becoming a university-level teacher. Language teaching as a career option seemed to come naturally to Minami, who engaged in part-time teaching in such institutions as cram schools and conversational school, and to Sumire, with her love for language and with her parent's recommendations. However, at the same time, the teachers also showed an interest in advanced study in fields related to their profession. Shizuka, who was the only one who did not obtain the certificate, came to be interested in the profession in the process of actually experiencing teaching at a conversational school a few years after graduation and studying abroad.

Decision to pursue master's studies.

As was the case with the findings in the existing literature (Casanave, 2002; Cho, 2013; Morita, 2004), the participants' retrospective observations on what led to their decision to pursue master's studies as well as their timings varied. However, the present study showed that the participants in their reflections related one or a combination of the following elements to their decision: external influences, desires to fulfill their learning needs, and professional considerations. It was notable that their decisions also involved the country in which they sought their studies, which supplemented the majority of the existing studies focused primarily on their learning in mainstream contexts. The majority of the participants pursued studies right after finishing their undergraduate programs and

reflected on their wish to make up for or augment what they needed in their undergraduate years in Japan.

External influences. Although not well documented in the existing literature, the present study indicated that NNES teachers' pursuit of master's studies can be unintentional. Wataru emphasized that his choice to go to a Japanese graduate school right after graduation was primarily motivated by the perceived challenge in obtaining any jobs in the midst of an economic recession. Additionally, Shizuka's pursuit of a master's degree in America was partially motivated by the fact that Japanese master's programs in a particular discipline at the time did not generally accept students from a different disciplinary background.

Desires to fulfill their learning needs. The majority of the participants reflected on their interest in fulfilling their learning needs that they came to be aware of over the course of their undergraduate studies. Takeshi and Koji decided to attend American institutions because of their long-term personal wish to go to an English-speaking environment and improve their English in authentic settings. Minami wished to attend a Japanese institution out of the consideration of learning more about Japan in general and English education in the country that she did not experience as a student. Sumire sought to satisfy her intellectual thirst, which she could not fulfill in her undergraduate years and desired to reconnect with America. Therefore, she decided to attend a Japanese master's program to prepare herself to study in America at the doctoral level.

Professional considerations. For Minami and Sumire, who had considered the English teaching profession in general, and Koji who was clear about wanting to become an university-level English teacher, attending a mater's may also be interpreted as relevant to their professional considerations. Shizuka, who was the only participant who decided to go to graduate school after a few years of teaching experience, emphasized the perceived practical significance of a master's in the field of TESOL.

Master's Studies and Early Teaching Experiences

According to their reflections, the participants became increasingly focused on their professional and disciplinary interests over the course of their master's studies and their initial teaching career. Those who chose to be trained in TESOL-oriented master's programs in America, immediately after graduation (Koji and Takeshi) or after having gained teaching experiences (Shizuka) mainly engaged in language, literacy, and disciplinary learning, and semi-professional teaching in the country. Those who went to Japanese programs with a greater focus on scholarly studies (Wataru, Minami, and Sumire) experienced disciplinary learning and research, and sought opportunities to teach at high school.

Among the participants, there were some who made additional efforts to attend another institution (Wataru and Koji) or to accumulate teaching experiences (Takeshi) after the completion of their first master's. Their accounts indicated that the teachers became more focused on their interest in the language teaching profession and in particular fields in their disciplines not only through their master's studies but also through their preliminary teaching experiences. Their stories and comments implied that their decisions to pursue doctoral studies were shaped by one or a combination of the following elements: external influences, career-oriented motivation, scholarly oriented motivations, and personally focused motivation.

Being trained in America: Engagement in English language, literacy, and disciplinary learning along with semi-professional teaching.

The literature suggests that NNES teachers learning in the master's program in an English speaking country are often faced with linguistic, affective, and other types of challenges in the process of disciplinary enculturation (Casanave, 2002; Cho, 2009, 2013; Morita, 2004). The three participants—Koji, Takeshi, and, Shizuka—illustrated part of this

point, particularly the linguistic aspects, but they all conceived the challenges as valuable. The different institutions they had attended full time were professional masters' programs with concentrations in TESOL primarily intended for new and experienced language teaching professionals. They reflected on their heightened engagement in language and literacy learning in specific disciplinary contexts in an English-speaking environment. Koji and Takeshi both often critically reflected on how little they had been trained for advanced language and literacy in their undergraduate years in Japan. They were candid in describing their perceived under-preparedness to deal with the tasks, especially in the area of writing. Having gone to Canada, experienced teaching English, and learned basic English academic literacy skills before enrolling in her master's program, Shizuka did not describe such a language-related struggle as much but did touch on how overwhelmed she was by the formal academic writing tasks at the master's level that she encountered for the first time.

As part of their literacy challenges, two of them also mentioned their perceived lack of background knowledge of their fields. Koji, originally an English major, did not fully understand the contents of the theories and practice at first. Shizuka, coming from a non-English major, also mentioned in her reflection at the end of her master's that her perceived lack of background knowledge hampered her understanding of the full picture of the field that she was studying. Takeshi, on the other hand, indicated that his background knowledge about the field that he had developed on his own helped him to keep himself on par with English-speaking peers.

All of them actively sought opportunities to improve their English language and literacy skills. All of them interacted with English-speaking individuals on and off campus. Koji additionally interacted with his seniors from Japan to supplement his knowledge of the field. Shizuka sought help from the learning center at the institution to cope with the task demands. Takeshi consistently committed to self-study in the library as in the case in

his undergraduate years.

All of them gained preliminary teaching opportunities in their masters' years without any explicit political disadvantages because of their NNES status, as shown in Cho (2013; see also Kamhi-Stein, 1999 and Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Nevertheless, they did not explicitly relate these opportunities in America to their subsequent career experiences in Japan. For example, Koji was not completely satisfied with his teaching experience in Japanese supplementary school because of the perceived self-conflict between his temporary status as a student and professional duties as teacher as well as because of the different teaching context from Japan. Takeshi recounted his pre-service teaching experiences mainly as a means of strengthening his skills and confidence in his English rather than in relation to his profession.

Being trained in Japan: Engagement in disciplinary learning and research along with preliminary professional teaching.

The literature suggests that many of the masters' programs at Japanese universities are often viewed as a preparatory program for a doctoral program at the same university (S.Yamamoto, 2007) and therefore are meant to be research oriented rather than professionally oriented. According to the accounts of Minami, Sumire, and Wataru, in their master's years, this characteristic seemed to have been partially applied to different Japanese institutions that they chose to attend. In other words, their institutions seemed to have offered courses in both scholarly and professional directions. On the other hand, without structured teacher training components in these masters' programs, the teachers' preliminary experiential learning as professionals took place primarily on the job in their respective workplaces at high school. This dual focus on disciplinary learning and professional learning was arguably challenging, especially for Wataru. Wataru joined a Japanese master's program as a tentative destination and started working as a full-time

contractual English teacher at a public high school. Conducting extracurricular duties in addition to teaching, Wataru reported that he could not afford to invest much in in his language and literacy learning, except for his last-minute attempt to complete a master's thesis in English. Nevertheless, the teaching experience allowed him to become aware of the learning needs of Japanese learners of English and thereby develop the basic research interest that he would like to pursue further. Minami and Sumire, who worked part time at a private high school, seemed to be able to have a slightly more balanced way of dividing their time between teaching and research. However, their teaching and research interests seemed to be somewhat separated, nevertheless. To these early bilinguals, especially for Minami, immersing themselves as teachers in the type of education in Japan that they had not experienced fully as students was important and enjoyable in itself. They, at the same time, engaged in their research projects through which they furthered their disciplinary knowledge and research-related expertise built on the foundation they had accumulated in their undergraduate years. As will be discussed, they valued the significance of peer or academic networks they took part in during the period rather than the coursework itself.

Additional investment in Japan after finishing a master's program.

Some of the participants recounted the extra efforts they made even after finishing their master's studies. Parts of these efforts were academic. According to their accounts, Wataru's and Koji's decisions to enroll in an additional graduate program derived from their consideration of their professional future in academe in Japan as well as other factors. Wataru came to his decision based on the imminent need to prepare himself for obtaining a job in academe after the termination of his contract as a high schoolteacher and on the desire to deepen the knowledge of his interest. Wataru's virtual second round of master's level study as a special student at University A came as a critical time when he actually started to engage with language, literacy and disciplinary development in earnest. During

this special period, similar to those who attended master's programs in America, Wataru focused on developing academic speaking, emulating his English-speaking or English proficient peers, and improving his reading skills through engaging in coursework. He was also eager to absorb the disciplinary knowledge related to his research interest. Koji's pursuit of a second master's at University N in Japan came primarily from the above-mentioned Japanese graduate school system that generally required a master's thesis to enroll in a doctoral program. Koji was able to consolidate his knowledge of the field by discussing what he had learned in America in light of the Japanese context with his peers at his second master's program, which was more academically oriented, and by engaging in writing a thesis. Koji and Takeshi engaged in professional English teaching in Japan after finishing their first master's. Koji's engagement in teaching at high school back in Japan when he was preparing for his second master's studies led him to be aware of students' needs and problems in Japanese educational systems in general and thereby establish his later research focus. For Takeshi, accumulating teaching experience was important to fully relate to the knowledge of his field that he obtained in his master's years in America.

Emerging pre-doctoral networks.

Some of the teachers' stories around Japan-based pre-doctoral graduate school experiences, like Sumire's story on her undergraduate years, further supported McAlpine's and Akerlind's (2010) mention of the possibility of the development of discipline-related networks before doctoral studies. Wataru's encounter with Seishiro, who shared a similar research interest and was academically oriented, during his pre-doctoral year at University A, seemed to boost his motivation to become research oriented in his later years. The special study group that Minami and Koji joined at University N, which reportedly was made up of experienced teacher researchers and professors, seemed to work both for professional communities of teachers and for research-related support groups. For Minami,

who had wanted to learn about education in Japan, and for Koji, who sought to advance his academic career in Japan, the networks seemed to be positive. Sumire, too, while not being able to find attractive areas of study within the limits of the coursework provided, discussed the value of networks with her peers, a student-initiated reading circle, as an important catalyst for the discovery of the field that she finally wanted to explore in her subsequent years. Sumire's independent attendance of a special workshop given by the American graduate school that she would eventually join is also an indication of the value of the networks she appreciated.

Increasingly focused disciplinary interests.

It is clear that the reflections of the participants indicated a little more focused disciplinary interests than in their undergraduate years, but it should be noted that what they reflected on was not explicitly their sense of membership in their fields through collective literacy practices in their chosen programs (Casanave, 2012). As shown above, Koji and Takeshi, who went to American institutions, did not seem to acknowledge any sense of membership in their fields despite their engagement in disciplinary writing. Their real disciplinary interests, if not their sense of disciplinary membership, emerged out of their actual teaching experiences after finishing the program rather than through writing. Likewise, Shizuka, who attended an American institution, came to be interested in one area of study because of her coursework, although she did not necessarily seem to see herself as a part of the field. Some of the participants who learned in or rejoined graduate studies in Japan may have become more conscious of their membership as a part of their physical communities because of their studies in relation to their master's thesis and the above-mentioned network they forged. However, the extent to which they developed their sense of membership in the field and through writing was unclear. For example, Minami and Sumire, in spite of their engagement in master's studies, did not feel compelled to

publicize their work at this stage.

Decision to pursue doctoral studies.

There has been little research exploring what motivates NNES teachers to pursue doctoral studies. Casanave (2012) and Pennington (2015) implied TESOL-related fields' tendency to see the master's degree, not the doctoral one, as the terminal degree. Casanave (2012) generalized that only language teachers who gain confidence in research skills in master's studies tend to proceed to doctoral studies. Casanave (2014) reported in another work that her own doctoral students who actually joined a doctoral program desired to improve their career prospects, financial conditions, or simply to fulfill their interests. Partially similar to her observation, the stories of the teachers in the present study suggested that their decisions behind the pursuit of doctorates were shaped by one or a combination of the following: external influences, career-oriented motivation, scholarly-oriented motivation, and personally-focused motivation. In retrospect, the teachers connected these influences to their cumulative language, literacy, and preliminary professional experiences.

External influences. To some of the participants, the decision to proceed to doctoral studies and where to do so was prompted mainly by external influences. To Minami, who had studied in Japan, and to Shizuka, who had studied in America, the pursuit of doctoral studies did not come as a decision. Minami, who missed some opportunities to teach at a high school in Japan, made a decision to go back to America partially through her professors' recommendation. Shizuka, meanwhile, despite the uncertainty of her academic plans, was pressured to attend a doctoral program because she found that the choice was quite common among her peers. However, she ended up enrolling in a Japanese doctoral program even after being accepted into an American program because of financial reasons. Koji and Wataru also took financial situations into account when they decided to choose

Japanese programs when starting a second master's level studies in Japan, although they also considered attending an institution in the mainstream setting first.

Career-oriented motivation. Koji and Wataru were relatively explicit in relating their goal of becoming university professors in Japan to their pursuit of doctoral studies. Their decision to pursue doctoral studies seems to have been made when they joined their second round of master's level studies in Japan. Koji reported that he continued to stick to his long-standing goal of becoming a teacher educator and felt the necessity of having a doctoral degree after obtaining a master's to fulfill this goal. Wataru, who initially was unclear about his career prospects, was now compelled to obtain a position in academia and to make a cost-effective decision to continue his studies in Japan following his training as a special student. Shizuka's story did not show her intention to become a university instructor at the outset, but her career focus expressed in her account on her entry to the master's program and her cautious alignment with her peers pursuing doctoral studies also indicated her career consciousness in her pursuit of a doctorate.

Scholarly-oriented motivation. While they were clear about eventually resuming a teaching career in Japan, Minami and Sumire intended to pursue doctoral studies in America largely because of their intrinsic love for research, particularly in scholarly areas rather than teaching-based themes. Although she was encouraged by her professors to attend a doctoral program, Minami herself developed an interest in linguistically related studies over the course of her master's years. In the case of Sumire, her effort to explore her own disciplinary areas of interest outside of what was offered in Japanese graduate school and to network with mainstream scholars led her to materialize her goal of attending a doctoral program in America.

Personally-focused motivation. Takeshi constructed a more personally focused, exploratory motivation. His story in the context of his American master's program revolved almost around his personal interest in language development, particularly

vis-à-vis his English-speaking peers. In addition, even after he developed an eventual interest in specific areas of studies back in Japan, Takeshi did not explicitly connect the areas with disciplines or careers. Notably, Takeshi recounted his reluctance to network with experts in his fields and his indifference to his career development in higher education in Japan. He emphasized that his pursuit of his doctorate was based primarily on his personal pursuit of intellectual curiosity, not out of career or scholarly considerations.

Research Question 2: What are the characteristics of the Japanese university English teachers' writing and research experiences over the course of their academic careers?

The second and main focus of the present study was on exploring the six teachers' writing and research experiences over the course of their academic careers. NNES university English teachers' writing and research experiences in the context of academia are as equally under-researched as their pre-professional backgrounds. What the limited body of research did indicate was that there are factors both facilitating and constraining any university faculty's writing and research endeavors in today's rise of managerialism in higher education (Benjamin 2000; Brenan, 2007; Fox, 1992; Finkelstein, 2007; Gordon, 2010; Gottlieb & Keith, 1997; Griffiths, 2004; Henkel, 2010; Johnstone, 2011; Kogan, 1997; Musselin, 2007; Sanyal & Johnston, 2011; Schwandt, 2009). It also indicated that across the board, language teachers' writing and research activities are particularly likely to be hampered in this climate because of TESOL-related fields' inconsistent research traditions (Borg, 2010, 2013; Pennington, 2015; Reis-Jorge, 2007) and low disciplinary status (Lorimer & Schulte, 2010; Pennington, 2015), as well as institutional constraints (Allison and Carey, 2007; Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg, 2010, 2013; Borg & Liu, 2013; Pennington, 2015; Xu, 2014).

Furthermore, the Japan-focused literature suggested that Japanese higher education

today by and large reflects the global trend towards managerialism coupled with a range of historical Japan-specific issues (Amano & Poole, 2005; Arimoto, 2015; Asonuma & Urata 2015; Goodman, 2010; MEXT, n.d.b, n.d.c.; Ogata, 2015), and there are conflicting forces both facilitating and constraining academics' writing and research engagement (Arimoto, 2015; Asonuma & Urata, 2015; Aspinall, 2005; Goodman, 2010; Hasegawa, 2015; Kano, 2015; Nagatomo, 2012; Shimada, Okui, & Hayashi, 2009; K.Yamamoto, 2004; Yonezawa, 2008). With the growth of the value of English education in higher education (MEXT, 2003 Hashimoto, 2009), Japanese university English teachers' missions as model language teachers, teacher educators, and examination developers have gained in value (Nagatomo, 2012), yet their roles as researchers seemed to be unacknowledged and unsupported. Despite the heightened necessity of a doctoral degree for them to advance their careers (McCrostie, 2010; Nagatomo, 2012; Poole, 2010), a number of negative circumstances including the low recognition of their fields and institutional constraints (MEXT, n.d.e, 2006; MEXT & JSPS, 2015; Nagatomo, 2012; Poole, 2010; Casanave, 2010) seem to affect Japanese university English teachers' writing and research engagement.

The findings in the present study illuminated Japanese university English teachers' proactive engagement in writing and research, but overall indicated a conflict between their intellectual strand of academic work experience and the other two strands of academic work experience—the networking and institutional (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010)—albeit to a differing degree. Regardless of where they were trained, all of the Japanese teachers, building on their own respective personal histories, constructed a non-linear and complex journey moving back and forth across the world of academia, where knowledge construction through writing is the norm, and the world of English teachers, where such endeavors are viewed as a "minority activity" (Borg, 2010, p. 391). Namely, the way they constantly engaged in teaching that they had always loved was different from the relatively linear mainstream scenario where scholars develop an

academic career after finishing full-time doctoral studies (Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015; Kubota & Sun, 2013). At the same time, their sincere commitment to writing and research differed from many cases of NNES English teachers portrayed in studies outside Japan who are reluctant to conduct research (Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg, 2010, 2013; Borg & Liu, 2013; Xu, 2014) or Japanese part-time teachers who are apathetic towards research, as mentioned in Poole (2010).

In graduate school contexts, particularly in American settings, the participants were expected to become a part of disciplines through writing. In contrast, in their professional contexts in Japan, they found themselves exposed to a widely held implicit view that language teachers were not expected to conduct research, particularly in their disciplinary contexts. This dilemma seemed to be consistent, even after they advanced to a tenured position in which they were officially acknowledged as researchers as well as teachers.

In line with some descriptions in Nagatomo's (2012) studies, the majority of the participants were reported to be committed to their doctoral and professional studies while working as teachers. According to their reports, they experienced varying forms of disciplinary enculturation and professional development (Casanave, 2012) through writing at an early stage of their career. Broad differences were seen between the Japan-trained teachers and American-trained teachers not only in terms of the academic environment they were exposed to in their doctoral programs but also in terms of how to balance work and research. The Japan-trained teachers seemed to have experienced concurrent engagement in research and teaching together with other professional work starting from the early phase of their doctoral lives, whereas those who trained in America experienced a focused period of research at first.

Both groups were found to be actively engaged in English-medium dissertations and other publications, although while the former group focused more on the efficient production of the works across languages and genres, the latter group valued the

intellectual process of the production of the work and used English-dominant genres mainly in the form of RAs. Overall, for all the teachers, the respective writing and research practices they adopted at the early stage of their academic career seemed to serve as the basis for their present practices.

Meanwhile, it is undeniable that mainly institutional factors including the ones documented in the literature (Allison & Carry, 2007; Benjamin, 2000; Borg, 2013; Casanave, 2010; Nagatomo, 2012; Pennington, 2015; Poole, 2010; Xu, 2014) continuously affected the way the teachers engaged in and advanced their practices throughout their career to date, while they were able to experience their advancement as teachers. Among the teachers, only one, Minami, who was American trained, was engaged in the mainstream scenario of "publishing out of the thesis" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 138).

At the present career stage, in the context of the era of intensified university reform and manageriarism, all of them viewed the institutional strand (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010) as central to their academic work experiences. It affected their networking strand (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010) as well as their intellectual strand (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010) in various ways. They expressed a sense of an institutional mission, as well as personal passion, to contribute to English education at their universities. However, the teachers, especially those tenured in private universities with an emphasis on a wider range of non-teaching professional duties, and among them those trained in America in particular, seemed to find it challenging to continue their studies the way they liked, despite their capacity for knowledge construction.

As compared with NNES teachers in other countries documented in the literature (Allison & Carry, 2007; Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg, 2010, 2013; Borg & Liu, 2013; Xu, 2014), many of them indicated a degree of confidence in the language, literacy, or research and publication experiences they had accumulated. However, persistent institutional constraints, as well as network constraints and their own personal orientations

and stances towards research grounded in their backgrounds seemed to have shaped their mixed feelings about being and becoming researchers. In view of these perceived challenges, their expressed research-related aspirations were modest and basic but still seemed to be quietly present.

Writing and Research Experiences in the Early Academic Career Phase

In contrast to many of the portrayals of NNES teachers' research engagement in the literature (Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg, 2010, 2013; Borg & Liu, 2013; Xu, 2014; Poole, 2010), the participants' stories of their experiences at the early stage of their career showed that they were all proactive in their writing and research, although their primary interests were in their language teaching profession. Their stories illuminated their considerable individual uniqueness especially in terms of the academic culture and trainings that they were exposed to in their graduate schools. The different academic trainings were also related to their different way of balancing academic and institutional commitments, particularly in their early careers. The three teachers—Wataru, Shizuka, and Koji—who were trained in Japan, started with a concurrent engagement in research and teaching together with other professional work like some of Nagatomo's (2012) participants did. The other three teachers, Takeshi, Sumire, and Minami, who were trained in America, had varying lengths of research-focused periods before beginning their professional lives in Japan with an increased focus on teaching.

In their early career phase, the majority of the teachers experienced insecure yet labor-intensive job conditions while they simultaneously gained valuable professional opportunities. However, this was an important period when they engaged in their research most actively. Their foundational writing and research practices seemed to have been developed in their early career contexts in their doctoral to post-doctoral years, drawing on available networks and resources under these very complex conditions.

Being trained in Japan: Engagement in bilingual writing and research practices while committing to teaching and other work.

Wataru, Shizuka, and Koji, who chose to obtain doctoral training in Japan, reflected on their challenging experience of concurrently engaging in research, teaching, and other professional work at the same time. Shizuka and Koji in particular emphasized their devotion to teaching and other professional work from the beginning while Wataru chose to start with a life focusing more on research, with a relatively small load of teaching. They all strived to achieve career advancement from part-time positions (MEXT, 2006; Nagatomo, 2012; Poole, 2010) to contractual ones (MEXT, 2006, n.d.f; Nagatomo, 2012; Kano, 2015) or to tenured full-time positions, while going through inter-institutional immigration accordingly. In their graduate schools, where students' independent efforts were expected, and under insecure, yet increasingly labor-intensive, job conditions without much support for research, they drew on networks independent of their advisors or their workplaces to enhance their productivity mainly at a local level. Under the constraints, their writing and research practices were naturally oriented towards efficiency.

Academic environments.

Self-directed apprenticeship. In their reflections, the characteristics of the writing culture of their doctoral programs at University A, which Wataru and Shizuka attended, and at University N, which Koji attended, were generally in line with those of Japanese graduate schools as documented in the literature (Maruyama 2008; MEXT, n.d.c.; Nagatomo, 2012; S.Yamamoto 2005, 2007). In contrast with their masters' programs, the coursework was often elective, and except for the requirements for qualifying papers at important junctures like candidacy examinations, research proposal defenses, and dissertation projects, it was primarily students' responsibilities to develop their writing and publication profiles. Koji's observation on the low graduation rate of the program at University N may partially reflect the extreme challenge associated with such

environments (See S.Yamamoto, 2007) as well as other issues.

As Casanave (2012) showed, even in the mainstream scenario, it is not always the case that doctoral students have advisors whose field exactly matches with theirs. This case may be more common in TESOL-related fields in Japan, particularly in light of the likely scarcity of departmental representations of faculty specializing in the fields (MEXT & JSPS, 2015; Poole, 2010). Wataru in particular explicitly stated that he had an advisor whose area of specialty was different from his. Wataru's efforts to publish an individual article in his field in the process of dissertation writing to prove his expertise to the advisor outside of the field aptly reflects this divide. Furthermore, graduate faculty members in Japanese universities have limited time for working with their own graduate students, as they typically take major responsibilities for undergraduate education (Kitamura, 1999) as well as other administrative responsibilities dictated by the institutions (Poole, 2010). Thus, formal apprenticeship writing or publication pedagogies (e.g., Casanave, 2012; Aitchison, Kamler, & Lee, 2010) with the guidance of advisors in their fields are not common either. This issue seems to have been relevant to the circumstances of all the three participants. Nevertheless, the teachers' stories indicated that they were aware of the need to be self-directed right from the beginning, and that they independently enculturated themselves into the literacy practices in local contexts that they felt the need to be familiarized with. They developed their disciplinary knowledge through an extensive reading of the literature in both languages. They sought a "textual mentorship" (Li, 2007, p. 67) approach, whereby they sought to emulate the textual practices in mainstream journals and other exemplar texts. Wataru additionally sought to model himself after the publication practices of both mainstream scholars in English-speaking countries and Japanese scholars in other fields. These endeavors could be interpreted as self-directed apprenticeship.

Institutional environments.

Insecure job conditions and increasingly wide-ranging professional duties. At differing points in time and to different degrees, the three teachers experienced insecure job conditions. Their first academic career started with part-time positions at multiple universities, with usually a one-year contract (Poole, 2010; Nagatomo, 2012). Shizuka and Koji, in particular, reported spending a considerable time teaching as they were part-time teachers at the beginning of their academic career. Around the time when they obtained a doctoral candidacy, they all conducted a job search for securing full-time contracts and changed their institutions. In keeping with the current trend of a limited-term tenure contract (MEXT, 2006; MEXT, n.d.f; Kano, 2015; Nagatomo, 2012), not all full-time contracts were tenured ones. In fact, Koji's full-time position at university at this stage was a limited term, requiring him to consider shifting to another university.

Their responsibilities at the time seemed to vary across institutions. Koji and Shizuka in particular indicated that their professional experiences in the capacity of full timers, such as having opportunities to teach some content courses in addition to language courses, were valuable. However, it was notable that the full-time contractual positions that the three teachers obtained seemed to have involved work beyond teaching, including program administration, recruitment, a range of committee work, and student-related services. Shizuka and Koji vividly remembered their experiences finalizing their dissertations at the peak of their institutional duties. Koji's story on his membership of multiple committee work across departments in the midst of his dissertation and childrearing particularly stood out. His intensive curriculum-related duties seemed to reflect the continued need for the systematization and improvement of English education in post-reform universities (Hadley, 1999; Nagatomo, 2012; Poole 2010).

Invisible research culture and distant disciplinary affiliation. The literature suggests that research culture is inconsistent in TESOL-related fields (Borg, 2010, 2013;

Pennington, 2015; Reis-Jorge, 2007; see also, Casanave & Vandrick 2003; Kubota & Sun, 2013; Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015). It also indicates that this weakness often infiltrates at the institutional level and manifests in a lack of support for research for university English teachers (Allison & Carry, 2007; Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg, 2010, 2013; Borg & Liu, 2013; Xu, 2014). It further suggests that their access to research varies according to institutional expectations (Allison & Carey, 2007; Pennington, 2015). These issues all arguably affected the experiences of these participants at an early stage of their career. According to their stories, research cultures in the departments or institutions they worked for did not seem to be explicit to them even after they became full-time members, an issue that seemed to be related to their large number of duties. The participants suggested that their institutions perceived their research endeavors primarily as necessary qualifications but did not have particular supports for research production. Koji, for example, was encouraged only to submit annual reports in Japanese. Shizuka mentioned her acknowledgement of the need for the annual production of tangible publications, but this did not necessarily fit with the practices of her fields. She sought to demonstrate productivity in any genre when she worked for her department. The participants indicated that there were almost no colleagues who specialized in the same TESOL-related disciplines and shared the similar literacy practices, although they were not concerned about this issue and focused on what they could do under the circumstances.

Networks.

Networks based in Japan: Graduate school peers or professional and general academic communities. While the three pressed on independently, they mentioned that they did draw on some sort of networks based in Japan in the process of their writing and research endeavors. In the above-mentioned situations, the networks they capitalized on were independent of their advisors or workplaces. Some of their networks were naturally built ones. Wataru and Koji mentioned their naturally built networks with their peers at

their respective graduate schools. Wataru worked mainly with his peer at graduate school, Seishiro, to stimulate each other, while Koji got occasional advice from his seniors and gain some opportunities for co-authorship. Other networks were purposefully sought out. Shizuka, for example, actively got involved in professional groups of Japanese experts in English teaching, who were active in local publishing. Her co-authored works were primarily made possible through the bond she established in the community. Additionally, Shizuka gained the membership of interdisciplinary communities of Japanese academics, where she learned how to appeal to the general academic audience in Japan outside of her disciplines.

Writing and research practices and their perceived values.

The teachers' stories indicated that under the hard-pressed conditions above, they, especially Wataru and Shizuka, focused on efficient production of their work. The literature suggested that while the traditional notion that "the major doctoral task is to get the research done and the dissertation written" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 138) still exists, doctoral researchers have been increasingly expected to publish during their studies, mainly out of the thesis. The three teachers sought to synthesize both traditions in their own ways. Their representative practices that they engaged in at their early stage of their career were dissertations in English and other works separate from the dissertations in various genres across languages. They produced most of these works in parallel with the dissertation work. The teachers generally had a relatively extrinsic and detached view towards their works as a necessary means to a career-related end.

Engagement in an English-medium dissertation as a necessary hurdle. The three Japan-trained teachers were reported to have dedicated considerable energy to their doctoral work in English. As shown in the related literature, academic knowledge construction in the HSS discipline in the periphery context involves unique complexity in an attempt to achieve the integration of locally situated research with "theoretical

discourses that aspire to universality" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 24). In particular, Wataru and Koji's stories showed that they tried to achieve this effort to construct knowledge. Their expressed effort involved contextualizing their research in the mainstream disciplinary discourse through extensive literature reviews, adhering to the standard methodologies in the mainstream context in an acceptable style and language. At the same time, they set their themes in their local settings in Japan where they worked to incorporate insights from Japanese-language journals into their related fields.

Despite the intellectual effort put into the work, however, the three participants all implied that their dissertation work was primarily an institutional genre and a necessary formality rather than a process of disciplinary enculturation, the basis of other works, or a contribution to their fields. Koji's pressure to complete his high quality doctoral dissertation was primarily based on his desire to get his work approved by his advisor. Inspired by her advisor, Shizuka had the idea that the dissertation should be something to finish without accounting much for creativity. Wataru viewed his work as a key to getting his title of Ph.D. Generally, they had a relatively humble and detached evaluation of their dissertation work. The attitude may also have to do with the perceived challenges in focusing on completing the work within the rigid time constraints resulting from their professional and institutional circumstances. They, however, perceived the pragmatic value of the doctoral degree. Shizuka's promotion within the institution at the time was not possible without the degree. Koji's securing of his current position required the degree as well. They also found their doctoral experiences in general meaningful. Koji gained confidence from finishing the dissertation despite the challenge. Wataru is proud of his publication of an article in a famous national journal in the process of his dissertation writing and its positive impact on his subsequent career.

Engagement in various bilingual works for career advancement and recognition. The literature showed that in the HSS disciplines, academics adopt a wide range of

acceptable academic writing practices across languages and genres when it comes to publishing their work in professional contexts (e.g., Casanave, 1998; Lillis & Curry 2010). This tendency seems to be applicable to the situation in HSS fields in Japan where genres such as books and in-house journal articles are widely accepted (Eades, 2002, 2005; Goodman, 2004; Kamada, 2007). In addition, the literature also suggests that that even in global research institutions where international English medium publications are promoted, HSS scholars prefer to publish in their L1s mainly due to time constraints and their locally oriented professional interests (e.g., Lillis & Curry, 2010; Li & Flowerdew, 2009). In line with this broad trend, the teachers, especially Wataru and Shizuka, strived to produce a variety of works across languages as a means of career advancement, mostly in parallel with their dissertation work in English.

The three participants in the present study were well aware that their English-medium work was the most important in the TESOL-related fields, and in fact, in addition to producing English-medium dissertations, they published their other works in English. However, they put equal emphasis on the Japanese-language medium. Their adoption of a Japanese-medium practice seemed to be reflective of their alignment to the practices endorsed in the networks they observed or found themselves be a part of. It also seemed to come from the need for efficient productivity and recognition under time constraints. In addition, it may also have something to do with their relatively Japanese-dominant language and literacy backgrounds although they reported that they found it difficult to write academically in the language at times. Wataru, who described himself to have believed in quantity in publications as paramount for recognition in academia in Japan, Japanese-medium RAs were a powerful source to achieve the goal. He also believed in the scholarly value of the abovementioned particular Japanese-language journal in the field that he sought to specialize in and challenged himself in the rigorous review processes by the experts in the field. Shizuka also believed in the importance of the

quantity of publications and the value of Japanese language publications as a key to career development. In her case, more emphasis was placed on the generalist approach to academic production, incorporating a wide variety of genres, including the ones targeted at practitioners. Shizuka further valued the benefits of publicizing some Japanese publications as a valuable step towards her subsequent work.

Being trained in America: A shift from focused engagement in English-medium writing and research practices to increased emphasis on teaching.

Takeshi, Minami, and Sumire, who chose to obtain their doctoral training in America, reflected on the complexity involved in undergoing a dramatic shift from research-focused lives in America to teaching-first lives in Japan. The three had the opportunity to focus on their doctoral studies for an extended period of time, where they were formally enculturated into disciplinary writing and research practices through coursework and varying degrees and types of expert apprenticeship. Unlike the Japan-based teachers, they showed an intrinsic fondness for writing and research endeavors. Therefore, the shift in the environment to teaching-focused lives had a considerable impact on them, although they profoundly loved teaching. While the institutional environment seemed to be relatively positive, they all had various tensions according to their respective statuses and conditions at the time. They worked with their advisors, graduate students in America, institutional colleagues, and old academic networks in Japan in producing their work mainly for international audiences. Their writing and research practices were primarily driven by their intellectual interests.

Academic environments.

Varying degrees and patterns of mentor-led apprenticeship. In the teachers' descriptions, both of the doctoral programs, the professionally oriented one that Takeshi attended and the research-oriented one that Minami and Sumire attended, required a

coherent writing intensive coursework that naturally led them into the knowledge and practice of disciplines, facilitating their disciplinary enculturation experiences. However, their stories also suggested that the degree to which writing for publication for professional development was emphasized seemed to vary across the institutions. When they were students, publishing their work for external audiences was apparently not explicitly emphasized in Takeshi's program, yet was demanded in Minami and Sumire's. Additionally, formal research apprenticeship as reported by CFAT, and cited in Donato, Tucker, and Hendry (2015), which values a close mentor-mentee collaboration among other elements, seemed to have been more common in Minami's and Sumire's program than Takeshi's. Minami assisted in her advisor's effort to produce her work as a member of her research team while learning specific research and literacy skills in the process. Sumire worked closely with her advisor on a range of research projects and conference-related works.

In addition, their stories also indicated that only Minami chose exactly the same field that her advisor belonged to. Sumire, while working closely with her advisor, pursued her own research interest, which she had originally developed in Japan and furthered in another professor's class. She was also actively involved in teaching as a Japanese teacher. Takeshi was clear about the original research agenda he had brought from Japan and was primarily independent of his advisor.

Institutional environments.

Insecure job conditions and teaching-focused duties. It may be interpreted that the three teachers were under a relatively stable institutional environment back in Japan, as they were all based primarily in a coordinated English language program at one single university, University A, right from the beginning of their academic careers in the country. Minami, with her doctoral project still in the early phase, and Takeshi, with his Ph. D. degree in hand, both obtained a full-time position without any prior experiences of

part-time positions. In addition, unlike the full-time positions that the former three teachers experienced, Takeshi and Minami's basic institutional missions in their program were focused on TESOL work that did not include interdepartmental responsibilities such as committee work in relation to entrance examinations, recruitment, and other services. The position involved many weekly class meetings primarily focused on language instructions with extended individualized tutorials. The programs, with a long tradition of English education, provided them with valuable teaching experiences and served as their primary research sites.

However, their conditions were not entirely secure. Like in the case of Koji in his early full-time career, Takeshi's and Minami's position were non-tenure track ones. Further, after her withdrawal from her position, Minami started to reenter academe as a part-timer at multiple universities. This was the careful decision that she made on her own, and she showed profound appreciation of the support from her former colleagues in her subsequent career. However, an element of wonder remains about the availability of official supports from the institution and academia at large to help English teachers like her navigate their maternity leave and return to work. Sumire started as a part-time instructor at two universities, including University A, when she was finalizing the dissertation. The part-time positions that Minami and Sumire obtained were the same type of contingent jobs that Wataru, Koji, and Shizuka experienced at the beginning of their career. Although both were appreciative of the opportunities, their career move comes off as somewhat regressive.

Visible research culture and close disciplinary affiliation. As Takeshi and Minami believed, a TESOL-based research culture seemed to have existed in the program, particularly for full timers. University A was deemed to have a tradition that put an emphasis on *teacher research*, educational research mainly in the capacity of teachers, although there was arguably no regulation as to research production. Their institutional

documents suggest that the program had its own peer-reviewed institutional research journals that their full-time teachers were encouraged to contribute to. In addition, the teachers in the program seemed to share similar research interests in TESOL-related fields, and collaborative work in their research, writings, and presentations was quite common. The existence of such a culture at the institutional level seem to be quite atypical in light of the situations shown in the literature (Allison & Carry, 2007; Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg, 2010, 2013; Borg & Liu, 2013; Xu, 2014) and those described in the other participants' reflections at the similar career stage as discussed above.

Networks.

Networks based in America: Advisors and graduate school peers. Like the Japan-trained teachers, the American-trained teachers also reported on their participation in both naturally built and purposeful networks in their writing and research efforts, although considerable individual differences existed in the types and trajectories. Some of their naturally built networks, mainly the ones with their advisors, were based in America. Especially for Minami, with her short stay in the doctoral program, her network around her advisor and her research team served as the basis for her research training and work production. Flowerdew (2000), in his case study, illustrated an American-educated Hong Kong scholar's perceived isolation from the "center" of the disciplinary community after his return to his home country upon the completion of a Ph.D., although he was able to maintain contact with mainstream scholars through e-mail. This scenario was not straightforwardly applied to Minami. Her connection with her network was quite solid and continued on even after her return to Japan and even during her withdrawal from work. For Sumire, too, her network with her advisor, whom she originally met at a special workshop in Japan, was valuable and continuous at least up to her completion of her dissertation. During a relatively long and focused stay in the program, she also worked with other graduate students in the program and linguists beyond the boundary of the program.

Networks based in Japan: Long-standing academic networks, current institutional colleagues, and others. The three participants also had naturally built networks based in Japan. Some of these networks were related to their communities forged in their prior years. While in America, Sumire worked with her professor from her undergraduate years and her seniors in her graduate school in Japan. Minami, during her withdrawal, reconnected with her network of Japanese graduate students of which Koji was also a part.

Other naturally built networks that the teachers forged were institutional ones. For Takeshi, who was initially indecisive about his career after finishing his doctoral studies, the opportunity to work with his colleagues seemed to be a critical starting point in developing his research profile. There was a fortunate match between Takeshi's original research focus and institutional teacher research focus, although he also felt the need to work on his own research separately. For Minami, whose core network was her advisor's community, while working hard on her dissertation, this institutional network seemed to have been her additional, albeit important, network. Sumire, as a part-timer, was arguably not expected to be part of the institutional research culture in the program at University A, the main institution that she worked for. She was, however, fortunately invited to work with colleagues to publish an in-house journal article at another university on a similar teacher research project, albeit only once.

Unlike the above-mentioned networks that were naturally forged, Sumire's new community of Western-educated scholars was a purposefully sought out one. Although Sumire's story is not as pessimistic as the case of the Hong Kong scholar in Flowerdew's (2000) study, Sumire needed extra effort back in Japan so that she could maintain her motivation to pursue the research interest that she developed in the mainstream context.

Writing and research practices and their perceived values.

According to their stories, Takeshi, Minami, and Sumire, with the opportunity to have a focused period of research, valued the very process of writing and research as much

as, or at times more than, their products. Like the cases of Koji, Wataru, and Shizuka, the representative practices that they engaged in at the early stage of their career included their dissertation in English. However, for them, the dissertation seemed to be the core intellectual work derived from their preceding knowledge development in the program. The timing of the production of other works for publication and presentation differed, but these works generally had a greater degree of connection with their dissertation work as compared with their Japan-trained counterparts and were produced all in English. Sumire, committed to writing for publication before and in parallel with her doctoral study, drew on the various networks mentioned above. Takeshi engaged in research production mainly in his post-doctoral years both independently and with his colleagues at University A. Minami's practice reflected a combination of both patterns. Her research production in collaboration with her advisor and her research team spanned from her doctoral to post-graduate years. They generally had a relatively intrinsic and cautiously positive view towards these works, although the meaning attached was considerably different.

Engagement in an English-medium dissertation as core intellectual work. The three American trained teachers, like their Japan-trained counterparts, suggested that they engaged considerably in doctoral work. Similar to Japan-trained counterparts, their own locality as Japanese or Japan-based individuals was at the core of their construction of knowledge, although they situated themselves in the mainstream research traditions they were trained in. Takeshi drew on his biographical particulars as a Japanese learner of English in the theme of his choice. Sumire too utilized her knowledge of Japanese that she consciously gained in her research. Minami chose to focus on collecting data from Japanese informants. In contrast to the Japan-trained teachers, however, the three did not view their doctoral works as a formality. They would rather do their work as their core intellectual work, and they appreciated the process that led to the work, such as their coursework, research training, and guidance offered in their respective contexts.

However, their evaluation of their dissertation was slightly different depending on the situation in which they produced the work. Takeshi and Sumire, who chose their themes outside of their professors' fields and stayed longer in the doctoral program in America, constructed their dissertation work as a stand-alone, distinct work in its own right. Both of them had a special attachment to their dissertation work. Takeshi emphasized the work as a source of intellectual fulfillment, personal growth, and linguistic and literacy development. Sumire, while being humble about her ambitious intellectual journey that cut across multiple disciplines, was grateful for the opportunity. Minami, who studied in her advisor's research area under time constraints back in Japan and who frequently judged herself against her American peers, was more modest about her work. She was more proud of the later work that she produced based on her work, as will be discussed below.

Engagement in other English-medium works as the ramifications of intellectual pursuits. The American-trained teachers, especially those who learned in the research universities, were active in presenting and publishing their works in addition to completing the dissertation. Their works that they engaged in at this stage had a degree of connection with their doctoral dissertation, and many of them fell into the broad genre of English-medium RAs. This basic tendency may reflect their immersion into the English-medium and writing intensive coursework in their fields in the doctoral program, and into the related culture maintained in the institutions at University A they were socialized into. Their almost exclusive use of English may have also to do with their language and literacy backgrounds. Takeshi, having experienced almost non-interrupted training in America from master's to doctoral level, stated that he did not see why some teachers write in Japanese in spite of their expertise in English in our casual conversation. For Minami and Sumire, because of their returnee backgrounds and American-based doctoral training, writing in English seemed to come naturally. Nevertheless, the timing of the production of these works and the meaning attached to them varied across individuals.

It was notable that only Minami pursued "publishing out of the thesis" (Kamler & Thomson, p. 138) at the post-doctoral stage.

English-medium works as a natural process of disciplinary enculturation. Minami and Sumire constructed their early works as a part of their learning process of disciplinary practices under the guidance of their advisors (Casanave, 2012). According to Kamler and Thomson (2014), it has become increasingly common for doctoral advisors to explicitly guide their own doctoral students through the process of writing for publication, and advisor-led co-authoring was a desirable pedagogical opportunity. At their early doctoral career, along with general research training, Sumire and Minami both obtained the opportunity to coauthor RAs for international journals with their advisors as well as with others. In this context, both seemed to have participated in some portions of the articles largely controlled by the advisors. Their advisors generally took the "cut it up and put it back together" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 146) approach to coauthoring, where "the sections of an article are divided between writers", and "one takes responsibility for meaning the pieces together" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 146). Both teachers appreciated these opportunities as an important yet natural process of disciplinary learning facilitated by experts in the fields. Sumire, who interpreted her doctoral years in America as the prime time for her research, was particularly proud of her co-authored RAs produced during her doctoral years.

English medium works for career advancement and professional development. Takeshi's initial effort to publish RAs based on his highly regarded coursework papers in professional English-language journals was made in the context of his job search back in Japan. Takeshi's comments suggested that the peer review process involved in the publication of his works in peer-reviewed professional journals was not as rigorous as in the case of formal peer-reviewed scholarly journals, and did not come as a particular challenge to Takeshi. Nevertheless, with his intrinsic love for writing developing in the

process of his doctoral work, Takeshi expressed dissatisfaction with these works produced in a somewhat hasty manner for pragmatic purposes. Takeshi exhibited a relatively greater sense of authenticity in his later RAs, although they were produced under pressure. In these works that branched out of his own dissertation with a methodological refinement, Takeshi himself served as a confident expert who inducted his colleague into the particular research practices he was familiar with. He generally adopted "the first cut" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 147) approach, where he wrote articles in their entirety at first for later collaborative revision (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 147). Minami, too, participated in and led this type of teacher research production although her central interest seemed to lie in research in her field with her research team in America.

English-medium works as contributions to the field. Among all the participants, it was only Minami who was pressured to follow the "publish out of the thesis" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 138) scenario after completing the dissertation. In addition, her networks played a significant role in facilitating the process of Minami's works. Lillis and Curry (2006, 2010), based on their analysis of the drafts of some nationally educated European non-English speaking scholars, indicated that NNES scholars' successful publication in international journals required two types of "literacy brokers" (Lillis & Curry 2010; see also Lillis & Curry, 2006). One type of "literacy brokers" were "language brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93), who helped scholars resolve surface level language issues. These included "professional language brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93) such as professional editors and language scholars and "informal language brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93) such as English-speaking friends. The other type of more crucial "literacy brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93) that contributed to the eventual acceptance of RAs were "academic brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93), who were able to give advice pertaining to the re-construction of the central theme, discipline-specific discourse, and target audience expectation. These academic brokers included a "general academic"

(Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93), a scholar whose discipline differed from the author, a "disciplinary expert" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93), who shared the same disciplinary background and interest with the author, and "sub-disciplinary specialist" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 93), whose specific field was the same as the author's. In the context of Miami's post-doctoral RA publication during her quasi leave of absence, her advisor, the insider of the field, served as a "literacy broker" (Lillis & Curry, 2010; see also Lillis & Curry, 2006) for her at language, disciplinary, and sub-disciplinary levels, although Minami took the lead in the content and linguistic brokering obtained was limited to issues with terminologies. Takeshi, too, started to consider publishing an RA out of the dissertation for some international journals in disciplinary fields, but his effort, ranging from searching for appropriate journals to interpreting reviewers' comments, was primarily an independent one and thus was challenging. In addition, it was was inevitably intermittent in the labor-intensive work environment.

Writing and Research Experiences in the Current Academic Career Phase

In their stories on their present career phase, the teachers in the present study, as tenured faculty members, equally presented themselves as institutionally adept faculty members who take on mainly educational missions at different post-reform Japanese universities. Among the main missions of university English teachers explained by Nagatomo (2012), all the participants mainly highlighted their heightened responsibilities as "model teachers" (Nagatomo 2012, p. 2) and related administrative works as coordinators. Some of them, particularly Koji and Minami, stressed the significance of their roles as teacher educators (Nagatomo, 2012) as well. Despite similarities in their mission across institutions, however, their stories suggested that the scope of their duties seemed to be relatively better defined and made clearer to those who worked for a national university. In other words, a greater amount and variety of professional duties were

foregrounded, especially in the reported experiences of the teachers tenured at private universities. In addition, although their publicized CVs indicated that all of the teachers are now officially acknowledged as researchers, the culture that promotes their intellectual endeavor was perceived to be relatively more visible at the national university. In accordance with the respective institutional contexts, they experienced a shift in the kind or proximity of their research-related networks. Irrespective of their circumstances, they all strive to build on and adapt the writing and research practices they previously developed to the best of their abilities. However, the teachers, especially those tenured in private universities and among them those trained in America in particular, seemed to find it difficult to advance their engagement as much as they would like despite their capacity for knowledge construction.

Being tenured in a national university: Slowly advancing from previous writing and research practices while committing to more focused professional duties.

Institutional environments.

Secure job conditions and focused professional duties. The two teachers, Wataru and Shizuka, who have now successfully obtained a tenured position at a national university, described their institutional duties as relatively clear-cut and focused. They both belonged to the coordinated language programs, and their main missions revolved around language teaching and related administrative and programmatic duties in the programs. They emphasized the educational mission as being central to the work but believed that their current overall duties have been somewhat reduced as compared to their previous service-intensive private institutions. This may partly be because of established and publicized faculty development policies unique to their university. The literature indicated that many post-reform national universities have adopted the standard faculty evaluation criteria that include “teaching,” “regional contribution,” and “administrative operation”

along with “research” to assess each academic’s performance as a basis for determining his or her salary level (Kano, 2015, p. 34). According to Wataru and Shizuka, and publicized institutional documents, their university has coherent performance rubrics in line with these criteria and offers regular opportunities for its faculty members to talk to their bosses about their targeted performance ratio based on the rubrics. Shizuka, who was in her first year of working at her institution at the time of her interviews for this study, commented that this system was helpful in understanding the degree to which she should perform in each category.

Visible research culture and close disciplinary affiliation. Wataru and Shizuka, in transitioning from service-intensive private universities, seemed to be satisfied with the current culture where research is relatively visibly encouraged. In other words, they now have legitimate access to research activities. Wataru and Shizuka acknowledged that their university put a reasonable emphasis on research, as well as on teaching, although there is no specific policy specifically about research production itself.

Donato, Tucker, and Hendry (2015) showed that new doctorates can go through a mismatch between their research interest and what institutions expect from them after they become faculty members there. Similarly, McAlpine (2012a) explained that early academics may experience a gap between the research agenda that is expected from the department or institution they end up being employed in and their original research expertise, leading to an “intellectual relocation” (p. 181) accompanied by an “institutional relocation” (p. 181). However, in the case of Wataru and Shizuka in the present institutional context, their “intellectual relocation” and “institutional relocation” (McAlpine, 2012, p. 181) did not particularly involve a mismatch between their fields and the research agenda expected by the department. Their colleagues are presently made up of those who share close disciplinary backgrounds and are expected to conduct research in their own field. Similar to the case of University A’s English program, for which Minami,

Takeshi, and Sumire used to work, the current program where Wataru and Shizuka teach has regular research-related meetings in which they are encouraged to present their respective projects. There are research collaborations among the faculty and departmental publications that disseminate their professional and academic contributions.

Networks.

Networks based in Japan: Current institutional colleagues. In contrast to their previous institutional contexts, the teachers' current major network resources seemed to be mainly focused on their current institutional networks, which also serve as their disciplinary affiliates. At their institution, Wataru seemed to take the lead in initiating research projects as part of the institutional research network and in introducing other colleagues, including Shizuka, to the practices.

Networks emerging overseas: International scholars. In addition to their local networks, the teachers have begun to network with scholars overseas. Lillis and Curry (2010) suggested that nationally trained researchers may start establishing their international research connections from their mid-career stage onwards. This applies to Wataru, who started to establish his ties to mainstream scholars to be exposed to, and collect information through his periodical attendance of international disciplinary conferences. Shizuka, who had just started her career at the institution, discussed her plan to attend the same conference as Wataru does after the main interviews.

Writing and research practices and perceived values.

Building on and adapting previous practices for acknowledgement and self-achievement. The two teachers' reports indicated that they primarily continued with the writing and research practices they adopted at their earlier career stage. They kept engaging in writing in both languages of various genres. Within this base line, however, they seemed to put more emphasis on English-medium publications and worked towards expanding their contributions in accordance with their own purposes. Wataru, who

previously focused on his specialism and on expanding publication profiles, started to make efforts to make high-quality contributions to wider arenas. For example, he started to publish not only for national disciplinary audiences but also for his institutional community, for his professional community, for society at large, and for international disciplinary audiences, in English and Japanese. As was the case with Takeshi at his previous institution, Wataru now takes initiative in coauthoring with his colleagues, mainly taking the "the first cut" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 147) approach. Shizuka, in contrast to her early career efforts at producing mainly professional genres in Japanese or bilingually, just started to write more in English and become more self-directed in her productions. As a first step, she contributed an article in English to an in-house journal and was preparing to turn her ongoing research project into a larger one.

Being tenured in private universities: Slowly advancing from previous writing and research practices while committing to increased professional duties.

Institutional environments.

Secure job conditions and expanding professional duties. The four teachers, Koji, Takeshi, Minami, and Sumire, who have been successfully tenured in different private institutions, all expressed somewhat increased amounts and kinds of professional work. Koji, Takeshi, and Minami, each of whom was a member of an English department, took on traditional duties involving a combination of language and major-specific teaching and related administrations. For Sumire, who was a member of a foreign language department, administrative duties became central to her role.

For Minami and Sumire, who transitioned to the tenured position right after the teaching-focused part-time position, the perceived increase in professional work must have been natural. However, even for those who transitioned from full-time contractual positions, like Koji and Takeshi, their new professional works, especially non-academic

works, seemed overwhelming. It can be speculated that Poole's (2010) and Casanave's (2010) observations about long committee work and other related non-academic administrative duties for tenured faculty in a Japanese university seemed to apply to the faculty's environments in their teaching-centered private universities. It was not discernable exactly how their performance was evaluated, but their universities did not publicize faculty development programs or policies, and the teachers themselves explained that they were completely not clear about their faculty development and evaluation. The participants' general professional stance seemed to be that they were poised to take on whatever duties they were asked to accomplish, although Koji and Minami emphasized the significance of a work-life balance first and foremost.

Implicit research culture and distant disciplinary affiliation. All the four teachers who worked for private teachers suggested that there was a mild "atmosphere" (雰囲気) or " subtle pressure"(なんとなくのプレッシャー) that encouraged their research endeavors at their institution, and they acknowledged that a degree of such endeavors seemed to be necessary for career purposes. However, they did not seem to be clear about any specific supports that promoted research. In addition, Minami and Takeshi, who went through an institutional relocation from an English language program filled with TESOL professionals to an English department where the majority of faculty members are scholars with differing disciplinary backgrounds, seemed to find themselves as distinct in terms of their writing and research practices as well as in terms of their obligations as educators. Sumire, however, was actively socialized into an institutional research related to TESOL through her colleagues outside her department. Sumire is profoundly appreciative of this new environment. At the same time, she mentioned the degree of complexity regarding the consequences of "intellectual relocation" (McAlpine, 2012a, p. 181) coupled with "institutional relocation" (McAlpine, 2012a, p. 181; see also Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015). Specifically, Sumire perceived a subtle mismatch between her specialism in

linguistics and the teacher research types of research agenda the institution seemingly looked for. Sumire was doing her best to exercise her versatility to adapt to these expectations. Sumire's case implied that NNES university English teachers may experience this type of research-related conflicts depending on their areas of disciplinary training particularly at the doctoral level and the types of disciplinary affiliations of their department or institutions (Pennington, 2015).

Networks.

Networks based in Japan: Current institutional colleagues, previous institutional colleagues, and long-standing academic networks. In contrast to the situations of Wataru and Shizuka, where they found their current institutional colleagues with almost the same disciplinary backgrounds as the main network resources, the networks that these four teachers drew on varied and were mainly outside the current institutions, excepting the case of Sumire. Sumire was the one who demonstrated a close collaboration with her current institutional colleagues in research production. However, for Sumire, her network outside her current institution, namely, her continued bond with her Western-educated scholars' research group, was equally important mainly to keep up her passion towards her research in her own field of linguistics. Takeshi implied that his network at his previous institution was the most solid one, although he also kept working independently. Koji, who found it a challenge to continue to conduct research in the first place, did not explicitly mention any networks in relation to research, but he did imply his continued work concerning wider professional endeavors with his networks in his Japanese graduate school. Minami too maintained her networks with her peers and seniors in the same Japanese graduate school, especially when she sought to study the educational situations in Japan.

Network based in America: Advisors and graduate school peers. Among the four teachers, Minami was the one who emphasized the value of ongoing networks in America, even though she said she also cherished her local networks. Minami, who seemed to be

particularly passionate in her research endeavor, continued to closely collaborate with her research team in her doctoral years, although she is increasingly taking the lead in the research group and working more closely with her graduate school peers than with her advisor.

Writing and research practices and their perceived values.

Building on and adapting previous practices for professional development and intellectual fulfillment. Like the cases of Wataru and Shizuka, the teachers working for private universities, particularly Minami and Sumire, not only built on their early writing and research practices but also sought to adapt their practices to the new phases that they found themselves in. Their endeavors seemed to be for both professional development and intellectual fulfillment. Koji, after presenting his dissertation-related work at an international conference, sought to write and publish in English at least annually in an in-house journal. Takeshi continued to write his work in English in collaboration with his previous colleagues while also striving to make progress in his sustained effort to publish his work in international journals. Minami had many ongoing research projects with her American peers, and was striving to devote herself to scholarly contributions in a new subfield in the mainstream context while also exploring a new locally topical research agenda. Reflective of her perceived expectations of an institutional mission, Sumire aligned herself to an institutional "practical" research focus and practice, as shown in her publishing of a case report in Japanese in an in-house journal and her coauthoring of a book chapter with her colleagues in English.

On being researchers.

Ambivalence of being and becoming researchers. The literature indicated that NNES language teachers have found it hard to view themselves as researchers. Xu (2014), based on her case study in China, suggested that it is difficult for NNES university English teachers to construct themselves as researchers unless the following conditions are met:

self-perceived interest in research, the experience of publishing their research, the availability of collegial and institutional support, and the appropriate ”professional life phases” (p. 254)

In the present study, all of the participants generally met these conditions. Namely, unlike the participants in Xu’s (2014) study at a Chinese university and many of the participants in the existing studies (Allison & Carry, 2007; Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Borg, 2010, 2013; Borg & Liu, 2013), the doctorate teachers in the present study all had started to cultivate an interest in some research areas by building on their earlier learning as students and teachers. They also accumulated publishing experience as they pursued their doctoral and academic careers, albeit to differing degrees. A degree of confidence in language, literacy, and research expertise were shown in many of the participants’ accounts. Minami and Sumire, as early bilinguals, indicated that they were confident in their advanced language and literacy skills. Minami additionally acknowledged the formal research-related knowledge base she acquired in mainstream fields. Takeshi, too, consistently showed confidence in his research ideas and capacity by building on his focused research experiences. Wataru, also demonstrated his pride and sense of achievement in his research contributions thus far. Additionally, as mentioned above, all of the six are at the career stage where their research activities are viewed as part of their jobs at least officially.

However, in their reflections, the six teachers showed ambivalence toward being or becoming researchers. In addition to the most critical and persistent factor of institutional constraints, including what Xu (2014) called the availability of collegial and institutional support, the teachers’ stories in this study also implied personal and network constraints that mediated the indicated ambivalence.

Personal constraints. The teachers’ overall reflections showed that a number of their conflicts seemed to relate to their personal orientations toward research grounded in

their pre-professional backgrounds. Koji indicated that he intended to become a professor early on, but his stated goal was centered on changing Japanese English education as an educator, and thus, he constructed his writing and research primarily as a means to this end. Shizuka and Takeshi dissociated themselves from the general world of "researchers" that they used to imagine. Shizuka, emphasizing her career pathways as accidental rather than intentional, sought to view her research effort thus far as a means of self-actualization. Takeshi, despite his confidence in his research capacity, consistently portrayed himself mainly as an independent learner and emphasized the personal meaning of research. Naturally, he was particularly hesitant toward positioning himself as a researcher in the academe. The other participants who were relatively more research oriented likewise emphasized the unintentional and serendipitous nature of their academic and job-related decision making when they described at least one point in their career, often using the expression "It happened [that way]" (たまたま). Some participants implied their personal attributes as a potential source of conflicts. Sumire showed her consistent preference for working with others rather than independently and for waiting for opportunities to emerge rather than proactively seizing on them. Another issue was regarding family commitments. Although all of them had such commitments, Minami and Koji in particular were explicit about their basic need to balance their family lives with their work lives, including research.

Institutional constraints. All of the teachers suggested that institutional issues were chronic even when they had obtained a tenured position. All of them consistently emphasized their current educational and administrative duties in their institutional strand (McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010) as their foremost mission. Although equally passionate about education and related duties, the teachers, particularly those in private universities, simultaneously felt conflicted as to how to negotiate these duties with their research endeavors. Many of them indicated a degree of synergy between their teaching and

research areas, but the actual translation from teaching to research seemed to be challenging owing to time constraints.

Network constraints. Additionally, most of the teachers indicated that the distance from their core networks, coupled with institutional constraints in the mainstream context, posed a challenge. The locally trained teachers suggested that they find it challenging or unrealistic to strive to be fully in line with their Western-educated Japanese and non-Japanese counterparts trained in the mainstream contexts, considering their pathways and current institutional contexts. The American-trained teachers had their own struggles as well. As mentioned above, Minami values a continued connection with mainstream scholars in her field as well as that with English teachers in local universities. However, her evolving commitment to teaching and her related professional work have kept her from keeping up with those whose primary job is research production. Sumire finds it hard to reconnect with the original networks of scholars in her field that she forged in her doctoral years partly because of work-related difficulties in attending international conferences as regularly as she would like.

Willingness to continue research. Despite these perceived challenges, the Japanese university teachers' research-related aspirations, albeit modest and basic, still seemed to be present. They were all positive about advancing their research efforts to the extent that their conditions allow, although with differing desires. In their own ways, they seemed to be trying to move on as researchers while living with the abovementioned ambivalence. Wataru, despite his engagement in institutional mission and perceived difficulty in catching up with the same level of research productivity of mainstream counterparts, wished to contribute to both local and international research, to add his voice to the discourse in his discipline as well as reach a wider audience. Shizuka and Takeshi, in spite of a feeling of awkwardness about being called a researcher, desired to pursue their own research interests mainly for themselves. With a personal, intrinsic love for the language, primarily, they both

seek to be true to themselves as individuals even while attempting to adjust to the researcher label. Minami, while overwhelmed by professional and familial duties, wanted to continue to work with her graduate school peers in the U.S. because of her consistent love of research, and sought to put together the expertise and experiences she accumulated thus far. Koji also voiced his willingness to advance his study at an international level once his family duties were settled, although his main passion leans toward the more practical side of research. Sumire, while prepared to deepen her knowledge in her research areas as expected by the institution of a teacher, strived to maintain her passion toward her original expertise.

Researcher's Reflections

Although the respective careers of the participants were much more advanced than my own, and their professions based in Japanese universities differed from mine, which is based in an American university, their storied experiences of career and research journeys and conflicts considerably echoed mine. The teachers and I share similar personal factors that shaped the ambivalence in being and becoming a researcher. I sympathized with Takeshi's emphasis on their learner selves, rather than as academic or researcher, shaped by their past language and literacy histories. Although my relative exposure to the English language was earlier than that of the non-returnee teachers and my main focus in my undergraduate years was Chinese, I shared a similar endeavor to the four non-returnee teachers in devoting much energy in the learning of English, particularly in the era of pre-reform higher education. I found that an accidental career path, which I acknowledged in my experience, is not uncommon, but rather a norm, at least among these teachers. I thus understand that the non-linear nature of their career further led them to view themselves as relatively accidental academics, differentiating themselves from traditional scholars in other disciplines. Having transitioned into a university teaching career from the publishing

industry, I resonated particularly with Shizuka, who also started with a non-English major and had a career outside of the academe before her master's, although I had a vague desire to become an academic of some sort early on.

Their early experience with part-time teaching and institutional immigration, and a degree of disruption in their intellectual endeavors as a result, which I did not share, must have also impacted their humble self-perception as researchers. Further, their ongoing stable yet unlimited amount of institutional duties, especially at private institutions, made me more aware of how challenging it has been for them to focus their attention to their selves as researchers. As I have not published any RAs in mainstream academic journals being swamped with teaching-related duties almost around the clock, I sympathized with the detached feelings toward his writing and research expressed by Koji, who similarly did not have control over his workload in his early career. I also relate to the increased sense of educational missions at their institutions, such as that shown by Koji and Minami as educators and by Sumire as an administrator. As mid-career members at institutions, we all found it difficult to reconcile these institutional endeavors with intellectual efforts.

Through the study, I also realized that while all the participants had stronger research-related networks than I did, their relationship with these was not constant, which also seemed to make it difficult for them to perceive themselves as researchers. Having gone through loss of my core network with the field of writing at the American graduate school, and having struggled with seeking an understanding of my research in the field in Japanese graduates school, I relate to the relative humbleness of Shizuka, Wataru, and Koji, who independently pursued their research career based in Japan without experiencing formal research apprenticeship at their graduate school, or powerful networks with the mainstream. Meanwhile, specializing in a field not prevalent in Japan, I also relate to Sumire, whose original field is not fully recognized in her institution.

Thus, their stories and mine, albeit respectively unique, can be interpreted as a

related, composite story of ambivalence oscillating between the world of academics and that of teachers. I found it conceivable that there may be more NNES university English teachers in Japan and other countries outside of the mainstream who are and will be faced with similar ambivalence reported. I thus deemed it important to consider potential ways to help NNES university English teachers improve their quality of writing and research experiences not only at their current institution but also in their overall career paths. In so doing, it would be critical to acknowledge that the environment surrounding NNES university English teachers, as well as academics at large, is likely to grow much harsher in the near future.

Implications

The findings of the present study shed light on Japanese university English teachers' sincere engagement in writing and research practices in the context of the challenging and non-linear academic careers embedded in their individual life courses. These insights gained from the findings can potentially serve as a starting point to consider ways to improve the quality of academically oriented NNES university language teachers' writing and research lives in the countries outside the center.

To facilitate the betterment of their writing and research lives, it would be important to pay attention to NNES university teachers' entire career, their disciplinary enculturation and professional writing, and their institutional conditions altogether.

As was implicit in the literature review, in TESOL and related fields, the following three issues have been not only under-researched but also treated and investigated separately among different groups:

1. The murkiness of language teachers' careers at large.
2. The challenge of disciplinary enculturation through writing.
3. Their struggle with their research engagements in professional contexts.

However, the present study, which was informed by individual teachers' accounts centered on their intellectual endeavor, suggested that these issues seem to be mutually related and consistently affecting the teachers throughout their lives and careers; therefore, some measures should be taken to address these concerns in a holistic manner.

It is clear that given the status quo where masters' degrees are viewed as the terminal degree (Casanave, 2012; Pennington, 2015) in TESOL-related fields, the emphasis on collective teaching-related practical trainings and writing and research-related instructions mainly in master's programs in the mainstream contexts will be important. This focus should be strengthened in mainly research-focused master's programs outside of mainstream contexts like those in Japan. An equally valuable objective would be providing English teachers with individualized writing and research-related supports and mentoring (Hanauer & Englander, 2013) and career education and guidance throughout their careers—not only during master's years but also prior to and following those years, regardless of the contexts of the program. Additionally, third parties, together with various *stakeholders* (Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Xu, 2014 ; McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010)—including the universities and graduate schools in which the teachers are educated, the institutions they work for, and international and national academic and professional bodies—should work together to help make the teachers' writing and research lives more fulfilling.

Needed Efforts for the betterment of NNES University English Teachers' Writing and Research Lives

Writing-and research-related training, support, and mentoring on a career-long basis.

Hanauer and Englander (2013), based on their case study of Mexican-based L2 scientists' literacy experiences and needs, suggested possible ways of helping to enhance

such experiences. Among their suggestions were for higher education institutions to provide such scientists with the following:

1. Focused instructions on language and writing in English and L1 and individual tutorials from the undergraduate level onwards.
2. Individualized writing and research supports and mentoring throughout their career.

The researchers also proposed that particularly from the master's and doctoral level through to professional levels, it is desirable to introduce collaborative writing projects led by senior academics and editing and translation services facilitated by language professionals.

In light of the findings of the present study, this type of long-term and increasingly individualized writing instruction and similar supports would be beneficial for NNES university English teachers as well. Universities outside of English-speaking countries should understand that their students, who may become academically oriented university language teachers, are likely to move back and forth between their countries and an English-speaking environment at a certain stage of their careers. Thus, such universities and graduate schools should prepare prospective and current teachers to be able to function as educators and researchers nationally and internationally. At the undergraduate level and graduate levels, for prospective teachers without prior experience of intensive learning in English, explicit language instruction as well as a basic level of disciplinary enculturation into TESOL-related fields through writing should be provided. The sub-disciplines or research areas that universities introduce to prospective English teachers should preferably be internationally transferrable ones in consideration of their academic journeys across countries.

Furthermore, as some of the participants like Wataru and Shizuka showed, writing in L1 is still alive and well in the form of legitimate academic writing genres in some

institutional and sub-disciplinary contexts. Thus, like Hanauer and Englander (2013) proposed, L1 academic writing instruction may also be incorporated, at least optionally, into undergraduate and graduate education. Further, universities should be aware that highly English proficient students like the returnee teachers in this study need specific intensive writing programs and disciplinary training to further enhance the full potential of their English literacy skills. At the master's and doctoral levels, as Hanauer and Englander (2013) stated, graduate schools should incorporate sustained language and writing-related instruction courses and collaborative co-authoring opportunities that go beyond institutional writing so that they can be confident when they start writing professionally.

I would also like to propose similar efforts on the part of graduate schools in the mainstream contexts as well. Graduate programs in English speaking countries should also be aware that NNES student teachers are likely to go back to their home countries and therefore that sustained supports should be provided. Additionally, it is desirable that such institutions in English speaking countries provide flexible online programs so that full-time language teachers in their home countries can start or continue their studies without risking local institutional engagements. If possible, local institutions of English teachers' home countries should collaborate with mainstream institutions to facilitate the learning of language teachers.

Similarly, it is desirable that institutions that NNES university teachers work for too will provide such supports as mentioned above, although this will probably require extra effort. Hanauer and Englander (2013) and Xu (2014) agreed that academics' institutions should offer writing-related tutorials, collaborative projects, workshops and faculty writing circles. However, in light of the findings of the present study, more fundamental consciousness-raising is necessary to improve the institutional awareness that language teachers need supports for their research regardless of their career stage and institutional orientations. From the findings, it is probable that while they were taking on insecure

part-time, or full-time contractual positions, their institutional duties were viewed primarily as teaching-related matters. However, the findings also showed that teachers are likely to be the most research engaged at this, most precarious, stage of their career. Thus, institutions and departments should acknowledge their writing and research activities as legitimate professional activities and provide some appropriate alleviation of workload when needed. They should also be considerate towards teachers' critical life commitments such as maternity and childrearing and offer supportive environments that facilitate their work–life balance.

It is notable that not only new teachers but also experienced, tenured teachers are also in need of writing- and research-related supports. Borg (2010) and Xu (2014), assumed that English teachers in leadership positions, including teacher educators, administrator, and managers, are supposed to be the primary supporters of individual English teachers' research efforts. While this is certainly understandable, institutions and departments should know that tenured English teachers in such high positions themselves still potentially need similar support, as the present study suggests. They should also be aware that the research culture that they promote may or may not go with the teachers' individual research needs and disciplinary contexts and thereby make sure that academic freedom of research is protected for the teachers.

Given the potentially complex research needs of language teachers, particularly in advanced positions, supports from institutions and their graduate schools are not sufficient. This need is also evident when considering the findings about the contingency and fluidity of the networks that individual teachers connect with in their ever-changing academic and institutional environments. Citing Salager-Meyer (2008), Hanauer and Englander (2013) suggested that in the field of hard science, there has been a heightened demand for L2 scientists' writing- and research-related support from scientific bodies and associations that host academic conferences and publish journals. Hanauer and Englander (2013) stated that

possible supports that such bodies should strengthen would include the provision of mentoring and networking opportunities mainly for younger or inexperienced scientists by matching them with senior or emeritus scientists. They also proposed that editorial services for L2 scientists should be provided by such bodies.

It may be difficult to call for such efforts from the numerous academic and professional bodies surrounding the TESOL-related fields that language teachers occupy, but such opportunities would be particularly beneficial for university language teachers in the following categories:

1. Those who are pursuing masters' or doctoral studies at the periphery.
2. Those who used to learn at the center but find it difficult to frequently reconnect with them.

Such bodies or associations should consider holding some form of online international conference so that even those who are busy with their local institutional endeavors can add their voices to the ongoing knowledge exchanges.

Sustained career education and guidance including entrepreneurship training.

The findings of the present study added to the confirmation that NNES university English teachers experience a *boundaryless career* (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996) across different institutions and career stages and that they engage concurrently in multiple, conflicting practices along the way (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Hui & Spurling, 2013). At the same time, the findings also implied that language teachers are not explicitly instructed on the possibility of such complex pathways and the place of writing and research in advance before entering academia. The findings further indicated that among the participants, only the teachers who obtained tenured positions and entered national institutions seemed to have been provided with research and career related support *after* becoming professors.

Thus, for NNES university English teachers, not only education that supports their writing and research endeavors but also career education and related guidance should be offered in parallel with usual teacher education. It would be ideal to provide them with such opportunities at any stage of their academic and professional lives and regardless of their institutional and national contexts.

Such long-term career education should be provided by immediate stakeholders (Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Xu, 2014; McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010) at any given stage of their lives. At undergraduate and graduate levels, prospective language teachers who are academically oriented should be informed of the connection and disconnection between the general language teaching profession in schools and that in academe, and the potential complexity that is involved in the latter. To make this possible, schools, universities and graduate schools, in both national and international settings, should work together to streamline possible flowcharts of career pathways of individual language teachers. For example, teachers should be instructed on the differing characteristics of Japanese and American graduate programs and the varied possibilities for professional and writing and research activities. They should also be honestly taught about the possible benefits and risks involved in their respective pathways, such as networking opportunities and insecurities and the workload concerns that await their futures. Once they decide to move to master's programs, more focused career education should be provided in their disciplinary contexts. Career guidance should continue even after they graduate from such academic programs, potentially from their immediate stakeholders (Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Xu, 2014; McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010).

However, at the same time, it is also desirable that individualized long-term career guidance will additionally be provided by third parties, such as professional academic career developers or counselors who are knowledgeable about the following:

1 Academic career development, particularly in TESOL-related fields or in HSS

fields in general.

2. Non-academic career development in a wider range of fields.

This is because different stakeholders (Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Xu, 2014; McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010), such as the teachers' advisors in graduate school and their bosses in their institutions, have their own agendas in their own contexts and are not entirely knowledgeable about individual teachers' needs. Such consulting services seem to be few and far between, and relevant documents are rare. Nevertheless, Wheeler and Mortensen (1984), based on their own voluntary experiences as career counselors with various university teachers, stated that such individualized and sustained guidance can be helpful for teachers to "successfully manage the career issues they are dealing with, experience more satisfaction out of their careers, and contribute in a meaningful way throughout their academic life" (p. 90). Thus, teachers would benefit from discussing their career-related concerns and decision making with people besides their immediate stakeholders (Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Xu, 2014; McAlpine & Akerlind, 2010).

This kind of career education should ideally include entrepreneurial education for English teachers, preferably at an early stage of their career. The insecure and unsupportive institutional conditions for such teachers, as well as for academics in general, are likely to continue across contexts in the managerial climate of higher education (Benjamin, 2000; Brenan, 2007; Finkelstein, 2007; Fox, 1992; Gordon, 2010; Gottlieb & Keith, 1997; Griffiths, 2004; Henkel, 2010; Johnstone, 2011; Kogan, 1997; Musselin, 2007; Sanyal & Johnston, 2011; Schwandt, 2009) and thus they are expected to be more self-reliant professionally and financially, if they wish to continue with their intellectual endeavor.

Unfortunately, harsh conditions facing language teachers have remained unresolved so long that the issue of faculty redundancy has recently become a legitimate area of inquiry in TESOL research (e.g., Bilgen & Richards, 2015). In Japan, several managerial trends that hinder the career advancement and research endeavor of university English

teachers have further intensified over the several years during my engagement in this dissertation project. The revised labor contract law enacted in 2012 (Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare, n.d.a.), which originally intended to give part-time employees with five years of career the right to request a permanent status, has now prompted Japanese universities to consider firing such faculty before their fifth year of employment so that their contractual conversion to a permanent status would not happen (e.g., Hayashi, 2014; Okunuki, 2016). The law was partially revised in 2014 particularly for researchers and teachers, including part-time university faculty (Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare, n.d.b), to extend the duration before the occurrence of their right for them to claim a conversion to a permanent contract, but similar incidents are likely to continue occurring. This insecurity for limited-contract language teachers must continually disempower them as academics as well as educators. More recently, MEXT proposed cutting down on HSS departments, including education-related ones, of undergraduate and graduate programs at national universities, in response to what it believes as societal demands (MEXT, 2014). This call from the government had considerable impacts on the management of national universities. For example, according to a survey conducted by *Yomiuri Shimbun* among 60 national universities, 26 answered that they were planning the modification or slashing of such departments according to the proposal, and part of their plan included the discontinuation of the recruitment of as many as 1,300 students in teacher education departments after the academic year 2016 ("A wave of restructuring of humanity and social sciences departments in national universities," 2015). The momentum toward de-emphasis on HSS in higher education has recently slowed down after facing harsh criticisms by many academics (e.g., Science Council of Japan, 2015). Nevetheless, a re-emergence of such movements may occur at any time, considering the continued shrinkage of the 18-year-old population in the country and the government's heightened recognition of imminent needs for scientific education in general, especially in response to the

exponential advancement of technology in the area of artificial intelligence over the years (MEXT, 2016).

At the global level, there has been ongoing discussion in higher education as a whole regarding the possible drastic changes in the educational landscape (e.g., Daily-Hebert & Dennis, 2015) as the world approaches the age of technological singularity (Kurzweil, 2005). Even at this point, with the advent of online education platforms, including those provided by non-academics outside the higher education system, the distinction between university and non-university has been viewed as “crumbling” according to Cowen, who is a professional blogger as well as a prominent professor of economics (Young, 2016). With this outlook, young university English teachers as well as academics in general should not only train themselves professionally for their “academic” career but also be prepared to survive even outside the academe. With the expected de-centralization of education in the forseeable future, the way teachers are expected to work at universities may drastically change, which may necessitate their efforts to become the owner of their own business or institution.

Entrepreneurial education in higher education has a long history in America (Katz, 2003). Europe, too, has recently started to strengthen its efforts in this regard (Wilson, 2008). While entrepreneurial education is often mainly offered in business schools, it has increasingly been implemented institutional contexts outside business schools and across disciplines (Kats, 2003, p. 295). If they are able to be trained to be entrepreneurs as well as academics and run their own businesses in partial lieu of traditional teaching, they can have more time and income to conduct research while strengthening themselves financially even in the more and more precarious institutional contexts they are likely to encounter.

Final Thoughts and Directions for Future Research and Career

The present study sheds light on Japanese university English teachers' writing and research experiences in their career contexts in their home country, as well as in their pre-professional backgrounds, through narrative inquiry.

Through the stories they shared, the individually unique progression of their language, literacy, and pre-professional activities became clear. Their shared agentic endeavors to respond proactively to their own learning needs that led them to their pursuit of doctoral studies were also evident. On the other hand, all of the Japanese teachers, building on their respective personal histories, constructed non-linear and complex journeys when it came to their main stories on their writing and research experiences. What they recounted in these sturies was their constant move back and forth across the world of academia on the one hand, where knowledge construction through research is the norm, and the world of English teachers on the other, where research is viewed as a "minority activity" (Borg, 2010, p. 391).

Broad differences were seen between the Japan- and American-trained teachers not only in terms of the academic environment they were exposed to in their graduate programs but also in terms of balancing work and research. Notwithstanding their differing academic training and pathways, the teachers all proactively learned or were introduced to writing and research practices that are reflective of both international and local characteristics. However, their sincere engagement in their respective writing and research practices was often affected by institutional factors throughout their career.

They currently seemed to be have several conditions in their favor (Xu, 2014, p. 254) that help them view themselves as researchers, unlike many of the NNES teachers portrayed in the existing literature. However, they showed ambivalence about being and becoming researchers because of their personal, institutional, and network constraints, although they were willing to continue their studies within the constraints. A considerable

part of their ambivalence was in line with what I myself was experiencing in my own career and research journey.

These findings suggested that the three issues that have been researched not only sparsely but also separately among the different groups—the murkiness of language teachers' careers, challenge of disciplinary enculturation through writing, and teachers' struggle with their research engagements in professional contexts—should be treated as interrelated issues and thus holistically addressed. The main implications, in part drawing on existing relevant proposals and the worsening research-related environment in academia, point to the need for the following efforts as critical to help improve the quality of the writing and research lives of NNES university English teachers:

1. Writing- and research-related training, support, and mentoring on a career-long basis
2. Sustained career education and guidance, including entrepreneurial training

Despite efforts to increase trustworthiness, including triangulation (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998), reflexivity (Guillemin & Gilliam, 2004), member checking (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998), and rich description (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998), limitations remain in the research. Potential constraints in the variations in the participants' experiences and perspectives resulted from the reliance on snowball sampling (Merriam, 1998). In addition, the effects of my multiple positionalities in the power dynamics with the participants and with their personal histories and experience inevitably shaped the research process and outcomes. Further, the level of rich descriptions was compromised to an extent owing to considerable individual differences in the degree to which the participants related themselves to the research topic, the absence of focus group (Creswell, 2013) or supplementary interviews, and the need for protectcting the anonymity of the participants. Finally, issues of time constraints, particularly on my part, prevented me from conducting data processing and analysis in a concentrated, timely manner.

Despite the limitations, it is hoped that the study will contribute to an increased understanding of academically oriented NNES university English teachers' situation regarding their knowledge contribution and the challenges involved therein. I also hope that the study will lead to a discussion on improving the career- and research-related conditions of such teachers. Further, the study is expected to add to the limited body of research on the lives of Japanese academics, which were almost exclusively conducted by English speakers. Finally, this study, with its focus on the interface and divide between the teaching and research lives in teachers' holistic career trajectories as well as on their writing and research practices, will hopefully stimulate new research developments surrounding university English teachers. Teacher studies in TESOL have tended to focus predominantly on English teachers' teaching lives in classroom contexts. Writing studies, on the other hand, have largely focused on their writing lives in either academic or institutional settings. The present study sought to narrow the gap between these areas.

Building on the present study, three possible research orientations can be considered. One potential area of investigation would be a close look at how career stories are told, which was beyond the scope of the present study. By analyzing their discursive positioning in the context of research to understand their identity work during conversations with the researcher, it would be possible to deepen the nature of the ongoing research related to self-conflicts. This approach has been taken in the recent emerging career-related studies (e.g., LaPointe, 2010, 2013). Another direction that could be taken is co-authoring auto-ethnographic work with teachers about our own teaching and research lives by drawing on our own self-reflective writings, and then conducting collaborative analyses of them for a certain period. As the present research drew largely on the teachers'narratives, the power differentials between the researcher and the researched remained. A collaborative auto-ethnographic study, like Lin et al. (2005), can resolve this weakness and may contribute practically to our own authentic reflective practices as

professionals. A final possible study for the future will be an institutional research which explores the writing and research practices and challenges of university English teachers at all career stages at one institution. This method will allow for examining how the prevalent trend that emerged in this study can be observed in a more situated context.

While the present study helped me envision the above directions in research, it also deepened my exploration into my career plan as well. As mentioned above, I fully resonate with these teachers' stories of ambivalence and profoundly admire their intellectual endeavors despite a range of constraints. However, emulating their career path based in Japanese universities would not be my option. In consideration of the abovementioned worsening local and global academic environments surrounding higher education compared with those experienced by the participants, and my late start of writing and research engagement, I found it prudent to construct my original career path.

Specifically, I decided to continue to work at the American university to the extent that I can while striving to find ways to improve future university English teachers' writing and research-related conditions, partly through research. Simultaneously, I made up my mind to be prepared to move in an entrepreneurial direction, building on my non-academic career background, while developing as a university teacher and researcher at the institution. By pursuing a parallel career in and outside the academe, I hope I can be more resilient to unpredictable challenges that could arise in the current institutional context, and in the world of higher education at large. Through establishing augmented economic and professional foundation beyond the realm of higher education, I would be able to continue my efforts to construct and contribute my knowledge and expertise not only to the field but also to a wider range of society. Immersing myself with the career and research journey of the teachers through this study renewed my career visions in such an unexpected way, which has opened the door to another phase of my own journey.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, C., Kamler, B. & Lee, A. (Eds.) (2010). *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond.* London: Routledge.

Allison, D., & Carey, J. (2007). What do university language teachers say about language teaching research? *TESOL Canada Journal, 24*(2), 61–81.

Allwright, D. (1995). Is your dissertation really necessary? In A. Gilpin (Ed.), *The relationship between research and teaching in higher education. IELT DHE fourth annual seminar* (pp.36–38). Bristol: Institute for English Language Teacher Development in Higher Education (IELTDHE).

Allwright, D. (1997). Quality and sustainability in teacher research. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 368–370.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution.* Paris: UNESCO.

Amano, I., & Poole, G. S. (2005). The Japanese university in crisis. *Higher Education, 50*(4), 685–711.

Arimoto, A. (2009). The competitive environment of academic productivity and the academic research enterprise in the case of Japan. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10*(1), 29–46.

Arimoto, A. (Ed.). (2008). *Henbo suru nihonno daigaku kyojyushoku* [The changing academic profession in Japan]. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Arimoto, A. (2015). Introduction: The changing academic profession in Japan: Its past and present. In A. Arimoto, W. K. Cummings, F. Huang, & J. C. Shin (Eds.), *The changing academic profession in Japan* (pp. 1–26). Cham: Springer.

Arthur, M. B., &. Rousseau, D.M. (Eds.). (1996). *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Asonuma, A., & Urata, H. (2015). Academic funding and allocation of research money. In A. Arimoto, W. K. Cummings, F. Huang, & J. C. Shin (Eds.), *The changing academic profession in Japan* (pp. 57–78). Cham: Springer.

Aspinall, R. W. (2005). University entrance in Japan. In J. S. Eades, R. Goodman, & Y. Hada (Eds.), *The "big bang" in Japanese higher education: The 2004 reforms and the dynamics of change* (pp. 199–218). Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Atkinson, D. (2005). Situated qualitative research and second language writing. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 49–64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baetens Beardsmore, H. B. (1986). *Bilingualism: Basic principles* (Vol. 1). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bai, L., Millwater, J., & Hudson, P. (2012). Chinese Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) academics' perceptions about research in a transitional culture. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34* (1), 91–102.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.

Beal, C. C. (2013). Keeping the story together: A holistic approach to narrative analysis. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 18*(8), 692–704.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines.* Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines.* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(2), 207–213.

Benjamin, E. (2000). Overreliance on part-time faculty: An American trend. *International Higher Education, 21*, 7–9.

Bilgen, F. E., & Richards, K. (2015). Identity negotiations of TEFL teachers during a time of uncertainty and redundancy. In Y. L. Cheung, S. B. Said, & K. Park (Eds.), *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research* (pp. 61–73). London: Routledge.

Billett, S. (2006). Relational interdependence between social and individual agency in work and working life. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 13*(1), 53–69.

Borg, S. (2010). Language teacher research engagement. *Language Teaching, 43*(4), 391–429.

Borg, S. (2013). *Teacher research in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Borg, S., & Liu, Y. (2013). Chinese college English teachers' research engagement. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(2), 270–299.

Brenan, J. (2007). The academic profession and increasing expectations of relevance. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (pp.19–28). Paris/Kassel: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge and International Center for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bunkyo Kyokai. (2015). *Heisei 27 nendo zenkoku daigaku ichiran* [A list of universities in Japan, Year 2015 version]. Tokyo: Bunkyo Kyokai.

Canagarajah, A. S. (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 Associates.

Casanave, C. P. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(2), 175–203.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Casanave, C. P. (2010). Dovetailing under impossible circumstances. In C. Aitchison, B. Kamler, & A. Lee (Eds.), *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond* (pp. 47–63). London: Routledge.

Casanave, C. P. (2014). *Before the dissertation: A textual mentor for doctoral students at early stages of a research project.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

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

Chen, C. P. (1998). Understanding career development: A convergence of perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training, 50*(3), 437–461.

Cho, S. (2009). Disciplinary enculturation experiences of five East Asian doctoral students in US-based second language studies programmes. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 29*(3), 295–310.

Cho, S. (2013). Disciplinary enculturation experiences of three Korean students in U.S.-based MATESOL programs. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 12*(2), 136–151.

Chomsky, N. (2007). *Interventions.* San Francisco, CA: City Lights Publishers.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Clark, B. R. (1997). The modern integration of research activities with teaching and learning. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(3), 241–255.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2–14.

Cook, M. (2013). The multipurpose entrance examination: Beliefs of expatriate ELT faculty. *The Language Teacher, 37*(1), 9–14.

Costantino, T. E. (2008). Construcivism. In L.M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 116–121). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cummings, W. K., & Amano, I. (1979). The changing role of the Japanese professor. In W. K. Cummings, I. Amano, & K. Kitamura (Eds.), *Changes in the Japanese University*: A *comparative perspective* (pp. 127–148). New York: Praeger.

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.

Dailey-Hebert, A., & Dennis, K.S. (Eds.) (2015). *Transformative perspectives and processes in higher education.* Cham: Springer.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Collier Books.

Donato, R., Tucker, G. R., & Hendry, H. (2015). Developing professional identities in applied linguistics: From doctoral study to professional practice. In Y. L. Cheung, S. B. Said, & K. Park (Eds.), *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research* (pp. 217–234). London: Routledge.

Eades, J. S. (2002). Why don't they write in English? Academic modes of production and academic discourses in Japan and the West. *Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 6, 58–77.

Eades, J. S. (2005). The Japanese 21st century center of excellence program: Internationalization in action? In J. S. Eades, R. Goodman, & Y. Hada (Eds.), *The "big bang" in Japanese higher education: The 2004 reforms and the dynamics of change* (pp. 295–323). Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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), 35–53.

Finkelstein, M. J. (2007). The "new" look of academic careers in the United States. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (pp. 145–158). Paris/Kassel: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge and International Center for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel.

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.

Fox, M. F. (1992). Research, teaching, and publication productivity: Mutuality versus competition in academia. *Sociology of Education, 65*(4), 293–305.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Taylor and Francis.

Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Gentil, G. (2002). *Academic biliteracy and identity construction: Case studies of Francophone science writers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). McGill University, Montreal.

Gentil, G. (2005). Commitments to academic biliteracy: Case studies of Francophone university writers. *Written Communication, 22*(4), 421–471.

Goodman, R. (1990). *Japan's "international youth": The emergence of a new class of schoolchildren*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goodman, R. (2004). Towards a cultural understanding of research writing, translation and editing. *Senri Ethnological Reports, 49*, 193–203.

Goodman, R. (2010). The rapid redrawing of boundaries in Japanese higher education. *Japan Forum, 22* (1-2), 65–87.

Gordon, G. (2010). Global contexts. In G. Gordon & C. Whitchurch (Eds.), *Academic and professional identities in higher education: The challenges of a diversifying workforce* (pp. 13–33). New York: Routledge.

Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL educational policies and educational cultures: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(4), 675–710.

Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese novices' research writing practices in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(2), 109–128.

Gottlieb, E. E., & Keith, B. (1997). The academic research-teaching nexus in eight advanced-industrialized countries. *Higher Education, 34*(3), 397–419.

Griffiths, R. (2004). Knowledge production and the research-teaching nexus: The case of the built environment disciplines. *Studies in Higher Education, 29*(6), 709–726.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(2), 261–280.

Hada, Y. (2005). Postgraduate and professional training in Japanese higher education: Causes and directions of change. In J. S. Eades, R. Goodman, & Y. Hada (Eds.), *The "big bang" in Japanese higher education: The 2004 reforms and the dynamics of change* (pp. 219–241). Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Hadley, G. S. (1999). Innovative curricula in tertiary ELT: A Japanese case study. *ELT Journal, 53*(2), 92–99.

Halai, N. (2007). Making use of bilingual interview data: Some experiences from the field. *The Qualitative Report, 12*(3), 344–355.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Hanauer, D. I., & Englander, K. (2013). *Scientific writing in a second language*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Hasegawa, Y. (2015). Working time and personal strain. In A. Arimoto, W. K. Cummings, F. Huang, & J. C. Shin (Eds.), *The changing academic profession in Japan* (pp. 135–148). Cham: Springer.

Hashimoto, K. (2009). Cultivating "Japanese who can use English": Problems and contradictions in government policy. *Asian Studies Review, 33*, 21–42.

Hayashi, K. (2014). *Burakku daigaku Waseda*. [Waseda, the black university]. Tokyo: Dojidaisha.

Hayes, D. (2005). Exploring the lives of non-native speaking English educators in Sri Lanka. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 11*(2), 169-194.

Hayes, D. (2008). Becoming a teacher of English in Thailand. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(4), 471–494.

Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. London: Routledge.

Henkel, M. (2010). Change and continuity in academic and professional identities. In G. Gordon &. C. Whitchurch (Eds.), *Academic and professional identities in higher education: The challenges of a diversifying workforce* (pp. 3–12). New York: Routledge.

Hirosawa, T. (2004). “Tanyi” seido no unyo ni kansuru genjyo to kadai: Daigakukyoiku ni okeru mikan no kaikaku o tembo shite [The current situation of and issues for the application of the credit system: An outlook of the ongoing reform of higher education]. *Matsuyama University Review, 16* (2), 95–114.

Huang, F. (2007). Challenges of internationalization of higher education and changes in the academic profession: A perspective from Japan. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (pp. 81–98). Paris/Kassel: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge and International Center for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel.

Hui, A. & Spurling, N. (2013). *Career dynamics in social practices: Accumulation, concurrent careers and career demographics*. Retrieved from https://nicolaspurling.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/hui-and-spurling-careers-paper-web-1.pdf

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London: Continuum.

JACET. (n.d.). *About JACET: Presidential message*. Retrieved from http://www.jacet.org/about_jacet/jacetoverview/

JALT. (n.d.). *About JALT*. Retrieved from http://jalt.org/main/about

Johnston, B. (1997). Do EFL teachers have careers? *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(4), 681–712.

Johnstone, D. B. (2011, November). The changing academic profession: The worldwide impact of expansion and austerity. *The Changing Academic Profession (CAP) Project*, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China.

Kamada, H. (2007). Kiyo journals and scholarly communication in Japan. *Libraries and the Academy, 7*(3), 375–383.

Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (1999). Preparing non-native professionals in TESOL: Implications for teacher education programs. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 145–158). New York: Routledge.

Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kano, Y. (2015). Higher education policy and the academic profession. In A. Arimoto, W. K. Cummings, F. Huang, & J. C. Shin (Eds.), *The changing academic profession in Japan* (pp. 27–40). Cham: Springer.

Katz, J. A. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education 1876–1999. *Journal of Business Venturing, 18*(2), 283–300.

Kitamura, K. (1999) *Gendai no daigaku koto kyoiku: Kyoiku no seido to kino* [Current university and higher education: Educational systems and functions]. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Kogan, M. (1997). Diversification in higher education: Differences and commonalities. *Minerva, 35*, 47–62.

Kokuritsu dai ni bunkei saihen no nami: 26 kou ga gakubu no kaihai keikaku [A wave of restructuring of humanity and social sciences deparments in national universities:

26 universities plan on departmental reorganization]. (2015, August, 24). *Yomiuri Shimbun.* Retrived from http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/national/ 20150823-OYT1T50098.html

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 Associates.

Kubota, R., & Sun, Y. (Eds.). (2013). *Demystifying career paths after graduate school*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology.* New York: Viking Press.

Kunino kenkyu hi haibun, kokuritsu shiritsu de kakusa? [Disparities in national research funding between national and private universities?]. (2007, November 26). *Asahi Shimbun.* Retrieved from http://www.asahi.com/edu/university/zennyu/ TKY200711300298.html

Kyriacou, C., & Kobori, M. (1998). Motivation to learn and teach English in Slovenia. *Educational Studies, 24* (3), 345–351.

LaPointe, K. (2010). Narrating career, positioning identity: Career identity as a narrative practice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*, 1–9.

LaPointe, K. (2013). Heroic career changers? Gendered identity work in career transitions. *Gender, Work and Organization, 20*(2), 133–146.

Lea, M. R., & Stierer, B. (2009). Lecturers' everyday writing as professional practice in the university as workplace: New insights into academic identities. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(4), 417–428.

Leki, I. (2007) *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Li, Y. (2002). Writing for international publication: The perception of Chinese doctoral researchers. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 12*, 179–193.

Li, Y. (2005). Multidimensional enculturation: The case of an EFL Chinese doctoral student. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 15*(1), 153–170.

Li, Y. (2006a). A doctoral student of physics writing for publication: A sociopolitically-oriented case study. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(4), 456–478.

Li, Y. (2006b). Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(3), 159–178.

Li, Y. (2006c). *Writing for international publication: The case of Chinese doctoral science students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

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. (2009). International engagement versus local commitment: Hong Kong academics in the humanities and social sciences writing for publication. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(4), 279–293.

Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2007). Shaping Chinese novice scientists' manuscripts for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(2), 100–117.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research: Reading, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Lillis, T. (2001). *Student writing: Access, regulation, desire.* London: Routledge.

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

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context*: *The politics and practices of publishing in English.* London: Routledge.

Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 5–32.

Lin, A., Wang, W., Akamatsu, N., & Riazi, M. (2005). International TESOL professionals and teaching English for glocalized communication (TEGCOM). In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice* (pp. 197–222). New York: Routledge.

Lorimer, C., & Schulte, J. (2011). Reimagining TESOL professionalism: The graduate student perspective. *The CATESOL Journal, 23*(1), 31–44.

Mahoney, M. J., & Granvold, D. K. (2005). Constructivism and psychotherapy. *World Psychiatry, 4*(2), 74–77.

Matsuda, P. K. (2005). Historical inquiry in second language writing. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 33–46). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Maruyama, F. (2008). The development and quality assurance of graduate education. In Center for National University Finance and Management (Ed.), *Japanese national university reform in 2004* (pp. 129–144). Tokyo: Center for National University Finance and Management

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

McAlpine, L. (2010). Fixed-term researchers in the social sciences: Passionate investment, yet marginalizing experiences. *International Journal for Academic Development, 15*(3), 229–240.

McAlpine, L. (2012a). Academic work and careers: Relocation, relocation, relocation. *Higher Education Quarterly, 66*(2), 174–188.

McAlpine, L. (2012b). Identity-trajectories: Doctoral journeys from past to present to future. *Australian Universities' Review, 54*(1), 38–46.

McAlpine, L., & Akerlind, G. (2010). *Becoming an academic: International perspectives*. London: Palgrave.

McAlpine, L., & Amundsen, C. (2009). Identity and agency: Pleasures and collegiality among the challenges of the doctoral journey. *Studies in Continuing Education, 31*(2), 109–125.

McAlpine, L., & Turner, G. (2011). Imagined and emerging career patterns: Perceptions of doctoral students and research staff. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 36*(4), 535–548.

McCrostie, J. (2010). The right stuff: Hiring trends for tenured university positions in Japan. *The Language Teacher, 34*(5), 31–35.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

MEXT. (2003). *Eigo ga tsukaeru nihonjin no ikusei no tameno koudoukeikakuan* [Action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities"]. Retrieved from http://www. mext.go.jp/ b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo4/007/gijiroku/03032401/009.pdf

MEXT. (2006). *OECD Thematic review of tertiary education: Country background report of Japan*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/japan/37052438.pdf

MEXT. (2008). *Section 9: Foreign languages*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/eiyaku2/gai.pdf

MEXT. (2011). *Chugakkou gakushu shidou yoryo kaisetsu gaikokugo hen* [Explanatory comment for the new course of study for foreign languages in junior high schools]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_ menu/education/ micro_detail/__ icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/01/05/1234912_010_1.pdf

MEXT. (2016). *Kyoiku no kyoujinka ni mukete (monbu kagaku daijin messegi ni tsuite)* [A message from the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology on the significance of strengthening education]. Retrieved from http://www.mext. go.jp/ b_menu/houdou/28/05/1370648.htm

MEXT. (n.d.a). *Dai 8 setsu: Gaikokugo* [Section 8: Foreign languages]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/ a_menu/shotou/old-cs/1322544.htm

MEXT. (n.d.b). *Daigaku secchi kijun tou no taikouka to jikohyoka* [The deregulation of standards for the establishment of universities and their self-evaluation]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/hpad199101/hpad199101_2_150.html

MEXT. (n.d.c). *Kenkyu jinzai no yousei kakuho* [Development and securement of research human resources]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/ hakusho/ html/hpad199701_2_020.html

MEXT. (n.d.d). *Daigakuin settchikijun nado no ichibu o kaisei suru shorei no shikou ni tsuite (tsuuchi)* [An announcement on enforcement of the ordinance for a partial revision of the standards for establishment of graduate schools]. Retrieved from http://www.mext. go.jp/a_menu/koutou/daigakuin/detail/1318972.htm

MEXT. (n.d.e). *Gakkakeitoubunruihyou* [The departmental classification of academic disciplines]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/components/b_menu/other/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2013/12/20/1342608_4.pdf

MEXT. (n.d.f.) *Daigakukyoin no ninkisei ni tsuite: Daigaku ni okeru kyoikukenkyu no kasseika no tameni* [A report on fixed term employment of university faculty: Towards the invigoration of education and research at universities]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/old_chukyo/old_daigaku_index/toushin/1315825.htm

MEXT & Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. (2015). *Grants-in-aid for scientific research: Creating knowledge for shaping and transmitting world-leading knowledge assets*. Retrieved from https://www.jsps.go.jp/english/e-grants/data/kakenhi_pamph_e.pdf

Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. (n.d.a.). *Roudou keiyakuhou no kaisei ni tsuite: Yuuki roudou keiyaku no atarashii ruru ga dekimasita* [An announcement on an amendment to Labor Contract Law: The establishment of new rules for fixed-term employment contracts]. Retrieved from http://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/ koyou_roudou/roudoukijun/keiyaku/kaisei/

Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. (n.d.b.). *Daigaku oyobi kenkyu houjin no kenkyusya, kyoin nado ni taisuru roudou keiyakuhou no tokurei ni tsuite* [An announcement on an exception to the Labor Contract Law for researchers and teachers employed at universities and research and development institutions]. Retrieved from http://www.mhlw.go.jp/file/06-Seisakujouhou-11200000-Roudoukijunkyoku/0000043387.pdf

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(4), 573–603.

Murray, L. (1992). What is practitioner based enquiry? *British Journal of In-Service Education*, *18*(3), 191–196.

Musselin, C. (2007). Transformation of academic work: Facts and analysis. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (pp. 175–190). Paris/Kassel: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge and International Center for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel.

Nagasawa, K. (2004). Teacher training and development. In V. Makarova & T. Rodgers (Eds.), *English Language Teaching: The case of Japan* (pp. 280–295). Munich: Lincom Europa.

Nagatomo, D. H. (2012). *Exploring Japanese university English teachers' professional identity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Neumann, R. (2003). A disciplinary perspective on university teaching and learning. In M. Tight (Ed.), *Access and Exclusion* (pp. 217–245). Oxford: Elsevier.

Newby, H., Weko, T., Breneman, D., Johanneson, T., & Maassen, P. (2009). *OECD reviews of tertiary education: Japan*. Paris: OECD.

Nunan, D. (1997). Developing standards for teacher-research in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 365–367.

Nunan, D. (1999a). So you think that language teaching is a profession (Part 1). *TESOL Matters, 9* (5), 1–3.

Nunan, D. (1999b). So you think that language teaching is a profession (Part 2). *TESOL Matters, 9* (6), 1–3.

Nybom, T. (2003). The Humboldt legacy: Reflections on the past, present and future of the European university. *Higher Education Policy, 16*(2), 141–159.

Ogata, N. (2015). Changes in university teachers' view towards students: Impact of universalization. In A. Arimoto, W. K. Cummings, F. Huang, & J. C. Shin (Eds.), *The changing academic profession in Japan* (pp. 79–88). Cham: Springer.

Okada, H. (2009). *Somewhere "in between": Languages and identities of three Japanese international school students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Tokyo.

Okamura, A. (2006). Two types of strategies used by Japanese scientists, when writing research articles in English. *System, 34*(1), 68–79.

Okunuki, H. (2016). “Five-year rule” triggers “Tohoku college massacre” of jobs. (2016, November 27). *Japan Times.* Retrieved from http://www. japantimes.co.jp/ community/2016/11/27/issues/five-year-rule-triggers-tohoku-college-massacre-jobs /#.WKGsS2-LRdg

Ollerenshaw, J. A., & Creswell., J. W. (2002). Narrative research: A comparison of two restorying data analysis approaches. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*(3), 329–347.

Ong, W. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London: Methuen.

Ota, N. (2000). Teacher education and its reform in contemporary Japan. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 10*(1), 43–60.

Ozga, J., & Deem, R. (2000). Carrying the burden of transformation: The experiences of women managers in UK higher and further education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 21* (2), 141–153.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(2), 163–188.

Pennington, M.C. (2015). Teacher identity in TESOL: A frames perspective. In Y. L. Cheung, S. B. Said, & K. Park (Eds.), *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research* (pp. 16–30). London: Routledge.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 137–145.

Poole, G. S. (2010). *The Japanese professor: An ethnography of a university faculty*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Raisborough, J. (2007). Gender and serious leisure careers: A case study of women sea cadets. *Journal of Leisure Research, 39*(4), 686–704.

Reis-Jorge, J. (2007). Teachers'conceptions of teacher-research and self-perceptions as enquiring practitioners: A longitudinal case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(4), 402–417

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Saito, E., & Murase, M. (2011). Adversity in teacher education in Japan: Professional development or professional impoverishment? *Journal of Research, Policy and Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education, 1*(1), 45–58.

Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(2), 121–132.

Samimy, K. K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perceptions of "non-native" students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127–144). New York: Routledge.

Sanyal, B. C., & Johnstone, D. B. (2011). International trends in the public and private financing of higher education. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education, 41*(1), 157–175.

Schwandt, T. A. (2009). Globalizing influences on the western evaluation imaginary. In K. E. Ryan & J. B. Cousins (Eds.), *The SAGE international handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 19–36). London: SAGE Publications.

Science Council of Japan. (2015). *Korekara no daigaku no arikata—tokuni kyoinyousei jinbunsyakaikagakukei no arikata—ni kansuru giron ni yosete*. [An announcement in reaction to the discussion on the way future universities, particularly their teacher education and humanities and social sciences departnemts, should be]. Retrieved from http://www.scj.go.jp/ja/info/kohyo/pdf/kohyo-23-kanji-1.pdf

Seidman, I. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (1st ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sekiguchi, I. (1993). *Keio Shonan Fujisawa Campus gaikokugo kyoiku e no chosen : Atarashii gaikokugo kyoiku o mezashite* [Keio University Shonan Fujisawa Campus's challenge against the existing foreign language education: Initiatives towards innovative language education]. Tokyo: Sansyusya.

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.

Smit, P., & Nyamapfene, K.(2010). Being an academic in contemporary South Africa. In G. Gordon & C. Whitchurch (Eds.), *Academic and professional identities in higher education: The challenges of a diversifying workplace* (pp. 113–124). New York: Routledge.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. New York: SAGE Publications.

Stewart, T. (2009). Will the new English curriculum for 2013 work? *The Language Teacher, 33*(11), 9–13.

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B.V. (1993). Introduction: The new literacy studies. In B. V. Street (Ed.),

Cross-cultural approaches to literacy (pp. 1-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Svejenova, S. (2005). "The path with the heart": Creating the authentic career. *Journal of Management Studies, 42*(5), 947–974.

Swales, J. M, & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: A course for nonnative speakers of English.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tahira, M. (2012). Behind MEXT's new Course of Study Guidelines. *The Language Teacher, 36*(3), 3–8.

Torikai, K., & Shindo, K (1996). *Daigaku eigo kyoiku no kaikaku: Toyoeiwa jogakuin daigaku no kokoromi* [Innovation in English education at the tertiary level: Toyo Eiwa University's attempt]. Tokyo: Sansyusya.

Trent, J. (2013). Becoming a teacher educator: The multiple boundary-crossing experiences of beginning teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(3), 262–275.

Uzuner, S. (2008). Multilingual scholars' participation in core/global academic communities: A literature review. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(4), 250–263.

Vianna, E., & Stetsenko, A. (2006). Embracing history through transforming it: Contrasting Piagetian versus Vygotskian (activity) theories of learning and development to expand constructivism within a dialectal view of history. *Theory and Psychology, 16*(1), 81–108.

Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2008). What is the impact of demography on higher education systems? A forward-looking approach for OECD countries. In OECD, *Higher education to 2030, Volume 1: Demography* (pp. 41–93). Paris: OECD Publishing.

Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Conklin Bueschel, A.C., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wheeler, D. W., & Mortensen, L. L. (1984). Career and instructional consulting with higher education faculty. *To Improve the Academy,* Paper 71. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad/71

Wilson, K. (2008). Entrepreneurship education in Europe. In J. Potter (Ed.), *OECD Entrepreneurship and higher education* (pp. 119–138). Paris: OECD Publishing.

Xu, Y. (2014). Becoming researchers: A narrative study of Chinese university EFL teachers' research practice and their professional identity construction. *Language Teaching Research, 18*(2), 242–259.

Yamamoto, K. (2004). Corporatization of national universities in Japan: Revolution for governance or rhetoric for downsizing? *Financial Accountability and Management, 20*(2), 153–181.

Yamamoto, S. (2005). *Recent change in doctoral education in Japan*. Retrieved from http://www.education.uw.edu/cirge/ wp-content/uploads/2008/01/japan.doc

Yamamoto, S. (2007). Doctoral education in Japan. In S. Powell & H. Green (Eds.), *The doctorate worldwide* (pp. 181–193). Maidenhead: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Yonezawa, A. (2008). Quality assessment and assurance in Japanese universities: The plight of the social sciences. *Social Science Japan Journal, 11*(1), 69–82.

Yoshida, K. (2003). Language education policy in Japan: The problem of espoused objectives versus practice. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*(2), 290–292.

Young, J. R. (2016). *Tyler Cowen says online professors should think like bloggers.* Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/Tyler-Cowen-Online/ 236090

Young, R. A., Valach, L., & Collin, A. (1996). A contextual explanation of career. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Part of the information on the study (e.g., the title of the study and themes of interviews) contained in the consent form was later modified in accordance with the participants' situations (see Chapters 1 and 4). Further, part of the researcher's own personal contact information, which was originally made explicit in the form, is deleted here. The English translation of the form is followed by the Japanese original.

Dear Professor _____

Request for Participation in a Study

Researcher Name: Mai Matsuno, International Christian University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Doctoral Program in Education

Research Theme: Japanese university English teachers' writing and research lives

I, Mai Matsuno, plan to conduct the abovementioned research as part of my dissertation project. I understand that you are very busy, but I would greatly appreciate your kind participation in the study, if you agree with and understand the overview of the research described below.

Purpose of the Study

In the context of universities in Japan, university English teachers have increasingly been expected to be active as researchers and authors at the same as language educators. This study seeks to deepen an understanding of (Japanese) what writing and research experiences university English teachers have had in their professional contexts and how they perceive these experiences.

Method of the Study

1. Audio-recorded interviews in Japanese
2. Follow-up interviews by e-mail (if possible)
3. Visits to the workplace (if possible)
4. Reading of your written works of your choice (Ideally, about three works for

the basis of a part of the interviews or for shedding light on the content of the interviews)

Time and Duration of Interviews

The time, frequency, and duration of the interviews will be arranged in full consideration of your circumstances.

Place of Interviews

The place will be determined based on your preference

Main Theme of Interviews

Details of the interviews will vary depending on your experiences, but they are planned to include the following main themes.

1. Your language, writing, and research backgrounds in English and Japanese
2. Your writing and research endeavors
3. The perception and meaning you have of the endeavors.

Ethical Considerations

1. ***Confidentiality***

Your personal information, including your name, background, affiliations, and research details, will be deleted or altered.

2. ***Your Feedback***

You will have a chance to review my report summarizing your stories, quoted English translations of the interviews, and my analyses of your experiences, so that you can check if your anonymity is fully protected. You will be invited to share advice on the contents and validity of the report to the extent possible.

3. ***Voluntary Participation***

Your participation in the study and permission to use particular data sources is voluntary. In addition, you can withdraw from the study at any time, even after your agreement is in place, per your circumstances.

Benefits of the Study

1. ***Benefits of the Study for Academic Communities and Future English Teachers***

The study can offer the abovementioned parties insights into the writing and research lives of Japanese university teachers specializing in English education and

applied linguistics.

2. Benefits of the Study for the Participants

Although the benefits for you are potential ones, I hope that this study, through giving an opportunity for you to reflect on your own experiences as a researcher and writer, will be of any help to your future endeavors.

Methods of Dissemination of the Study Outcomes

It is possible that the outcome of the study will be disseminated not only through the dissertation but also through presentations and in publication forms, such as conference proceedings and in-house, academic, or professional journals. In this case, full care will be taken of the protection of your personal information.

Inquiry about the Study

For any questions regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact me at the following any time.

Researcher's name: Mai Matsuno
Affiliation: International Christian University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences,
Doctoral Program in Education
Home Address:
Phone:
E-mail:

Study Participation Consent Form

Participant Statement:

I have been hereby fully informed by the researcher on the following elements of the study on Japanese university English teachers' writing and research lives based on the above document.

1. Purpose of the Study
2. Method of the Study
3. Time and Duration of Interviews
4. Place of Interviews
5. Main Theme of Interviews
6. Ethical Considerations
7. Benefits of the Study
8. Methods of Dissemination of the Study Outcomes
9. Inquiry about the Study

As I fully understand the above contents, I agree to participate voluntarily in the study.

Date: **Year:**

Signature of Participant

_____

Researcher Statement:

I hereby confirm that I explained the study and obtained the consent of the above professor to participate in the study. I promise to protect their personal information when conducting and disseminating the study.

Date: **Year:**

Signature of Researcher

_____

研究へのご参加のお願い

研究者：　国際基督教大学　大学院　教育学研究科博士課程　松野まい
研究課題：日本人大学英語教員の研究・著作生活に関する研究

このたび、私松野まいは、博士論文の課題といたしまして、表記の研究を行いたいと考えております。つきましては、大変ご多忙の折、誠に恐れ入りますが、以下をご高覧の上、研究趣旨についてご理解いただき、ご協力を賜りますよう、お願い申し上げます。

研究目的

今日の日本の大学において、英語教員の方々には、語学教育者としてのご貢献と同時に、研究者・著者としてのご活躍もますます期待されています。本研究では、英語教員の方々がご自身の職業生活のなかで、どのような研究・執筆活動をご経験され、また、そのご経験についてどのようにお考えになっているかについて、理解を深めることを目的としております。

研究の方法

1. 日本語による録音インタビュー
2. （可能であれば）E-mail によるフォローアップインタビュー
3. （可能であれば）お仕事の現場等の訪問
4. （可能であれば）先生ご自身で選ばれたご著作の参照（三点ほど、一部のインタビューの基礎として、あるいはインタビュー内容について理解を深める参考として）

インタビューの時期・期間

時期、回数、時間については先生のご都合を十分に配慮して調整させていただきたく存じます。

インタビューの場所

ご相談の上、先生のご都合のよい場所にさせていただきます。

インタビューの主なテーマ

インタビューの詳細は、先生のご経験によって変わりますが、主なテーマとして以下を含む予定です。

1. ご自身の英語・日本語での言語・ライティング・研究バックグラウンドについて
2. ご自身の研究執筆活動について
3. ご自身にとっての研究執筆活動の感想や意味について

倫理的配慮

１.守秘義務

先生個人のお名前、ご経歴、ご所属、ご研究内容の詳細、その他個人情報が特定される情報は削除させていただくか適宜変更いたします。

2.先生によるフィードバック

先生方に関する記述や、インタビューの英訳の引用、および当方の分析などを英語でまとめたものを一度先生にご覧に入れ、十分な匿名性の確保をご確認いただき、また、当方の記述内容や分析の妥当性などについて、可能な範囲でご助言いただければと存じます。

3. 自由意思によるご参加
この研究のご参加、および特定のデータの当方の使用の可否は、先生の自由意思で決定いただくものです。また、ご同意いただいた後でも、もしご都合が悪くなった場合は任意に撤回いただけます。

研究の利点
1.学界、後進の英語講師にとっての利点
英語教育、応用言語学を専門とする日本の大学教員の研究・執筆生活について、示唆を得ることができます。

2.先生ご自身にとっての利点
先生にとっての利点は、あくまで潜在的なものとは存じますが、インタビューを通して、ご自身の研究者・著者としてのご経験を一度振り返っていただくことで、先生の今後のご活動に少しでもお役に立つことがありましたら幸いです。

研究成果の公開手段
本研究の成果を博士論文による公開のほか、プレゼンテーション、学会プロシーディングス、紀要、学会誌・専門誌等の出版物にて発表する可能性がありますが、その際には先生方の個人情報の保護に十分に配慮いたします。

研究に関するお問い合わせ
本研究につきまして、お問い合わせ等ございましたら、いつでも以下までご連絡をくださいますようお願い申し上げます。

研究者：松野まい
所属機関：国際基督教大学　大学院　教育学研究科博士課程
住所：
電話：
E-mail:
Cellphone E-mail:

研究参加同意書

参加者声明
私は、このたび、日本人大学英語教員の研究・著作生活に関する研究にあたって、研究者より、以下について文書によって十分な説明を受けました。

① 研究の目的

② 研究の方法

③ インタビューの時期・期間

④ インタビューの場所

⑤ インタビューの主なテーマ

⑥ 倫理的配慮

⑦ 研究の利点

⑧ 研究成果の公開手段

⑨ 研究に関する問い合わせ

上記内容を十分に理解いたしましたので、この研究に自主的に参加することに同意いたします。

年　　月　　日

参加者署名

_____

研究者声明

私は、このたび、本研究に関する説明を行い、上記の方にご参加を同意いただいたことを確認いたします。研究の実施・公開にあたっては、参加者の方の個人情報を保護することをお約束いたします。

年　　月　　日

研究者署名

_____

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The English translation of the form is followed by the Japanese original.

Participant Questionnaire

Please fill in the following form. I appreciate your time in advance.

Today's Date _____ Name _____
Place of Birth _____ Year of Birth _____
Current Institution _____ Faculty/Department _____ Position _____
Courses Taught (A simple description would suffice) _____

Please give an overview of your academic background (A simple description would suffice)

Education	Place/Country	Language(s) you used	Language(s) instructed in School	Year of Enrollment	Year of Graduation
Kindergarten					
Elementary School					
Junior High School					
Senior High School					
University (Undergraduate Program)					
Graduate School (Master's program)					
Graduate School (Doctoral program)					

Please give an overview of your field (A simple description would suffice)

Undergraduate Program	Major	Theme of Graduate Thesis	Language used
Graduate School (Master's program)	Concentration	Theme of Master's Thesis	Language used
Graduate School (Doctoral program)	Concentration	Theme of Dissertation	Language used

Language(s) used at work at your university

Your main academic associations and language(s) used there

Thank you very much for taking the time to cooperate.

研究参加者質問票

誠にお手数ですが、以下、ご記入くださいますようお願い申し上げます。

本日の日付＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　ご氏名＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

ご出生地＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　ご生年＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

勤務大学名＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　所属学部・学科＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　職位＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

担当授業（概略で結構です）＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

学歴の概要をご記入ください（概略で結構です）

教育	場所・国	使用言語	学習言語	入学年	卒業年
幼稚園					
小学校					
中学校					
高校					
大学（学部）					
大学院（修士）					
大学院（博士）					

ご専門の概要をご記入ください（概略で結構です）

大学名　（学部）	専攻	卒業論文テーマ	使用言語
大学院名（修士）	専攻	修士論文テーマ	使用言語
大学院名（博士）	専攻	博士論文テーマ	使用言語

現在の大学での使用言語

現在の主な所属学会と各学会での使用言語

大変お忙しいなか、ご協力誠にありがとうございました。

APPENDIX C

GENERAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

These guides were modified according to each participant's background and schedule as well as the context of the interviews. Some degree of digression from the schedule was allowed for the researcher to gain an understanding of any participant concerns of which she had been formerly unaware. The actual interviews were conducted in Japanese. The guide in English will be followed by its Japanese version.

Interview 1: The Participants' Backgrounds

(Verification questions on the information in the completed questionnaires and CVs were inserted where appropriate.)

Pre-University to University Experiences

Please tell me about your first encounter with the English language.

Please tell me about your experience of learning English language/literacy up until your pre-university years.

Please tell me about your experience of learning Japanese language/literacy back then.

Please tell me about your university life.

Please tell me about your English language/literacy learning experience.

How did you come to be interested in teaching?

Master's and Early Teaching Experiences

What made you decide to pursue master's study at the school you attended?

How did you come to be interested in your field or research area?

How did you learn your field or research area?

Please tell me about your English language/literacy learning experience in the program.

How did you begin teaching?

Please tell me about your experience, if any, of teaching.

Doctoral and Post-Doctoral Experiences

What made you decide to pursue doctoral study at the school you attended?

What are your reflections on the academic culture in your graduate school?

Please tell me about your experience, if any, of teaching during the doctoral years and thereafter.

What are your reflections on your workplace back then?

Current Experiences

Please tell me about your current duties in your workplace.

How do you describe the institutional culture or systems in relation to research?

Interview 2: The Participants' Writing and Research Experiences Over the Course of Their Careers

(The participants were asked the following questions for each of the written works of their choice.)

Could you please describe your experience with the work you chose?

How did you come to start the work?

What was the context or environment in which you worked on the project?

What was the purpose of writing and publishing the work?

Who was the audience of the work?

What was the process involved in writing and publishing the work?

With whom did you work in the process?

Did you have any challenges that you experienced in the process? If so, how did you overcome them?

What are your reflections on your overall experience of the work?

What meaning do you see in the work?

Interview 3: Clarifications, Reflections, and Future Aspirations

(Clarification questions based on the previous sessions were inserted where appropriate.)

Looking back at your writing and research experiences, how do you see yourself as a researcher?

Where would you like to see yourself in the area of research in the future?

Do you have any specific plans or goals in relation to research?

Member Check Interview

Do you think these restoried accounts ring true to you?

Could you please tell me if there were any changes, deletions, or additions you would like to make?

インタビュー・ガイド

インタビュー１: 先生方のバックグラウンドについて

（参加者質問票や経歴書にある情報の確認の質問も適宜挿入。)

大学進学前から大学時代のご経験

英語との最初の出会いについてお話しいただけますか。

大学進学前までの英語、英語の読み書きの学習経験についてお話しいただけますか。

当時の日本語、日本語の読み書きの学習経験についてお話しいただけますか。

大学生活についてお話しいただけますか。

大学時代の英語、英語の読み書きの学習経験についてお話しいただけますか。

英語教育にはどのようにして興味をもたれましたか。

修士時代と早期のティーチングのご経験

どのようにしてこちらの大学院で修士に進まれようと決意されましたか。

修士課程においてはどのように英語、英語の読み書きを学ばれましたか。

先生の分野、研究領域にはどのようにして興味をもたれましたか。

どのようにその分野・研究領域について学ばれましたか。

ティーチングはどのように始められましたか。

ティーチングについてのご経験があればお話しいただけますか。

博士時代とポスドク時代のご経験

どのようにしてこちらの大学院で博士にすすまれようと決意されましたか。

大学院ではどのような学風がありましたか。

博士課程、そしてその後のティーチングの経験がございましたらお話しいただけますか。

職場はどのようなものでしたか。

現在のご経験

現在の職場においてのお仕事についてお話しいただけますか。

お勤めの大学では研究に関してどのような文化や制度がありますか。

インタビュー２: 先生方のキャリアの過程における執筆・研究経験について

（自選されたご研究・ご著作のそれぞれについて）

こちらのご研究・ご著作についてのご経験についてお話しいただけますか。

どのようなきっかけでこのご研究・ご著作をはじめられましたか。

どのような文脈や環境で進められましたか。

どのような目的で執筆・出版をされましたか。

どのようなプロセスで執筆・出版をされましたか。

そのプロセスではどなたと協力して取り組まれましたか。

そのプロセスで困難はありましたか。その場合どのように乗り越えられましたか。

全般的にご経験についてどのように振り返られますか。

このご研究・ご著作はどのような意味を持ちますか。

インタビュー３： 補足説明、振り返り、および今後の抱負について

（前回のインタビューに基づいて補足説明をお伺いする質問を適宜挿入。）

ご自分の執筆研究経験を振り返られて、ご自分を研究者としてどのようにごらんになりますか。

今後研究に関してどのようになさっていきたいと思われますか。

研究に関して具体的なご計画や目標はございますか。

メンバーチェック・インタビュー

こちらでまとめさせていただいたストーリーはご自身から見て実際のご経験と合っていると思われますか。

変更、削除、追加などのご希望がございましたらお聞かせ願えますか。