tesol QUARTERLY

Building a Career in English: Users of English as an Additional Language in Academia in the Arabian Gulf

LOUISA BUCKINGHAM
Bilkent University
Ankara, Turkey

This study investigates how a group of 30 multilingual academics, all users of English as an additional language (EAL) working at a private university in Oman, acquired discourse community membership in their disciplines through publishing in English, and the strategies they use to sustain the level of literacy needed to disseminate their research in refereed journals while working on the periphery. The participants, from the natural sciences, information technology, and economics, originate from countries in the surrounding region and, although many did not study in one of the traditional Anglophone countries, their academic literacy skills in English have been the cornerstones of their peripatetic academic careers. Participants describe their experience publishing from the periphery and perceptions of reviewer bias, and identify strategies used to overcome material shortcomings and linguistic challenges. The practice of language reuse to support the drafting of particular sections of an article is a recurring theme in many interviews. The article discusses the importance of conventional language in the sciences and the differing understandings of plagiarism among academics from the humanities and sciences. An implication from this study is the need for greater institutional support for the writing process in environments where most faculty members are EAL users.
doi: 10.1002/tesq.124

This article presents the results of a qualitative study into the role of English in the careers of 30 multilingual academics from the sciences, engineering, and economics at the second largest university in the Sultanate of Oman. It investigates how these scholars, all speakers of English as an additional language (EAL)[1] originating from countries surrounding the Arabian Gulf, acquired discourse community

[1] In addition to EAL, the traditional terms of *nonnative English speaker (NNES)* and *native English speaker (NES)* are used in this article, because these are the terms used by the participants in this study.

membership and have developed and maintained an active and competitive research and publication record in English while working internationally on the periphery.

Research into the experiences of nonnative-English-speaking (NNES) academics working both from the periphery and from central locations has shed light on the heterogeneity of both contexts in which EAL academics undertake research-related activities. Previous studies have documented the development of rhetorical expertise by postgraduate students in native-English-speaking (NES) contexts (e.g., Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Casanave & Vandrick, 2003; S. Cho, 2004; Dong, 1996, 1998; Pecorari, 2003); in these studies, language-related issues are compounded with the challenges of learning how to participate in a global disciplinary community. For EAL academics without formal academic training in an Anglophone country, the process of acquiring the academic literacy skills needed to publish in English may imply an immense additional burden (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Englander & López Bonilla, 2011). Not only may English academic rhetorical conventions differ from other languages (Abasi, 2012; Hirose, 2003; Petrić, 2005; Simpson, 2000), but previous general English language training is often not sufficient for academic work in English, and institutional support for the development of discipline-specific English literacy skills may be inadequate (Fernández Polo & Cal Varela, 2009; Pérez-Llantada, Plo, & Ferguson, 2011).

Although the development and maintenance of academic biliteracy or multiliteracy involves considerable intellectual investment (Casanave, 1998), for EAL academics in some disciplines first language (L1) academic literacy may bring additional publishing opportunities (Calaresu, 2011; W. D. Cho, 2009; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Fernández Polo & Cal Varela, 2009; Flowerdew and Li, 2009; Ljosland, 2007; Olsson & Sheridan, 2012; Pérez-Llantada et al., 2011; St. John, 1987). Premiums may be placed on publications in both languages, and in some contexts dual publications are encouraged (Flowerdew and Li, 2009).

Studies on the development of discipline-specific English literacy skills by EAL academics in both centre and peripheral locations have highlighted strategies such as the use of core published texts as models during the writing process, and various textual borrowing practices, including using the structure as a framework or copying chunks of text at lexical, phrasal, or clausal level. This latter form of intertextuality has been termed *textual plagiarism* (Pecorari, 2003), *patchwriting* (Howard, 1995), *transgressive* (or *nontransgressive*) *textual borrowing* (Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004), or *language reuse* (Flowerdew & Li, 2007b). In this article, I prefer the terms *language reuse* or *recycling* because these imply a measure of pragmatism on behalf of the writer and do not a priori imply intentional deceit. Indeed, the extent to which the practice constitutes plagiarism is still contested (Flowerdew & Li, 2007b; Pecorari, 2003, 2008; Roig, 2010). Reusing language, particularly conventionalised formulations, has been described by novice or semiproficient writers as assisting with the drafting process and compensating for shortcomings in linguistic or rhetorical proficiency (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Flowerdew & Li, 2007b; Y. Li, 2006, 2007; J. Li & Schmitt, 2009). It is of pedagogical value not only to EAL academics, but has also been used in native speaker contexts to scaffold the development of academic rhetorical skills (Hull & Rose, 1989; Jones & Freeman, 2003).

Clearly, in addition to linguistic competence, economic and material factors also dictate scholars' ability to participate in global academic discourse communities (Canagarajah, 1996, 2003). Material shortcomings and limited access to English language journal databases may curtail the availability of academic literature needed to remain abreast with evolving disciplinary conversations and pursue research aimed at top-tier journals (Flowerdew, 2000; Lillis & Curry, 2006). Curry and Lillis (2010) underscore the importance of informal collaborative networking within academic communities to boost opportunities to undertake and disseminate research in English by pooling both material resources and disciplinary and linguistic expertise.

This study explores the importance of English in the careers of mid-career EAL scholars who pursue transnational careers in *off-network* (Swales, 1987) or *peripheral* countries (in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa) in institutions which use English as the medium of instruction. The Arabian Gulf is a region which receives scant coverage in applied linguistic literature, and little is known about literacy and discourse community practices of EAL academics working in this region's rapidly expanding tertiary sector. This study first focuses on how this diverse group of scholars acquired and maintain discipline-specific literacy skills in English, probing factors concerning the dissemination of their work such as language choice and publishing outlets, and their perceptions of linguistic and rhetorical challenges of disciplinary writing. Finally, I investigate strategies that these scholars have developed to facilitate their drafting in English of texts intended for journal submission.

METHODS

Study Context

Oman, the second most populous Gulf state, opened its first university in 1986; it has since been joined by a further five private universities and numerous colleges. The medium of instruction in all tertiary institutions is English (excepting selected degree programmes such as Arabic language and literature); most foreign academic staff are from South Asia and the MENA countries (the Middle East and North Africa). This study was undertaken at an institution comprising four colleges offering bachelor's degrees and several master's programs with a student enrolment of approximately 6,000. Although it is primarily a teaching-oriented institution, the contracts of academic staff stipulate that they are expected to conduct and publish research, and the strength of an individual's research profile is taken into account in gatekeeping encounters, such as hiring, promotion, and contract renewal.

Data Collection and Analysis

Most data for this study were compiled between November 2011 and March 2012, with additional data collected in October 2012. From research statistics compiled by the institution, it was clear that not all departments or schools published research in peer-reviewed journals; I aimed to secure around 4 participants from each research-active department, which would result in a final group of around 30. After obtaining administrative approval, I sent an email to all academic staff requesting volunteers. I gave a brief description of the study to ensure that only faculty members who publish in English language international journals and who self-identify as EAL academics volunteered. Two other strategies were used to increase the participant number: the *snowball* technique and identifying potential candidates from information on the university website. My active recruiting continued until I reached the initial goal of 30 participants (albeit without attaining at least 4 from each department); despite the presence of female faculty in some departments, all respondents were male. I conducted trial interviews with three EAL colleagues from the humanities with previous experience of using interviews for research. Their feedback was beneficial when formulating particular questions.

Data were collected in two main stages. Biographical information was compiled via email; the results appear in Tables 1 and 2. This was followed by a semistructured in-depth interview in English lasting 45–60 minutes in the participant's office. This interview format enabled me to probe topics not previously anticipated in the original research framework as they emerged during the conversation (such as the value of peer reviewing experience) and facilitated the collection of rich, descriptive detail relating to the participants' professional lives and their perceptions.

TABLE 1
Participants

Department	Nationality	First language	Additional home language	Age
Biology (BG) (6)	Egypt (5)	Arabic (23)	French (4)	61–70 (1)
Maths and physics (MP) (6)	Iraq (4)	Pashto (2)	English (2)	51–60 (4)
Engineering (EG) (5)	Tunisia (4)	Kashmiri (1)	Russian (1)	41–50 (14)
Chemistry (CH) (3)	India (3)	Sindhi (1)	Italian (1)	31–40 (10)
Economics and commerce (EC) (6)	Yemen (3)	Urdu (1)		21–30 (1)
Computer science (CS) (2)	Pakistan (3)	Kiswahili (1)		
Pharmacy (PH) (2)	Libya (2)	Malayalam (1)		
	Oman (2)			
	Sudan (2)			
	Jordan (1)			
	Tanzania (1)			

TABLE 2
Graduate Study Undertaken Abroad

Master's	Japan (4), Britain (1), India (1), Malaysia (1), Netherlands (1), Ukraine (1), Russia (1)
PhD	Japan (5), Britain (3), Malaysia (2), Australia (1), France (1), Germany (1), India (1), Ireland (1), New Zealand (1), Norway (1), Ukraine (1), United States (1), Russia (1)

The interview questions inquired into how the interviewees had acquired professional academic literacy in English, the role English expertise had played in their professional lives and publishing experience, and strategies to maintain this level of written literacy while located on the periphery (see Appendix A). The same general topics were raised, but their order and the exact phrasing of questions varied according to the circumstances. The interviewees themselves anticipated some topics in the course of the conversation, while I occasionally raised additional topics in response to particular experiences or views they articulated.

Upon recording the first interviews, I discerned that some participants were uncomfortable speaking openly about issues concerning their work environment due to the adverse implications this could potentially have; I thus decided to transcribe conversations during the interview. As the questions posed encouraged reflection, resulting in a slower speaking pace, noting interviewees' answers during the interview was a feasible alternative.

Each interviewee received a typed version of his interview, which allowed him the option of amending inaccuracies. Three interviewees responded to this. Excerpts from interviews inserted in this article have been edited to a certain degree: fillers, repetitions, and interruptions have been omitted and grammatical errors corrected. Occasionally, the interviewee's answer as transcribed here was given in response to two questions (i.e., the first a closed question and the second a request for detail); it is represented here as a single answer for convenience.

Contact between most participants and me continued formally and informally, and I followed up certain topics with individuals over the following year. This ongoing contact allowed me to discuss examples of participants' published work 6 months after completing the interview stage and examine their writing.

I am a white, middle-aged female, a native speaker of English, originating from one of the *centre* countries. Despite the apparent differences between the participants and me, I am their colleague and thus share the same resource-related difficulties identified by many interviewees when undertaking research at an institution such as this. I also revealed to the participants certain aspects of my own background that I judged would be of interest before each interview. I have been a second language writing instructor for many years and have experienced the demands of achieving and maintaining academic biliteracy, having completed my graduate studies and published in Spanish.

Through close readings of the interview transcripts, I identified recurring themes (attitudes, motivations, views, and behaviours) expressed by the participants to which I assigned *textual terms* for retrieval purposes, akin to the open-coding described by Strauss and Corbin (1998, p. 101). Following Ritchie, Spencer, and O'Connor's (2003, p. 222) recommendations, I used language as close as possible to the speakers' own words for these terms. The assignment of terms for one interview was cross-checked by one participant from the trial interviews. The second step involved grouping these terms together under a higher order category heading (Ritchie et al., 2003, p. 221; Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 113). For example, *help from writing centre*, *help from colleagues*, and *help from editing agencies* were grouped under the category *assistance in writing up research*. This led to the construction of a matrix or "conceptual framework" (Ritchie et al., 2003, p. 221) consisting of related themes arranged under a higher order category. A total of eight categories were formulated. I then extracted from the interviews the passages of text which had been assigned a term and grouped them under the appropriate theme of each main category. I conserved the speaker's identity by the use of codes (e.g., MP1, MP2). This procedure gave me an overview of participants' comments relating to themes within a particular category.

An example of the matrix for the category *resource-related difficulties* appears in Appendix B. The speakers' comments illustrated here were in response to the query into how the university could support them in undertaking and writing up their research. As can be seen, in addition to the actual writing-related difficulties, participants mentioned a variety of challenges concerning the actual undertaking of research, which necessitated this additional category. Because this categorisation procedure involves extracting short passages from their broader context where themes are naturally interspersed and "weave in and out of each other" (Ritchie et al., 2003, p. 225), the extracts (as presented in Appendix B) may sometimes appear incongruous to the reader who does not have the benefit of the original data. To ensure the contextualisation of these utterances is not lost during the process of comparing and seeking linkages between individuals' experiences, I continuously worked back and forth between the original interview text and the extracted passages.

The interview data was later complemented by an analysis of the published articles produced by four participants to learn more about the practice of language reuse, whether in the participant's own articles (i.e., the recurrence of passages in multiple articles by the participant) or recycled from a third article (i.e., not authored by the participant). Of the participants who had mentioned the utility of using published articles as models during the drafting process, I requested five to share with me articles they had authored (and for which they considered themselves to have been the main author), together with an article not authored by them which they had viewed as a useful model while drafting their own. Four participants were able to deliver copies of their own articles to me (the fifth did not respond), but only two (CS2, PH1) were able to provide a text considered to have been useful as a model. With each participant, I discussed how he had used the model to support his drafting. A close reading of all articles provided by the four participants revealed evidence of authors recycling language from their own and others' work. The results of this analysis appear in the section titled "Language Reuse."

Description of Participants

Participants were drawn from seven departments in the university (see Table 1 for biographic information). Ten had received a scholarship to complete a master's degree abroad, and 20 had pursued doctoral studies abroad (Table 2 displays the countries where graduate studies were undertaken). Excepting Russia, Ukraine, Tunisia, Germany, and France, all foreign doctoral and master's programmes were conducted in English. Those who had completed their doctorate in their home countries studied in English in the case of Pakistan and India, or in both Arabic and English in the case of

Sudan and Egypt, or Arabic and French in the case of Tunisia. Whereas only 7 participants completed their PhD in one of the traditional centre Anglophone countries, 9 others had undertaken postdoctoral research in a traditional Anglophone country for a period lasting between 6 months and 2 years. Although currently employed in Oman, many previously held positions in their home countries, other Gulf or MENA countries, or in other off-network locations where English is used in the education sector, such as Malaysia or India.

All participants consider that publishing research in English in international refereed journals to be either *very important* (27) or *extremely important* (3) for their professional identity, job security, and mobility. The number of English publications in refereed international journals authored by participants varied from 2 to 57, with 12 being the mean. Most international publications were coauthored, with the participant often appearing as the second or even third author. This does not necessarily imply less responsibility for the drafting of the article, however. One participant (PH1) appeared as third author of an article he wrote and for which he had been the principal researcher. Contrary to clear guidelines by professional associations (such as the International Committee for Medical Journal Editors), the order of names in the byline is not necessarily indicative of the degree of contribution of the respective author to the writing of the article (Tarnow, 2002). Some participants had published additional articles in national or regional journals during their careers, and of these the vast majority were also in English.

RESULTS

The common themes emerging from the interviews have been grouped in three main sections: acquiring and exercising discourse community membership, the linguistic and discursive considerations of second language writing, and drafting and composition strategies.

Acquiring and Exercising Discourse Community Membership

For 20 participants, a period of apprenticeship with their PhD (or MA) supervisor was key to their learning how to draft a research article (RA) and express themselves appropriately in discipline-specific English. For those who had studied in Japan and Britain, acceptance to their specific PhD program hinged on fulfilling the requirement of having published in refereed journals. Some prepared manuscripts for publication during their degree program, and the multiple drafts were revised by the supervisor. The sense of joint effort was sometimes expressed spontaneously by the participants through the choice of pronoun during the interview:

> My first experience was during my MA program in Egypt. We failed to publish in an international journal because of our methods; we didn't have access to some equipment that was necessary in the eyes of the reviewer. (CH2)

> The first paper I published was during my PhD; I spent a lot of time on this paper and my supervisor made me revise it six or seven times. We submitted it to a US journal. (EG5)

In almost all cases, the participants' first article(s) was published jointly with his supervisor, with his name appearing usually as principal author, or less often as second author. The supervisor had often contributed substantially to the drafting of the article(s), either through writing or through detailed feedback on drafts, and the doctoral research was usually part of a larger study which their supervisor partly or wholly managed, and for which the supervisor may have obtained funding. In such circumstances, participants considered it to be entirely appropriate that their supervisor's name appear on all publications stemming from the project and there was no sense that the supervisor had unduly benefited.

Not all participants were supervised by academics willing or able to guide them in their acquisition of RA writing competence. Four participants considered that their supervisor had provided no guidance on writing. The autodidactic approach taken by these participants was often helped by collaboration with colleagues on research projects. In such cases, the learning period occurred after they had graduated from their PhD program and had begun teaching at a university, or alternatively, during a stint in the United States on a postdoctoral scholarship. The research and publishing partnerships that were established (with or without their doctoral supervisor) often lasted many years, and usually involved the participant repeatedly publishing with the same coauthor(s).

> I had many Indian colleagues when I worked in Libya. I didn't know so much English then and they helped me learn how to write. (MP1)

> My PhD supervisor didn't teach me but I learned from experience and by working in a team. You get a lot of feedback through working with other people. (MP6)

The publishing hierarchy: local, regional and international journals. Publishing in local or regional journals was considered by 12 participants as a useful strategy to encourage graduate students to publish and learn from the publishing process, recognising that novice researchers can easily be discouraged by rejections from prestigious international journals. However, most participants doubted that such a journal could contribute to their own career development, because it was unlikely to be evaluated favourably by the university's promotion committee. For those who were required to participate formally in a discourse community as part of their doctoral programme, the value of a local publication was clear: It gave students the incentive to write and could also serve a pedagogic function.

> I used to write up reports during my PhD; some of them were published in the university magazine. It taught me a lot about how to write up and organise a report. It was voluntary, but I really benefited from this. (MP6)

Five participants claimed that their first publication was in an international refereed journal, whereas others began first by writing reports and conference proceedings, submitting articles to a local or regional journal (these were also almost exclusively in English), before attempting to publish in an international journal. Among those who began with international journals, some upon completion of their PhD published in local journals of lesser quality before succeeding to publish again in a higher ranking international journal, and they acknowledged the role of their supervisor in their initial publishing success.

For many, the journal's impact factor was a key consideration when disseminating research and publishing in a journal with a low impact factor seemed to imply a sense of failed effort. Four participants, however, expressed a more holistic view, recognising that different publication outlets serve diverse audiences. For these, having local visibility and writing on topics of relevance to a local readership was an important component of their professional identity.

> I have published in local journals in Sudan, but not yet in the Gulf. It is important to publish in regional journals because you contribute to your environment and recognise the importance of things around you. If not, no one around you will recognise what you are doing; I want to establish myself in the Gulf region, so the first to benefit should be my immediate society. (CH3)

The benefits of peer reviewing. Nineteen participants mentioned being active peer reviewers for local or international journals. Of these, almost all considered this to be a form of exercising discourse community membership and participation in a professional network that afforded them insights into developments in their field, and from which they had learned a lot about writing. The task of formulating a well-founded critique of another's work was seen as an intellectual exercise that sharpened their ability to critique their own work and taught them "to think like a reviewer." Four participants admitted to commenting in general terms on language use, or instructing writers to have the manuscript proofread by a native speaker, but most limited their review to technical matters. Those who were reviewers for local journals in addition to prestigious journals recognised the need to adapt reviewing standards to local conditions. Although the importance of such contributions was frequently not recognised by institutional gatekeepers, for these participants it was a means to maintain a presence in and contribute to a local academic environment.

> I am a referee for a local journal in Sudan. You need to be a little easier when refereeing a local journal. You need to encourage writers to contribute, young academics or non-academics, to write on topics that often don't get published, like the knowledge of the effects of plants on treating certain illnesses; people who don't have degrees but who have knowledge and practice. It helps them in their career and encourages them to take things more seriously. (CH3)

Second Language Writing: Linguistic and Discursive Considerations

For this group of scholars, undertaking research and publishing in a language other than English is rarely an option due to limited levels of academic multiliteracy, the dearth of reputable journals in their L1 in their discipline, and the perceived lack of institutional recognition for publications in languages other than English in the Gulf region.

For most Arab participants, the formal features of English that contrasted with Arabic were potentially problematic. However, participants acknowledged that, once identified, difficulties with "general English" were relatively easy to correct because they usually did not require knowledge of discipline-specific linguistic conventions. Seventeen participants admitted that their manuscript had been rejected by a journal at least once. The primary reasons for the rejection, however, were never language related (only once did the quality of writing appear to be an issue, but language in this case was French not English), but rather the topic, the choice of methodology, the quantity of data, or the soundness of the arguments.

Linguistically more challenging were discourse-related difficulties, in particular stylistic concerns when adapting conference papers to journal articles or adjusting a manuscript to the requirements of different publication outlets, varying style and tone when drafting multiple articles on the same general topic, reformulating ideas, writing concisely, and selecting (and maintaining) the appropriate level of formality.

Views regarding the relative difficulty of particular sections varied. Although the discussion section was frequently identified as posing most challenges, the abstract and the conclusion were also considered difficult due to the need to write concisely, using precise, *concentrated* language. The introduction presented difficulties insofar as it had to fulfil numerous functions: generate interest, situate the study, and establish a gap. Where potential overlap in the content of some sections existed (such as between the abstract and the introduction, or the abstract and the conclusion), separating each section's function and ensuring writing did not become repetitive challenged their ability to reformulate content and to engage with the reader. Sections considered more straightforward, in contrast, were those where information could be expressed through conventionalised formulations.

The formulaic nature of science writing. The formulaic and conventional nature of scientific writing was seen as facilitating the acquisition and maintenance of discipline-specific written discourse. The tendency to replace text with figures and formulae and the high incidence of terminology were considered advantages.

> The problems are not so much to do with language. We have a very fixed language that we use, we always use the same techniques, similar approaches and we learn how to say these things. Then a lot of our paper is formulae and symbols. *Novel* or *interesting* ways of expressing ideas were not valued and would usually be considered inappropriate; as RAs were usually coauthored by a team of researchers, developing a unique authorial style or *voice* was also not an option. (MP4)

> People from a qualitative area need a more elaborate style and a higher level of fluency to write research papers; for us, language is not as important as the idea and the work. (EC3)

Several participants viewed the use of conventionalised language to signal the rhetorical function of particular sections as a strategy to orient the peer reviewer towards key information. Participants were able to skim a familiar article and underline stock phrases used to signal the shortcomings of previous research, the organisation of the current article, procedures, results, and the author's contribution. The participant CS2, for example, underlined the conventional formulations in

Example 1 in the conclusion section of a published article from computer science which he recognised as serving important *sign-posting* functions.

Example 1

In this paper we have discussed … a new scheme that uses … has been proposed. The proposed scheme has three advantages …. We also proposed three strategies for selecting …. Simulation results have demonstrated the effectiveness of our method in ….

Composing and drafting strategies. Working at an off-network tertiary institution, participants pointed to the difficulty of maintaining the high level of disciplinary fluency in an environment where access to the specialised professional literature of their field was limited and where the language of communication between colleagues frequently was not English. Most participants in this study had consciously developed strategies to maintain their level of drafting expertise attained during their years of doctoral or postdoctoral research. Ten participants specifically identified extensive reading in their field, or targeted reading on their specific area of current research as being a key predrafting step; this was also possible at the postdrafting stage to compare the use of punctuation, tenses, and sentence structure with a similar article.

When I begin a paper, I go to the data base and I find a similar article and I analyse it; I use the same patterns of English that I see in the article. I also note alternatives that are used. I analyse the organisation of this article and I try to do my work in the same way; for example, I notice that I need to put a short overview of the results before I discuss the results one by one. If I use the same pattern in my work then I find that it will be accepted more easily than if I try to invent some different way. (BG4)

Identifying and using appropriate vocabulary was generally not considered challenging, provided the writer was describing a familiar concept. If unfamiliar words (e.g., synonyms) were needed, some participants noted the convenience of using electronic reference tools to expand their active vocabulary and to verify the appropriateness of word choice in particular contexts. One interviewee mentioned the usefulness of Google as a corpus tool to verify collocational aspects of word usage:

Google is my biggest language assistant. I use Google as a reference, for example "perfume diffuses throughout the room" or "moves through the room"; I can check how frequently "diffuses" is used. I see which verbs are used in different processes, what nouns they combine

> with. I can find the same word in many contexts with many examples. It is cheap, it is private, and it doesn't impose on other people. (BG1)

Where new or less familiar phenomena were described, appropriate language may not have been readily found by using electronic resources. A strategy used by some involved mining published articles in the field for appropriate terms.

> I sometimes find that I don't have the right word to describe something very specific, an exact phenomenon, I have to read a relevant paper to find the typical words already used and this takes considerable time. (EG2)

Drafting assistance. Participants noted the difficulty of polishing their draft in a second-language environment. Many had prior experience of assistance from *literacy brokers* (Lillis & Curry, 2006): Two had used such services during their doctoral studies, whereas the five graduates of Japanese universities had used a professional editing agency in the final stages of manuscript preparation, paid for by the respective university. Many acknowledged the potential advantage of having a proofreading service within the university (e.g., offered by the writing centre), with the provision that the provider be versed in the norms of scientific language and RA rhetorical conventions. Most participants with prior experience were ambivalent about the service they had previously received, claiming changes suggested by a professional agency had often been inappropriate.

All participants had received critical comments on language use in journal peer review reports at some point. Although most considered these to be normal editing changes and viewed them as an opportunity to improve their writing, several articulated their frustrations at recommendations to have the manuscript revised by a native speaker; often the manuscript had already been proofread by an NES colleague or a professional agency.

> It makes me very irritated when the review opens by saying language needs to be revised. The reviewer should concentrate on the technical data and ensure the study is sound. It is completely natural that we make mistakes, especially as I live in an Arabic speaking environment. (MP6)

> The first comment is always that I need to submit the article to a NES for review regardless of the amount of changes needed. This is the response in 95% of the articles that I submit, whether or not there are changes needed, or so I think. (CH2)

Participants' main form of assistance at their current location involved proofreading by colleagues onsite and by peers in their research network. Collaborative research and coauthorship had been the norm for most throughout their careers. Whereas the latter usually implies a contribution of scientific value to the article, some were prepared to share authorship of an article in exchange for language assistance. One respondent regularly added the name of a native speaker colleague as coauthor in exchange for proofreading.

Language reuse. Recycling phrases from published articles (or language reuse) was acknowledged by 10 participants as an important strategy to achieving greater fluency in the drafting process (response to Question 4). Most participants viewed this as a legitimate approach to drafting an RA in disciplines in which conventional language use was not only appropriate but preferred.

> I read a lot of articles; I don't try to invent new phrases or expressions, I use the ones that are used in these articles. (BG4)

> We can copy information from other journals, not use it exactly the same way, but we use something similar. We don't have to invent what we say. (MP4)

The extent of the reused text varied considerably, from certain word combinations to sentences. Some participants could spontaneously recall phrases that they had reused from other texts, and which they considered standard ways of saying something (e.g,, "a cell line has been cultured for three weeks using…" [BG4]). If longer passages were involved, structural or lexical changes might be introduced to ensure the phrase was not copied verbatim and to merge the recycled text with the scholar's own work. Typical changes included reordering, replacing, or supplementing part of the recycled text; because this often involved substituting technical information, some interviewees referred to this as *changing the parameters*. In this case, the recycled text (whether phrases or sentences) became a skeleton for the development of the writer's own text.

To analyse how participants reused language, I compiled 11 published articles authored by four participants from four different disciplines (chemistry [CH1], maths [MP1], pharmacy [PH1], and computer science [CS2]). Each participant provided a minimum of two articles on a similar topic which he considered to be representative of his work. The work of three participants (CH1, MP1, PH1) contained varying degrees of language reuse, but none were recorded in work provided by the fourth (CS2). To maintain the authors' anonymity in the following discussion, particular words have been omitted (as indicated in brackets) from the excerpts and extracts have been limited to one sentence.

The excerpts displayed in Figure 1 are from two published texts volunteered by a pharmacist [PH1]. Text 1 served as a model for parts of his own work (Text 2), and he could identify sentences which had assisted him in constructing his own text. The evidence of structural borrowing is of greater interest than the lexical repetitions, which are predominantly standard terms.

Language reuse also extended to recycling longer sections of text from published articles, often from previously published work they had authored. Such passages were usually borrowed from the introduction, background, or literature review, or from the methods sections of an article and, according to the participants, contained established discourse conventions and conventional formulations which accelerated the laborious drafting process. Author citations were also recycled; although this is likely inevitable when recycling tracts of previously published text, some participants also considered this a legitimate means of partially circumventing inadequate access to bibliographic resources.

> The literature review is formulaic, the introduction is taken from other people's work, but the results, discussion, procedure and methodology sections I have to write. (CH1)

> The discussion section is the most difficult, I have to use my own words and my own thinking. In the introduction you collect information and

Text 1. Source Text	**Text 2. Text by PH1**
a. The genus (name) presents phytochemical features, such as terpenoides, phenolics, flavones and coumarins.	a. The genus (name) possesses phytochemical features, such as terpenoides, phenolics, flavones, and coumarins.
b. Many of its plants are used in folk medicine for skin diseases, anti-tumors and as insecticides.	b. Many of the plants belonging to the genus (name) are used in folk medicine for skin disease, as anti-tumors, anthelmintics, insecticides and for renal disorders.
c. A voucher specimen was deposited at the herbarium of (institution name) under the code number (number).	c. A voucher specimen was deposited at the herbarium of (institution name).

FIGURE 1. Sentence paradigms.

explain; in the methodology section you can repeat what others have said before but change the parameters. (EG3)

My analysis of participants' published articles confirmed the recycling of varying amounts of text from the introduction and methods sections (or statement of assumptions in the case of mathematics), particularly if the studies were on a similar topic; occasionally the recycling of information also occurred in the conclusion section. The source for the greatest amount of such borrowing was texts previously published by the participant. In most such instances, the author did not cite himself.

In the methods (or assumptions) section, the description of procedures was reused from a previously published text from the same participant either verbatim or with minor changes to figures or formulae. Examples a and b appeared verbatim in multiple published articles provided by the participants CH1 and MP1, respectively.

a. The chromatographic analysis of each liquid fraction was carried out on a (*machine*) equipped with a flame ionization detector. (CH1)

b. We assume a linear thermoelastic material occupies a regular region (*symbol*) with a piecewise smooth boundary surface (*symbol*) in the three-dimensional (*name*) space. (MP1)

Although example a was one of multiple recycled sentences from a single paragraph, example b was the first sentence of two paragraphs (six sentences, 132 words) which were recycled verbatim in different articles by this author. In the field of mathematics, the exact formulation of a theory or an assumption is vital for the coherence of the work and some mathematicians may occasionally consider the verbatim reuse of a previously used theory to be acceptable. In other branches of the sciences, procedural information may be reformulated more readily. Example c appeared in identical form in two chemistry articles authored by CH1, but in a third article published later on the same topic the same procedure is formulated differently, as example d shows:

c. In order to dispose of invariable and representative samples of (*product*), cross-sectional pieces of 5–10 mm width of (*product*) were used for the thermal and catalytic pyrolysis experiment. (CH1)

d. For catalytic pyrolysis, representative samples of (*product*) in 5–10 mm wide pieces were used. (CH1)

The recycling of sentences to review literature was also evident. The same sentence was frequently used in different articles by the same author to refer to a given study. Each of the following three examples appeared in four different published articles by CH1.

e. Similarly, (*Author*) used fast pyrolysis method and obtained high yield of oil with high heating values. (CH1)

f. (*Author, year*) investigated the two-temperature theory in the context of a generalised theory of thermoelasticity. (CH1)

g. (*Authors, year*) have formulated a theory of heat conduction in deformable bodies, which depends upon two distinct temperatures, the conductive temperature (*symbol*) and the thermodynamic temperature (*symbol*). (CH1)

Perhaps the most surprising finding in this brief survey is the extent of language reuse across particular sections. Whereas in some cases, a certain amount of reshuffling of sentences occurred (termed *paragraph fragmentation* by Roig, 2010), in two articles appearing in different editions of the same journal authored by MP1 the opening paragraphs of the articles are almost identical. During the interviews, only one respondent mentioned having been challenged during the peer review process for excessive textual homology:

> One reviewer said that 28% was copied from a previous article of mine. Of course it was copied! I don't have the language to reformulate what I want to say. I don't have the language to create new sentences saying the same thing. (MP2)

DISCUSSION

In the experience of this group of participants, junior academics who receive guidance on English rhetorical norms and orientation towards publishing outlets from supervisors seem to enter the world of publishing in international journals relatively early (while still a PhD student). In such cases, the apprentice is empowered to attain a level of competence that would not have been possible without the scaffolding provided by the supervisor (S. Cho, 2004). For participants who did not receive such mentoring by their supervisor, informal collegial networks were an important alternative route to acquiring disciplinary rhetorical conventions.

Participation in such networks was also vital for career development. Echoing findings from Curry and Lillis (2010), the extent to which participants informally networked with research-oriented peers appeared to be an important factor influencing the degree to which they perceived themselves to be productive researchers and expressed satisfaction with their output. Working at a less prestigious location in the developing world, however, meant institutional support for conference attendance and research leave to collaborate with colleagues located elsewhere was rare.

Once the academic was established in his field, peer reviewing experience may have facilitate insights into the research and publishing process and sharpened critical awareness of disciplinary rhetorical style. A correlation between peer reviewing and the improvement of the reviewer's own writing and research skills is difficult to establish; Lundstrom and Baker's (2009) study on peer reviewing in the controlled environment of a composition classroom suggests that exercising the peer reviewer role was, particularly for weaker writers, pedagogically beneficial. The evidence here is anecdotal, but even more established academics in the present study perceived peer reviewing as benefiting their own writing.

At this stage of the participants' careers, language was not perceived to be the main challenge to the dissemination of their research in high-stakes journals, but rather access to resources and time constraints. Although the university has recently acquired access to a limited number of electronic databases, these are insufficient for research aimed at prestigious publication outlets and access is often restricted to trial periods conceded by the publishing group. As described by Canagarajah (1996, 2003), the practice of recycling author citations is thus a strategy that may be employed by academics in peripheral locations to overcome a material deficit. It would seem from some participants' responses, however, that this may also be seen as a shortcut tactic to drafting which enables the author to fulfil journals reviewers' expectations concerning the number and breadth of citations, while avoiding deep engagement with the relevant literature. This tactic has been documented in both Harwood and Petrić's (2012) and Pecorari's (2003, 2006) respective studies of citation behaviour of postgraduate students at British universities. For example, in Pecorari's (2006) corpus of student work from four different disciplines, the use of secondary (or indirect) citations was most frequent in the sciences; in no instance, however, did writers formally acknowledge not having read the original source text.

All participants had independently developed strategies to assist their drafting in English. Peer assistance when it involved linguistic support from a more competent user from the same discipline was valued more highly than proofreading provided by professional agencies (including writing centres). Considering the high stakes involved in academic publishing, Burrough-Boenisch (2003, p. 240) champions greater professionalisation in the field of language services through specialised training in applied linguistics and English for specific purposes. Not unlike translators and interpreters, proofreaders naturally have areas of expertise and may encounter difficulties when working outside their academic specialisations (Harwood, Austin, & Macaulay, 2009). The practice of giving coauthorship to a colleague in return for proofreading (as previously documented in this study) contravenes the guidelines for research and publishing ethics as articulated by professional scientific associations such as the International Committee for Medical Journal Editors. It is, however, in line with previous research (Shi, Wenyu, & Jinwei, 2005; Tarnow, 2002) that indicates that the assignation of coauthorship may be a reflection of collegial collaborative practices or social pressures rather than relative degree of scientific contribution.

Similar to the Spanish scholars in St. John's (1987) small-scale study, the participants' awareness of the relatively predictable nature of much language in their discipline aided their drafting process, although no participant had received formal instruction on recognising and using conventional language during his academic training. Recent work has documented how genre analysis may be incorporated into second language writing pedagogy to improve the professional writing skills of established EAL academics. In a training programme for NES scholars in China described in Cargill and O'Connor (2006), participants were shown how a basic concordancing programme could be used to advance disciplinary language skills, and the authors devised flexible *sentence templates* of formulations typical for specific scientific genres.

Reusing language at both the lexical and syntactic level is a drafting strategy practised by both NES and NNES scientists (Jones & Freeman, 2003; Y. Li, 2006, 2007; St. John, 1987) and students (Abasi, Akbari, & Graves, 2006; Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Eckel, 2010; Y. Li, 2012a; Pecorari, 2006). Although one may tend to view this practice as a stage novice writers traverse in their acquisition of literacy skills (Flowerdew & Li, 2007b, p. 167; Howard, 1995, p. 796; Hull & Rose, 1989, p. 151), according to evidence from this study some mid- to late-career academics with established publishing records may continue to recycle stretches of text from specific sections of published articles, particularly from their own. When viewed through a transgressive lens, the practice is termed *self-plagiarism*; previous studies have revealed its relative frequency, particularly in biomedical research (Bretag & Mahmud, 2009; Roig, 2010). As previously reported by St. John (1987), passages prone to recycling usually appeared in sections identified by participants as being rhetorically difficult, such as the introduction and literature review, or mechanical but requiring precision, such as the methods section. Not unlike findings in Flowerdew and Li (2007a), many participants in this study viewed such borrowing practices as a legitimate strategy to facilitate the drafting of sections intended to situate their current study and not expected to be original. The practice is not limited to texts disseminated in low-prestige journals; of the three examples provided here, two (chemistry and mathematics) involved articles from journals published by Elsevier, Taylor and Francis, and Springer. This is not to suggest all participants in this study condoned this practice, however. Similarly, recent research by Y. Li (2012b) has also described how senior Chinese scientists she interviewed were generally dismissive of the verbatim recycling of passages in multiple publications without appropriate acknowledgement. As Pecorari (2008) demonstrates, scientific formulations deemed unoriginal can in fact be reformulated in multifarious ways.

The practice of recycling text is indeed contentious and guidelines are difficult to formulate, in part due to disciplinary differences (Pecorari, 2008; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012), but also to the recognition that the nature of academic work involves the "circulation and re-circulation" (Pennycook, 1996, p. 207) of ideas and, inevitably, formulations in a disciplinary community (Ivanič, 1998). Nevertheless, criticism of transgressive borrowing practices has been repeatedly articulated by science journal editors (Chabner, 2011; Y. Li, 2012a). The ease with which RAs can now be mined electronically has rendered language reuse easily identifiable at the submission stage (Y. Li, 2012a), but also after publication. The detection of significant plagiarism in published articles or doctoral theses has led on occasion to publications being retracted (Williams & Wagner, 2011) and doctoral degrees revoked (see, e.g., the high-profile cases involving senior German government officials, as documented in Klöckner, 2012).

CONCLUSION

These findings contribute to the growing body of research on the acquisition of academic literacy by EALs in centre and periphery contexts; as upheld by Flowerdew (2000) and Belcher (2007), such studies give applied linguists and second language writing instructors further insight into the diversity of multilingual scholars' experiences in acquiring and sustaining academic literacy practices. Although the data were collected from a relatively small, teaching-focused institution in the Gulf with a relatively high turnover of academic staff, the experiences described are likely to be familiar to academics at similar institutions in other countries of the Inner or the Expanding Circle (to use the Kachruvian paradigm). Because much of the discussion in this study was based on self-report data, however, the usual caution should be exercised when drawing conclusions; the participants may be selective in what they choose to report and the veracity of much of the information is difficult to verify.

Personal testimonies from this group of EAL scholars generally support the view that an interplay of complex factors influences the degree of participation in global academic discourse communities. Developing an English language research profile implies significant effort and skill and it was considered by most to be the cornerstone of their successful international careers. Language competence is an important element, but access to resources and involvement in peer networks are also significant considerations. When selecting an outlet for their research, these academics make calculated choices, believing the journal's impact factor to influence their peers' reception of their work and determine the relative utility of their publication for their career aspirations. Publishing in low-prestige, locally based publication outlets was viewed as paying dividends, however, if it could result in stronger integration of the author into regional research networks.

The descriptions of professional literacy development provided by these academics underscore the importance for second language writers of recognising conventional structural patterns and lexical combinations in discipline-specific scholarly writing and developing an awareness of how these may be reformulated. Considering the ad hoc manner in which many writers develop their scholarly writing skills, a more systematic approach to developing such vital professional skills during postgraduate study (such as the programmes described by Cargill & O'Connor, 2006, or Swales, 1987) seems appropriate, particularly for EAL academics. The imperative for junior academics to become acquainted with the conventional nature of much discipline-specific writing needs to be balanced with awareness-raising of the often fine distinction between legitimate and transgressive textual borrowing practices (Pecorari & Shaw, 2012) and the implications that the latter might have (Y. Li, 2012a).

The participants' accounts of their drafting strategies and the examination of published texts have highlighted the importance of existing model texts for the crafting of new ones. When this intertextuality involves the reuse of extended passages, whether verbatim, with minor adjustments, or reshuffled, it raises a number of questions regarding journal publication procedures and ethics. Although some science journals have taken a position on the reuse of an author's own work without appropriate referencing of the source (e.g., Chabner, 2011), and have on occasion even withdrawn an article evidencing substantial self-plagiarism from its archives, data from this study and others (e.g., Bretag & Mahmud, 2009) suggest that the practice is tolerated by many reputable journals and is defended by some writers as involving *unoriginal* information. Future research could usefully shed light on the extent of language reuse in quality journals across different disciplines and the diversity of academics' beliefs and practices (as is indicated, for instance, in Sutherland-Smith, 2005, and Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). Such information could contribute to the much-needed formulation of guidelines for authors, educators, and literacy brokers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the constructive comments from *TESOL Quarterly* reviewers and Joseph Rega for his feedback on an earlier draft. I also thank Timor Alexandrov and Nora Schlenzig for assistance in locating some of the literature used in this study.

THE AUTHOR

Louisa Buckingham completed a PhD in linguistics at the University of Granada with a thesis on light verb constructions in Spanish academic writing. She has worked at universities in Bosnia, Turkey, and Oman, and has published work on light verb constructions, critical discourse analysis, and academic writing.

REFERENCES

Abasi, A. R. (2012). The pedagogical value of intercultural rhetoric: A report from a Persian-as-a-foreign-language classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*, 195–220. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.05.010

Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N., & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*, 102–117. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2006.05.001

Belcher, D. D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*(1), 1–22. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2006.12.001

Bitchener J., & Basturkmen, H. (2006). Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *5*, 4–18. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2005.10.002

Bretag, T., & Mahmud, S. (2009). Self-plagiarism or appropriate textual reuse? *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *7*, 193–205. doi:10.1007/s10805-009-9092-1

Burrough-Boenisch, J. (2003). Shapers of published NNS research articles. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*, 223–243. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00037-7

Calaresu, E. (2011). The declining status of Italian as a language of scientific communication and the issue of diglossia in scientific communities. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *210*, 93–108. doi:10.1515/IJSL.2011.032

Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). "Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication*, *13*, 435–472.

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. 233–248). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2006). Developing Chinese scientists' skills for publishing in English: Evaluating collaborating-colleague workshops based on genre analysis. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*, 207–221. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2006.07.002

Casanave, C. P. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 175–203.

Casanave, C. P., & Vandrick, S. (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in scholarly publication.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chabner, B. A. (2011). Editorial: Self-plagiarism. *The Oncologist, 16*, 1347–1348. doi:10.1634/theoncologist.2011-0312

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 3*(3), 171–193. doi:10.1207/s15327701jlie0303_1

Cho, S. (2004). Challenges of entering discourse communities through publishing in English: Perspectives of nonnative-speaking doctoral students in the United States of America. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 3*(1), 47–72. doi:10.1207/s15327701jlie0301_3

Cho, W. D. (2009). Science journal paper writing in an EFL context: The case of Korea. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*, 230–239. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2009.06.002

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

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2010). Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes, 29*, 281–295. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2010.06.002

Dong, Y. R. (1996). Learning how to use citations for knowledge transformation: Non-native doctoral students' dissertation writing in science. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30*, 428–457.

Dong, Y. R. (1998). Non-native graduate students' thesis/dissertation writing in science: Self-reports by students and their advisors from two U.S. institutions. *English for Specific Purposes, 17*, 369–390.

Eckel, E. J. (2010). Textual appropriation in engineering master's theses: A preliminary study. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 17*, 469–483. doi:10.1007/s11948-010-9214-6

Englander, K., & López Bonilla, G. (2011). Acknowledging or denying membership: Reviewers' responses to non-Anglophone scientists' manuscripts. *Discourse Studies, 13*, 395–416. doi:10.1177/1461445611403261

Fernández Polo, F. J., & Cal Varela, M. (2009). English for research purposes at the University of Santiago de Compostela: A survey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*, 152–164. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2009.05.003

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

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007a). Language reuse among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics, 28*, 440–465. doi:10.1093/applin/amm031

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007b). Plagiarism and second language writing in an electronic age. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 27*, 161–183. doi:10.1017/S0267190508070086

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*, 1–16. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2008.09.005

Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2009). Proofreading in a UK university: Proofreaders' beliefs, practices, and experiences. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 166–190. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2009.05.002

Harwood, N., & Petrić, B. (2012). Performance in the citing behavior of two student writers. *Written Communication, 29*(1), 55–103. doi:10.1177/0741088311424133

Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 181–209. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00015-8

Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarism, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*, 788–806.

Hull, G., & Rose, M. (1989). Rethinking remediation: Toward a socio-cognitive understanding of reading and writing. *Written Communication, 6*(2), 139–154.

International Committee for Medical Journal Editors. (2010). *Uniform requirements for manuscripts*. Retrieved from http://www.icmje.org/urm_main.html

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Jones, A. A., & Freeman, T. E. (2003). Imitation, copying, and the use of models: Report writing in an introductory physics course. *IEEE Transactions of Professional Communication, 46*(3), 168–184. doi:10.1109/TPC.2003.816790

Klöckner, L. (2012, October 17). Das plagiatoren-ranking [The ranking of plagiarists]. *Die Zeit*. Retrieved from http://www.zeit.de/

Li, J., & Schmitt, N. (2009). The acquisition of lexical phrases in academic writing: A longitudinal case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 85–102. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2009.02.001

Li, Y. (2006). 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. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2006.07.001

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*, 55–79.

Li, Y. (2012a). Text-based plagiarism in scientific publishing: Issues, developments and education. *Science and Engineering Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s11948-012-9367-6

Li, Y. (2012b). Text-based plagiarism in scientific writing: What Chinese supervisors think about copying and how to reduce it in students' writing. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 19*, 569–583. doi:10.1007/s11948-011-9342-7

Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication, 23*, 3–35. doi:10.1177/0741088305283754

Ljosland, R. (2007). English in Norwegian academia: A step towards diglossia? *World Englishes, 26*, 395–410.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 30–43. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002

Olsson, A., & Sheridan, V. (2012). A case study of Swedish scholars' experiences with and perceptions of the use of English in academic publishing. *Written Communication, 29*(1), 33–54. doi:10.1177/0741088311428566

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*, 317–345. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004

Pecorari, D. (2006). Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second language writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*, 4–29. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2005.04.00

Pecorari, D. (2008). Repeated language in academic discourse: The case of biology background statements. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 7*(3), 9–33.

Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 149–164. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.006

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 201–230.

Pérez-Llantada, C., Plo, R., & Ferguson, G. R. (2011). "You don't say what you know, only what you can": The perceptions and practices of senior Spanish academics regarding research dissemination in English. *English for Specific Purposes, 30*, 18–30. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2010.05.001

Petrić, B. (2005). Contrastive rhetoric in the writing classroom: A case study. *English for Specific Purposes, 24*, 213–228. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2004.09.001

Ritchie, J., Spencer, L., & O'Connor, W. (2003). Carrying out qualitative analysis. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 219–262). London, England: Sage.

Roig, M. (2010). Plagiarism and self-plagiarism: What every author should know. *Biochemia Medica, 20*, 295–300.

Shi, L., Wenyu, W., & Jinwei, X. (2005). Publication culture of foreign language education journals in China. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*, 765–776.

Simpson, J. M. (2000). Topical structure analysis of academic paragraphs in English and Spanish. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 293–309.

St. John, M. (1987). Writing processes of Spanish scientists publishing in English. *English for Specific Purposes, 6*, 113–120.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research. Grounded theory: Procedures and technique.* London, England: Sage.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*, 83–95. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2004.07.007

Swales, J. (1987). Utilizing the literatures in teaching the research paper. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 41–68.

Tarnow, E. (2002). Coauthorship in physics. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 8*, 175–190.

Williams, P., & Wagner, E. (2011). Exploring why and how journal editors retract articles: Findings from a qualitative study. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 19*(1), 1–11. doi:10.1007/s11948-011-9292-0

APPENDIX A

Interview Guide

1. How did you learn how to conduct and write up research of the standard that could be submitted to an international English language journal?
2. What challenges do you experience in writing up your research?
3. What are the most difficult parts of a paper to write?
4. Are you aware of any strategies you use to help you express yourself in academic English when writing up your research?
5. What sort of assistance have you had in preparing drafts for publication?
6. Can you tell me about your experience publishing in journals?
7. Can you tell me about times you were unsuccessful and why you think you were unsuccessful?
8. Are you a peer reviewer for a journal?
9. How could the university better support you as you undertake research and write it up for publication?

APPENDIX B

Matrix for the Categorisation of Themes

Due to considerations of space, this is an abbreviated framework. I have included only four themes within this category and two extracts each from the interviews for illustrative purposes.

Resource-related difficulties			
Bibliographical resources	**Lack of time**	**Equipment**	**Research students**
I need access to electronic resources; we didn't have this before. (MP1) Access to literature can be difficult; I need to ask colleagues at other universities sometimes. (BG2)	The administration are not collaborative when it comes to permitting short leave periods for research. (CS1) I am unable to focus on anything for a length of time; we are overloaded with little tasks. This is not a research university and they do not allow us time to actually do research. (CH4)	The laboratory facilities need to be improved. To do more research we need more chemicals and instruments (CH1) You need to establish a well-equipped laboratory. (CH3)	We need more research students to help with the work. (CH1) It is very difficult to do research with them [the students]. (CH4)