

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

以第二語言撰寫研究論文之負擔：分析臺灣學者之經驗

計畫類別：個別型計畫
計畫編號：MOST 105-2410-H-004-160-
執行期間：105年08月01日至106年07月31日
執行單位：國立政治大學外文中心

計畫主持人：謝思蕾

計畫參與人員：大專生-兼任助理：賴奕霖

報告附件：出席國際學術會議心得報告

中華民國 106 年 11 月 03 日

中文摘要：本計畫旨在以量化手法探究台灣的多語言學者以英文撰寫學術著作之負擔是否較以中文撰寫重。上述之負擔係依學者以第二語言撰寫時較以第一語言撰寫所增加之困難度、不滿意度及焦慮感而定 (Hanauer & Englander, 2011)。本研究採用量化手法複製 Hanauer與Englander (2011)及採用Duszak與Lewkowicz (2008) 先前研究製作的線上問卷。透過電子郵件邀請臺灣五所國立大學以及五所私立大學的1,822名人文及社會領域(HSS)和1,697名理、工及醫學領域(STEM + M)之教職員填寫此中英文線上問卷。236名受訪者中，75人在過去五年內以英文及中文向主要期刊提交了論文稿件，而得以回答在以英文撰寫研究著作時，相較於以中文撰寫之負擔。受訪者為助理教授、副教授、及教授，且在人社領域與理、工、醫學領域之分布相當平均。

本研究以成對樣本t檢定比較L1中文和L2英文出版所感知困難度、不滿意度和焦慮。其中量化的感知負擔L2較L1增加23.4%的困難度、9.4%的不滿意度以及22.7%的焦慮。此結果與Hanauer與Englander (2011) 以西班牙語為母語之科學家之研究一致，顯示以英文作為科學著作出版之第二語言具額外負擔，且可以為不同國家背景、不同語言背景之個人所感受。

依本研究之結果，使用英文撰寫學術文章的最常見原因是為了吸引特定讀者群，然而第二常見的原因是為了達到各科系之要求，即鼓勵學者在國際索引期刊發表論文之政策 (Chou, 2014; Sheridan, 2017)。上述兩大領域(人文社會及理、工、醫學)之學者向國際索引期刊 (IIJ) 提交了大約57%的論著之調查結果即可佐證此論點。此外，低於5%的受訪者認為使用英文寫作的的能力非發表論著的障礙，此意味著絕大多數受訪者認為以英文寫作為發表論著的障礙。

此項研究結果支持多語言學者在壓力下發表英文研究之經驗之質化及量化研究，特別是在國際索引期刊領域。具體而言，此顯示不同的語言和國家背景下，以第二語言出版科學論著者，其以英文寫作出版將增加負擔，而這種負擔係源自於語言之困難，而非學術寫作之挑戰 (Hyland, 2016)，為所謂之隱藏的語言不正義。由於本研究之對象包含人文社會領域及理、工、醫學領域之學者，研究之結果更強調此「負擔」乃源自於語言而非專業領域之不同。此研究成果亦探討語言特權之議題，並影響全球學術出版和國家高等教育政策，特別是對教師的評鑑和升等。以臺灣來說，這個研究在提供一個理由質疑“SSCI 症候群” (Chou, 2014) 和“引用文獻索引綜合症” (Sheridan, 2017) 的同時，亦透過國家引用指數繼續支持中文期刊。

中文關鍵詞：科學寫作，學術出版，研究文章，第二語言，第二語言寫作，困難度，語言不正義，負擔

英文摘要：The purpose of this project was to determine if multilingual researchers in Taiwan perceive a greater burden when writing for scholarly publication in English compared to Chinese. Burden was operationalized as additional difficulty, dissatisfaction, and anxiety when writing research in their L2 as compared to their L1 (Hanauer & Englander, 2011). This study utilized a

quantitative approach with an online questionnaire replicating Hanauer and Englander (2011) and adapting Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008). Email invitations to the English and Chinese online survey were sent to 1,822 humanities and social sciences (HSS) and 1,697 science, technology, engineering, and math, plus medicine (STEM+Med) faculty members at five national and five private universities around Taiwan. Of 236 respondents, 75 submitted manuscripts to major journals in both English and Chinese in the last five years, thereby qualifying to respond to questions eliciting perceived burden when writing research in English as compared to Chinese. They were assistant, associate, and full professors and split fairly evenly between HSS and STEM+Med disciplines. A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare perceived difficulty, dissatisfaction and anxiety in publishing in L1 Chinese and in L2 English. The perceived burden was quantified as generating 23.4% more difficulty, 9.4% more dissatisfaction, and 22.7% more anxiety. The results aligned with Hanauer and Englander's (2011) study of Spanish-speaking scientists, showing that writing English, as an L2 for scientific publication purposes, presents an added burden and can be experienced by individuals from different language backgrounds in different national contexts.

The most common reason for writing academic texts in English was to reach a specialized audience, but a close second was to meet department requirements, which ostensibly refers to institutional policies that encourage publishing in internationally indexed journals (IIJs) (Chou, 2014; Sheridan, 2017). This is supported by results showing both disciplinary groups have submitted about 57% of their manuscripts to IIJs. Less than 5% of respondents felt their ability to write in English was not a barrier to publishing their research, meaning the majority of respondents do view writing in English as a barrier. The results support qualitative and quantitative research into the experiences of multilingual scholars, who are under pressure to publish research in English, especially in IIJs. It shows that L2 science writers in different linguistic and national contexts can experience added burden when writing in English for publication and that this burden is derived from linguistic difficulties and not just the challenges of scholarly writing (Hyland, 2016), an argument that masks linguistic injustice (Hanauer & Englander, 2013). Because the current study included HSS and STEM+Medical researchers, it emphasizes that burden is tied to linguistic issues rather than disciplinary

differences. The findings raise issues of linguistic privilege and have implications for global academic publishing and national higher education policies, especially governing faculty evaluation and promotion. For Taiwan, in particular, the study provides another reason to question “SSCI syndrome” (Chou, 2014) and the “citation index complex” (Sheridan, 2017), while continuing to support Chinese language journals through national citation indexes.

英文關鍵詞： science writing, scholarly publishing, research article, second language, second language writing, difficulty, linguistic injustice, burden

The Burden of Writing Research Articles in a Second Language:
Data from Taiwanese Scholars

Globalization has existed over centuries in different forms, but began in earnest in the modern era with technological developments that started to make the world a smaller place. Contemporary globalization is described as a further intensification of the flow of information, technology, and goods since the 1980s (Eriksen, 2007; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999; Wallerstein, 2004). Similarly, higher education (HE) has been infused by international networks for decades, if not centuries (Altbach, 2004/2013). However, with the spread of neoliberal policies (Chou, Lin, & Chiu, 2013), the globalization of higher education has led to privatization, commodification, and marketization of universities around the world, especially since the 2000s (Englander & Uzuner-Smith, 2013; Mok, 2007). Under these conditions, academia in peripheral contexts has adopted norms from the dominant Anglophone center countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom, through government and institutional policies related to knowledge production and dissemination (Lillis, 2012; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Sheridan, 2015). In this process, English has become the assumed lingua franca of science and scholarly publishing has become a globalized phenomenon that affects scientists on national, institutional, and individual levels (Englander, 2011; Lillis & Curry, 2010).

Higher education globalization has affected the type of research that is conducted on what issues for whom, and most important to the current study, it has influenced the language that scientists use for publication. Because of government policies aimed at raising institutional competitiveness through worldwide rankings, it is common for multilingual scholars, who use English as a foreign language, to be impelled to publish in Anglophone journals listed in bibliographic indexes such as Science Citation Index (SCI), Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) or Arts and Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI), which are included in Thomson Reuters'¹ Web of Science (WoS) (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Delgado, 2011; Lawrick, 2011; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Mok, 2000). This has also complicated decisions researchers make regarding research topics (Mok, 2007) and publishing outlets (Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Lillis & Curry, 2013). Because of the preferred scope of most center-based journals, research on local issues of importance to national contexts is affected (Lillis & Curry, 2010, 2013). Even when the results are of vital importance to that context, they may be considered valuable only if published in Anglophone center journals, which may be inaccessible, due to linguistic, economic, and logistical barriers, to the people who would benefit most from the results (Mok, 2007). These conditions have been challenged in different ways. For example, Li and Flowerdew (2009) found that scholars in Hong Kong published in English *and* Chinese to reach their local audiences. In Taiwan, there has been concerted faculty lobbying to dislodge the near obsession with SSCI ranked journals (Chou, 2014a; Chou et al., 2013; Min, 2014) While we acknowledge this fundamental problem, we also recognize that, especially for newly hired faculty at universities,

¹ Eugene Garfield founded the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) in the 1950s. ISI was later taken over by Thomson Reuters and in 2016 was bought by Clarivate Analytics.

not only in Taiwan, but Korea (Lee & Lee, 2013), Turkey and Mexico (Englander & Uzuner-Smith, 2013), Russia (Lawrick, 2011), and South Africa (Soudien, 2014), to just name just one on each continent, publishing internationally in English still presents practical concerns. Therefore, like Hanauer and Englander (2013), Flowerdew (2007), and Sheridan (2015), we adopt a critical pragmatic (Harwood & Hadley, 2004) stance in this research.

Taiwan shares many HE effects of globalization with other countries, but has a unique historical background. After 38 years, martial law was lifted in 1987 and Taiwan began a series of socio-political reforms that included the University Act of 1994. Aside from changes in funding and governance structures, establishment of higher education institutes (HEIs) was increased as the economy modernized and society democratized (Mok, 2000). The dramatic growth in the number of universities from 105 in 1986 to peak at 163 in 2006 (Ministry of Education, 2013; Shen & Chang, 2010) began to outpace budget outlays (Chang, Wu, Ching, & Tang, 2009). Funding had been evenly distributed to public universities based on student enrollment, but in 2000 up to 20 percent shifted to a competitive model based on institutional evaluations (ranking) and proposals submitted by universities, which tended to favor technology universities (Chang et al., 2009).

In 2003, the Ministry of Education published a controversial report ranking universities according to the number of papers faculty from each published in journals listed in the WoS (A. H.-m. Huang, 2009; J. Huang, 2003). This in turn further raised evaluation and promotion criteria, especially in terms of research output of university faculty (Ministry of Education, 2009). These developments have impacted hiring practices, faculty evaluation, and tenure and promotion review (Ching, 2014). As a result, faculty in Taiwan, the vast majority of whom learned Taiwanese or Chinese as a first and/or second language and English is a second or third language, have come under tremendous pressure to publish in English, with internationally indexed journals as the ultimate goal (Liu, 2014).

Lillis and Curry (2016) identified disciplinarity, especially the different situations of scholars in the natural sciences compared to social sciences, as a factor contributing to the pressure of and their response to the dominance and privileging of English in scholarly publishing. In Taiwan, it appears that these conditions have been received differently in the two main disciplinary areas—STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) plus medicine (STEM+M), and humanities and social sciences (HSS). When the “I-type” ranking regime was initiated, science and engineering universities fared best because their faculties had already been publishing in English internationally for some time (J. Huang, 2003) and they continue to focus on SCI journals (J. C. Huang, 2010). Scholars in the social sciences and especially in the humanities were at a disadvantage because their research interests are traditionally more focused on national and local questions, which they may address in the local standard written language, Chinese, more than English, such as Polish scholars (Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008). This presented much less opportunity to publish in the Anglophone center and indexed journals. Furthermore, based on initial results from my current MOST-funded project, scholars in HSS disciplines tend to believe that it is easier for natural scientists to publish in English because

research papers are shorter and are more focused on reporting experimental quantitative results rather than exploring questions through historical, theoretical, and qualitative investigations.

To address the deficit between prestige of natural sciences publications, which have been published in international indexes in higher numbers, and HSS research, and because Taiwan-based journals were not included in Mainland China databases, the National Science Council, renamed the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) in 2014, established the Taiwan Social Science Citation Index (TSSCI) and the Taiwan Humanities Citation Index Core (THCI-C) in 2004 and 2008, respectively (Chen, 2004; Sheridan, 2014). A separate journal indexing system including all Taiwan-based journals, the Taiwan Citation Index (TCI) was also established by a commercial publisher, *Aritri* (Chiu, personal communication). The three were then combined at the end of 2015 (RIHSS, 2015) into one ranking system, and “B” level journals were invited to apply for THCI Core or TSSCI membership. The THCI Core has since been renamed THCI and includes “A” ranked journals.

The citation indexes have been attributed to raising the quality and prestige of some national HSS journals so that research conducted in Taiwan has respected venues and publishing in the indexed journals can be helpful to a researcher’s evaluations or promotion (Sheridan, 2015), results of my previous MOST-funded study indicate that, at least from researchers’ perspectives, institutional policies still tend to favor journals in the WoS indexes (Sheridan, 2017). Despite a faculty campaign against “SSCI Syndrome” (Chou et al., 2013; Min, 2014) and an open letter from the Ministry of Education stating the intension to reevaluate the quantitative evaluation policies (Ministry of Education, 2014), similar to the applied linguists in Min’s study, my current I found that scholars are most concerned with publishing in English in SSCI journals. However, a few studies on Taiwan-based academics in a wide variety of disciplines, including STEM fields, indicates that they face serious challenges as L2 English writers due to language issues, research focus and scope, and the revision process, among other problems (J. C. Huang, 2010, 2011; Liu, 2014; Min, 2014; Su, 2014). In addition, these studies show that there is a critical awareness of the dominance and privileging of English in international scholarship and the higher education system in general. On the other hand, of the 58 THCI Core and 101 TSSCI journals in 2014, the most recent list, only 14 regularly publish full original research articles in English, indicating a substantial amount of Chinese scholarship is produced in Taiwan. In conclusion, researchers in Taiwan publish in Chinese and English and they experience various difficulties publishing in English, especially in high status journals. However, it is not empirically known how frequently Taiwanese researchers publish in each language in domestic versus “international” journals, how these experiences compare in terms of their relative burden.

Purpose of the Study

Therefore, to address this gap, for the proposed study, Hanauer and I will replicate Hanauer and Englander (2011) in the Taiwan context. In a quantitative questionnaire study conducted in Mexico, they drew on previous research on multilingual researchers’ experiences using English for journal articles to conceptualize the L2 writers’ burden of writing scientific

articles in English “in relation to the self-evaluation of difficulty, anxiety, and satisfaction” (2013, p. 61) compared to their experiences when writing in their L1, Spanish. In this way, they isolated the language aspect of L2 writers writing for publication experiences to challenge the “disciplinary argument [which] proposes that it is the conventions of scientific writing itself rather than language that poses the main difficulty for all scientists” (2011, p. 406). Their results, based on 148 returned surveys from scientists in a range of disciplines, showed that “the experience of writing scientific research articles in a second language is significantly different from the experience of writing in a first language and that this involves an additional burden on the second-language scientist” (p. 410). Furthermore, for the 148 Mexican scientists that completed the questionnaire, the burden was “quantified as consisting of a 24% increase in perceived difficulty, an 11% increase in dissatisfaction, and a 21% increase in anxiety.”

As noted in the background section, studies on Taiwanese researchers have established that language and other issues are a major impediment to publishing internationally in English; however, to what degree this is the case over a broad variety of disciplines has not been investigated in Taiwan. Therefore, the objectives of this study were to determine Taiwanese scientists’ journal publication preferences in terms of language and venue, and then to quantitatively determine their “relative, perceived burden of writing research articles in English as a second language” (Hanauer & Englander, 2011). This was accomplished by replicating Hanauer and Englander’s quantitative survey study among humanities and social sciences, and STEM and medicine researchers in Taiwan.

Significance

By replicating and extending Hanauer and Englander’s (2011) study in Taiwan, this project investigates Taiwanese researchers’ publishing activities, challenges, and needs at a broad quantitative level crossing disciplines at public and private universities.

Relevant Literature

According to (Lillis & Curry, 2016), research on “academic writing for publication in a multilingual world” has been developing over three decades from four research traditions: English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Second Language Writing (SLW), Contrastive Rhetoric/Intercultural Rhetoric, and Ethnographic Approaches. This proposed study develops from the first two and aims to make a contribution to this body of research through a survey.

The theoretical stance of this research is based on the concept that writing is a social practice. In particular, it takes:

1. A *theoretical position* on writing which states that writing cannot and should not be viewed as separate from contexts of use and users.
2. An *empirical position* which states that texts, uses and users need to be the subjects of empirical research rather than being driven by *a priori* assumptions and value positions (Lillis 2013: 16). (Lillis & Curry)

In her review of 39 articles on multilingual scholars and academic publishing since the

mid-1980s, Uzuner (2008) showed that the primary concern in the research has been centered on issues multilingual scholars face when trying to publish articles in English in “international” journals of the Anglophone “center” of scholarly publishing. Since Uzuner’s review article, research on scholarly publishing and multilingual scientists’ involvement with it has continued to grow in many regional contexts such as southern and eastern Europe (eg. Curry & Lillis, 2014; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008), Russia (eg. Lawrick, 2011), Latin America (eg. Delgado, 2011; Englander, 2011; Hanauer & Englander, 2013), and Asia (eg. Lee & Lee, 2013; Mayumi, 2014)—especially, China (eg. Feng, Beckett, & Huang, 2013; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Ge, 2015), Hong Kong (eg. Li & Flowerdew, 2009), and Taiwan (eg. J. C. Huang, 2010, 2011; Liu, 2014; Min, 2014; Sheridan, 2015). In addition, new themes have emerged, such as broader issues of the effect of power dynamics of institutional ranking systems on scholars and publishing (Chou, 2014b; Lillis & Curry, 2013; Mayumi, 2014; Soudien, 2014) and how this affects journal publishing in peripheral contexts (Labassi, 2009; Lillis, 2012; Lundin, Jönsson, Kreiner, & Tienari, 2010; Sheridan, 2015). Because the conditions predicating these studies are often based on institutional reactions to globalization, the following review will first explore the impact of globalization on higher education institutes (HEIs) and why this has brought about an emphasis on “international” (Anglophone WoS) publications as ideal outlets for knowledge generated by their faculties, especially in the Taiwan context. It will then consider recent research that has used large-scale questionnaires and in-depth interviews to gather perspectives of multilingual scholars on the periphery regarding their publication choices and experiences of using English as an L2 in scientific writing. These studies provide perspective on the proposed project.

International scholarly publishing pressure

The policies adopted by institutions in the face of globalization-induced competition for world-class universities have exacerbated the tendency to equate “international” and “English” as automatically better than “national” and “local” journals and languages (Englander & Uzuner-Smith, 2013). Mok (2007) noted the ironic situation when studies of greatest concern to local audiences, which could reach more readers who could benefit from the knowledge through local languages or publications, are only considered “high-quality and high-impact” (p. 446) if published in “international” journals listed in SCI or SSCI. Globalization induced national policies have affected institutional policies (Chang, Wu, Ching, & Tang, 2009; Mok, 2000) and individual scholars (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Englander & Uzuner-Smith, 2013; Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Liu, 2014). The resulting effects at the national, institutional, and individual levels seem to be affected by several factors.

According to Salager-Meyer’s (2008) assessment of “macro bibliometric and scientometric” research “...there is a strong association between scientific research output and national wealth distribution across the world” (p. 122). Related to this condition, Lillis and Curry (2010) described the relationship between research and development (R&D) spending in various countries to the percentage of article output and number published in Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) (now known as Thomson Reuters Web of Science) journals and showed that

the countries or regions with greater R&D investment have relatively more active journals and research output (p. 14-15). Taiwan's Gross Expenditures on Research and Development (GERD) had been growing in recent years from 2.93% in 2009 to 3.01 in 2013 (MOST, 2014). While in actual R&D, the United States invests the largest chunk, 31% of the world total, its GERD has been decreasing for a number of years down to 2.70 in 2012 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012). In 2013 it was up slightly to 2.73%. GERD in the U.K. was 1.85% in 2009 and has steadily fallen to 1.67 in 2013. However, China's GERD was 1.70% and Mexico's was only .37% in 2009, but has increased since, and by 2013 stood at 2.08 and .50 respectively (MOST). This shows that for a small nation, Taiwan invests relatively heavily in research and development. This level of investment may help explain the programs and policies related to the "publish or perish" conditions for Taiwan-based scientists in that since the government is investing in research activity, it expects the recipients of the funding to produce knowledge through publications that can be quantitatively assessed.

In order to encourage this publication activity to raise their universities' international rankings, countries such as Mexico and Turkey (Englander & Uzuner-Smith, 2013) and Hungary, Slovakia, and Spain (Curry & Lillis, 2004) have established faculty evaluation systems focused on quantitative measures of research output through "carrot and stick" policies. Likewise, in Taiwan, after the Ministry of Education very publicly began ranking universities based on faculty research output in "I-type" journals, those listed in Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge (J. Huang, 2003), universities responded by increasing research publication requirements for performance review and promotion along with awards systems based on journal status. Then, similar to moves in Japan, Korea, China and other countries in Asia (Mok, 2007), the Ministry of Education in Taiwan initiated the "Plan to Develop First-Class Universities and Top-level Research Centers" (PDFURC) worth 50 billion New Taiwan Dollars or about US\$1.64 billion in 2006 (Chang et al., 2009). Twelve HEIs were allotted different sums of the budget based on how "promising" they appeared to the committee. Franzoni, Scellato, and Stephan (2011) reported that countries that have provided cash incentives to researchers to publish internationally have increased their presence in prestigious journals like Science. PDFURC funding has been much more extensive than just cash incentives for publication successes. However, Chang et al. found while the universities that received funding in the first year of the program did all increase the number of publications in ISI journals and improved other internationalization indicators, the amount of funding received did not determine their performance efficiency. For example, National Taiwan University (NTU) received ten times as much funding as National Chengchi University (NCCU), but NCCU outperformed NTU in the researchers' efficiency scale in meeting development goals. They concluded that providing more funding does not necessarily lead to better results. It appears that researchers in Taiwan are relatively well supported compared to "peripheral" scholars in underdeveloped areas (Canagarajah, 2003; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Labassi, 2009). However, academics' perceptions of the campaign for world-class universities, which in 2011 was renamed "Heading Toward Top Universities" (Ministry of Education, 2013), have not been all positive and it and

other policies it has inspired now affect Taiwan-based scholars' decisions regarding language of research articles and where to submit manuscripts for publication. This will be discussed further in the next section.

Perceptions of English in scholarly publishing beyond the Anglophone center

Because the proposed study is concerned with the choices Taiwanese researchers make regarding language of publication and issues related to writing for publication in English as an L2, related studies published since Uzuner (2008) will be reviewed. In addition, it will focus on research that employed relatively large-scale questionnaire studies or questionnaires with in-depth individual interviews in order to inform the proposed study. These studies tend to focus on attitudes of using English and what factors seem to help or hinder their success of publishing in internationally indexed journals.

In the study after which the current study is modeled, Hanauer and Englander (2011, 2013), distributed an online questionnaire to scientists at two institutions in Mexico and used descriptive and inferential statistics to show the degree to which 148 Spanish-speaking scientists in Mexico felt writing an article in English was a greater burden than when writing in Spanish. A qualitative study followed comprising in-depth interviews with 16 researchers and document analysis of their educational and professional trajectories and publications (2013). They found that the burden scholars felt in writing for publication in English was highest among junior faculty at a research university and lowest among senior faculty at a research institute. This indicates that educational and professional experience, as well as type of institution where they studied and work, may be related to the language scholars were likely to use and in which type of journal they would publish articles.

Ferguson, PÉRez-Llantada, and Plo (2011), conducted a survey study at a university in Spain to investigate faculty attitudes regarding the dominance of English in publishing in terms of advantage or disadvantage. Their data included returned surveys from 300 faculty in various disciplines and levels of experience. They found that researchers believed native English speakers (NES) had an advantage in scholarly publishing, but did not necessarily view this as an *unfair* advantage. Those who self-identified as having higher English writing proficiency were less likely to feel disadvantaged vis-à-vis native English speaker scientists. In their study, English proficiency was a stronger indicator for feeling of advantage/disadvantage than discipline or seniority. Pérez-Llantada, Plo, and Ferguson (2011) followed their survey study with a qualitative project in which they interviewed ten researchers from natural and social sciences. Their main finding was that the participants exhibited a sense of “pragmatic resignation” (p. 28) in regards to the dominance of English in scholarly publishing.

In another multi-method study, Lawrick (2011) studied the academic publishing environment in Russia through policy developments, gathered surveys from 421 researchers from various disciplines in 22 public universities, and then interviewed five from different disciplines. She found that English was seen as a “tool” to accomplish academic activity and that awareness of the need to use English for publication was on the rise. However, the concurrent

and resilient need to publish in Russian meant that many publish in both languages.

Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008) surveyed Polish researchers from a variety of natural and social sciences, receiving 99 completed questionnaires. They found that their respondents also faced pressure to publish internationally in English while still contributing knowledge in their local language. They maintain that deciding which language to use for publication is a complicated issue for Polish academics as language choice is wrapped up in social conditions and ideology, which is similar to what Lillis (2012) found in Hungary, Spain, Slovakia, and Portugal. Duszak and Lewkowicz's respondents perceived language ability as an issue. Of those who had papers rejected by international Anglophone journals, 30 percent said it was because of "language problems" (p. 113). Other reasons mentioned were related to topic and journal scope issues. Even more Polish researchers, 59%, claimed they have trouble with English in general, while 18 percent reported having trouble with written academic English specifically. Overall, they found that younger scientists were as, or more, likely to be successful publishing in English, ostensibly because they have had more contact with and education in English than more experienced scholars, which challenged (Swales, 2004) idea that publishing experience is a major indicator of international publishing success.

Min (2014) conducted a smaller scale study based on Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008) in Taiwan. She studied surveys completed by 38 Taiwan-based NNES applied linguistics scholars to understand their perceptions of experiences publishing in Anglophone-center journals. Respondents included associate, assistant, and full professors, of which most had received PhDs in the US. The top three issues related to their challenges publishing in center journals were "language, topic, and perceived bias" (p. 190) of reviewers and editors. The "publication dilemma" (p. 190) of the researchers was generally how to conduct research from a peripheral context and write articles in a way that satisfies gatekeepers in the center. This is similar to what Liu (2014) discovered from five researchers through studying reviewers' comments on their articles and in-depth individual interviews. Liu concluded that "English proficiency and academic literacy are the most salient problems encountered by NNES/EIL scholars" (p. 124).

Effects of "SSCI Syndrome"

Contributors to the (2014b) edited volume about the "SSCI Syndrome" in Taiwan challenged the institutionally dominant view of the necessity that Taiwan-based humanities and social science scholars contribute to the international conversation of their disciplines and that the most valuable place to do that is in the "3-I" journals (Wu & Bristow, 2014), meaning those included in the SCI, SSCI, and A&HCI. Several studies showed the influence of international benchmarking mentality in nearly all evaluative situations in general (Chan & Lee, 2014; Mok, 2014) or especially for the job hunt, promotion, regular evaluation, and grant applications (Ching, 2014). Chan and Lee (2014) described the "unwritten standards for research performance that exist ... in the minds of evaluators" (p. 44), which put English over Chinese publication, internationally indexed journals over national journals, TSSCI and THCI Core journals over THCI database and conference proceedings, and even national level science ministry grants fund

over funding from other ministries or industry. According to Liu (2014), “One significant impact of SSCI [syndrome] is that English has become the language used for intellectual discussions not only in the international journals but also in the local journals. Moreover, the push for English publications poses a major challenge to Taiwan-based researchers who use English as a foreign language (Liu, 2014), but especially to those who received their advanced degree in Taiwan, not in an Anglophone country (Su, 2014). In her conclusion (Su) maintained:

...the “I”-orientated evaluation incurs grave impacts on higher education in several aspects, ranging from academic discrimination of locality/nativism, academic inferiority in the place of the global academic world, and partial development of Taiwanese academic research, all of which derive from language constraints and readership problems, to degrading local journals to a consequence of the latent threat of the academic colonization of the native English speaking countries. p. 74

Privileging of internationally indexed journals in Taiwan

Min (2014) identified two ways that applied linguists in Taiwan have dealt with this issue. She claimed that 68% took a pragmatic approach in order to meet institutional expectations while others have challenged the conditions. Min called for governments to “mandate a reexamination of research evaluation systems at local universities” (p. 196) and for journal editors and reviewers to be more open to varieties of English as a lingua franca and research topics from beyond their immediate environment. While there has been some movement towards the former, respondents in (Sheridan, 2017) have expressed doubt that SSCI publications carry any less weight than before. The insecurity seems to revolve around the “unspoken rules” among evaluators. However, I have found that some researchers *want* to publish internationally in order to be part of the broader conversation in their field, but find it daunting. Considering the challenges mentioned above, scholars need support to reach their publishing goals other than relaxed evaluation policies and journal editors who are more accepting of varieties of English as a lingua franca. Changes at the editorial level are needed, but as (Ferguson et al., 2011) pointed out, there are things that can be done more immediately to “encourage the appropriation of English” (p. 55). After all, the current conditions are affecting the immediate job prospects and security of scholars all around the world. Besides, as Hanauer and Englander stated, “the writing of research articles in English should not be a barrier to the generation of new scientific knowledge across the world” (2013, p. 135). Next I will outline some of the interventions that have been suggested in the studies reviewed above.

Ferguson et al. (2011) cited Benfield and Feak (2006) to suggest that journals can play a part in this endeavor, however, by providing “more extensive language review and advisory services than is currently customary” (p. 55) to help alleviate language issues in manuscripts before sending them out for review. In addition, it is suggested that more peer reviewers and editorial committee members should be non-native English speakers (NNEs). There are likely many concerns and challenges to such a proposal, but these are beyond the scope of the current review. They then suggest that the universities “play their part in alleviating linguistic

disadvantage” (p. 55) through providing funding for services of “language brokers” (Lillis & Curry, 2010) and academic writing courses.

Hanauer and Englander (2013) recognized that scientists are not an “undifferentiated, homogenous group” (p. 134). Therefore, while their proposals for administrative and educational support of Mexican scientists can be applied to other non-center non-Anglophone contexts, the experience and knowledge scientists bring must be acknowledged and incorporated into any interventions. They then proposed a range of practical proposals for academic writing education from the beginning of tertiary education through post-doctoral level scientists continuing through all stages in scientists’ academic careers based on need. This should come from those with expertise in advance literacy and disciplinary knowledge. It can be provided in various settings from classroom situations to writing groups to individual mentoring.

Research Questions

1. Does the experience of writing a research article in English as a second language involve the perception of increased degree of burden when compared with the experience of first language science writing?
 - a. To what degree is writing a scientific article in English as a second language perceived to be more difficult than writing a scientific article in a first language?
 - b. To what degree does writing a scientific article in English as a second language generate more dissatisfaction than writing a scientific article in a first language?
 - c. To what degree does writing a scientific article in English as a second language generate more anxiety than writing a scientific article in a first language?

Methodology

We used a quantitative survey design to replicate Hanauer and Englander (2011) in order to “quantify the perceived burden of writing science in English as a second language” (p. 407). The first part of the survey used Hanauer and Englander’s survey and the second part adapted Duszak and Lewkowicz’s (2008) to gain further understanding of English publishing experiences and perspectives. The main difference in the current study iteration from Hanauer and Englander was the incorporation of Duszak and Lewkowicz’s survey and that participants were Taiwanese whose first written language is Mandarin Chinese (Traditional characters) rather than Mexican Spanish L1 participants.

Rationale of Participant Recruitment

Hanauer and Englander (2011) focused their study on natural sciences researchers, but this study distributed the online questionnaire to two broad disciplinary areas: humanities and social sciences, and STEM and medicine. Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008) and Ferguson et al. (2011) both surveyed researchers in the social sciences and natural sciences or medicine because

they wanted to test the often-mentioned sense that the latter two have been “used to” publishing in the Anglophone world already for some time, and therefore would experience less difficulty or disadvantage than social sciences. As mentioned in the introduction section of this proposal, this perception also exists in Taiwan. Duszak and Lewkowicz also noted that the social sciences are “fields [that] naturally invite localization and make communication in English an ideological choice” as opposed to medicine, a field not steeped in “culture” (p. 111). This condition may also apply to the Taiwan context. On the other hand, the push to publish in English has recently been spreading to the humanities in China (Flowerdew & Li, 2009), which may also be the case in Taiwan. While the existence of these conditions in Taiwan makes sense, this study addressed them empirically by recruiting participants from as wide of a disciplinary spectrum as possible. Another factor that has been of interest in previous studies is the relationships among the amount of research experience, rank, and/or seniority and type of institution and publication success. Hanauer and Englander (2011) surveyed researchers at a university and research institution. Therefore, the survey for this study was sent to researchers from a broad range of disciplines at both national and private universities because the former pose a relatively heavier research mandate on their faculty than private universities (Sheridan, 2017).

Recruitment. We first compiled a database of deans at one national and one private university in Taiwan. Following Internal Review Board for Ethical Research protocol approval, we sent emails to the deans of colleges to request assistance with distributing the email with the link to the online survey. Because there was little response to this effort we sent emails deans at one more national and one more private university. As there were only three responses to the survey two weeks after this effort, from university websites, we gathered email addresses of faculty members from a cross-section of colleges at an additional five national and five private universities. In total, emails were sent to 1,822 HSS and 1,697 STEM+M faculty members. From these, there were 236 responses for a response rate of 7%. Of the 236, 199 completed questions related to publishing preferences and demographic information and 69 indicated they had submitted articles written in both English and Chinese to a major journal, thereby qualifying to respond to the six questions related to the burden of writing research in English and questions about language-related issues in publishing.

Ethical considerations. Participation in this questionnaire was completely voluntary and participants’ identities were protected; respondents’ names nor institutions’ names were collected. They were free to quit the questionnaire and have their recorded answers deleted at any point in the survey. An informed voluntary consent form was shown on the first view of the Qualtrics survey. Participants were asked to “click agree” in order to indicate their voluntary consent to begin the questionnaire.

Tool

In this study, burden was conceptualized as “self-perceived difficulty, anxiety, and dissatisfaction” (p. 407). By setting up parallel questions regarding each of these aspects of burden, the survey, which had been validated (Hanauer & Englander, 2011), makes it possible to quantify the perceived differences of difficulty, dissatisfaction, and anxiety in L1 and L2

academic writing. The six questions, in the current study, with Spanish changed to Chinese were:

1. On the scale below, rank the degree to which you find it *easy or difficult* to write a scientific article in **Chinese** for a major journal.
Very Easy | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Very Difficult
2. On the scale below, rank the degree to which you find it *easy or difficult* to write a scientific article in **English** for a major journal.
Very Easy | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Very Difficult
3. On the scale below, rank the degree to which you are *satisfied or dissatisfied* that your writing in **Chinese** conveys the scientific research that you have conducted.
Very Satisfied | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Very Dissatisfied
4. On the scale below, rank the degree to which you are *satisfied or dissatisfied* that your writing in **English** conveys the scientific research that you have conducted.
Very Satisfied | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Very Dissatisfied
5. On the scale below, rate the degree to which writing a scientific article in **Chinese** for a major journal causes you to feel *anxiety*.
Not at all Anxious | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Very Anxious
6. On the scale below, rate the degree to which writing a scientific article in **English** for a major journal causes you to feel *anxiety*.
Not at all Anxious | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Very Anxious

The survey was created in English, translated into Chinese, and reconfigured for online access (Appendix).

Results

I will first report demographic data of the survey to situate the study among all respondents. The data showed that these Taiwanese researchers are writing in English much more than in Chinese. Besides the 75 who reported submitting both English and Chinese manuscripts to a major journal in the last five years, even more respondents (N=89) have submitted *only* English manuscripts. Of the 199 respondents, over 80% are writing research in English, while only 12% have submitted only Chinese manuscripts and less than 9% have not submitted in either language (Table 1).

Table 1

Language/s of publication submission in the last five years of full sample. (N=199)

Chinese	English	N	Valid Percent
No	Yes	89	44.7
Yes	Yes	69	34.7
Yes	No	24	12.1
No	No	17	8.5

This report focuses on the results related to the relative burden on scientists when writing English as an L2 compared to their L1 Chinese through self-reported data from 75 respondents (69 completed burden questions). About two-thirds are men and nearly 75% are over 45 years old (Table 2). These numbers are similar to the entire sample of 199 (Table 2).

Table 2
Gender and age of respondents (N=69)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Male	47	68.1
Female	22	31.9
22 – 35	1	1.4
36 – 45	17	21.8
46 – 55	29	42.0
56 – 65	22	31.9
66 +	0	0

Table 3
Gender and age of respondents (N=199)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Male	130	65.3
Female	69	34.7
22 – 35	5	2.5
36 – 45	49	24.6
46 – 55	83	41.7
56 – 65	61	30.7
66 +	1	0.5

All respondents in this (English and Chinese) group are PhD holders and over half are full professors. Furthermore, over 72% are faculty at national universities (Tables 4). These numbers are similar to the sample overall, although the percentage of full professors is higher.

Table 4
Education, rank, and institution type of respondents (N=69)

	Frequency	Percent
MA	0	0
PhD	69	100
Instructor/Lecturer	0	0
Assistant Professor	12	17.4
Associate Professor	18	26.1
Full Professor	38	55.1
Other	1	1.4
Public/National university	50	72.5
Private university	18	26.1
Other institution type	1	1.4

Table 5
Education, rank, and institution type of respondents (N=199)

	Frequency	Percent
MA	1	0.5
PhD	198	99.5
Instructor/Lecturer	1	0.5
Assistant Professor	40	20.1
Associate Professor	66	33.2
Full Professor	90	45.2
Other	2	1
Public/National university	144	72.4
Private university	53	26.6
Other institution type	2	1

This group is generally composed of experienced and senior scholars, who are likely

expected to publish their research in “international” journals because of their affiliation with national universities. While the most-mentioned first reason for publishing in English was to reach a specialist audience (n=21), the second was to fulfill requirements of department (n=19). These requirements most likely refer to promotion and evaluation policies that tend to emphasize publications in “international” indexed journals (Sheridan, 2017). Table 6 shows the types of publications that respondents submitted their manuscripts to over the last five years. In both broad categories, HSS and STEM+Med, respondents most often submitted of their English publications to “international” indexed journals. However, when dealing with Chinese scientific writing, the latter most often submitted manuscripts for book publishing, while the former still focused on IIJs.

Table 6

Publications submitted to in English (E) and Chinese (C) by two disciplinary categories (N=75)

Publication type	HSS				STEM + Med			
	E	E Avg.	C	C Avg.	E	E Avg.	C	C Avg.
Books	1	1.45	8	10.26	1	3.57	5	22.73
Book Chapters	15	21.74	22	28.21	2	7.14	3	13.64
Taiwan-based not TSSCI/THCI	3	4.35	5	6.41	2	7.14	4	18.18
TSSCI/THCI	5	7.25	4	5.13	1	3.57	1	4.55
Taiwan-based IIJs*	4	5.80	0	0.00	5	17.86	2	9.09
IIJs (Not Taiwan-based)	39	56.52	33	42.31	16	57.14	3	13.64
Book Reviews	1	1.45	6	7.69	0	0.00	2	9.09
None	1	1.45	0	0.00	1	3.57	2	9.09
Total	69	100	78	100	28	100	22	100

* Indicates internationally indexed journals, usually included in citation indexes such as Engineering Index (EI), Social Science Citation Index (SSCI), or Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI).

Difficulty, Dissatisfaction, and Anxiety

The purpose of this study was to replicate Hanauer and Englander (2013) to quantify the burden that L2 English scholarly writers in Taiwan perceived when writing in English for publication. Following Hanauer and Englander, burden was “seen as consisting of three related but different components: self-perceived difficulty, anxiety, and dissatisfaction” (p. 407). A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare perceived difficulty, dissatisfaction and anxiety in publishing in L1 Chinese and in L2 English. The results show that perceived burden can be quantified as generating 23.4% more difficulty, 9.4% more dissatisfaction, and 22.7% more anxiety.

In order to further explore these descriptive results, inferential statistics were used to

establish whether the differences between the ratings for the L1 and L2 science writing were systematic. Since the design of the survey involved the same participants providing ratings on their L1 (Mandarin Chinese) and L2 (English) science writing, a series of paired t-tests were conducted. Six paired-samples t-tests were conducted to compare perceived difficulty, dissatisfaction and anxiety in publishing in L1 Chinese and in L2 English for the Taiwanese researchers. For the Taiwanese researchers, there was a significant difference in the scores for difficulty [Chinese M= 2.9 SD=1.87; English M=4.55, SD=1.49; $t(75)=-8.03$, $p=.0001$], for dissatisfaction [Chinese M= 2.96, SD=1.72; English M=3.64, SD=1.58; $t(75)=-3.89$, $p=.0001$], and for anxiety [Chinese M= 2.77 SD=1.69; English M=4.36, SD=1.79; $t(74)=-7.5$, $p=.0001$] (Table 7). These results suggest increased burden when L1 Mandarin Chinese scientists write scientific research in L2 English.

Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations for Self-Perception Ratings on Questions of Difficulty, Satisfaction, and Anxiety in First Language (Spanish) and Second Language (English) Scientific Writing (n = 75)

	M	SD
Difficulty in Chinese	2.91	1.87
Difficulty in English	4.55	1.49
Dissatisfaction in Chinese	2.92	1.699
Dissatisfaction in English	3.63	1.583
Anxiety in Chinese	2.77	1.689
Anxiety in English	4.36	1.798

Aside from gathering Taiwanese scientists' self-reported perspectives of the additional burden they face when writing in English over when writing Chinese, this study also examined English as a barrier to publication. In response to the survey item: "Rate the degree to which you consider your ability to write in English to be a barrier to publishing your research, where "1" means not a barrier at all, and "7" means a significant barrier," all but 4.3 percent of respondents considered English as a barrier to publication, with 7.1% considering it a significant barrier (Table 8).

Table 8
Perception of English as a barrier to publication where "1" means not a barrier at all, and "7" means a significant barrier. (N=70)

Scale	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	3	4.3
2	16	22.9
3	8	11.4
4	9	12.9
5	17	24.3
6	12	17.1
7	5	7.1

Discussion

In the early 2000s, when globalization-induced higher education policies began to impact faculty at Taiwanese institutions (Sheridan, 2015), a controversial report ranked universities based on the numbers of papers their faculty published in journals included in the Web of Science citation indexes (J. Huang, 2003). In this report, universities that have more STEM+Med colleges and departments were ranked higher than those that emphasize HSS disciplines. This report inspired a strong reaction among HSS scholars, who resented the lower value given to their research into issues of local and national importance, more conducive to Chinese language publishing. A common refrain among Taiwanese HSS scholars that their colleagues in the natural sciences have an easier time publishing high quantities of papers because science papers are shorter and less focused on language proficiency. While this assumption should be further investigated, the current study shows that, even if it is true, STEM+Med researchers do also consider writing in English as an added burden that constitutes a barrier to publication.

In addition, it may seem more likely that senior scholars would experience less burden in publishing their research in English than less experienced ones. However, in this study, among the respondents who submitted English and Chinese manuscripts to major journals over the last five years, most were over 45 years old and over half were full professors, and they still experienced significant added burden when writing in English compared to Chinese. This further refutes Hyland's (2016) stance that L2 writers' difficulties are due to disciplinary conventions, and no different from native speakers, and supports the notion that problems L2 scholars face when writing research papers in English are linguistic in nature (Hanauer and Englander, 2011).

The results of this study support both qualitative and quantitative research into the experiences of multilingual scholars, who are under pressure to publish research in English, especially in IIJs. In particular, it shows that L2 science writers in different language and national contexts can experience added burden when writing in English for publication and that this burden is related to linguistic challenges and not disciplinary conventions. Ultimately, the findings raise issues of linguistic privilege and have implications for global academic publishing and national higher education policies, especially governing faculty evaluation and promotion. For Taiwan, in particular, the study provides another reason to question "SSCI syndrome" (Chou, 2014) and the "citation index complex" (Sheridan, 2017), while continuing to support

Chinese language journals through national citation indexes.

The results of the study contribute to the research on multilingual scholars publishing perspectives and practices and points to further work to be done. First, we have gained a broader understanding of the preferences for language of publication and publication outlets among Taiwanese researchers from HSS, and STEM+Med disciplines. We have ascertained that they experience a greater burden when using English to write research than they do when writing Chinese. By learning this, we can begin to determine which researchers in Taiwan need support in their English publication work. This project, however, has not provided in-depth knowledge of their experiences as multilingual writers writing in English as a second language. Therefore, a further qualitative interview study is necessary to find out what type of support would be helpful to which type of scholars in Taiwan.

While Hanauer and Englander (2011) had a response rate of 38%, Ferguson et al. (2011) study had a response rate of 10%. During the planning of this project there was a concern that gathering a large sample from researchers in Taiwan who have written journal articles in both Chinese and English would be difficult. Despite sending out invitations to thousands of faculty members all over Taiwan, the completion rate was quite low in this study at 7%. While the entire sample represented a fairly even cross-section of disciplines, other data showed that the low response rate is likely because most Taiwanese academics are writing their articles only in English. This secondary finding suggests that investigations into multilingual scientists around the world need to take careful account of the national contexts. In Sheridan (2017), a qualitative interview study, it was found that younger scholars in Taiwan, those who entered the HE system after 2000, faced greater publishing demands than the more senior participants. It seems somewhat counterintuitive that the senior respondents in the current quantitative study experienced greater burden of writing in English. This is a phenomenon that warrants further research.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2004/2013). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. In R. King, S. Marginson, & R. Naidoo (Eds.), *The globalization of higher education* (pp. 1-23). Cheltenham, Glos, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited (Reprinted from *Tertiary Education and Management* 10: 3-25, 2004, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publications).
- 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, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chan, J. C.-Y., & Lee, C.-N. (2014). A difficult situation of higher education in Taiwan. In C. P. Chou (Ed.), *The SSCI syndrome in higher education: A local or global phenomenon* (pp. 39-50). The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Chang, D.-f., Wu, C.-t., Ching, G., & Tang, C.-w. (2009). An evaluation of the dynamics of the plan to develop first-class universities and top-level research centers in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10(1), 47-57. doi:10.1007/s12564-009-9010-7
- Chen, K.-h. (2004). The construction of the Taiwan Humanities Citation Index. *Online Information Review*, 28(6), 410-419. doi:DOI 10.1108/14684520410570535
- Ching, G. S. (2014). ISI perceptions and hard facts: An empirical study from Taiwan. In C. P. Chou (Ed.), *The SSCI syndrome in higher education: A local or global phenomenon* (pp. 81-96). The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Chou, C. P. (2014a). Jingai de Wu Buzhang, Xiaozhang [Letter to Minister Wu] [*Open letter to the faculty of National Chengchi University*]. Taipei.
- Chou, C. P. (Ed.) (2014b). *The SSCI syndrome in higher education: A local or global phenomenon*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Chou, C. P., Lin, H. F., & Chiu, Y.-j. (2013). The impact of SSCI and SCI on Taiwan's academy: An outcry for fair play. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 14, 23-31. doi:10.1007/s12564-013-9245-1
- 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.

- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2014). Strategies and tactics in academic knowledge production by multilingual scholars. *Estratégias e táticas na produção de conhecimento acadêmico para pesquisadores multilíngües.*, 22(26/34), 1-24. doi:10.14507/epaa.v22n32.2014
- Delgado, J. E. (2011). *Journal publication in Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela: University responses to global, regional, and national pressures and trends.* (Ph.D.), University of Pittsburgh, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/908423407?accountid=11652> (908423407)
- Duszak, A., & Lewkowicz, J. (2008). Publishing academic texts in English: A Polish perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 108-120. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.001>
- Englander, K. (2011). The globalized world of English scientific publishing: An analytical proposal that situates a multilingual scholar. In G. Lopez-Bonilla & K. Englander (Eds.), *Discourses and identities in contexts of educational change* (pp. 209-228). New York: Peter Lang.
- Englander, K., & Uzuner-Smith, S. (2013). The role of policy in constructing the peripheral scientist in the era of globalization. *Language Policy*, 12, 231-250.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2007). *Globalization: The Key Concepts* (pp. 1-14). Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Feng, H., Beckett, G. H., & Huang, D. (2013). From 'import' to 'import-export' oriented internationalization: The impact of national policy on scholarly publication in China. *Language Policy*, 12, 251-272.
- Ferguson, G., PÉRez-Llantada, C., & Plo, R. (2011). English as an international language of scientific publication: a study of attitudes. *World Englishes*, 30(1), 41-59. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2010.01656.x
- Flowerdew, J. (2007). The non-Anglophone scholar on the periphery of scholarly publication. *AILA Review*, 20(1), 14-27. doi:10.1075/aila.20.04flo
- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and the social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 1-16.
- Ge, M. (2015). English Writing for International Publication in the Age of Globalization: Practices and Perceptions of Mainland Chinese Academics in the Humanities and Social Sciences. *Publications*, 3, 43-64. doi:10.3390/publications3020043

- Hanauer, D. I., & Englander, K. (2011). Quantifying the burden of writing research articles in a second language: Data from Mexican scientists. *Written Communication, 28*(4), 403-416. doi:DOI: 10.1177/0741088311420056
- Hanauer, D. I., & Englander, K. (2013). *Scientific writing in a second language*. Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press.
- Harwood, N., & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*, 355-377. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2003.08.001>
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 31*, 58-69. doi:[dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005)
- Huang, A. H.-m. (2009). Science as ideology: SSCI, TSSCI and the evaluation system of social sciences in Taiwan. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies, 10*(2), 282 - 291.
- Huang, J. (2003). Survey by Ministry of Education rankles some in academia. *Taipei Times*, (October 21), 4. Retrieved from <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2003/10/21/2003072762>
- Huang, J. C. (2010). Publishing and learning writing for publication in English: Perspectives of NNES PhD students in science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(1), 33-44. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.10.001>
- Huang, J. C. (2011). Attitudes of Taiwanese scholars toward English and Chinese as languages of publication. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 31*(2), 115-128. doi:10.1080/02188791.2011.566983
- Labassi, T. (2009). Periphery non-Anglophone scholarship in English-only journals: Conditions of a better visibility. *Changing English, 16*(2), 247-254.
- Lawrick, E. P. Z. (2011). *English in Russian academe: Uses and perceived significance*. (PhD), Purdue, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (901113909)
- Lee, H., & Lee, K. (2013). Publish (in international indexed journals) or perish: Neoliberal ideology in a Korean university. *Language Policy, 12*, 215-230.

- Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (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.
- Lillis, T. (2012). Economies of signs in writing for academic publication: The case of English medium “national” journals. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 32(3-4), 695-722.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2013). English, scientific publishing and participation in the global knowledge economy. In E. J. Erling & P. Seargeant (Eds.), *English and Development: Policy, Pedagogy and Globalization* (pp. 220-242). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2016). Academic writing for publication in a multilingual world. In R. Manchon & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing* (pp. 201-222): De Gruyter Mouton.
- Liu, J. Y. (2014). Problems, strategies, and impact of SSCI publication in English: Perceptions and negotiations of Taiwanese researchers. In C. P. Chou (Ed.), *The SSCI syndrome in higher education: A local or global phenomenon* (pp. 109-126). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Lundin, R. A., Jönsson, S., Kreiner, K., & Tienari, J. (2010). The changing face of academic publishing: On the past, present and future of the Scandinavian Journal of Management. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(3), 309-317.
- Mayumi, I. (2014). Ranking Regime and the Future of Vernacular Scholarship. *Sistema de Classificação e o Futuro da Pesquisa local.*, 22(26/34), 1-23.
doi:10.14507/epaa.v22n30.2014
- Min, H.-T. (2014). Participating in international academic publishing: A Taiwan perspective. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 48(1), 188-200.
- Ministry of Education. (2009). *Daxue Pingjian Banfa [University Evaluation Regulation]*. Taipei: Ministry of Education Retrieved from <http://edu.law.moe.gov.tw/PrintLawContentDetails.aspx?id=FL041732>.

- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Education in Taiwan 2013-2014*. Taipei: Ministry of Education Republic of China Retrieved from <http://english.moe.gov.tw/ct.asp?xItem=8376&ctNode=814&mp=1>.
- Ministry of Education. (2014). *Taijiaogao (2) No. 1030140439*. Taipei: October 23.
- Mok, K.-H. (2000). Reflecting globalization effects on local policy: higher education reform in Taiwan. *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(6), 637-660.
- Mok, K.-H. (2007). Questing for internationalization of universities in Asia: Critical reflections. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 433-454.
doi:10.1177/1028315306291945
- Mok, K.-H. (2014). Promoting the global university in Taiwan: University governance reforms and academic reflections. In C. P. Chou (Ed.), *The SSCI syndrome in higher education: A local or global phenomenon* (pp. 1-24). The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- MOST. (2014). R&D Expenditure as a Percentage in GDP [2010-2014]. Retrieved from <https://ap0512.most.gov.tw/WAS2/English/AsTechnologyEStatistics.aspx?ID=1>
- 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(1), 18-30.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2010.05.001>
- RIHSS. (2015). 2015 nian TSSCI shoulu qikan mingdan [2015 list of TSSCI journals]. Taipei: Research Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences, Ministry of Science and Technology Retrieved from <http://www.hss.ntu.edu.tw/model.aspx?no=67>.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 121-132.
- Shen, D.-s., & Chang, M.-k. (2010). Higher education in Taiwan: The crisis of rapid expansion. Retrieved from <http://www.isa-sociology.org/universities-in-crisis/?p=417>
- Sheridan, C. L. (2014). *A globalized peripheral context: Development of a citation index in Taiwan and its role in scholarly publication and research Dissemination*. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics 2014 Conference, Portland, Oregon.
- Sheridan, C. L. (2015). National journals and centering institutions: A historiography of an English language teaching journal in Taiwan. *English for Specific Purposes*, 38, 70–84.
doi:10.1016/j.esp.2014.12.001

- Sheridan, C. L. (2017). *English Medium "National" Journals Beyond the Anglophone Center: A Qualitative Study of Multilingual Scholars and their Publishing Decisions in Taiwan*. (PhD), Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Soudien, C. (2014). The influence of rankings and incentive systems on academic publishing in South African universities [La influencia de los rankings y sistemas de incentivos en las publicaciones académicas en las universidades de Sudáfrica]. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives & Education Review*, 22, 1-16. doi:10.14507/epaa.v22n33.2014
- Su, S.-W. (2014). To be or not to be: Impacts of "I" idolization from the perspective of humanities and social sciences faculty in Taiwan. In C. P. Chou (Ed.), *The SSCI syndrome in higher education: A local or global phenomenon* (pp. 51-80). The Netherlands: Sense.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). Research genres: Explorations and applications. In Michael H. Long & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Cambridge applied linguistics* (pp. 33-59). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2012). Global Investments in R&D. Retrieved February 15, 2013 <http://www.uis.unesco.org/FactSheets/Pages/ScienceTech.aspx>
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Block 1

QID60.

Scholarly Publishing Experiences of Researchers in Taiwan

臺灣學者學術出版經驗

You are invited to participate in this research study about the scholarly publishing practices of researchers in Taiwan by completing this online questionnaire. The following information is provided to you in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate.

My name is Cheryl Sheridan (謝思蕾). I am a full-time faculty member of the Foreign Language Center (FLC) at National Chengchi University (NCCU). I am the principal investigator (PI) for a project funded by the Ministry of Science and Technology in Taiwan (MOST 105-2410-H-004-160-). This study is being conducted in collaboration with Dr. David Ian Hanauer from Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) in the USA.

You are eligible to participate in this study because you are a faculty member at a university in Taiwan. The questionnaire includes a maximum of 27 items and takes about 10 to 15 minutes to complete. You may choose to use an English or Chinese version of the survey. It is designed to provide us general information about the scientific publishing experiences of scholars in Taiwan. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at Sheridan@nccu.edu.tw.

您已受邀填寫此線上問卷參與臺灣學者學術出版研究。以下提供之資訊將協助您決定是否參與本研究。

我是謝思蕾，現為國立政治大學外文中心專任教師，也是這項科技部研究計畫(MOST 105-2410-H-004-160-) 的主持人。這項計畫係與美國賓夕法尼亞州印第安納大學的教授 David Ian Hanauer 博士共同合作執行。

由於您現為台灣的大學教職人員，因此已具備參與此項研究的資格。這份問卷共有27題，約10到15分鐘可完成。問卷有中文及英文兩個版本供您選擇使用。問卷的目的是為了幫助我們了解台灣學者的學術出版經驗。若您有任何疑問，請隨時與我<Sheridan@nccu.edu.tw>聯繫。

Time

This questionnaire consists of two sections. The first includes up to nineteen items regarding the language or languages you use for your scholarly publications. The second includes eight items regarding your background and general publishing experience. The survey will take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

時間

此問卷共分為兩部份，第一部份共有十九題，內容關於您出版學術論文時所使用的語言。第二部份共有八題，內容是關於您的背景資料以及出版經歷。完成所需時間約為10到15分鐘。

Confidentiality

Participation in this study carries no more than minimal risk. This questionnaire has been set up so your response will be anonymous. You will not be asked to provide your name or the name of your institution. The information obtained from this questionnaire may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings, but your identity will not be able to be revealed.

機密性

參與這份問卷調查並不會使您的相關資料外洩。此份問卷經過詳細設計，不會要求您提供姓名或是所屬機構名稱，您的所有填答都將以匿名方式呈現。問卷所蒐集到的資料將來也許會於學術期刊或研討會發表，但您的身分絕不會被公開。

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose to opt out of completing the questionnaire at any time by closing the questionnaire browsing window. Upon your request to withdraw, all information pertaining to you will be destroyed.

If you agree to participate in this study, please click 'Next' below.

By clicking "Next", you certify that you have read and understood the information on the form and you consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. You understand that your responses are completely confidential and that you have the right to end the questionnaire at any point.

自願性

您可自由決定是否填寫此問卷。問卷進行中，您可隨時關閉視窗以中止填答；當您選擇關閉視窗的同時，您的所有相關資料也會一併銷毀。

如果您同意參與此次調查，請點選「下一步」。

Principal Investigator: Cheryl Lynn Sheridan (謝思蕾)

Affiliation: 國立政治大學外文中心

Foreign Language Center, National Chengchi University; Taipei, Taiwan

Phone: 02-2939-3091 x 69510 e-mail address: sheridan@nccu.edu.tw

Collaborating Investigator: David Ian Hanauer

Affiliation: Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP); Indiana, Pennsylvania, USA

e-mail address: hanauer@iup.edu

This project has been approved by both the National Chengchi University Research Ethics Review Board and the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

此研究計畫已通過科學研究倫理審查委員會與美國賓夕法尼亞州印第安納大學人類研究受試者保護研究倫理審查委員會審核。(電話：724-357-7730)

- Next (下一步)
- No, thank you (不同意，離開)

QID63. Please choose questionnaire language

- English (英文)
- Chinese (繁體中文)

Part I: Screen

QID61. In the last 5 years, have you submitted a scientific article in Chinese to a major journal?

- Yes
- No

QID62. In the last 5 years, have you submitted a scientific article in English to a major journal?

- Yes
- No

Part II: Burden

QID51_1.

On the scale below, rate the degree to which you find it easy or difficult to write a scientific article in Chinese for a major journal, where "1" means very easy , and "7" means very difficult.

1 Very Easy	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very Difficult
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

QID52_2.

On the scale below, rate the degree to which you find it easy or difficult to write a scientific article in English for a major journal, where "1" means very easy, and "7" means very difficult.

1 Very Easy	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very Difficult
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

QID17_1.

On the scale below, rate the degree to which you are *satisfied* or *dissatisfied* that your writing in Chinese conveys the scientific research that you have conducted, where "1" means very satisfied, and "7" means very dissatisfied.

1 Very Satisfied	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very Dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

QID18_1.

On the scale below, rate the degree to which you are satisfied or dissatisfied that your writing in English conveys the scientific research that you have conducted, where "1" means very satisfied, and "7" means very dissatisfied.

1 Very Satisfied	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very Dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

QID53_1.

On the scale below, rate the degree to which writing a scientific article in Chinese for a major journal causes you to feel anxiety, where "1" means not at all anxious, and "7" means very anxious.

1 Not at all Anxious	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very Anxious
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

QID54_1. On the scale below, rate the degree to which writing a scientific article in English for a major journal causes you to feel anxiety, where "1" means not at all anxious, and "7" means very anxious.

1 Not at all Anxious	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very Anxious
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

QID44_1. On the scale below, indicate what percentage of your published research is written in English.

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please rank in order the reasons why it is important to you to publish in English, where #1 indicates most important, and #5 indicates least important.

A-1 To reach a specialist audience who shares my particular research

A-2 interest To reach a broad international audience

A-3 To gain prestige or be known in my field

A-4 To increase my monetary income

A-5 To fulfill the requirements of my department and/or institution

A-0. Are there any other reasons why it is important to you to publish in English?

Yes (Please specify)

No

A_1.0.

On the scale below, rate the degree to which you consider your ability to write in English to be a barrier to publishing your research, where "1" means not a barrier at all, and "7" means a significant barrier.

1 Not a Barrier At All	2	3	4	5	6	7 A Significant Barrier
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A_1.1.

On the scale below, rate the degree to which you think that editors and reviewers of international English-language journals review fairly the manuscripts written by scientists with Chinese names or from Taiwanese institutions, where "1" means very fair , and "7" means very unfair.

1 Very Fair	2	3	4	5	6	7 Very Unfair
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

QID19.

While writing a scientific paper in English for a major journal which of the writing strategies below do you most commonly use? From the list below, select the one strategy which you use most frequently.

1. I trust my own English writing, so I write the research paper by myself (and show it to my fellow co-authors for any content they may want to add).
2. I write collaboratively with other members of the research team. I do not share this with anyone outside the research team for editing of my English writing.
3. After writing the research paper (individually or collaboratively) I pass it to a native English speaker for editing. After this review and editing, I submit the paper.
4. I write (individually or collaboratively) the research paper in Chinese, then I contract a translator to produce a final version of the paper in English for submission.
- QID19_5_TEXT Other method (Please specify)

QID46. While submitting a paper in English to a major journal have you ever received reviewer comments criticizing your English?

1. Yes
2. No

QID55.0. While submitting a paper in English to a major journal have you ever received reviewer comments criticizing your English? How many times this has happened?

QID56.0. What percentage of your articles does this represent?

QID57.0. What percentage of the time did you revise and then the same journal accepted your article?

?????. Please write the name of the journal(s).

A_.1.

Have you ever published as part of collaboration with an U.S. or U.K.-based colleague?

1. Yes

2. No

A_.2 [REPEATED, DELETED]. Have you ever published as part of collaboration with an U.S. or U.K.-based colleague?

1. Yes

2. No

A_.3.

Who was the principal investigator: You or Your Foreign Colleague?

1. I was the principal investigator.

2. My foreign colleague was the principal investigator.

QID49.0.

In the space below please list briefly the difficulties (if any) that you face in writing a scientific article in English for a major international journal.

QID85.0. In the space below please list briefly the difficulties (if any) that you face in writing a scientific article in English for a major international journal.

Part III: Background Information

QID21 AGE.

Please indicate your age group

1. 22 – 35

2. 36 – 45

3. 46 – 55

- 4. 56 – 65
- 5. 66 +

QID4 GENDER. Please indicate your gender

- 1. Male
- 2. Female

QID5 DEGREE.

Please indicate your highest degree obtained

- 1. Master's degree (碩士)
- 2. PhD (博士)
- Other (please specify)

QID64 RANK. Please indicate your current position

- 1. instructor/lecturer (講師)
- 2. assistant professor (助理教授)
- 3. associate professor (副教授)
- 4. full professor (正教授)
- QID64_5_TEXT Other (please specify)

QID6 INSTITUTION. Please indicate the type of institution for which you work

- 1. Public/National university (國立大學)
- 2. Private university(私立大學)
- QID6-3_TEXT Other (please specify)

QID7 DISCIPLINE.

Please indicate your specialization (e.g. language teaching methodology, neurology, etc.)

QID9_7 PUBLICATIONS_CHINESE. Please click to indicate the types of scholarly publications you have published in Chinese within the last 5 years

- 9-11 None
- 9-1 Books
- 9-2 Book chapters
- 9-3 Journal articles published in Taiwan (not TSSCI or THCI Core)
- 9-4 Journal articles in TSSCI or THCI Core journal published in Taiwan
- 9-6 Journal articles in Thomson Reuters ISI (SSCI, A&HCI, EI, etc) journals published in Taiwan
- 9-8 Journal articles in Thomson Reuters ISI (SSCI, A&HCI, EI, etc) journals NOT published in Taiwan
- 9-9 Book reviews
- 9-7 QID9_7_TEXT Other (Please specify)

QID59_8. PUBLICATIONS_ENGLISH. Please click to indicate the types of scholarly publications you have published in English within the last 5 years

- 9-9 None
- 9-1 Books
- 9-2 Book chapters
- 9-3 Journal articles published in Taiwan (not TSSCI or THCI Core)
- 9-4 Journal articles in TSSCI or THCI Core journal published in Taiwan
- 9-5 Journal articles in Thomson Reuters ISI (SSCI, A&HCI, EI, etc) journals published in Taiwan
- 9-6 Journal articles in Thomson Reuters ISI (SSCI, A&HCI, EI, etc) journals NOT published in Taiwan
- 9-7 Book reviews
- QID59_8_TEXT Other (Please imply)

QID14.0.

What other question should we have asked in this survey concerning publishing your scientific work either in English or in Chinese, and how would you answer that question?

第二部分：負擔程度

. 於過去五年間，您是否曾經以中文投稿科學論文於重要期刊？

- 是
- 否

. 於過去五年間，您是否曾經以英文投稿科學論文於重要期刊？

- 是
- 否

. 於過去五年間，您是否曾經以英文投稿科學論文於重要期刊？

- 是
- 否

. 請利用以下分級，表示您使用中文寫作期刊論文的難易程度

非常容易	容易	有點容易	不容易也 不困難	有點困難	困難	非常困難
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

. 請利用以下分級，表示您使用英文寫作期刊論文的難易程度

非常容易	容易	有點容易	不容易也 不困難	有點困難	困難	非常困難
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

請利用以下分級，表示您對自己使用中文寫作說明研究成果的滿意程度 (1表示非常滿意，7表示非常不滿意)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

請利用以下分級，表示您對自己使用英文寫作說明研究成果的滿意程度 (1表示非常滿意，7表示非常不滿意)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

請利用以下分級，表示您對使用中文為知名期刊寫作科學論著的焦慮程度 (1表示完全不焦慮，7表示非常焦慮)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

請利用以下分級，表示您對使用英文為知名期刊寫作科學論著的焦慮程度 (1表示完全不焦慮，7表示非常焦慮)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

請依照 1 到 5 的順序來排序以下您重視以英文出版的原因，1 表示最重要，5 表示最不重要

可以接觸與我有相同研究領域的專業讀者

可以接觸廣泛的國際讀者

可以在我的專業領域提高名聲或知名度

可以增加我的收入

可以滿足我的部門及／或機構的要求

是否有其他原因讓您重視以英文出版?

是 (請說明)

否

. 請利用以下分級，表示以英文出版研究成果對您的困難程度，「1」表示完全不困難，「7」表示非常困難

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

. 請利用以下分級，表示您認為國際英文期刊的編輯與審稿員，對於中文姓名科學家所撰寫之稿件或來自台灣機構之稿件的審查公平性，「1」表示非常公平，「7」表示非常不公平

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

. 為主要期刊撰寫英文科學論文時，您最常使用以下何種撰寫策略？請從下列選項選取您最常使用的一種策略。

- 我相信自己的英文寫作能力，所以我自己撰寫研究論文（並且拿給共同作者確認有無需要增補的內容）。
- 我與研究團隊的其他成員共同撰寫論文。我不會讓研究團隊以外的人員編輯我的英文論文。
- 當研究論文（獨立或共同）撰寫完成後，我會交由英文母語人士進行編輯工作。當完成審稿及編輯後，方提交論文
- 我用中文（獨立或共同）撰寫研究論文，並且聘請譯者以英文翻譯成最終版論文後提交。
- 其他方法（請說明）

. 當英文論文提交到重要期刊時，您是否曾遇過審查者批評您的英文？

- 是
- 否

. 若是的話，這種情形發生過幾次？

. 您的論文有多少內容發生此情形（以百分比表示）？

. 您花了多少百分比的時間修改，直到同一家期刊接受您的論文為止？

. 請寫下期刊的名稱

. 是否曾與美國或英國同事共同發表過論文？

是

否

. 是否曾與美國或英國同事共同發表過論文？

是

否

. 誰是計畫主持人？您本人或您的外籍同事？

我是計畫主持人

我的外籍同事是計畫主持人

. 請簡短列出為主要國際期刊撰寫英文科學論文時遇到的困境（如果有）。

. 請簡短列出為主要國際期刊撰寫英文科學論文時遇到的困境（如果有）。

Block 2

.
您的年齡

- 22 – 35
- 36 – 45
- 46 – 55
- 56 – 65
- 66 +

.
您的性別

- 男
- 女

.
您的最高學位

- 碩士
- 博士
- 其他(請說明)

.
您的職稱

- 講師
- 助理教授
- 副教授
- 正教授
- 其他 (請說明)

您的服務單位

- 公立／國立大學
- 私立大學
- 其他(請說明)

您的專業領域 (例如語言學、心理學等等)

請選擇您於過去五年間曾經出版的中文學術刊物類型：

- 無
- 專書
- 專書論文
- 在台灣出版之期刊論文(非TSSCI或THCI Core期刊)
- 在台灣出版之期刊論文(TSSCI或THCI Core期刊)
- 在台灣出版之期刊論文(Thomson Reuters ISI ; SSCI, A&HCI, EI等期刊)
- 非在台灣出版之期刊論文(Thomson Reuters ISI ; SSCI, A&HCI, EI等期刊)
- 書評
- 其他(請說明)

請選擇您於過去五年間曾經出版的英文學術刊物類型：

- 無
- 專書
- 專書論文
- 在台灣出版之期刊論文(非TSSCI或THCI Core期刊)
- 在台灣出版之期刊論文(TSSCI或THCI Core期刊)
- 在台灣出版之期刊論文(Thomson Reuters ISI ; SSCI, A&HCI, EI等期刊)
- 非在台灣出版之期刊論文(Thomson Reuters ISI ; SSCI, A&HCI, EI等期刊)
- 書評
- 其他 (請說明)

National Chengchi University Faculty Attendance at International Conferences--Report

23

Oct. 2017

Name	謝思蕾 Cheryl L. Sheridan	Administrative Unit and Job Title	外文中心 專任講師級專業技術人員
Location of Conference	Portland, Oregon USA	Duration of Conference	March 18-21, 2017
Name of Conference	(Chinese) (English) American Association of Applied Linguists (AAAL)		
Title of Presented Manuscript	(Chinese) (English) Factors Influencing Participation In English Medium Journals From The Semi-periphery: Experiences Of Authors In Taiwan		

一、 Type of participation in the conference

At the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) I gave a presentation on the morning of March 19, 2017. The presentation covered the highlights of my paper, “Factors Influencing Participation In English Medium Journals From the Semi-periphery: Experiences of Authors in Taiwan.”

This was my third time to AAAL and the second with the conference in Portland. AAAL is a large conference, but not overwhelming. I attended plenary talks, numerous concurrent sessions, several colloquia, and conference social events. Being able to meet and interact with established scholars who are working on related topics and methodologies in my field in these ways was extremely gratifying and inspiring. Attending sessions on topics I am curious about is a great way to expand my horizons.

I went to many sessions, mostly in the Reading, Writing, Literacy strand, but also in the Research Methods strand. Those I found most interesting and useful:

- When a First Language is Like a Second: Multilingual Striving for Academic Literacy and Publication Success in a Mother Tongue. Diane Belcher and Caroline Payant.
- English for Research Publication Purposes Tutoring at one Colombian

University: What Maximal Text Histories Reveal about PhD Students and Professors. Gerriet Janssen and Kathleen Sheridan.

- Reframing Doctoral Students' Challenges in Scholarly Publishing from an Activity Theory Perspective. Guangwei Hu and Jun Lei.
- Messy research in applied linguistics: methodological realities, problems and honest reporting when social research goes awry. Colloquium organized by Christine Pearson Casanave.
- Ethnographic Research in Applied Linguistics: Transdisciplinarity, Transnationalism, Transformation. Colloquium organized by Angela Creese and Patricia Duff

I also attended plenary presentations, but the one that was quite out of the ordinary was "Talking with Robots" by Janet Wiles from the University of Queensland. It was thought provoking to consider how robots learn from each other and how they can also learn languages from us. I attended a few invited colloquia, but one that was particularly interesting was titled Extending the Legacy of Leo Van Lier: Ecologizing Pedagogy (Wilga Rivers Language Pedagogy Colloquium). Organized by Dwight Atkinson and Steven Thorne. This was one of those "star-studded" gatherings of immense intellectual value that one can experience at AAAL.

二、 Reflections deriving from conference participation

Even though traveling to Portland was exhausting and preparing for the presentation was a lot of work, it was definitely worth it. Being able to meet with people from all over the world in person and discuss ideas is invigorating. It is also fantastic to talk with the established scholars in the field. This happens in formal and informal situations; perhaps the most important interactions happen in the social or semi-social events. Standing in line for a buffet, I had the opportunity to chat with Suresh Canagarajah, who remembered me from attending a conference he hosted at Penn State University in 2011! I was also able to take a walk with Mary Jane Curry, one of the leaders in scholarly publishing research, and talk about my work for over one hour. Strolling along the riverfront was an invigorating backdrop to have a discussion. Most gratifying was after Guangwei Hu's talk, when I introduced myself: He immediately recognized my name and told me that he had been one of the reviewers of my 2015 article in *English for Specific Purposes*. I was a bit shocked, but mostly very happy to be able to express my gratitude to him (and the other reviewer) because I received such critical, constructive, and positive feedback from them.

In terms of my presentation, I presented at 8:00 AM and was pleased that a respectable number of seats in the small concurrent session room were filled, though perhaps some of them were there to see Diane Belcher, who presented after me. However, Christine Casanave was there and I was thrilled to finally meet her. She asked several questions about the faculty evaluation system in Taiwan. She did not know about the point systems that are common in many non-center contexts. I was also happy to see scholars from Taiwan and China there, too. Presenting my study at AAAL pushed me to work through the findings of my study and consider implications. I suggested that the investment in English medium national journals in Taiwan has been worthwhile. While they are often where researchers turn after being unsuccessful with “international” journals, they fulfill other needs, too. On the other hand, while it shows local knowledge is being published, it is not clear as to how far it is being distributed or utilized. Also, although metrics such as impact factors are controversial, if the TBEMJs ISI journals’ IF’s rise, this will further encourage their support and show that nationally-based journals do not necessarily function only as “manuscript graveyards”

三、 Suggestions

Institutions in Taiwan and MOST should continue to encourage their faculty to participate in international conferences abroad. My findings from the MOST-funded project for 民國 104 support this activity. Several interviewees mentioned not only the valuable feedback researchers received on their presentations, but also direct connections to later journal publications. The immediate face-to-face feedback and encouragement from peers and mentors in social and professional settings directly affected future publication success.

As in my report from attendance at AILA in 2014, I argue that if more scholars from Taiwan receive funding for participation in these conferences, more voices from here will be included in the discussions, debates, and decisions regarding the overall research trends. Through this experience, researchers in Taiwan can step up into and become part of the greater international academic community. This is an exciting and extremely motivational experience and positively affects Taiwan-based scholars’ chances of publishing in international publications. While this helps lengthen individual CVs, it also means that scholars in Taiwan have a greater chance of contributing to the broader conversation in their respective fields locally, regionally, and internationally. Therefore, as far as the travel grant is concerned, the most important thing is that the MOST continues to provide funding to faculty in Taiwan so that they may participate in more academic gatherings around the world.

四、 Name and content of the materials brought back

Besides the conference program book, I brought back handouts from talks I attended, and audio files recorded on my digital recorder of most of the plenary talks. In addition, the conference app is pretty amazing; I hardly used the clunky hard copy of the program book.

五、 Other:

To conclude this report, I would like to thank the reviewers and others who have attended to my proposal and application for the MOST funding that directly contributed to the chance for me to attend the AAAL this year.

National Chengchi University Faculty Attendance at International Conferences--Report

8 Oct. 2017

Name	謝思蕾 Cheryl L. Sheridan	Administrative Unit and Job Title	外文中心 專任講師級專業技術人員
Location of Conference	Bangkok, Thailand	Duration of Conference	June 30-July 2, 2017
Name of Conference	(Chinese) (English) Symposium on Second Language Writing (SSLW)		
Title of Presented Manuscript	(Chinese) (English) Taiwan's academic evaluation regime: A politics of citation indexes		

一、 Type of participation in the conference

At the Symposium on Second Language Writing (SSLW) I gave an individual presentation on the afternoon of June 30, 2017. The presentation covered the highlights of my paper, "Taiwan's academic evaluation regime: A politics of citation indexes." The project fit well with the conference theme, Assessing Second Language Writing. One of the questions posed in the conference call for papers was: What should L2 writing assessment look like in light of the global spread and diversification of languages, their uses and users? My project addresses this question because the participants in my study are all multilingual users of academic written English dealing with the assessment regime initiated by the Ministry of Education under global ranking pressures. The promotion and evaluation policies of higher education institutes in Taiwan are a major influence on scholars publishing decisions, especially related to English medium journals published here.

SSLW is a relatively small conference, but represents high quality research in second language writing. I went to many sessions, mostly in the areas of scholarly and academic writing, but also those related to classroom assessment, such as peer review and rubrics. Some I found most interesting and useful:

- Discursive Challenges in Academic Publishing by Multilingual Novice Writers by Fang Xu
- Assessing Translingual Academic Writing by Melanie Brinkschulte

- “A- isn’t an Asian F”: Using Peer Review to Help L2 Students See Beyond the Test in the L2 Composition Classroom by Titcha Kedsri Ho
- The “Burden” of Designing Writing Portfolio Assessment Rubrics by Mira Bekar

There were many colloquia. Of particular interest to me were:

- A Review and Analysis of L2 Writing Scholarship as Represented in the Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW) by Mehdi Riazi, Ling Shi, John Haggerty and Ice Lee.
- The Politics of English Second Language Writing Assessment Around the World organized by Todd Ruecker and including 11 scholars from around the world.
- Developing Abilities to Write from Sources in English at Universities in China by Alister Cumming, Luxin Yang, Ling Shi, Ju Zhan, Fengjuan Zhang, Lian Zhang and Lu Yu.

I also attended several of the plenary presentations. I particularly appreciated Deborah Crusan’s talk, Writing Assessment: Do We Practice What We Preach? In her talk, she advocates for teaching writing assessment literacy in MATESOL and ESL certificate programs so that teachers are better equipped to properly assess their students’ writing.

Finally, this year I attended the last event of the conference, Reflections and Closing Ceremony. Dwight Atkinson led a discussion about the future of L2 writing. The discussion turned to the ongoing debate regarding translingualism and even the legitimacy of the term, “L2” writing. This has been a heated issue primarily in the United States within the college composition scholarly community and the issue of ESL/EFL writing. To conclude the conference, it was announced that SSLW 2018 would be held in Vancouver.

二、 Reflections deriving from conference participation

This was the first time I had been to Bangkok for many years, and my second experience with SSLW since it was held in Taipei in 2011. I attended plenary talks, numerous concurrent sessions, and all conference social events. I appreciated the delicious lunch boxes that were provided by the conference because aside from having a convenient and healthy lunch, it made it easy to gather with other conference attendees. Being able to interact with established scholars working on related topics and methodologies in my field in these ways was extremely gratifying and inspiring. In order to extend the conference experience, I recorded many of the talks on a digital recorder and listened to them during on the flight back to Taiwan. I also have many more entries on my must-read list of articles and books. Next, I will reflect more on my participation in the conference.

It was great to be able to go to such a good conference in the Asia region so the travel was not so long and exhausting. However, even though preparing for the presentation was a lot of work, it was definitely worth it. Because the cost of the accommodation of conference hotel was prohibitively high, I shared an apartment with several other friends who are faculty in the USA. We had breakfasts in the apartment before walking to the conference venue together. In the evenings, we were able to discuss the sessions we attended.

One of the most compelling presentations was by Tony Silva, who addressed the translingualism debate between composition and L2 writing specialists. The room where this talk was scheduled was far too small and became packed with people sitting on the floor and standing all around the back. I had arrived early to attend the previous presentation, so I was lucky to get a seat. Silva presented five assumptions from translingual writing and refuted them based on logic, cognitive science, and L2 writing perspectives. Translingual perspectives, especially those from (generally monolingual) compositionists in the US suggest that different distinct languages are “constructs” therefore do not exist. Somewhat contradicting this premise, they also suggest that working among registers or dialects of one language is somehow equivalent to working between languages. This seems to somehow allow a generally monolingual field to see itself as multilingual, while also leading to the erasure of multilingualism. Translingual scholars have thrown confusion over L2 writing as a field as they have challenged its relevance. However, agreeing with Bruce Horner, Silva maintained that the two can co-exist and that they should be complementary rather than in antagonistic competition.

As mentioned above, this issue was also raised during the reflection session at the end of the conference. I am sure that it will continue to be an issue, especially in the US. Translingual practice seems to be less of an issue outside of the US, but there are aspects that can be useful in our classrooms in Taiwan. I think that some concepts such as code-meshing can be appreciated in the language use of our students in the classroom and of multilingual culture of Taiwanese society. It is important to recognize the different ways learners adopt English as a foreign language, but it is still important to be serious about the pragmatic needs of students to learn standard written English. This becomes very apparent in the findings of my research; if scholars are not properly trained in academic genres, they will not be successful publishing academics.

三、 Suggestions

One critique I have of SSLW 2017 was the so-called “round table sessions.” They were set up just like regular sessions with one speaker at a time in one room, so ended up just

being short presentations. However, most of the speakers did not have experience with this format and went overtime and left no time for discussion. The organizers should have set up the round-table sessions as is done at AAAL with actual *round* tables set up in a large room where presenters provide critical information about their project and then the group can discuss them and the presenters can get valuable feedback.

In terms of the opportunity to attend international conferences, I believe that institutions in Taiwan and MOST should continue to encourage their faculty to participate in international conferences abroad. My findings from the MOST-funded project for 民國 104 support the value of this activity. Several interviewees mentioned not only the valuable feedback researchers received on their presentations, but also direct connections to later journal publications. The immediate face-to-face feedback and encouragement from peers and mentors in social and professional settings directly affected future publication success.

As in my report from attendance at AILA in 2014, I argue that if more scholars from Taiwan receive funding for participation in these conferences, more voices from here will be included in the discussions, debates, and decisions regarding the overall research trends. Through this experience, researchers in Taiwan can step up into and become part of the greater international academic community. While this helps lengthen individual CVs, it also means that scholars in Taiwan have a greater chance of contributing to the broader conversation in their respective fields locally, regionally, and internationally. Therefore, as far as the travel grant is concerned, the most important thing is that the MOST continues to provide funding to faculty in Taiwan so that they may participate in more academic gatherings around the world.

四、 Name and content of the materials brought back

Besides the conference program book, I brought back handouts from talks I attended, and audio files recorded on my digital recorder of presentations and plenaries. I also took photos during presentations and posted some on social media.

五、 Other:

I would like to point out that the benefits of attending a conference do not end when the last session finishes. It is an exciting and extremely motivational experience and positively affects Taiwan-based scholars' chances of publishing in international publications.

To conclude this report, I would like to thank the reviewers and others who have attended to my proposal and application for the MOST funding that directly contributed to the chance for me to attend the SSLW this year.

105年度專題研究計畫成果彙整表

計畫主持人：謝思蕃			計畫編號：105-2410-H-004-160-				
計畫名稱：以第二語言撰寫研究論文之負擔：分析臺灣學者之經驗							
成果項目			量化	單位	質化 (說明：各成果項目請附佐證資料或細項說明，如期刊名稱、年份、卷期、起訖頁數、證號...等)		
國內	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇		
		研討會論文		0			
		專書		0	本		
		專書論文		0	章		
		技術報告		0	篇		
		其他		0	篇		
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權		0			
		營業秘密		0			
		積體電路電路布局權		0			
		著作權		0			
		品種權		0			
		其他		0			
	技術移轉	件數		0	件		
		收入		0	千元		
	國外	學術性論文	期刊論文		1	篇	Hanauer, D; Sheridan, C; Englander, K. (Submitted). Linguistic Injustice in the Writing of Research Articles in English as a Second Language: Data from Taiwanese and Mexican Researchers. Written Communication (Special issue on science writing, December 2018)
			研討會論文		0		
專書			0	本			
專書論文			0	章			
技術報告			0	篇			
其他			0	篇			
智慧財產權及成果		專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
	已獲得			0			
	新型/設計專利		0				

		商標權	0		
		營業秘密	0		
		積體電路電路布局權	0		
		著作權	0		
		品種權	0		
		其他	0		
	技術移轉	件數	0	件	
		收入	0	千元	
參與計畫人力	本國籍	大專生	0	人次	
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
	非本國籍	大專生	0		
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)					

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否具有政策應用參考價值及具影響公共利益之重大發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以100字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形（請於其他欄註明專利及技轉之證號、合約、申請及洽談等詳細資訊）

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以200字為限）

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性，以500字為限）

This study showed that L2 science writers in different language and national contexts experience added burden when writing in English for publication and that this burden is related to linguistic challenges and not disciplinary conventions. Ultimately, the findings raise issues of linguistic privilege and have implications for global academic publishing and national higher education policies, especially governing faculty evaluation and promotion.

4. 主要發現

本研究具有政策應用參考價值： 否 是，建議提供機關教育部, 科技部, (勾選「是」者，請列舉建議可提供施政參考之業務主管機關)

本研究具影響公共利益之重大發現： 否 是

說明：（以150字為限）

Taiwanese researchers experience extra burden publishing in English. Direct educational interventions and financial support should be considered.