國立政治大學英國語文學系博士班博士論文

指導教授：招靜琪博士

Advisor: Dr. Chin-chi Chao

一位台灣博士生於英語教學學術社群的參與經驗之敘事探究

A Narrative Inquiry into Experience of A Taiwanese Ph.D. Student Participating in the TESOL Academic Community

研究生：蔣宗益

Name: Tsung-yi Chiang

中華民國 **103** 年 **7** 月

July, 2014

A NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO EXPERIENCE OF A TAIWANESE PH.D. STUDENT PARTICIPATING IN THE TESOL ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

A Dissertation
Presented to
Department of English

National Chengchi University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Tsung-yi Chiang

July, 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my advisor, Prof. Chin-chi Chao, who has patiently guided me through these nine years of my doctoral study and inspired confidence in me. She is a diligent and professional scholar. Although she is always busy with teaching and doing research, she would still spare time discussing with me about my dissertation in her office whenever I make an appointment with her. As a professor, her kindness and gentleness have led me to take her as a role model in my future life-long career. Without her guidance, I would never be able to finish my dissertation and get the degree. I really thank her!

I would like to appreciate my research participant, Andrew (pseudonym), who spent much time meeting me regularly during the data collection period. His warm personality, openness, and generosity have made this research journey enjoyable and learnable. He is really a promising young scholar, and he is energetic and enthusiastic. His scholarly achievements and his humble attitudes always make me impressive. I am so grateful to have Andrew to be my research participant.

I also want to express my gratitude to my parents and all my family. Without their support and encouragement, I might not be able to have such an opportunity to continue my study in the doctoral program. I love all my family.

Finally, I would thank all the professors, faculty members, classmates, and friends whom I have met and communed with on the campus or in the TESOL academic community, for your friendship and sincere support!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

國立政治大學英國語言學系博士班

博士論文提要

論文名稱: 一位台灣博士生於英語教學學術社群的參與經驗之敘事探究

指導教授 : 招靜琪 教授

研究生 : 蔣宗益

論文提要內容:

本研究為長期性的敘事研究，運用了 Wenger (1998)的「實踐社群」社會學習理論(communities of practice)，以及 Norton(1995)的投資理論 (investment)，研究目的是為了探索一位台灣的英語教學研究所博士生的學術成長經驗及其所衍生的意義，特別是針對他奮勉進行學術研究投稿、完成博士學位、並進而開啓他未來的學術生涯等等的過程。本研究主要追蹤了研究參與者在其博士生涯的三個形成階段中，他的學術投稿經驗的心路歷程，一路到研究參與者最後在全球的英語教學領域之學術社群中取得更完全的參與度階段。為了能夠對於研究參與者其經驗有深入的了解，本研究採用了「敘事研究法」，收集了研究參與者的學習經驗自傳、敘說訪談的錄音及其逐字稿、研究者的現場筆記及研究筆記、以及其他由研究參與者所提供的文件等資料，以便能分析參與者的言談資料、且對資料進行敘事性的分析、並進而產出情節故事作為研究結果。研究結果發現，研究參與者持續努力來達成其所認定的學術投稿要求，確實增長了他在學術素養的成長，並足以成為學術社群當中的一員。在其過程當中，研究參與者對於實踐其學術投稿的過程當中相關資源的運用方式，與在 Wenger ‘s (1998) 「實踐社群」社會學習理論的非正式學習的特色是相互呼應的。研究參與者在學術社群當中所獲得的參與度，也表現出了其所累積的文化資產。最重要的是，從研究參與者的經驗透露出，就其受到英語教學社群的社會文化的影響之下來看，研究參與者埋首致力於學術投稿活動不僅僅是為了當下於英語教學社群的參與，也為了即將到來的終生志業進行 Norton (1995)理論當中的個人投資的傾向。這樣的情況顯示出，要學習成為一個英語教學研究領域的學者，的確是涉及了諸多層面的複雜構面及諸多意

義上的磋商。而就整個過程來說，也是與研究參與者 ，他身爲初階的年輕學人，身處於台灣的社會情境當中， 爲了能夠符合全球各地諸多種類專業社群的規範，他以放遠全球的思維來，來實踐在地的行動 ，成長中的信念是有所共鳴的。最後，本研究將針對台灣高等教育環境中的英語教學研究領域之博士班課程提出建議並討論，以促進年青學人們在學術領域的發展。

關鍵字: 學術投稿、文化資產、實踐社群、投資

ABSTRACT

Drawing on Wenger's (1998) social learning theory as well as Norton's (1995) notion of investment, this longitudinal qualitative study aims to investigate and derive meanings from the academic experience of one former Taiwanese TESOL doctoral student as he struggled to write for scholarly publications, survived the Ph.D. program, and initiated his academic career. The study mainly traces the twists and turns of his publishing experience in three stages of his forming years till the participant finally has acquired a fuller membership in the global TESOL academic community. To capture and derive an in-depth understanding of the experiences, a narrative inquiry approach was adopted, collecting the young scholar's written autobiography, recorded narrative interviews and transcripts, the researcher's research notes and other related documents that the participant provided, so as to thematically analyze the narrative data and then exert the narrative analysis to configure the happenings and events into seven emplotted narratives as the research results. The findings indicate that the participant's continual endeavor to meet the perceived and assumed requirements for publishing indeed rendered him the academic literacy development necessary to become a member of the academic community. In the process, the participant's ways of utilizing resources situated in the practice of publishing echo the features of informal learning in Wenger's (1998) social learning theory. The membership in the academic community gained by the participant also indicates the accumulated cultural capital. Most importantly, the participant's experience as a doctoral student, being socially and culturally medicated by the TESOL academic community, reveals a tendency to engage in academic tasks for scholarly purposes not only for the current participation in the TESOL academic community but also for personal investment (Norton, 1995) for the coming life-long career. This suggests learning to become a TESOL scholar indeed involves multiple layers of complexity and challenges, and the whole process is also a resonant to his growing faith as a novice young scholar, situated in the social context of Taiwan, to act locally and think globally, in order to conform to norms of various discourse communities around the world. Suggestions for TESOL doctoral programs in Taiwanese higher education to help and support young scholars' academic development are discussed.

Key Words: Scholarly Publication, Cultural Capital, Community of Practice, Investment

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Academic writing for scholarly publications has been playing an important role in the academic career, but scholars are usually hindered from publishing successfully in the mainstream Anglophone journals because of various challenges, either due to the conventional linguistic and rhetorical requirements in academic writing, journals' biased selection of preferred research content, researchers' limited access to resources for conducting research and submitting for publication, or the discursive processes of negotiating feedback from journals (Belcher, 2007; Canagarajah, 1996; Gosden, 1992; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hyland, 2002; Leki & Sliva, 2008; Swales, 1990). For several decades, being able to write for scholarly publication in English has become a prerequisite among scholars around the world. Scholars in different professional fields are eager to publish their research by presenting their research in conferences or getting their manuscripts published in international refereed journals. Scholars do so maybe because they want to contribute to professional knowledge in their fields, to maintain their disciplinary reputations, to develop their expertise, or to get upgraded in the rank for their positions in the academia. No matter for what reasons they publish their research, one fact that cannot be neglected is that the rate of being accepted by international journals is usually rather low and the process of submitting for journal publications can be time-consuming and frustrating. In fact, the difficulties for being accepted successfully by journal editors and reviewers may vary. For example, gatekeepers or referees might consider whether the research content is suitable, where there is a research niche, whether the requirements of writing conventions are achieved, or whether the language use in the texts is appropriate or not and so forth (Flowerdew 1999a, 1999b). As a result, for scholars around the world, it would really take much effort in submitting their manuscripts for scholarly publication and finally successfully get published in international refereed journals.

Although it seems that all scholars around the world may experience similar difficulties in writing for scholarly publications, for scholars who are non-native speakers of English (NNS scholars), they may encounter more linguistic or rhetorical challengers in meeting the requirements of writing conventions (Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 1999a, 1999b). English has become a dominant required language for scholarly publication for many decades in most international discourse communities around the world. Under this circumstance, for all the NNS scholars, no matter pursuing a doctoral degree or in an EFL context or in the western countries where English is spoken as a native language, it has been challenging to engage in the scholarly publication (Li, 2002, 2007; Li & Flowerdew, 2007).

Moreover, it seems there is no exception for doctoral students under the trend of getting research published. In fact, doctoral students as well as novice scholars around the world are all striving with much effort to come up with research ideas, conduct the research, writing up the papers, and then submit their manuscripts for publication. There have been studies conducted to investigate the experiences of NNS doctoral students in writing for academic purposes or for scholarly publication, with the view to enhancing the doctoral education (Cho, 2004; Kwan, 2008, 2009, 2010; Li, 2002, 2007; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Lee & Kamler, 2008). Those studies report the challenges those NNS doctoral students have encountered, and some pedagogical suggestions are given. However, a full picture of the experiences of the doctoral education in the context of Taiwan is actually missing, especially about the Taiwanese doctoral students' experiences in developing their academic literacy to survive their dissertation research or writing for scholarly publication to gain career advancement.

Graduation Requirements in TESOL Ph.D. Programs in Taiwan

A quick survey on the overall situation of the TESOL doctoral programs in Taiwan shows that currently there are five national universities and one private university that offer a TESOL doctoral program in Taiwan. The six TESOL doctoral programs have different policies in terms of providing courses at the doctoral level and graduation requirements for their doctoral students, particularly publication requirements. For example, one program requests the doctoral students to publish at least three refereed journal papers, together with one required experience of presenting research at an overseas international conference. Another program requests the doctoral students to have two research papers published in either refereed journals or presented in international conferences, with the premise as the individual author of their papers. Another program also asks the doctoral students to publish papers either in refereed journals or to present research at international conferences, but they do not indicate the exact number of papers. Some would offer the chances for the doctoral students to waive their qualifying exam if they have any publications accepted by refereed journals. Some would encourage their doctoral students to present in either international conferences or to publish in refereed journals by offering financial sponsorship. Almost all of the TESOL doctoral programs in these five universities in Taiwan have a common goal --- to lead their doctoral students to equip themselves with the essential scholarly competence before they get the doctoral degree and move on to the next stage of their future career in the TESOL academia.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to investigate the academic development process of a Taiwanese doctoral student studying in a TESOL doctoral program in a university in the social context of Taiwan, especially about his experiences in presenting his research in conferences, publishing his research in refereed journals, and in conducting his doctoral dissertation research and writing it up.

Throughout the period as a graduate student in a TESOL doctoral program, the processes of how the participant coped with challenges by making essential decisions, applying needed strategies, and utilizing resources available, how he was socio-culturally mediated by significant people around him, and how he perceived those experiences throughout the way to acquire his doctoral degree in TESOL would be depicted and interpreted.

Significance of the Study

With the purpose to investigate an TESOL doctoral student's experiences in the TESOL academia during the doctoral education period within and beyond the EFL context, this study aims to contribute to several aspects of the higher education, especially the TESOL doctoral program in Taiwan. This research may shed light on some issues related to the challenges the research participant was facing as a TESOL graduate student in submitting research for and presenting research at conferences, submitting research for and publishing research in peer-reviewed journals, and completing his dissertation research and writing it up. In addition, the research may illuminate the similarities and/or differences between the experiences of the research participant and the experiences of other NNS scholars and/or NNS doctoral students situated in other countries in related literature.

Starting from the Personal Curiosity

Drawing on the concepts from Clandinin and Connelly (2000) and Casanave (2010), the researcher of this current study started this research from his personal curiosity and decided to take the risk of adopting a narrative inquiry approach to investigate the experience of another Taiwanese TESOL doctoral student in the context Taiwan. When this study was initiated, the researcher of this research was also a TESOL doctoral candidate in a university situated in the social context of Taiwan. In order to gain a better understanding about the participant's experiences, the researcher took an "emic" point of view, with the purpose to describe the culture of the TESOL community "in its own cultural terms" and also from the perspective of an insider of it (Pike, 1954 as cited in Damen,1986, pp.59). Thus, in the following, the researcher would begin from his own stories in the TESOL community.

The Researcher's Narratives about His Own Experience

Two narrative accounts below depict the researcher's experience in a TESOL doctoral program in Taiwan as well as the interpretations of it. This is necessary because the researcher's personal points of view and attitudes towards the academia social context where the researcher is in is exactly where this research is situated.

Narrative I: A narrative about my experience in a TESOL doctoral program in the social context of Taiwan

The activities that I have been engaged in during these years in the doctoral program include a series of compulsory academic tasks in the programs, some self-initiated ones outside the program, teaching part-time in colleges, and working as a part-time assistant on campus.

First of all, during the first three years after I entered the program, I had to attend courses provided in the doctoral program because they are the requirements. A plenty of courses in relation to theories and practice in SLA, TESOL, and applied linguistics were offered while I was in the program, and I submitted for conference presentations with term papers for the courses I had taken. To finish this stage, five or six semesters would be an average duration for one to complete, and I spent six semesters during this coursework stage. To move forward, I struggled to prepare and study for the qualifying exams. The processes were painful but learnable to me because I striven to pass those exams several times before I really made it. It was also demanding to get ready for the dissertation proposal defense, because I had to figure out the domain and the paradigm I would be in so as to proceed with my dissertation research design as well as to demonstrate my understanding of related previous studies and the research issues that I intended to explore. It was the time I started to feel that conducting the dissertation research required more than what I had thought needed. After the proposal, it was time for the tasks of conducting the research for the dissertation, which included collecting the research data, analyzing the data, and coming up with the preliminary results for a rough draft. Those tasks really took me much more energy and time than I had expected due to the time-consuming processes of transcribing the audio clips and summarizing the information from multiple resources of research data. Finally, most important of all, it would be the obligatory and endless effort to write up the dissertation research as what I am doing now, and only by finishing a decent dissertation with a certain contribution to the field can I officially obtain the admitted qualification and get the degree. So far, this has also been a torturing but learnable process. However, time constraints and the quality of my dissertation are always what I am concerned about most.

In addition to the above-mentioned required tasks in the doctoral program, during these years, I also took chances to give myself opportunities to learn from the context outside the program. For example, I went to conferences to be a speaker by *presenting my term papers or to be just one of the audiences to update myself with the current research trends and learn from others. Plus, I also attended several workshops to acquire more understanding about the theoretical perspectives and the experience from the real practice about conducting research and methodology. Furthermore, I also worked hard by cooperatively participating in a study group with other doctoral student peers, so as to enhance my abilities to cope with the demands from the qualifying exams. I would say I had also been substantially nurtured academically from the above learning experiences in those contexts.*

In order to maintain the needed financial capacity, I always needed to work part-time by teaching English courses in colleges so as to make money and support myself. But, another important motive for doing so is to gain the teaching experience and to conduct research. With the accumulated teaching experience, I often regarded teaching part-time in colleges as quite rewarding, but sometimes I also felt worried that I had spent a big amount of time on the part-time teaching jobs. Besides, I also worked part-time as an on-campus research and teaching assistant to make extra money and gain the experience as well as the explicit and implicit knowledge from the contextual experience shared by some professors I regarded as role models.

Everything I did was for the purpose to survive, either academically or economically, so as to go through these processes in the doctoral program and to equip myself with the competence to conduct research and write scholarly papers. In other words, what I have been doing is not only for the demands from the doctoral program but also for my own expectations to become a competent scholar in TESOL, to work in the academia or to teach in a college, to be able to contribute to the knowledge field, and so forth.

Besides, being a Taiwanese TESOL doctoral student educated in Taiwan has led a certain belief in my mind. That is, I felt that it would be beneficial to be an exchange student in a certain foreign country where English is spoken. For example, I used to dream of being an exchange scholar doctoral student with the scholarship from the government, like the Ministry of Science and Technology, even though finally I abandoned that plan. I had that intention to be an exchange student scholar when I entered the program because I was very aware of my existence as a homemade (Made in Taiwan) TESOL Ph.D. one day. To expand the horizons by staying in the U.S. for academic purposes for a period of time, I thought, would be one of the solutions to reduce my apprehension over the fact that I would be a homemade TESOL Ph.D. Even though I did not have a chance to prove whether or not it is beneficial to be an *overseas exchange scholar, I have been occupied with the thought during these years.*

Now, when I recall my personal experience as a TESOL doctoral student during these years, it is easy for me to be aware that my attitudes towards myself were changing along with the stages I was in. As I was just entered the doctoral program, whenever I was inquired by people what I am doing and who I am, I would tell them that I am a TESOL Ph.D. student, and I felt so proud of that. Then, when I had the chances to present my term papers in some conferences, I felt that I was a young scholar because I was at the conference venues, interacting with other people from the TESOL academia. Later, when I was striving again to pass the qualifying exams, I hesitatively and timidly replied to others' question about my identity, "Yes, I am a TESOL Ph.D. student, but I am still working on my qualifying exams." Then, after I passed the qualifying exams and became a candidate, I felt I was willing to discuss with others about my plans for the future because I thought I was close to graduation. Then, when I was done with the dissertation proposal oral defense and started to conduct my dissertation research, I finally came to realize the meaning of what others at conferences used to tell me that they were ABDs. It seems that what I could achieve may influence my perceptions of who I am!

Narrative II: Awareness of the future challenges

Under the social context of the academia in Taiwan and around the world, it is no doubt that to be able to conduct research and successfully publish scholarly publications is the basic requirement or the threshold for being a competent scholar or continually getting promoted to be as a professor in a college. People in the academia would acknowledge the merits from scholarly publications, which may reveal one's scholarly expertise and the capacity to produce scholarly papers. The capacity requirement has caused people in the academia to invest much more time and energy on conducting research, for writing scholarly papers and contributing to the knowledge field. It is no exception to the doctoral students in general, who are endeavoring to get their research published, no matter it is due to the formal graduation requirements from the doctoral program or due to one's own intention to accumulate more entries of scholarly papers on his/her curriculum vita for future job position searching. As a TESOL doctoral student in Taiwan, I know I am learning under such a demanding and competitive contextual atmosphere, and I have been working hard to equip myself with the needed competence to survive in the academia in the future. However, I have also been curious about what other peers are doing, what they have achieved, how they feel about themselves, or how they strive to survive *in the processes of achieving a doctoral degree.*

Definitions of Terms

The definitions of terms adopted in this research are elaborated as the following:

TESOL academic community

In this research, the term TESOL refers to the conventional meaning as teaching English to speakers of other languages, and the term TESOL academic community may comprise at least two subordinate communities---(1) the community of TESOL academia and (2) the community of graduate school program of TESOL, as indicated in Table 1.1 below. First, the community of TESOL academia is concerned about the people related to refereed journals and conferences, and it has both the local and the global contexts. Second, the community of graduate school program of TESOL pertains specifically to the population related to the graduate school program that offers the master's degree or doctoral degree to the research participant.

Table 1.1 TESOL Academic Community

Community / Items	TESOL academic community	
Subordinate communities	(1) the community of TESOL academia	(2) the community of graduate school program of TESOL
Academic tasks	submitting for and presenting at conferences in local or global context; submitting for and publishing in journals in local or global context	conducting research for and writing up master's thesis conducting research for and writing up doctoral dissertation

Narrative inquiry

The term, narrative inquiry, used in this research may include two perspectives. One is from Clandinin and Connelly (2000), and the other is from Polkinghorne (1995).

First, according to Clandinin and Connelly (2000), narrative inquiry means the "phenomena under study" and the "method of study (p.4)." The phenomena under study means the data collected from the participant (e.g. oral history, written autobiography, or documents), and the method of study means the ways of analyzing the data and interpreting the data, based on "situation, continuity, and interaction" (p.49).

Second, according to Polkinghorne (1995), there are two types of narrative inquiry: (1) paradigmatic-type narrative inquiry, also called as "analysis of narratives," which is based on the "traditional logical-scientific mode of knowing" (Bruner, 1985) and (2) narrative-type narrative inquiry, also named as "narrative analysis," which is based on "storied knowing" (Bruner, 1985).

Thus, in the research, the research collected the narrative data (e.g. autobiography, narrative interviews, written logs, and documents) from the participant to analyze them and categorize the narrative data from the participant into various themes of participant's stories. Then, the researcher wrote seven narratives by configuring these participant's stories into seven researcher's narratives based on the researcher's understanding of the participant's experiences to gain the meanings of the participant's experience. Meanwhile, the researcher also referred to Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) "situation, continuity, and interaction" to interpret the meanings while writing the seven narratives for chapter four.

Narrative (= the researcher-composed narrative), Story, and Event

In this research, there are seven narratives in chapter four, which are composed by the researcher to analyze and interpret the participant's experience. In each narrative, there are several stories to deal with the participant's experiences of various topics, and each story may consist of several events.

Academic visibility

In this research, it refers to the extent people know one's academic works. Leahey (2007) defines "visibility in an academic field" as the situation when "people know your name, are familiar with your works, and think highly of your intellectual contributions" (p.537).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Reviewing relevant previous studies, in order to connect the existing literature with this current research, the researcher synthesized a variety of research on different research subjects/participants who are English nonnative speakers, including scholars submitting for scholarly publication, doctoral students submitting for scholarly publication, and doctoral students completing their dissertations. Besides, the theoretical framework for this study is provided and elaborated.

Studies about NNS Scholars Submitting for Scholarly Publication

Since two more decades ago, there have been more and more studies conducted to explore the issues related to professional writing in English for scholarly publication around the world, especially about the experiences of scholars who are English non-native speakers (Belcher, 2007; Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Canagarajah, 1996; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew,1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2001, 2005; Gosden, 2003; Kourilova,1998).

Scholars from around the world, where English is not spoken as a first language, as well as those scholars who are English native speakers, are all eager to participate in their professional scholarly communities through scholarly publication , for example, publishing in international refereed journals, in order to contribute to the knowledge field of a certain kind, and English, as a lingua franca, has become a dominant language (Belcher, 2007; Canagarajah, 1996; Curry & Lilis, 2004;

Flowerdew, 2000).

For nonnative English speaker scholars around the world, in order to submit their manuscripts for scholarly publication to a certain scholarly community, for example, a scholarly journal, there would be some requirements given by the peer-reviewed journal editors and reviewers as gatekeepers because they are the people who would review the manuscripts first and give feedback and decide whether to reject the submission or to suggest revision and resubmission again (Gosden, 2003). In fact, most of the processes are not transparent, and there are some studies aiming to uncover the requirements behind those processes, in which NNS researchers try to communicate with journal editors and reviewers through their comments and replies. First of all, Gosden (1992) highlights the importance of the linguistic and socio-pragmatic skills needed for the researchers to reply to the comments from journal editors and reviewers. Other researchers also give similar suggestions to those nonnative English speaker researchers. Kourilova (1998) indicates that to get accepted, NNS researchers not only should have the "professional ideas" but also the "academic literacy"(p.114). He also concludes that the "socio-cultural sensitivity and pragmalinguistic competence" are the prerequisites for the researchers to get accepted and "fit in both professional and socially as members of the scientific community" (p.114). Gosden (2003) also indicates that the process of reviewing the manuscripts is a complicated process that may demand the "socio-cultural sensitivity" and "pragma-linguistic competence" (p.87). In other words, the process of submitting to peer-reviewed journals is not just related to the research, but it is also related to the understanding the requirements from the journal editors and reviewers and the communication with. As a result, Gosden suggests that it is essential for the young researchers to understand properly "the motivation behind the referees' comments" (p.87). Belcher (2007) also indicates that the processes of communicating with those gatekeepers should be negotiable, and she also suggests that with the “authorial persistence, that is, willingness to continue revising and resubmitting when faced with extensive critical commentary from reviewers, can result in publication” (p.1). Thus, from the above, it can be concluded that in submitting manuscripts for scholarly publication, it would be necessary to learn to communicate and negotiate with the journal editors and reviewers when encountering criticisms.

In addition, there are some problematic aspects when journal editors and reviewers review NNS manuscripts. For example, Flowerdew (2001) investigates the attitudes of journal editors and reviewers when reviewing the manuscripts from NNS researchers, and he found some problematic aspects from NNS manuscripts, such as the “surface language errors”, “parochialism,” which means "the failure to show the relevance of the study to the international community"(p.135), and the inability of NNS researchers to carve out a niche (p.136). Besides, Curry and Lillis (2004) also indicate another common problem that many NNS researchers have, that is, the insufficient language proficiency of English. They indicate NNS “scholars often feel frustrated with the way English functions as an obligatory additional academic medium” (p.681). Indeed, NNS researchers are under increasing pressure because of the requirement of using English as a language to write for their academic works; however, most of the NNS researchers are short of the good language skills, especially writing for academic purposes. However, Belcher (2007) does not just elaborate on the criticisms given by the editors and reviewers, but instead she suggests that journal editors can help “to support off-network scholars through careful choice of reviewers and clear-as-possible correspondence with authors” (p.19), and “in communicating the reviewers’ and their own recommendation to authors, should do so in as unambiguous a manner as possible" (p.19). It seems that the responsibilities of publishing in peer-reviewed journals should be shared by both the contributors and the editors and reviewers, instead of the NNS contributors. This concept also echoes what Flowerdew (1999a) claims that "compensatory measures of an international nature" should be considered (p.260). One of the measures he suggests is to enhance the awareness of the editors and reviewers while reviewing the works from NNS contributors .Thus, although editors and reviewers as gatekeepers have the authority to identify flaws in NNS manuscripts, some of them are willing to take the responsibility to enhance the clarity of their language in giving comments and feedback as well as to give support.

Given the problematic aspects that NNS scholars may have in submitting for scholarly publication, some studies also suggest solutions to help to enhance the possibilities for NNS manuscripts to be accepted. For example, Burrough-Boenisch (2003) indicates the necessity for NNS authors to hire the copy-editor to enhance the quality of the NNS researchers' manuscripts because the editing part can be left to the journal's copy-editors, so that the quality of the manuscripts can be raised enough to meet the requirements form the journals (p.238). This echoes what Flowerdew's (1999a) suggestion for the compensatory measure, in which the "mentoring service" can be given to assist the contributors' writing proficiency. However, Leki and Sliva, (2008) point out there might be some problem with that. They indicate that around the world there is a big amount of people who are copy-editors in English language and are working as an industry to help NNS researchers to improve their manuscript quality by editing and rewiring the texts, but this might cause many problems (p.59). For example, one of the concerns is who the owner of the texts is after the texts are adjusted and refined, and the manuscripts are published (p.59) because the texts might be adjusted and rewritten based on the English proficiency level of the language editors. Another concern is if the English-language editor is an insider and is quite “familiar with the disciplinary discourse and can be of greatest assistance” (p.59), then the English-language editors might commit the ethical problem because the content of the manuscripts might not be the original work of the NNS author. Besides, some other studies suggest the collaboration with native speaker scholars (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 1999a; Leki & Sliva, 2008). They suggest either work with a co-author or collaborate with other NS scholars to enhance the quality of manuscripts. All in all, scholars should be cautious about committing ethical problems when asking for the help from the copy-editor or proof-reading service in revising their texts.

Studies about NNS Doctoral Students Submitting for Scholarly Publication

Doctoral students around the world are often regarded as the emerging scholars, novice doctoral scholars, and apprentice scholars, who can also contribute to the knowledge field by submitting for publication to different discourse communities, and there is no exception to NNE doctoral students. There are some studies that have been conducted to investigate these processes and experiences (Cho, 2004; Li, 2006, 2007; Li & Flowerdew, 2007, Kamler, 2008; Kwan, 2010, 2013).

Some studies investigate the processes of NNS doctoral students during their doctoral study periods taking efforts in trying to submit their research for scholarly journal publication. Cho (2004) points out the experiences of the four research participants in her study revealed many challenges, including language challenges, co-authoring with supervisors or colleagues, and looking for proof-reading assistance from NSs. Besides, Li (2006) investigates the processes of a NNS computer science doctoral student publishing under the pressure from" the graduation requirements," the contribution to the "home research group," and "her personal academic record" by submitting her manuscripts to "three layers of communities", so as to contribute to the disciplinary knowledge.

Many studies that suggest the necessity of giving pedagogical guidance from experienced supervisors or colleagues to NNS doctoral students while writing for scholarly publication (Kamler, 2008; Kwan, 2008, 2010, 2013; Lee & Kamler, 2008; Li, 2006, 2007). First, Li (2006) suggests the necessity to help doctoral students understand the "generic variations" in and to help them able to reuse the appropriate language in research writing (p. 175). This study also highlights the importance of embedding the "discussions of issues" in EAP classrooms, which may help learners to develop the knowledge of "epistemological procedures" of certain discipline as well as to cultivate the learners to be independent writers who are able to articulate their voices and project their identities in their writing (p.175). Besides, Li (2007) examines a NNS doctoral student's experiences in engaging with his communities of practice, such as "the local research community," "the laboratory data," "his own experience of writing research articles," and "the global specialist research community" (p.55). Li herself in the study works as an EAP practitioner to give the assistance to the subject. However, Li also questions if there would be "enough TESOL practitioners in non-Angolophone contexts" who can offer the needed help and support to students (p.74). Furthermore, Lee and Kamler (2008) also suggest that there should be the pedagogy that can help to "explicitly" give the doctoral students the guidance of participating in the "the world of peer-reviewed publication" (p.511). However, they do not recommend the "master class" because they regard the traditional master class is usually given by those "published writers, significant figures in the field, journal editors and publishers”(p. 512) because they think this type of pedagogical process is usually occasional and theme-specific (p.512). Instead, they suggest the pedagogical assistance should be on a regular based in the doctoral education (p.512). In other words, such type of courses should be embedded into the doctoral course. They argue that there should be the “explicit and well-theorised pedagogies of writing and publishing in, for and beyond the doctorate” (p.512). In other words, doctoral students should be instructed to publish before and after they graduate. Third, likewise, Kamler (2008) also indicates the need to give attention to the formal pedagogical instructions to doctoral students because most of the doctoral students do not have the chance to receive “adequate mentoring or structural support” to make their own research published (p.283). They also suggest co-authoring with supervisors because in their study “co-authorship with supervisors” plays a important role in giving assistance to doctoral student to writ papers for peer-reviewed publications (p.287). Finally, Kwan (2010) examines the “instruction in research publication (IRP) given in the universities in Hong Kong, indicating that IRP needs to be given some priority in doctoral programs in the Asian contexts” (p.55). Some domains of competence are recommended to be developed in order to publish internationally, such as “scholarly communication, strategic, research conception, strategic management of publishing” (p. 55). All the above studies stress the importance of pedagogical instruction or guidance given to NNS doctoral students for publishing in refereed journals.

Studies about Completing the Doctoral Dissertation

Some studies also give attention to the processes of doctoral students’ completing the dissertation (Aitchison, 2009; Aitchison & Lee, 2006; Allison et al.,1998; Dong, 1998; Hasrati, 2005; Kamler, 2008; Lee & Boud, 2003; Lee & Kamler, 2008). To give support to doctoral students while fulfill their dissertation requirements, different studies give a variety of suggestions in terms of their own contexts. First of all, Allison et al (1998) investigate the supporting program in an English center given to NNS graduate students in Hong Kong while writing up their theses or dissertations. Through their investigation, they try to figure out what areas that students' shortcomings might be located, such as failure to create a research space, failure to substantiate arguments, inability to organize information, and other local writing problems. They try to develop the program and give assistance to NNS graduate students based on their diagnostic framework and the writing program, which is based on the macro textual level of students' written texts of their dissertations.

However, suggestions from other studies might incorporate more than the writing itself (Aitchison, 2009; Aitchison & Lee, 2006; Done, 1998; Parker, 2009). For example, Dong (1998) examines the experiences of graduate students and advisors in two universities in the U.S. and finds NNS graduate students are short of the "social networks and use of writing resources" (p.369), and they suggest EAP classes teach "knowledge transformation skills" (p.369), the necessity to build "helping networks," and the need of a "collaboration among disciplines on audience/genre/discipline specific writing instruction" (p.369). Other studies all suggest the use of peer writing group or study group. For example, Parker's (2009) study is on the "collaborative and collective forms of doctoral education" which is realized in the form as a "scholarly writing group" in Australia, and it draws on the concept of the social learning approach, the community of practice (p.44). Besides, Aitchison (2009) suggests the writing group approach drawing on the concept of Lave and Wenger's (1991) "legitimate peripheral participation" for doctoral education to cultivate doctoral students from different disciplines to engage in discussions on their own writing texts so as to learn by “critiquing” each other’s texts and also gain the “working knowledge” of academic writing needed for doctoral students (p.909). The above studies all highlight the benefits from the form of group learning among peers to enhance their learning from mutual interactions or sharing.

For the strategies to survive in the doctoral program, studies offer their suggestions in different angles (Casanave, 2010; Hasrati, 2005; Hasrati & Street; Kwan, 2008, 2009). First of all, Hasrati (2005) examines the process of “academic socialization” of doctoral students in five UK university with the concept of “legitimate peripheral participation” (Lave & Wenger, 1991), specially about the relationship between students and supervisors. The study highlights the “informal routes to learning” found in the doctoral students participants who “learned most what they needed through information interactions with their supervisors and other Ph.D. students” (p.567). Hasrati and Street (2008) investigates the doctoral students’ experiences with research topics for their dissertation research in UK universities. They find doctoral students from engineering major are usually assigned a topic by their supervisors, while students from social sciences or humanities mostly select their own topics. They suggest that the EAP course should redefine the concept of discourse, which should consist of both “linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of advanced academic literacy” (p.14). Finally, Kwan (2008) indicates strategic preparation for writing literature review through the combination of reading, writing, and researching. Kwan (2009) also investigates the role of reading in preparing for writing for a doctoral dissertation, especially about how doctoral students as ”insiders” of a certain discipline develop their understanding of the related literature on “theoretical and methodological works”(p.188) and apply the knowledge to their own writing needs for research articles and thesis writing. She indicates that selecting what discipline literature to read for review is “socially mediated, ” and for this reason, research articles may serve the “socialization” function as to leading students to a certain “research community” (p. 188).The above-mentioned studies all contribute to the understanding of the processes of or the preparations for completing dissertation or theses.

Having reviewed related studies concerning the experiences of scholarly publication by NNS scholars or by doctoral students as well as the related issues about the processes of completing the dissertations, a better understanding about the whole pictures and the features of discourse communities of NNS scholars and doctoral students and their related experience or challenges is gained. However, there seems to be an obvious lack in the literature related to the experiences of NNS TESOL doctoral students situated in the context of Taiwan, presenting the research in conferences, submitting for scholarly publication, and completing the dissertation. Until now, Taiwanese TESOL doctoral students’ experiences in submitting papers for scholarly purposes and going through the processes of fulfilling the dissertation requirements have not been documented. To inform the policy makers for the higher education in Taiwan and to contribute to the knowledge about how doctoral students situated in the social context of Taiwan would cope with challenges or utilize resources, either to survive or to enhance their learning, throughout the period of doctoral study, compared with the examples from previous studies, conducting a study aiming to investigate doctoral students’ experiences in their development of writing for scholarly purposes is justifiable. As a result, this research is expected to contribute to the TESOL academic community or the doctoral education in the context of Taiwan or worldwide. Hence, this current research would investigate the experience of a

Taiwanese TESOL doctoral student in writing and submitting for scholarly purposes as well as fulfilling the dissertation.

Theoretical Frameworks

The research is premised on several theoretical assumptions, including the characteristics of discourse community defined by Swales (1990), the concepts of communities of practice from Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998), and the notions of academic literacy by Braine (2002) and Casanave and Li (2008).

First of all, it is the notion of 'discourse community' defined by Swales (1990) that may depict the phenomena of conforming to requirements of academic writing for scholarly publications, especially when scholars around the world are eager to publish in refereed journals through English. In such a social context, members of a certain community are required to follow "patterns and conventions which reflect the sociocultural understandings of that community"(Hyland, 2002, p.41) if they want to share their professional knowledge with other members. Swales (1990) defined it as a 'discourse community'(p.20) with the following features:

1. A discourse community has a broadly agreed set of common public goals.
2. A discourse community has mechanisms of intercommunication among its members.
3. A discourse community uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback.
4. A discourse community utilizes and hence possesses one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims.

5. In addition to owning genres, a discourse community has acquired some specific lexis.
6. A discourse community has a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discourse expertise.

Swales (1990) gave the meaning of ‘discourse community’ as “the socio-rhetorical character of communities organized to accomplish common goals through their use of particular genres” (Swales, 1990, p.24-26). In other words, this definition given by Swales (1990) refers mainly to the rhetorical features of genres at that time. Then, Swales (1998) redefined the meanings of it as “a group of people who typically work together with a sense of the group’s roles and purposes, an evolved range of genres, some consensus on work patterns and a way of initiating novices into its practices” (Swales, 1998, as cited in Hyland, 2002, p. 42). Both definitions for this metaphor ‘discourse community’ imply that members of the communities have to follow the requirements of conventions or norms in their written knowledge productions of texts, so as to communicate with other members in the same community.

Second, this current research adopts the concept of community of practice by Wenger (1998) in order to interpret the phenomena of social learning. Wenger’s theory was developed based on an observation of medical claim processors working in their workplace, an insurance company in the U.S. In that context, those processors informally get together and learn from each other in order to meet the demands from the institution by forming communities in the workplace to learn from each other (p.46). In this context, they develop their own ways of doing things, which are more effective than what the official training courses would offer. The skills or tips of doing things that they commonly develop can be defined as the “practice” (p. 47). Thus, the members have the chances to form their communities of practice so as to engage mutually with each other, to work for their joint enterprises, and to develop their shared repertories (p.72). Through participation and reification in the inform context, based on the social relations, they learn from each other, negotiate the meaning in the process, and gain their membership in practice, as what Wenger (1998) indicates:

> [This book,] Communities of Practice, presents a theory of learning that starts with this assumption: engagement in social practice is the fundamental process by which we learn and so become who we are. The primary unit of analysis is neither the individual nor social institutions but rather the informal 'communities of practice' that people form as they pursue shared enterprises over time.

The social learning theory of Wenger's communities of practice dwells on learning in the informal rather than the formal context. Thus, it is suitable for this current research. The central reason for adopting the social learning theory as the lens to interpret the experiences of the doctoral student in this research is that most of the resources of knowledge or occasions of learning in learning to submit to and present at conferences, to submit to and publish in peer-reviewed journals, and to complete the dissertation research are not directly offered by the institutional courses. But, instead, the doctoral student may have to learn by doing or by participating in a certain real context to engage with others. In other words, this social learning is not directly taught in the classroom context.

Third, Braine (2002) defines "academic literacy" as the abilities not limited to reading and writing, but related to a more comprehensive and wide range of abilities that graduate students should develop:

> ....the acquisition of "academic literacy" that is essential for graduate studies is more than the ability to read and write effectively...graduate students not only need to build interactive relationships with their teachers, thesis supervisors, and peers, and develop effective research strategies and good writing skills, they also need to adapt smoothly to the linguistic and social milieu of their host environment and to the culture of their academic departments and institutions (p.60).

This concept may be in line with the situation that the doctoral student in this research is in because what the doctoral student has to be faced with is not just related to reading and writing, but also to a broad range of norms or requirements in the academic context.

Likewise, Casanava and Li (2008) also define “academic literacy” as the concept of “participatory practice,” which is concerning “literacy-related issues” (p.16):

> In short, looking at academic literacy as participatory practice involves looking at what people do, particularly in relationship to other community members, not just at what they write. The activities students become involved in and the alliances they forge while pursuing graduate degrees immerse students in a variety of practices within disciplinary communities heretofore unknown to them even if they are familiar with disciplinary subject matter (p.17).

In this research, the doctoral student is situated in the social context of TESOL academic communities, which may include the academia of TESOL and the graduate school programs of TESOL, in which the doctoral student, while pursuing the degrees, is seeking advice from other members or is socially mediated by other members in a variety of informal contexts. Hence, this research draws on the notions of “academic literacy” defined by Braine (2002) and Casanava and Li (2008).

Finally, Norton (1995) adopts the concept of “investment” instead of the general wording “motivation” to depict one’s intention to learn the target language:

> The concept of investment…signals the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language, and their often ambivalent desire to learn and practice it (p.10).

Norton’s concept of “investment” is derived from Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1977) notion of ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977, as cited in Norton, 2000, p.10).” Norton further explains:

> If learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital. Learners expect or hope to have a good return on that investment--- a return that will give them access to hitherto unattainable resources (p.10).

According to the above notion for “investment” by Norton, learners might invest in learning a second language with the intention to enhance the value of their cultural capital. Although Norton’s (1995) definition of “investment” is related to second language learners, the notion of “investment” can be applied to this research by analogy because it may be regarded as the intention of doctoral students to engage in academic tasks for scholarly purposes.

Thus, combining the above-mentioned concepts, including academic literacy (Braine, 2002; Casanava & Li, 2008), the community of practice theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), and the notion of investment (Norton,1995), this research explored the experiences of a Taiwanese TESOL doctoral student who was struggling to engage in various academic tasks for scholarly purposes as well as investing in the development of his academic literacy in the TESOL graduate school programs and the TESOL academia, through different stages to, in order to enhance his cultural capital and finally gain a fuller membership in the TESOL community, both local and global.

.

Research Questions

With the purpose to investigate the experiences of a Taiwanese TESOL doctoral student engaging in academic tasks for scholarly purposes and fulfilling the dissertation task for a doctoral degree, two research questions are raised as follows:

Question1. As a doctoral student in a TESOL program, what kinds of academic tasks for scholarly purposes was the participant engaged in, and what challenges or problems did the participant encounter while fulfilling these tasks? How did the participant perceive these experiences?

Question2. What resources or strategies did the participant seek and utilize to overcome the challenges or problems that the participant encountered? How was the participant socially and culturally mediated while he was fulfilling related academic tasks? How did the participant perceive these experiences?

CHAPTER3

METHDOLOGY

The Research Paradigm

As for the research paradigm, it is the constructivism that this research adopted. According to Guba and Lincoln (1994), a paradigm is "a set of basic beliefs" that help to determine the basic “principles” of conducting research, and it is based on "ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions" (p.107). In this regard, three fundamental questions corresponding to these three assumptions should be answered while considering the paradigm, including the ontological question, the epistemological question, and the methodological question. The three questions are summarized as follows:

1. What is the form and nature of reality and, therefore, what is there that can be known about it?
2. What is the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known?
3. How can the inquirer (would-be knower) go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known? (p.108)

In the paradigm of constructivism, first of all, as for the ontological question, Guba and Lincoln (1994) indicated that “realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature, and dependent for their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions (p.111).” In other words, constructivism assumes a “relativist” position for the ontological assumption, which means that the realities exist relatively in the individual’s perceptions of any phenomena. In this research, the participant’s narratives about his experiences were the targeted resources of realities, and these realities were based on his involvement in various social contexts and the interpretations of his own experiences.

In addition, for the epistemological question, Guba and Lincoln (1994) pointed out that ”the investigator and the object of investigation are assumed to be interactively linked so that the ‘findings’ are literally created as the investigation proceeds (p.111).” Thus, constructivism holds a transactional and subjectivist view for the epistemological assumption. This means that the relationship between the investigator and the object of research is interactively connected enough for the findings to be made during the processes of the investigation. In this research, the mutual interactions between the participant and the researcher were deep, and the participant’s subjective experiences could be interpreted and understood by the researcher during the processes of research.

Finally, as for the methodological question, Guba and Lincoln (1994) indicated that “individual constructions can be elicited and refined only through interaction between and among investigator and respondents. These varying constructions are interpreted using conventional hermeneutical techniques, and are compared and contrasted through a dialectical interchange (p.111).” Namely, the constructivism holds a hermeneutical and dialectical position for the methodological assumption. This means that the interpretations for the constructions are through the hermeneutical explanations and dialectical interactions to acquire and confirm the interpretative meanings. In this research, the participant’s written autobiography, transcripts of narrative interviews, weekly logs, and related documents from the participant were analyzed and interpreted hermeneutically by the researcher to gain the understanding of the participant's experiences, which were reconfirmed through the dialectical interactions between the researcher and the participant.

Justifying the Approach to Collect the Research Data

To understand the participant's experiences in presenting research at conferences, publishing in refereed journals, and completing his doctoral dissertation, this research employed a longitudinal narrative inquiry approach. To this end, in this research, a prolonged engagement (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with the participant in order to establish the truthworthiness was carried out. In addition, a multiple resources of narratives were gathered from the participant as research data, which were then analyzed and interpreted to gain the findings. Thus, the narrative data from the participant were collected as research data, and the researcher employed narrative analysis to analyze and interpret the data, as Clandinin and Connelly (2000) indicated that "narrative is both the phenomenon and the method of the social sciences" (p.18). Riessman (2008) also defined these two terms, "narrative data" and "narrative analysis" as "the empirical materials" and "the systematic study of narrative data," (p.6) respectively.

There are several reasons elaborated below for the narrative inquiry approach to be adopted in this research. First of all, storytelling can be an appropriate way to understand one's experiences because of its communicative function and the important role it plays in human's life. Lieblich et al (1998) argue that "stories provide coherence and continuity to one's experience and have a central role in our communication with others" (p.7). Besides, Lieblich et al also indicated "one of the clearest channels for learning about the inner world is through verbal accounts and stories presented by individual narrators about their lives and their experienced reality" (p.7). Thus, to understand the participant's experience, collecting narrative data from the participant can be an effective approach.

Second, narrative can be the best method for one to present his own experiences and for the researcher to understand his experiences because of its "continuity and wholeness" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p.17). Clandinin and Connelly (2000) claim that to understand experiences, it is essential for a researcher to be "not only concerned with life as it is in the here and now but also with life as it is experienced on a continuum"(p.19).In other words, through narrative the participant may reveal the "continuity and wholeness" (p.17) of his experiences, and the researcher can get a better understanding by thinking of the participant's experiences in a holistic manner.

Third, narrative can be a good tool because it is a suitable "linguistic form" to present human's "situated" experiences (Polkinghorne, 1995, p.5). Polkinghorne (1995) indicates that "narrative descriptions exhibit human activity as purposeful engagement in the world. Narrative is the type of discourse composition that draws together diverse events, happenings, and actions of human lives into thematically unified goal-directed processes" (p.5). Thus, in this research, many details of the participant's experiences can be elicited through his narrative, and the researcher can reorganize episodes or events from the participant's narrative into meaningful stories.

Fourth, narrative can help the researcher to understand the participant's life from the participant's perspective because of the participant's subjectivity. Atkinson (1997) indicates that “as a way of meaning making, identifying life influences, and interpreting experience, there may be no better method than the subjective narrative of the life story to help the researchers understand a life from the insider’s point of view” (p.13). Thus, in this research, through narrative data, it will be proper for the researcher to understand the experiences from the participant’s subjective viewpoint.

Fifth, using narratives as research data can provide various dimensions of information about a narrator’s experiences. Casanave (2005) argues that “the stories, in other words, provide the authors with the kind of deep understanding of students’ knowledge, decision processes, and affective states that can only be hinted as from non-narrative data” (p.25). Thus, in this research, with the narrative data, a rich collection of descriptions about the participant’s experiences can be gained.

Based on the above previous studies, the reasons of utilizing narrative as data to do research are listed, including `the effective communicative feature, the continuity and wholeness, the appropriate linguistic form, the participant’s subjectivity, and a wide range of dimensions of information it may offer, which all may contribute to the understanding of the participant’s experiences. Hence, to conduct this research through the narrative inquiry approach is justifiable.

The Research Participant

The research participant’s background

Andrew Liu (pseudonym), the research participant, was a male Taiwanese doctoral candidate of a TESOL doctoral program in a university in the northern

Taiwan when the data collection for this research just started to be conducted in August 2011. At that time, Andrew was about thirty years old, and just began the sixth year of his doctoral study. He came back to Taiwan from the U.S., where he had been staying during the previous twelve months as an exchange scholar in a university. Before Andrew went to the U.S. as an exchange scholar, he had been spending four years studying in the doctoral program since 2006, and then he finished his doctoral degree in July, 2012. Hence, he spent totally six years on his doctoral study. Before that he had spent another three years, from 2003 to 2006, pursuing a TESOL master's degree in another university in Taiwan. In addition, while Andrew was a doctoral student, he was working as a full-time lecturer, teaching several English courses in a college.

How the researcher participant was recruited

The process to recruit a qualified research participant for this research was a painful and uncertain process. Before the researcher started to conduct the data collection, he had tried many times to know if there was any suitable doctoral student, who was about to start his/her dissertation research, who had a certain experience in submitting for scholarly publication, and most important of all, who was willing to share his/her experience in the TESOL academic context. Naturally, such inquiries or invitations were rejected by many doctoral students due to some personal reasons. To the researcher, it was a struggling process, full of uncertainties, and the researcher was not sure if the original dissertation research design would be really carried out. Finally, the researcher luckily got the tentative confirmation from the current research participant, Andrew, in November 2010. At that time, Andrew was working on his first three chapters for his dissertation proposal, while as an exchange scholar staying in the U.S.

Andrew went to the U.S. as an exchange scholar in August 2010, and he spent about twelve months, preparing for the first three chapters of his dissertation. The researcher met Andrew in a doctoral seminar class in the fall semester of 2007 in a university. Because of the cross-university cooperation Act, the researcher had a chance to take a course and attended a seminar class in Andrew's university. At that time, Andrew was in the second year of his doctoral study, and the researcher was in the third year of his doctoral study. Although both the researcher and the participant were TESOL doctoral students, they were studying in different universities. During that semester, the researcher did not know much about Andrew, except through the interaction from the discussion in the class.

But, before that, the researcher met Andrew at a conference in May 2006 when Andrew came to present his conference paper in the researcher's university. Due to a common friend, the researcher and Andrew met in the conference tea break. Andrew sincerely gave his student name card to the researcher. At that time, the researcher's impression on Andrew was vague, but the researcher knew Andrew was a polite, well-educated, sincere, and hard-working doctoral student from another university, who enjoyed socializing at the conference venue.

In September 2010, the researcher happened to link to Andrew's webpage on Facebook, the online social networking service, and the researcher was so surprised to find some pictures with beautiful campus scenes and some pictures with some young scholars vigorously posing their gestures and smiling hilariously while the pictures were taken. The researcher was really impressed with those pictures and felt curious about what Andrew was doing there. The researcher was curious and eager to know what he was doing there, especially when it was the time the researcher was busy looking for participants for the dissertation research. Andrew replied that he went there as an exchange scholar with the sponsorship by a certain international scholarship foundation. The researcher felt so excited about Andrew's message because Andrew seemed to be a potential participant that the researcher was searching for ---a Taiwanese doctoral student who has the experiences of presenting at conferences and publishing in journals, and who is about to work on his/her own dissertation research.

However, the researcher was not so sure if Andrew was suitable to be one of the participants in the research and if Andrew would be interested in becoming a participant. Several weeks later, in October 2010, the researcher explained his research ideas to Andrew and inquired him if he would be interested in participating in this research. Luckily, Andrew replied to the researcher with confirmation, indicating he would like to participate in the research, but he said he was not interested in becoming a participant for one of the suggested research topics, a cross-cultural writing issue, as the researcher had mentioned. However, he said he was not able to work with the researcher immediately because he was then in the U.S. Then, in November 2010, through email, the research asked Andrew to start with a written autobiography. However, the first autobiography was not a learning story, but instead a collection of strategies Andrew employed to conduct research. With the second try on writing another autobiography in December 2010, Andrew finally developed a personal learning history. The research-participant relationship was gradually built during this period when negotiations like this between the researcher and Andrew were made and when an agreement as to what the data collection procedure would be like was reached. In August 2011, the research journey began.

The reasons why Andrew was recruited as the research participant

Basically, Andrew, the participant was selected to be the focus of this study because of his rich experience in presenting at conferences and publishing in journals and because of the timing when he was about to start his dissertation research. But other important factors that should not be neglected are his willingness to share his experience and the high interest he showed during the pre-research period during December 2010 and January 2011. For example, in December 2010, in an e-mail replied to the researcher, Andrew wrote:

> Hi Daniel,
>
> I think your research topic is quite interesting, and it is quite innovative. I have never read any dissertation taking the TESOL doctoral students as the subjects. Also the issues are quite comprehensive, which are about the processes from the basic cultivation of writing skills to writing for scholarly publication. That's really fun! Before, I have read a paper related to your topic. The author is Li Youngyan. Her expertise is scholarly literacy. Maybe you've read her works, but I'd like to send you the URL for your reference. (E-mail, 12/09/2010)

In this e-mail, Andrew showed his interest in this research, and he also introduced one important author for the researcher to read. However, the process of confirming the participation was not so smooth because Andrew declined to follow the original idea raised by the research, and in another e-mail, he wrote:

> Hi Daniel,
>
> I've read your email, and I think I would like to participate in your research. No problem! However, as for the topic of cross-cultural issue, I don't think I

> would be able to contribute anything to your research. That's because what I am doing here is writing up my dissertation, and so far in this place I have not found any things different from the contexts I have experienced in Taiwan. So, if you want me to share my experience in the cross-cultural issues in writing, I would have nothing at all to share with you. That's because I personally do not think there is no differences here! I would like to give you help. No problem! You just go on with your research designing. Good luck! (E-mail, 12/14/2010)

In this e-mail, Andrew indicated that he would not be able to contribute anything if the research issues would be related to the cross-cultural writing issue. But, he would like to participate in the research. Then after this email, the researcher formally wrote to Andrew to invite him to be the participant of the research, and it was the middle of December in 2010.

The interaction in the first narrative interview

The first narrative interview in August 2011 was really crucial because it was the first time that the researcher met Andrew for the first narrative interview and it was the first chance for the researcher to really converse with him in person. When the researcher had the first sight at him when meeting up each other in front of a university library, to the researcher's surprise, Andrew looked more mature than before. He looked more confident but still friendly, and he was greeting and smiling at the researcher warmly. Then, Andrew and the researcher had some small talks, and most of the topics were related to his life as an exchange scholar in the U.S. Like two old friends meeting each other, they talked hilariously and they had a very enjoyable conversation before they started the first narrative interview.

At that time, Andrew seemed to be a suitable participant for the research, even though the researcher was not so sure if Andrew would definitely feel comfortable with the ways to collect the data from him in the subsequent occasions. But, the researcher was sure Andrew is an easy-going and experienced young scholar who would like to share his academic experiences with the researcher for the research. As a doctoral peer with Andrew, during the first narrative interview that night, the researcher was astonished by hearing about Andrew's performance in scholarly publication, especially his long list of thirteen papers presented at conferences and eight papers published in journals, one manuscript under review, which he revealed orally during the first narrative interview. This understanding about how many conference papers Andrew might have presented or journal papers published also made the research eager to explore further about Andrew's experiences in submitting scholarly publications and conducting research. Besides, the commitment made by both the researcher and the participant in the first narrative interview also enhanced the growing rapport as well as trust between the researcher and the participant in the subsequent months.

Data Collection

In order to investigate the Taiwanese TESOL doctoral students' academic experience, this longitudinal research collected multiple resources of data, including e-mails, autobiography, oral narrative interviews, participant's written weekly logs, researcher's field notes and research notes, related documents given by the participant, with the purpose to acquire the information about the participant's experiences in the graduate school periods in the TESOL local community in Taiwan context and that around the world. As for the duration[1] to collect the data, from August 2011 to September 2012, the researcher and Andrew meet each other regularly to have a series of fifteen narrative interviews, and while Andrew was writing up his dissertation from the end of April 2012 to the end of July 2012 when he was uploading his dissertation to the library archive system, he kept on writing the weekly log once a week, resulting in fourteen weekly logs in total. Then during the year of 2013, three additional interviews for member check.

Below is the overview of multiple methods used to collect the research data. All the narrative interviews and all the written data were collected mainly in Chinese. Then the researcher translated all the needed research data into English before and during the period of writing up the dissertation.

Autobiography

There were two autobiographies. Both of them were done in December 2010. The first one is a collection of skills, which Andrew would employed when conducting research. The second one is a learner's story, which includes a history about Andrew's English learning experience from his childhood to the undergraduate stage, an overview about his academic experience in the master's program, and a description about his experiences in conducting research and writing for scholarly publication in the doctoral program period.

Narrative Interview

The concept of narrative interview adopted in this research is derived from Riessman's (2008) "narrative interviewing", which Riessman defined as " [the]

[1] Please refer to Appendix I: The Timeline for Data Collection

conversation where interviewees can develop narrative accounts" (p.23) and both of the interviewee and interviewer can "render events and experiences meaningful---collaboratively" (p.23). In other words, during the narrative occasion, both the interviewee and interviewer are "two active participants who jointly construct narrative and meaning" (p.23). In this research, such a mode of collaborative interviewing is adopted, and it is coined by the researcher as 'narrative interview.'

There were eighteen narrative interviews during the whole process of data collection. Actually in the beginning of the pre-research period during December 2010 and January 2011, the researcher just planned to have five or six interviews, each time for one hour or two hours long, and Andrew was informed of how many interviews might be held. But, after the first three interviews were conducted, the researcher found it would be necessary to have more interviews. With more trust built in these processes, both Andrew and the researcher came to an agreement to have more interviews when time allowed and when the need for additional narrative interviews was obvious.

All of the narrative interview processes were conducted with the open-ended interview approach (Atkinson,1997), and each time it would last two or three hours. In order to help the participant to say more about his experiences, the researcher would give the prompts with key words or phrases on a worksheet for the participant to recall his own experience, such as scholarly publication, conference experiences, copyright issues, awareness of being a young scholar, proofreading service, comments editors/reviewers, dissertation research, committee members, advisor, time management, teaching experiences and so on. These key words could be divided into three groups, including conference-related issues, journal-related issues, and dissertation-related issues, which also corresponded to the research topics of this research. These key words or phrases were written in either English or Chinese, just for the purpose to enhance the participant’s memory as well as to elicit more related topics from the participant. Each time, in the beginning of the narrative interview, the researcher explained the purposes of the interview or suggested possible topics which had not yet been dealt with, and then the participant would make his decisions in choosing what he would like to talk about or to extend the related topics or issues that he thought meaningful for him to dwell on. If there were any questions asked by the researcher during the interview, they just served the functions to “provide a direction to pursue,” if the participant had “exhausted a topic” or served the function as “periodic questions” to keep his story going (Atkinson,1997).

During the interview processes, much freedom was provided for Andrew to choose any topics to talk about, especially during the first eight narrative interviews (No.1- 8). Then in order for the researcher to gain more needed information, there were more interactive dialogues between Andrew and the researcher, especially in another seven narrative interviews, from No. 9 to No.15. Besides, in these narrative interviews, from No.9 to No.12, Andrew was asked by the researcher to elaborate on the fourteen weekly logs that he had written, for the purpose to triangulate the content and pursue the clarification of any ambiguities if any (Richard, 2003). Then, No. 16, No. 17 and No.18, done in 2013, were for the purposes of member check and additional supplementary clarification, focusing especially on the experiences in submitting for journal publication. But, No. 16 was abandoned because of the low relevance of its content to the research goal itself.

All the processes of the narrative interviews were recorded with a SONY digital recorder, and then right after each interview, within one week or two weeks, the researcher would go over the clips by listening to all of them and jotted down the summary with main ideas for all of them. The purpose of this summary after the interview was to capture all the issues or ideas that had been mentioned by the participant as well as to collect or generate any possible ideas to suggest for the participant to dwell on in the subsequent narrative interview.

Then, in the following months, during the period of narrative interview or after the narrative interview period was over, the researcher laboriously transcribed the needed sections in Chinese, and then translated them into English when necessary, so as to build a database. Most of the clips were transcribed verbatim, but some of the audio clips were transcribed only for the summary with main ideas attached with thematic words. When writing up the narratives and stories, the researcher would transcribe these needed sections verbatim again and more carefully for research purposes. The primary goal of transcribing the clips or translating the transcripts into English was “shooting for accuracy in meaning” and so “the guidelines in doing this are clarity, completeness, and conciseness” (Atkinson,1997). As for editing as well as translations, what the most important that the researcher kept in mind was to transcribe or translate for the meanings that the participant would want to convey.

Weekly Logs

There were fourteen weekly logs written by the participant while writing up his dissertation (From No.1 to No. 12) and after he just finished his dissertation and got his degree (No.13 & No.14). Some prompt questions as guidance were given to the participant to refer to when writing down his logs[2]. But, the participant was not supposed to answer those prompt questions because they are just some possible questions that cover many aspects of the participant's processes of writing up the dissertation. In other words, these questions are used to provide a direction for the participant to follow (Atkinson,1997). The participant was also given the freedom to choose what to write about.

Researcher's research notes

Throughout the research processes, including the data collection, data analysis, and writing up the papers, the researcher jotted down on papers or typed with the WORD processor the emerging ideas or reflections on the research processes. They were used to help the researcher have a better memory about what had been mentioned or what had been done during the data collection periods. When writing up the dissertation, the researcher sometimes also needed to refer to these notes.

Related documents given by the participant

During the No. 14 narrative interview, the participant gave his general response to reviewers' comments to the researcher and also talked a lot about the content of it. Then, after the No. 15 narrative interview, the participant gave his curriculum vita to the researcher, for a better understanding of his publication. Then, in the No. 17 and No. 18, the participant talked a lot about his experiences in submitting for refereed journal publication.

[2] Please refer to Appendix II: Prompt Questions as Guidance for Writing the Weekly Logs

Data Analysis

Both gathering and analyzing the data took place concurrently in three stages. The first stage was (December 2010~ October 2012) to collect the data from the participant with the above-mentioned methods, with the purposes to portray the context, to uncover what had happened to the participant as well as aspects about his attitudes towards, strategies for, and reflections on his own experiences (O'Donnoghue, 2007). During this stage, the analytical procedure employed was mainly based on Polkinghorne's (1995) "analysis of narratives" by which "common themes or conceptual manifestations" from the participant's narratives were located through an "inductive analysis" (p.13) as well as Riessman's (2008) thematic analysis, by which the participant's stories were kept "intact" or the events in the participant's experiences were categorized thematically. The events selected are the "critical events" (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p.73) The "critical events" in this research are defined by Webster and Mertova (2007) which are "characterized by time, challenges, and change" and are "in retrospect" that can be regarded as "critical for the storyteller" (p.74). The events are selected because they are of their "unique, illustrative and confirmatory nature" (p.79). Besides, during this period, the summaries that the researcher wrote based on the main ideas of the narrative interview clips also helped to generate a better understanding of the data. In addition, in the end of this first stage, the researcher created some charts to include and organize the information gained during this period and presented to the participant for the member check purpose in October 2012.

Then, the second stage started when all the procedure of data gathering was almost finished and before the researcher proceeded with writing up the dissertation, so the duration was about twelve months (October 2012~ September 2013). During this period, the transcribing of the audio narrative clips was still on, and more summaries of the participant's narrative were created by the researcher. Besides, in the period, informed by Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) three-dimensional narrative space and Webster and Mertova's (2007) "critical event," the researcher also started to write some stories of critical events of the participant's experience, as the "interim texts" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), which were between the field texts and the final research texts, for the purpose of describing the researcher's experiences in an organized written format. Some of the interim texts were also used by the researcher for a member check purpose with the participant in February 2013 and October 2013.

The third stage lasted about eight months (September 2013~ April 2014), and during this stage, Polkinghorne's (1995) concept of "analysis of narratives" was employed again to analyze the data through an "inductive analysis" (p.13). The researcher analyzed the data and generated several charts with thematically categorized stories or critical events for the purpose of generating a whole picture about the participant's experiences as well as of easily identifying and locating the needed transcripts, the weekly logs, and the original audio clips. Then, informed by Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) three-dimensional narrative space, Webster and Mertova's (2007) "critical event" and Polkinghorn's (1995) "narrative analysis," the researcher started to write seven narratives as a way to interpret the participant's experiences and generate meanings. The principles of composing them are elaborated below.

The Researcher-Composed Narratives

In order to compose the research narratives, the researcher considered many and took several procedures. First of all, in thinking about the narrative data, some concepts from the metaphor “three-dimensional narrative space” by Clandinin and Connelly (2000) were adopted, including the temporal dimension (e.g. continuity: past, present, and future), the social and the personal dimension, and the specific places or sequences of places (p.50). There concepts were employed to consider and reconsider the relationships among different critical events in the participant’s experiences.

In constructing the narratives, the researcher referred both to Polkinghorne’s (1995) “narrative analysis” and the guideline statement provided by Polkinghorne’s (1995), which are directed from Dollard’s (1935) criteria for developing a narrative (Dollard, 1935, as cited in Polkinghorne, 1995), and composed seven narratives, which are representative of the participant’s experiences in different stages or issues of different kinds. Polkinghorne’s (1995) “narrative analysis” refers to a configurative process “by which happenings are drawn together and integrated into a temporally organized whole” (p.5), and “the results of a narrative analysis is an explanation that is retrospective, having linked past events together to account for how a final outcome might have come about” (p.16). In this research, to construct a narrative, several related events from the participant’s narratives were purposefully selected and configured “into a coherent whole” (p.15) based on “a bounded system for study” (p.15) (e.g. three years in the master’s program) and the “emerging thematic plot” (p.16) from the data.

The seven narratives that comprise various critical events were generated based on analysis of the participant's experiences, and they are related to the participant's life as a graduate student within nine years, including three years in the master's program (2003-2006) and six years in the doctoral program (2006-2012). But, mainly the life in the doctoral program is what this research dwells on.

The beginning of each narrative includes the following information, including the narrative number (Narrative 1~7), Title, Stage & Time, and Production. The "number" attached to each narrative represents the different narrative. There are totally seven narratives. "Title" represents the theme or plot that the content of the narrative is based on. As for the meaning of each title, the researcher generated a metaphorical title for each narrative to represent the core spirit of each narrative. "Stage & Time" represents the development of Andrew's life in the graduate school. "Production(s)" represents the academic work(s) that Andrew produced during the duration of that stage.

Each narrative is composed with the following organization: (1) an introductory overview, (2) several stories. Besides, each story is comprised of several events plus the researcher's interpretative remark in its end, and/or (3) a concluding remark for this narrative. As a result, within each narrative, the content begins with an overall introductory narrative about what happened to the participant and then followed by some related stories, which include some critical events. In those stories, some extracts as the supportive evidence derived from the participant's narrative data, which were translated into English, are embedded.

As for the content of the seven narratives, Narrative 1 is about Andrew's life in the master's program, and Narrative 2 through Narrative 7 are related his experiences in the doctoral program, as shown in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 The Content of Researcher-Composed Narratives

Narratives	Content
Narrative 1	Three years of the master's study The processes of submitting to and presenting at conferences
Narrative 2	The first two years of the Ph.D. study The processes of submitting to and presenting at conferences
Narrative 3	The 3rd and 4th years of the Ph.D. study The processes of submitting to and presenting at conferences
Narrative 4	The last two years of the Ph.D. study The processes of submitting to and presenting at conferences
Narrative 5	All the six years of the Ph.D. study The processes of submitting to and publishing in journals
Narrative 6	All the six years of the Ph.D. study The experiences learned from submitting to and publishing in journals
Narrative 7	The last two years of the Ph.D. study The processes of fulfilling the required dissertation

However, due to the research ethics and the agreement between Andrew and the research, some issues are not described in the researcher-composed narratives. For example, in Narrative 7, some issues related to the experiences of taking the oral defense (proposal & dissertation), Andrew's experiences in collecting data for his research, and the relationship between Andrew and his advisors were omitted, even though the data about them were collected. The understanding of these issues just serves the purpose as the background information of Andrew for the researcher.

Besides, in order to discuss Andrew's experiences and respect the research ethics, all the titles of these conference or journal papers were coded by the researcher, and some examples are demonstrated as follows. CP =[3] conference paper; TW = Taiwan; OC = on-campus; 2012.1-6 = January through June in the year of 2012; M1-1= the first semester of the first year of master's study; M1-2= the second semester of the first year of master's study; D1-1= the first semester of the first year of doctoral study; D1-2 = the second semester of the first year of doctoral study; TWCP1(2005)= the first conference paper presented at the local international conference, which was held in 2005; IntelCP1 (2007) = the first conference paper presented at the overseas international conference, which was held in 2007 etc.

Establishing the Truthworthiness of the Findings

In order to enhance the quality of the research, this researcher was informed by Lincoln and Guba's (1985) evaluative criteria as well as needed techniques to attend to truthworthiness of this research, especially the "credibility"(p.301), which is related to the confidence of the truth in the findings. To establish the credibility, the researcher employed the prolonged engagement, triangulation, and member-checking. First, the researcher adopted a longitudinal study to have a series of extended interviews and engage with the participant for the purpose to build the rapport between the researcher and the participant. In addition, in gathering the narrative data, multiple methods of and resources of data gathering were employed, including the autobiography of learning history, the weekly logs of writing up the dissertation, the narrative interviews, and related documents given by the participant. Besides, in gathering the data, related issues of the participant's experiences were repeatedly dealt with at different times purposefully for the purpose to triangulate the data. Finally, the researcher employed the member checking continually throughout the processes of

[3] The symbol" =" represents "equals to."

conducting this research, whether through the interviews, the private talk, or the online digital social network and e-mails, for the purpose to check whether the data gathered, the categorized themes from the data, the interpretations, and conclusions are in line with what the participant would like to convey. Thus, the seven narratives were collected and arranged in chapter four in this research, which were sent to the participant for member check in the months of April and May in 2014.

CHAPTER 4

SEVEN NARRATIVES ABOUT ANDREW'S EXPERIENCE

In this chapter, Andrew's experiences throughout the nine years as a graduate student in the TESOL master's program (2003-2006) and doctoral program (2006-2012) are presented, including presenting papers at conferences, publishing papers in peer-reviewed journals, and the experiences in fulfilling the required doctoral dissertation[4].

Seven narratives are constructed by the researcher to report as well as interpret Andrew's experiences engaging in the TESOL community. Each narrative is composed with the following organization: (1) an introductory overview and (2) several stories. Besides, each story is comprised of several events plus the researcher's interpretative remarks in its end, and/or (3) a concluding remark for the narrative.

While these narratives were being constructed, multiple dimensions were considered at the same time, such as time (e.g. past, present, future), significant related people, context (e.g. place, situation), and Andrew's personal beliefs, attitudes, values, and perceptions related to any events.

Below are the seven narratives, in which Narrative 1 is about Andrew's life in the master's program, and Narrative 2 through Narrative 7 are related to his experiences in the doctoral program.

[4] Please refer to Appendix III: The Overview of Andrew's Academic Development

Narrative 1
Title: Preliminary Learning and Enlightenment
Stage & Time: Master’s Study (Sep. 2003- Jun. 2006)

Throughout the three years, when Andrew was a graduate student in a TESOL master’s program, he experienced a series of initial academic tasks which were enlightening to him and finally boosted him into another higher level of study in TESOL doctoral program.

As a graduate student in the TESOL master’s program, in addition to the required seminar courses, Andrew took every possible chance to participate in some academic tasks or activities, such as being a teacher assistant (T.A.) for a professor, which required him to guide undergraduates to develop their writing skills in English, attending local international conferences to see how others presenting their research papers, teaching English courses part-time in some language centers, conducting research and submitting for conference, presenting his papers in conferences, and finally to work on his master’s thesis and get the degree. Engaged in those tasks and activities, through his efforts to realize the tasks and through the interactions with others, Andrew was getting more and more experiences in academic writing and in conducting research, which led him to the pursuit of his further study in the next period.

As the title “Preliminary Learning and Enlightenment” may imply, Andrew was learning in an initial stage, in which he was just like a newborn child in the TESOL academia, growing up swiftly into his early childhood. He was always curious and willing to try anything. Every challenge might turn out to be the promoter of his growth, either in his knowledge or zest. He was enlightened by people he met in the

TESOL academia, through the academic tasks he was doing, and with his reflections on those academic experiences. All these experiences had enriched his life as a graduate student in the TESOL master's program and freed him from the state of being ignorant of the TESOL academia.

During this period, Andrew submitted two conference papers in the local international conferences, respectively in 2005 and 2006. But before these two conference presentations, he had initially tried his first conference proposal abstract submission and was luckily accepted in 2004, even though finally it was cancelled by him. Andrew also submitted one journal paper for a local international journal (JP1) after he had presented his second conference paper in 2006, but it was actually an invited paper submission, which was smooth, with a less struggle.

Besides, in the last year of his study in the master's program, from the fall semester of 2005 to the spring semester of 2006, Andrew was occupied by his master's thesis research and busy writing up the thesis. Under the guidance of his thesis advisor, Andrew had endeavored to go through a series of processes of repeated drafting, revising, and rewriting for each chapter with the collaboration with his advisor, which were laborious and tedious. However, these processes were rewarding and valuable to Andrew's development in his abilities to convey his ideas and thoughts through writing and also facilitated his further progress in the doctoral study.

Three stories about Andrew's life as a graduate student in the master's program are offered to depict his experiences in engaging in academic tasks, presenting at conferences, and writing up for the master's thesis.

Story I: Presenting at conferences in the early stage

In his second year as a TESOL graduate student in the master's program, Andrew saw other graduate students presenting papers in conferences, and he hoped he could do the same one day, as he indicated:

> …The first time I submitted for conference is when I was in the second year of the graduate school. At that time, I knew that many graduate students from other universities were presenting in conferences, and it made me feel like giving it a try. (Autobiography 2)

Although later he did not complete the study for his first accepted conference proposal (TWCP0) in 2004, he still tried another conference submission and successfully made public his first conference paper (TWCP1) in 2005. He felt it was necessary to give it a try because he had already conceived a plan to study further in the doctoral program, and he thought it would be a positive move for him. He remembered:

> The second time I submitted my conference proposal abstract was for RRR-TTT conference. My intention was to have a research study presented because I knew I was going to take the entrance exam for the doctoral program. I happened to attend a professor's presentation at a conference and found the study interesting, which I would like to have a further study. So, I started to design the study and collect the data. (Autobiography 2)

Andrew cared so much about his first conference submission. In order to enhance the quality of his writing, he asked for the help from his colleague in a language center, who is a native speaker, to proofread for him, as he recalled:

> That study was the first one that I fully completed. The data were collected through questionnaires and interviews. When I finished writing up my paper, I asked for the help from a native-speaker colleague to proofread it. So, the paper was of a certain level of good quality. That paper may be regarded as my first research paper that looks like a decent paper. (Autobiography 2)

In addition to the first conference paper published during this period, Andrew also selected part of his master's thesis to compile an individual paper for submission in 2006. With this paper, Andrew was later invited to submit it to the conference affiliated journal and was accepted. Andrew thought this second conference paper would also be a positive contribution to the document evaluation for the TESOL doctoral program entrance exam in the spring semester of 2006.

During this stage, Andrew started to submit for presentations at conferences. He applied what he had learned in classes or at conferences to conduct his own research. By submitting for conference publication, he had not only achieved the instrumental purpose to increase the value of application documents for entering the doctoral program, but also implicitly claimed that he was indeed a TESOL graduate student.

Story II: Searching for research topics for term projects

Reflecting on his experiences of searching for research topics for term projects, Andrew gave a concrete example about his habitual ways of searching for research ideas during this period as a student in the master's program. Although he would search for ideas by referring to others' work then, he usually started with his personal preferences, instead of finding a niche from the previous studies. He said:

> While I was in the master’s program, to come up with the ideas for the research papers, mainly I would read through papers and refer to others’ works. At that time, I was not so sure about the ways to conduct research, so whenever it was time to think about the research ideas for term papers, I would begin with topics interesting to me, based on my own learning experiences and interests to search for the research ideas, instead of looking for a proper research gap. The research topics I considered at that time were less based on theories or on the existing literature. (Autobiography 2)

Those topics he cared about at that time were interesting to him, familiar to him, or related to his experiences in teaching and learning English. He was not aware of the concept of a research gap.

During this stage, Andrew would often search for research ideas for his term papers based on what he cared about and felt interested, including his personal experiences in teaching and learning as well as experiences gained from conferences.

Story III: Participating in related academic writing activities

In addition to submitting for conferences and generating for research ideas for his term projects, Andrew also had other experiences in writing for academic purposes, which might also contribute to the growth of his academic literacy.

After he entered the TESOL master’s program in 2003, Andrew worked as a part-time assistant and a student peer writing counselor for the professor of a course that he took. About this, he said:

> When I was in my first year of the TESOL master’s program in Taiwan, in order to submit the term paper for a course assignment in the graduate school program,

> I wrote a paper in English with a length for over ten more pages. I was actually not so confident about my ability in English academic writing, but the teacher inquired me of my willingness to be a part-time assistant for her course after she had read my paper. She wanted me to be the student writing counselor for several undergraduate students. (Autobiography 2)

In this regard, it seemed that he was invited to be a writing counselor due to his good performance of one of his term papers. However, as he was about to write up his master's thesis, he had encountered the real challenge --- it was really hard for him to write in a logical way. He remembered:

> At that time, my writing was often criticized by my advisor for that it lacked the logic or the thought flow was always shifting. In other words, the content of paper usually fell short of a unity. (Autobiography 2)

Fortunately, with the patience of his thesis advisor, the quality of Andrew's master's thesis as well as his writing abilities were all enhanced, and he believed that it was a turning point, as he recounted:

> As for my academic writing experience in the master's program, I would regard the whole process of writing up my master's thesis as the most beneficial to my writing abilities. To design the experiment for the thesis research, to collect the data, and to analyze the data in a row were all trifles to me, but what really tortured me was how to write a good thesis….But, due to the interactions with my thesis advisor, my writing abilities improved a lot….So, I think of the period of writing up my master's thesis as a turning point for my writing abilities. (Autobiography 2)

With the patient guidance of his thesis advisor, Andrew completed his master's thesis in 2006 and got the degree. In addition, he also successfully submitted part of this research to a conference (TWCP2).

From 2003 to 2006, Andrew started to submit for conference publications and also acquired his master's degree. It seemed to be a preliminary period, in which he was just starting his career in the academia and he was not so sure about what to do. Throughout this period, Andrew was always trying new things, learning from others, and searching for proper ways to meet the requirements of some academic tasks.

Narrative 2
Title: A Brand-New Start: Trials and Errors
Stage & Time: The First Two Years of Ph.D. study (Sep. 2006-Jun. 2008)

A place with new challenges did bring about new chances to Andrew's life in the first two years of the doctoral study. In the fall semester of 2006, Andrew entered the TESOL doctoral program in a university in the northern Taiwan. During the first two years, from the fall semester of 2006 to that spring semester of 2008, Andrew took the required courses offered by the doctoral program. In each semester, for different courses, Andrew had the chances to develop research ideas and conduct research for his final projects. In order to submit for scholarly publication, Andrew often submitted his term papers to conferences or refereed journals. The situation of submitting for publication in these two years was like a trial-and-error process because Andrew kept on submitting for publication, but most of the time his proposal abstracts or papers were rejected. Even though he had these failures, Andrew still endeavored to try for any chances of submission.

Some reasons might explain why during these two years Andrew was so earnest in trying to submit for conference presentations. First, when Andrew just started his doctoral study, he was informed of the necessity to present in conferences or to publish in journals. Besides, once in a conference session, Andrew happened to acquire the concept of the academic visibility, which indeed had a great influence on him. In addition, Andrew saw the people around him in the department or in the graduate school were all busy with submitting for scholarly publication, and so Andrew thought he should submit papers, too.

In total, Andrew had submitted five conference papers during this stage, including three conference papers which were published in Taiwan, two research abstracts which were published overseas, and one journal paper that was accepted by a local journal.

As the title, "A Brand-New Start: Trials and Errors," may imply, this period was like a new beginning, in which Andrew went into a new environment with more new challenges, and this new context boosted Andrew to a new stage and gave him more opportunities to try. Although Andrew had been rejected for several times or had a hard time presenting in conferences, he learned from these experiences and kept on trying for scholarly activities.

Below, four stories are presented to describe Andrew's experiences in submitting papers for scholarly purposes during this period, including events that motivated him to keep on submitting papers, the strategies he applied during this stage, what he learned from these experiences, and his perceptions about what he was doing.

Story I: Being motivated by people around

In the beginning of Andrew's life as a doctoral student, there were several occasions that he was motivated to submit for conference presentations. In a lunch gathering, for example, he met one of his seniors, who suggested that Andrew should utilize his term papers for scholarly submission. This suggestion made a great impact on him, as Andrew recalled:

> When I was in my first year in the doctoral program, one of my seniors gave me the advice:"You should seize the occasion to write your papers elaborately every semester, and then you can submit them for conference presentations." She told me that when she was a doctoral student she took 12 courses, and she got twelve papers presented or published in total. Hearing this, I thought to myself, "Wow, I should really make some efforts to do so. (Interview 1)

Andrew was really surprised to hear the number, twelve, of the papers his senior had published, and he interpreted her intention as to boost the quantity of her publications. Andrew felt so excited because the personal experience shared by his senior, who was like a role model to Andrew, was quite encouraging to him. Andrew promised to himself that he would follow her footsteps.

In another occasion, at a local international conference in Taiwan, he heard one speaker giving a speech about the concept of academic visibility[5]. After that he was often contemplating how to enhance his academic visibility. He really cared about what visibility meant to him. He mentioned:

> Once I went to a conference in Tamkang University to attend a presentation session. The topic was quite interesting to me, which was about….it is called visibility, I mean, the level to be seen. I thought it was such an interesting

[5] The meaning of 'academic visibility' that Andrew referred to equals to what Leahey (2007) defines: "Visibility in an academic field is achieved when people know your name, are familiar with your work, and think highly of your intellectual contributions"(p.537).

> topic…It regards the extent you can make yourself visible in the academia…to let people know you…the academic visibility of you through your publications…. At that time, I thought the concept of visibility is meaningful and valuable to scholars, and it should be also of the same value to graduate students. Then, I was considering then if I could enhance my academic visibility by making public my scholarly papers or by presenting my studies. (Interview 1)

On this occasion, Andrew's intention to let others know his academic performance through submitting papers for conference presentations or journal publications had also been lit up!

From these two events in this story, it is easy to find that when Andrew just started his doctoral study, firstly he happened to be informed by his senior of the necessity to present papers in conferences or to publish papers in journals and he felt he was motivated. Then, his belief was strengthened after attending a conference session on academic visibility.

Story II: Effective strategies applied for productivity

In reflecting on the experiences of generating research studies for submissions during this stage, Andrew pointed out that he applied some strategies during this stage.

He would increase the chances to submit more papers to conferences by making good use of his research data. Three of the studies (TWCP3; IntelCP1; IntelCP2) for his conference submissions during this stage were conducted based on the same dataset. He submitted the first study as a full paper (TWCP3) to a local international conference[6] first, and after that he developed the study further by analyzing the qualitative data and incorporated it with the first study to submit it as a new paper (IntelCP1) to an overseas international conference. He said:

> Like that paper about the blog, I presented it in Japan…ur…in 2007. I submitted my term paper to the local international conference first, and then I submitted it to the conference in Osaka…Yeah…I just did an oral presentation there. (Interview 1)

As to how Andrew developed the strategy to effectively utilize the same dataset, it was actually suggested by one of his classmates of a seminar class. He remembered:

> …I was presenting my first[7] presented conference paper in the seminar class, which was conducted quantitatively...and after I finished it my classmates suggested I could analyze the data from students' blog comments. (Interview 1)

Andrew regarded this strategy as killing several birds with one stone. He used the same dataset to conduct a series of studies to serve different purposes, such as a term paper for the course he took, a paper presented in Taiwan in 2007 (TWCP3), a paper presented in Japan in 2007 (IntelCP1), which was later submitted for a refereed journal publication in 2009 (JP3), and another paper presented in India in 2008 (IntelCP2), which was later submitted for a refereed journal publication in 2009 (JP2), too.

Besides, another strategy that Andrew utilized was to conduct research with the

---

[6] A 'local international conference' means the conference is held in the local context of Taiwan, but it is labeled as 'international' because some of the presenters or speakers are foreigners from other countries. Likewise, if a conference is labeled as 'overseas international conference', it is held overseas in other foreign countries.

[7] This means his first conference paper which was presented during the doctoral study. In fact, it is the third paper (TWCP3) that Andrew has ever presented.

resources available to him, including a research topic related to his teaching class, a convenient site to gather data, adapted survey questions for a duplicate study, and another doctoral student to collaborate with and share the load.

First of all, in order to generate a term paper for a course he took which is related to the topic of the curriculum and material design, Andrew investigated his adult students' needs in a writing class that he was teaching. He indicated:

> …I used to take a course, the curriculum and material design, and I wanted to know what the adults students in my class that I was teaching would need, so I started with the needs analysis and then design my course. (Interview 1)

In fact, before then in his career as an English instructor, Andrew was not so familiar with the features of adult learners. He was not sure what they would need, and so he thought it was necessary for him to conduct this research and collect the data to write for his term paper, which was later presented in a local international conference in 2008 (TWCP4). In conducting this study, he also had the first chance to conduct the research collaboratively with one of his friends, combining his own teaching needs with the requirement from the course he took, at the same time catering for what those students would really need. He remembered:

> …My friend was also a doctoral student then. He was from another university…I thought we doctoral students were all faced with a challenge, that is, the department would require us to submit papers for publication. His department also required him to publish a lot. He was faced with this challenge, and I was, too. So, we thought we'd like to collaborate with each other. (Interview 2)

Also, in order to conduct a study for the term paper for another course related to second language acquisition research, he conducted a duplicate study in 2008. At that time he found a research study from the reading packing quite interesting to him. He then conducted a duplicate study based on the study by adapting the survey questions in order to collect the data in the context of Taiwan. He indicated:

> …I used to take a course in SLA, and I read a paper about error correction regarding the Spanish grammar, so I made the duplicate research by adopting and modifying its survey questions. We collected the data from several classes located in the northern part, the middle part, and the southern part of Taiwan. (Interview 2)

He conducted this research through collaboration with his friend again because his friend was more energetic and would execute the research plan to collect the data, and Andrew would discuss with his friend and helped to write up the paper. This paper was then presented at a local international conference in 2008 (TWCP5). Later, during the year of 2009, the original dataset of this study was utilized again to conduct studies for another conference paper (TWCP6) and a journal paper (JP6), respectively.

From the above story, Andrew's strategies to enhance his productivity in research papers are exemplified. In order to produce more paper, he made good use of the same dataset to conduct a series of studies and wrote different papers for submissions. Besides, he utilized resources available to him to effectively conduct studies for his term papers and then presented them at conferences and published them in journals.

Story III: Valuable experiences acquired at conferences

During the first two years of the doctoral study, Andrew also benefited from several events that took place at some conferences that he had participated in, which were meaningful to him as a TESOL doctoral student. Once at a local international conference in 2007, Andrew was presenting his paper (TWCP3), and he was reporting the statistical results. However, after he finished the presentation, a young assistant professor came directly to talk with him about the mistaken interpretation of statistical data in Andrew's study. Andrew was really shocked at that time because no one in the audience raised any question about that, and it was corrected in private by the young scholar as a stranger who had never met him before. Very sincerely and politely, the young scholar shared what he knew with Andrew. At that time Andrew was really embarrassed, but he felt so grateful for that kindness and generosity. He remembered:

> As for my experience in the quantitative study….I thought I was not good at statistics and I thought I was learning by doing to acquire the knowledge about statistics. I remembered a professor who is from NXXU. He was so kind, and after I finished my presentation, he came to me and said, "You are wrong with your statistics!" He did not say it in public. Instead, he just came to me and told me in private about what I should have done and should not have done. (Interview 3)

Andrew considered this experience as enlightening to him because he was being corrected about his inexperienced use of statistics in a friendly way, instead of the fierce and direct feedback given in public. The assistant professor saved the face for him and shared the knowledge with him. That was really unforgettable to Andrew.

Andrew also learned from the interactions with others while he was participating in the international conference overseas during this stage. When he was presenting his paper in Japan in 2007 (IntelCP1), Andrew felt shocked again because he thought his awkward performance was inferior to another speaker in the same session. He mentioned:

> Actually for that conference paper in Japan I presented in 2007, I felt my oral presentation performance was really bad. Because it was an international conference, there were so many scholars from other countries. Another speaker in my session was a master's student from Hong Kong, and she was presenting after me. At that time, I was not so well-organized in writing a paper, nor did I have a good command of English to do an oral presentation. So, I thought my presentation at that time was really messy…terribly messy… Then when the Hong Kong master's student started to present her study in a smooth and logic way…I felt really embarrassed…. I thought my performance really sucked. How come? Actually, no one attacked me, but I just felt so upset like a loser. (Interview1)

Andrew was so conscious about his performance. He thought his presentation was given in a less logical way and his research focus was not well conveyed. Luckily, after his presentation, a male U.S. scholar, as a journal editor, who was among the audience in that session and was aware of his dismay, came to comfort him by talking with him and recommended some papers for him to read. However, even though the experience in Osaka seemed so negative on the spot, when Andrew recalled it several years later, he had a positive attitude toward this experience. He said:

> Although I felt frustrated, somehow I felt I was learning something from her. Listening to her presentation, I knew she was presenting her study so assertively, and the content was so concise. Her speech had a main idea to convey. On the contrary, I felt I was a little bit stumbling, and I was not so assertive. I felt I had learned a lot from this student. (Interview 15)

Although Andrew had a hard time in presenting his conference paper at that time in Japan, and obviously, he was thrown into the shade by another presenter, he still took this process as a learnable experience which could help him to improve.

In addition, at the same conference in Japan in 2007, Andrew felt the sense of equality with other scholars by being treated equal in the TESOL academia. Before the conference, through email he was invited by the conference committee to be the moderator in the conference session. He thought he was not qualified because he knew there were other scholars from Taiwan who were professors or assistant professors, and he was just a doctoral student. Then, he wrote back to the committee and tried to refuse it. He remembered:

> The conference in Japan was really fun. It was the first time for me to be a moderator. Maybe the coordinator just randomly chose anyone of the speakers in the session to be a moderator. As far as I knew at that time, I thought if you would like to be a moderator in the context of Taiwan, at least you should have a certain social status or social rank in the TESOL academia. But, the coordinator just asked me if I would like to be the moderator for my own session in the conference. I thought it was fun, and thought to myself, "How come the coordinator chose me as a moderator, and he chose such a doctoral student like me?" (Interview 3)

However, the conference coordinator insisted that Andrew should take the job as a moderator during that session because the coordinator definitely regarded him as qualified. Andrew recalled:

> The coordinator was so kind, and he replied that he did not think that Ph.D. students are not qualified to be a moderator. The coordinator thought Ph.D. students are an important population in the research field, and he thought that I should be the moderator. So, I just promised to be the moderator then. (Interview 3)

In that social context, as a doctoral student, Andrew was treated the way as other scholars being treated. Andrew thought he had learned about the cultural difference from this experience, as he recounted:

> What I learned from that experience is that in fact foreigners would not take the social rank so seriously, but in the context of Taiwan, your identity might be judged based on the social rank. So, the coordinator gave me an important opportunity to be the moderator at that conference. (Interview 3)

Andrew would never be able to imagine this situation before he went to the conference in Japan in 2007 because it was really different from that in the context of Taiwan, and he thought this experience was an important opportunity for him to be the moderator in an overseas international conference.

From the above three events in this story, it is obvious to find that Andrew was learning from the social interactions with other members by engaging in the TESOL community. For example, Andrew's knowledge in statistics was corrected sincerely by an assistant professor at a local international conference in Taiwan. Andrew experienced his inferiority to another graduate student at an overseas international conference in Japan, but found this experience inspiring. Andrew gained the comfort from an editor among the audience through conversation and felt being supported. In addition, negotiating whether to be a moderator, Andrew had a chance to become aware of his self-perceived identity as a doctoral student, which is different from what foreigners might think of him. This cross-cultural experience is valuable to him. From all these above experiences, Andrew had gradually gained the membership through practice in the TESOL community.

Story IV: Reflections on gained experiences

During the first two years of his doctoral study, Andrew always kept the concept of academic visibility in his mind, and he made efforts to present several of his studies at conferences. Recalling on his experiences during this stage, Andrew also had some reflections.

At this stage, Andrew presented three local international conference papers (TWCP3,TWCP4,TWCP5), which were all collected in the conferences' proceedings, and two studies (IntelCP1, IntelCP2) at two overseas international conferences, which were only with abstracts. In addition to his senior's words and the concept of academic visibility, there was still something else that made him do so, as he explained:

> Besides, during the first two years, I was just a new comer in the community of my department, and I felt that I always got the earnest wish to submit papers. I saw the professors were submitting papers and my peer classmates were submitting papers. It was not only I that was busy with that. Doctoral students were submitting papers, and those master's students were also submitting their papers. I felt there seemed to be the power from the group of people, just like a pull affecting me as if I should do the same as everyone is doing. (Interview 15)

To Andrew, the power of the pull from the group of people in his department seemed to be an invisible bond, a connection between the department and him, which made a great impact on him and made him persist on submitting his papers for publication after he entered the doctoral program.

However, despite the fact that Andrew was active in participating in publishing scholarly papers, he still had a concern; he was worried that his topics of studies were not related and without any focus. He remembered:

> I think during the first two years, for submitting papers for scholarly purposes, I always wanted to give it a try whenever there was a notice of conference call-for-paper. Then, this situation turned out to be that I wanted to submit for publications not because I had any research already done at hand. I know the best situation is you do the experiment and after you have got something, you submit. But, when I was in my first two years in the doctoral program, I would, even now, manage to come up with anything to submit for publication if there is any conference call-for-papers. (Interview 3)

Very often it seemed that Andrew submitted abstracts just for the sake of submitting for and participating in conferences. Actually, Andrew admitted that during this stage almost none of those papers were done with the consideration of filling the research gap. It was not till the time in the second year of his life as a TESOL doctoral student that Andrew became aware of the importance of filling research gaps. A professor's words always reminded him of the importance of looking for the research gap when conducting research. "Poke a hole! For a doctoral student, it would be necessary!" said the professor in a SLA research course in the doctoral program. For this reason, even though he had several conference papers presented and published in proceedings and he had gained experiences, during this period, he never thought he was a young scholar.

From the above story, Andrew's reflections on his experiences indeed depict his practice in the TESOL communities, either in the graduate school program or in the academia. First, the invisible bond between Andrew and the graduate school, which led him to more productivity of papers, may mirror the concept from Wenger's (1998) "joint enterprise" that there exist "relations of mutual accountability" (p.78) among Andrew and other members in the community of his department in the TESOL graduate school. Besides, Andrew's concern that his studies are not related and without a focus reflects the fact that Andrew did care about the productivity, the amount of papers presented or published, but he was still not able at the same time to pay attention to the contribution or significance of these papers, which they might have. Likewise, being unable to fill research gaps caused Andrew to perceive that he was still not qualified for being a young scholar.

Narrative 3
Title: Taking Off: Progressing and Harvest
Stage & Time: The Third and Fourth Years of Ph.D. Study (Jul. 2008-Jun. 2010)

What Andrew experienced in submitting papers for scholarly purposes during the third and fourth years indeed reflect the fact that confidence naturally comes with success. During the third and fourth year of Andrew's study in the TESOL doctoral program, in order to pursue the academic visibility as a doctoral student, Andrew kept on presenting at conferences as usual, and he started to successfully published papers in refereed journals. Another reason that caused him to do so was that he wanted to become more competitive for the application for a scholarship and become an exchange scholar in the U.S. To this end, Andrew always tried to accumulate more paper lines on his curriculum vita.

As the title, "Taking Off: Progressing and Harvest," may imply, during this period, Andrew started to have a better command of the skills in conducting research and writing for scholarly papers, and compared with the previous period, he was like an airplane taking off, flying into the sky energetically and smoothly. Also, he was harvesting the term papers as fruit from those seminar classes that he had attended because he developed them further for journal publications.

Andrew was productive, and he presented two studies at two local international conferences, one presented in an overseas international conference, and two on-campus presented in the college he was teaching. In additional, for journal publications, Andrew published six papers, including five in 2009 and one in 2010.

Below are three stories concerning Andrew’s experiences in presenting in conferences, especially about his motivations, strategies he applied, what he learned, and his comments on these experiences.

Story I: A series of chances to present papers at conferences

During the third and fourth years of doctoral study, Andrew always exerted his strength to present his papers at conferences and to submit for journal publications. For conferences, he presented two conference papers(TWCP6,TWCP7), which were also published in the conference proceedings, at local international conferences in 2009, one overseas international conference presentation in New Zealand in 2009 (IntelCP3), and two on-campus presentations in 2009 and 2010 (OCCP1, OCCP2), respectively.

The first conference paper (TWCP6) that Andrew presented in 2009 was derived from one term paper for a seminar class, for which Andrew conducted the study collaboratively with his friend in the previous stage, which was also presented as a conference paper (TWCP5) in 2008. These two conference papers are derived from the same dataset, but these two papers deal with different research issues. Andrew remembered:

> It seemed to be in 2008, [in the paper] we looked at the differences between teachers and students. Then during the next year we submitted the research paper to another conference. At that time, we had more data from more classes. (Interview 2)

Andrew gained many valuable experiences through the collaboration with his friend to conduct the research for his term paper and for these two conference papers (TWCP5, TWCP6). They shared the research load during the processes and conducted the research effectively because their expertise is complementary to each other's. Moreover, luckily, the conference paper (TWCP6) was then revised based on the comments gained in the conference presentation and developed into a journal paper (JP6).

The second conference paper (TWCP7) that Andrew presented in the third and fourth years of doctoral study was also derived from his term paper for a seminar class, and it was concerned about academic writing skills. The quality of Andrew's research and his presentation at that conference were praised by the audience. Before long, after the conference, one day, Andrew suddenly got a phone call from the English department of that university where the conference had been held, inviting him to teach English writing classes in that university. But, Andrew declined this offer, as he recalled:

> It seemed to be in my third year in the doctoral program, one day the university gave me a phone call and said, I mean their English department office. They wanted me to teach English writing classes. I replied to them "Ur….now I am…"

> I felt hesitative because I knew I could pave my way if I could teach in that kind of university, but I also pondered upon teaching writing in such a nice university to provide students of a high proficiency level with writing classes… Well, forget about it! So, I replied and said, “Sorry, I’ve got a full-time teaching job and I am not allowed to teach outside my college.” So, I did not take the offer. (Interview 2)

Although Andrew’s research and presentation were praised, he did not take the chance to teach in that university. He felt that as a doctoral student, he needed the time to conduct research and write papers rather than preparing for classes.

The third time Andrew presented a study at the conference in the third and fourth years of doctoral study was at an overseas international conference in New Zealand, and the topic of it was about gender differences in language use. Andrew enjoyed presenting his paper in that conference. Before he took the trip to the conference, the manuscript had been accepted by an overseas international journal. Andrew remembered:

> For the third overseas international conference, I went to New Zealand. The paper I presented had been accepted in a journal already, so I felt kind of released. In the same session, another speaker was a lady from Demark. I felt so confident because the research had been completed already, and I felt it was fun…Among the audience there was a Japanese scholar, and he gave me his business card and invited me to submit my papers to their conference. (Interview 3)

Andrew was actually quite interested in the research topic itself: sociolinguistics and the language use on a newspaper column in the real-world context of Taiwan. From the interaction on the spot at the conference, Andrew felt quite flattered “because of the positive reactions from the audience,” and he was invited by a Japanese scholar to submit his studies to the conference at their university. The experience in this conference presentation was quite encouraging to Andrew.

Then later Andrew conducted two on-campus research studies in 2009 and 2010, respectively, based on the requirements from the administration of the college where Andrew was teaching, with the purpose to enhance the efficiency of English instruction in his college. The first on-campus research study (OCCP1) conducted in 2009 was related to teaching vocabulary, and the research was on vocabulary learning issues of English for specific purposes. Andrew developed that research based on the context of his college.

Another on-campus research study conducted in 2010 was related to course design, which was an action research with the collaboration with other colleagues in his college. The department chair wanted Andrew to lead his colleagues to design the course, to teach the course and do the oral report. They applied the course design to the real teaching contexts and then examined its efficiency. Later Andrew also wrote up the paper (OCCP2) by himself based on this research for a journal submission (JP7) and it was accepted in 2009.

From the above story, there are some facts can be found about Andrew's experiences in presenting conference papers. First of all, he also applied the strategy of making good use of the same dataset as well as collaborating with another doctoral student to conduct research in order to increase his productivity, for example, the first paper (TWCP6) presented in 2009. Besides, he conducted studies for conference submissions with the convenient resources available to him. No matter they are the resources from seminar classes, from his friend, or from the college where he was teaching. Of these studies, most of the research topics were interesting to Andrew, but due to the convenience of acquiring the resources or chances to do the research, the research topics were not related. In addition, from one of the events, Andrew's attitude towards his own role as a doctoral student is seen. He refused to take the offer to teach part-time in a university where he had just presented his research paper. He thought he needed more time to do research.

Story II: Insisting on his research interests to conduct research

In 2008, one day Andrew was talking with his friend about the possible research ideas that he would like to proceed with, in a brainstorming stage. Andrew remembered:

> As for another of my research, the language use in a newspaper column, it is also interesting to me. I was talking with my friend about it, and I told my friend that I would like to try such kind of research topic. I thought it was so interesting and my other doctoral classmates agreed with me that it was fun. My friend commented that it would be good for me because I was conducting my research with much pleasure. (Interview 2)

Actually, Andrew enjoyed conducting the research with the topic to explore the language phenomena from the real materials in a newspaper. He spent much time collecting the data, analyzing the data, and then writing up the paper, endeavoring to produce a good paper. However, later one day in another conversation with the same friend, Andrew felt hurt because his friend implicitly revealed a disdainful attitude towards Andrew's research, as Andrew remembered:

> But then when I talked with my friend again, my friend did not speak out the words clearly, but he did not…I think…my friend might regard this research as

> nothing at all. That is, the research seemed to be in a very low class. (Interview2)

Maybe Andrew's friend was not actually criticizing the quality of his research, but it seemed to mean that such a research topic was selected due to the intention to produce a paper for convenience without any careful selection of the topic. Andrew recalled:

> In a private talk later, my friend unconsciously said, "Conducting research in a careless manner is just like what you did for your research, as the one you've done, the language use in a newspaper column!" (Interview 2)

Andrew's friend seemed to use inappropriate words to describe his research because he indicated that Andrew's research was conducted in a careless, sloppy, or lousy manner. Although Andrew felt upset when he heard his friend's words, he did not give up his enthusiasm for the research. Instead, he still insisted on his interests, as he said:

> I thought my friend did not take my research seriously. I felt a little bit hurt when I heard it because actually I enjoyed researching this topic. But sometimes I think that the more others devalue it, the stronger intention I would have to research it and write up the paper. (Interview2)

Finally Andrew's research was done and the manuscript was accepted by an international journal in 2009 (JP5), and then, he also presented this paper (IntelCP3) at the conference in New Zealand later in the same year, 2009. Andrew also commented on his insistence on the research topic he had chosen. He said:

> I felt so happy to conduct such kind of research, even though in the beginning other people thought it would be meaningless to conduct it. (Interview 2)

At that time, Andrew was making efforts to conduct research and produced papers for publication. Although he had to conform to the requirements about the research methods, the writing styles, or the formats, Andrew still enjoyed the freedom to choose what he was really interested in based on his values and beliefs and then conducted the research because he said he was "so happy to conduct such kind of research."

From the above story, Andrew's personal values and beliefs for choosing research topics conducting research are exemplified. Although his friend was criticizing his choice of the research topic and his design to conduct the research, he did not abandon the research topic which he found was interesting to him. Without caring about the cynical comments from his friend on his research idea, through the success of presenting the paper at a conference and getting it published in a journal, Andrew proves to himself that his insistence and efforts are worthy.

Story III: Dealing with copyright issues

Another meaningful experience that Andrew had in conducting research for his term papers and publication is related to the copyright of the materials adapted from publishers' textbooks and newspapers. In conducting the research for his term paper, which was later published as a journal paper, he took the initiative in connecting with the publisher, as he said:

> When conducting research, sometimes some materials or tools would be needed. You have to contact the publishers. At that time, in my paper about the phrasal verb topic, I adapted one article from an English textbook. But, I was not sure if I could put the whole article in my paper when I wanted to submit for

> publication. So, I started to contact the publisher, so as to find out what publisher the article belongs to, who is the author, and how I can have contact them. Then, I wrote to them and learned that I would not be allowed to put their texts in my research paper without their permission. (Interview 2)

Andrew was very aware of the possible problematic situations he might be involved in, so he actively contacted the publishers to. Unfortunately, the publisher did not grant Andrew's request. He added:

> In other words, I could not put the texts in my research paper at will, which would be concerned about the copyright issue. They said even for conducting research they would not allow it. They still needed to review it. So, later I decided to avoid such a problem and I abandoned the idea to put the article into the research paper. I just put some selected sentences which I had adapted. (Interview 2)

In addition to the textbook publisher's copyright issue, in 2009, Andrew had another chance in negotiating with the newspaper publisher about the materials he used for the research on the language use in the newspaper column, as he said:

> A similar experience is another research conducted in 2009. It was about the column texts in a newspaper. At that time, I needed to cite some sample texts. I thought I was worried about the copyright issue. I was not sure if I could use these texts. So, I gave a phone call to the newspaper office and raised my question by telling them I had such a concern in my research. They transferred my phone call to the department dealing with copyright issues. They told me if it is out of the research purpose, it would be all right. They told me that I could cite their materials directly. This is what I knew after I made contact with them. (Interview 2)

This time Andrew gained the permission from the newspaper publisher to use the materials from their newspapers for research purposes. Andrew was so grateful for the newspaper publisher's generosity, and he felt his experience in conducting research was connecting with the real real-world society.

From the two events in the above story, they all indicate Andrew's efforts in following the norms of the academia--- avoiding committing the copyright. His awareness of the possible copyright problems and his responsible attitudes to deal with copyright issues all seem to prove his mature personality. Besides, in order to ask for the permission of adopting the materials from the two publishers, Andrew had the chances to contact them and extended his research life to the real-world society, which made him feel connected with the world.

Narrative 4
Title: Getting Matured: Concentration and Withdraw
Stage &Time: The Fifth and Sixth Years of Ph.D. Study (Jul. 2010-Jun. 2012)

It was not easy for Andrew to change his eagerness for presenting more papers at conferences and publishing more papers in journals, especially when he was faced with a crucial task, the dissertation research, but finally he had to change his mindset.

During the fifth year, Andrew successfully won the scholarship and became an exchange scholar at a university in the U.S. for one year. During that year, he was mainly working on the first three chapters of his dissertation research. After Andrew came back to Taiwan in August 2011, he started to proceed with his dissertation research, and then about eleven months later, he got his doctoral degree in July 2012. From the fall semester of 2011 to the spring semester of 2012, he was devoting his attention to his dissertation research. But, he was always trying to keep a balance between the desire to publish scholarly papers and the required energy and time to spend on his dissertation research.

As before, Andrew still had the intention to pursue academic visibility, and he was always aware of it. Andrew also expected himself to be more competitive for his future career in the TESOL academia, and so he always felt eager to publish papers for the purpose of accumulating more publications on his curriculum vita. However, in reality, the limited time and energy that he had did not allow him to publish so often as before.

Sometimes, he was struggling with the inner conflict between the eagerness to publish and the indispensible attention to his dissertation research. The decline of frequency in publishing papers always made him feel uneasy. However, taking the advice from professors and seniors, reflecting on his position as doctoral student in the social hierarchy in TESOL academia, and engaging actively in the tasks for his dissertation research, he gradually changed his mindset from being a productive doctoral student busy with publishing papers to being a doctoral candidate devoted to his dissertation research.

As the title, “Getting Matured: Concentration and Withdraw,” may imply, during this period, Andrew primarily concentrated on the tasks of completing his doctoral dissertation and withdrew from his regular track of eagerly presenting papers in conferences or publishing papers in journals. Besides, his attitudes towards publishing scholarly papers also turned from the emphasis on the total quantity of the studies to be that on the quality of the studies.

For conference presentations, during these two years, he presented only twice at conferences. One was presented in an overseas international conference in Canada when he was staying in the U.S. as an exchange scholar in 2011. The other one was presented at the on-campus conference during the sixth year of doctoral study in 2012.

For journal publications, Andrew published one journal paper in 2011, which was derived from his master's thesis. Besides, during this period, Andrew was also continually submitting one paper manuscript to an overseas international journal for being reviewed, but it took a really long time and till the end of this research, the results had not yet come out.

The last two years of Andrew's doctoral study culminated in the completion of his doctoral degree in July 2012. During the process, although the frequency of his scholarly publication declined, Andrew changed his mindset and concentrated on the tasks for his dissertation research.

In the following, some critical events that would vividly portray Andrew's experiences of presenting at conferences and other related episodes about changing his mindset of submitting for scholarly publication in this period are offered.

Story I: The self-initiative study based on Andrew's insistence and personal beliefs

The last conference paper that Andrew presented at the overseas international conference during his life as a doctoral student is the one he presented in Canada in spring semester of 2011. This research was derived from the term paper for a seminar class in 2007, which was an unfinished research proposal plus the literature review at that time. But in the subsequent three years from 2007 to 2010, he made efforts to overcome problems and finally finished the research. He remembered:

> The paper on visual aids for testing listening initiated in 2007 was for the seminar class of Dr. X., but I finished the research in 2010. The duration between them is three years. The first reason is that I did not know the proper way to analyze the content related to pictures. I was not motivated to complete it immediately, either, and I thought I would wait for the chance. I thought one day I would figure out a certain way to finalize the research. Then, in 2010 I went to the library to search for some books to do some research. Besides, I also got some students in my class, and I thought I would collect some data from my own class. Then, I finished this research in 2010, and I presented it at 2011 in a conference this year. (Interview 2)

With the zest to explore further, after the seminar class, in the following three years, Andrew independently conducted the research and completed the research. However, in the beginning, he had actually been reminded by others that for such a research topic there were not enough previous studies conducted ever and it might be meaningless, but Andrew still insisted on completing this research, as he said:

> …Just few people were dealing with this research topic, and so it would be meaningless. But, to myself, I thought it was the research issue that I wanted to know about, and I definitely had the intention to complete it no matter how meaningless other people considered it would be. (Interview 2)

Andrew said he felt delighted to conduct the research, even though some other people considered it to be worthless in the beginning. He insisted on his own values and beliefs to maintain his enthusiasm for this research.

With his persistence and perspiration, Andrew finished writing up the research paper in 2010, and then he submitted his manuscript (JP9) to an overseas international journal for peer review as well as submitted the abstract proposal (IntelCP4) to a conference call-for-papers.

From the above story, Andrew's persistence and perspiration to independently conduct the research based on a proposal for a seminar class are manifested. Although he might do so out of productivity, he was interested in figuring out the solutions for research design, and finally he completed the research and the paper for submissions.

Story II: An unforgettable but learnable conference presentation experience

In the spring semester of 2011, when he was staying in the U.S. as an exchange scholar, Andrew flied to Canada to attend a conference and presented this research (IntelCP4) there. That was an unforgettable experience, but it was also learnable to Andrew. Before that day, while Andrew was preparing for the speech, he was expecting his audience to clap and cheer after his presentation at the conference. He recollected:

> …Before I took my trip to the conference, I thought I had finished writing up my paper, I also had submitted it to a refereed journal to be reviewed, I knew what my research is concerned about, and I also knew how I had analyzed my data. So, basically, I spent plenty of time preparing for the power point slides, making them amusing and fun. (Interview3)

Although he Andrew was so excited, he still felt nervous while he was preparing the presentation materials. He recalled:

…At that time, on the one hand, I wished there would be just a few people coming, so I would not be challenged, because being faced with a crowd of native speakers as the audience, I thought I would be nervous. On the other hand, I also wished there would be more people coming to my session. (Interview 3)

This ambivalence was so vividly reflected by Andrew's reactions to the arrival of the conference presentation.

To Andrew's surprise, when he was ready to present his paper at the conference, the situation on the spot was not as what he had expected, as he recalled:

Then, on that day, I went to the conference. Well, it was really a shame….When I was at the conference in Canada, about the time my session to begin, the number of the audience was…You know how many? Zero! Then, one of the conference staff came in and found no one in the audience. After he left, I thought to myself," How come? What's going on now?" (Interview 3)

There seemed to be no one coming to his session in the beginning. One lady came and then left because the topic was not as she had expected. Finally another lady came into Andrew's session room, and Andrew stared to present his research and finished the presentation within a short time. After that, Andrew wondered what was going on with the situation, and then he found the discrepancy between his research topic and the themes initiated by the conference committee. He said:

I think what I have learned from the presentation session is that your research topic should be interesting to the audience. Or, when you choose to submit for a certain conference call-for-papers, you have to be aware of the background of most of the audience. If I had been aware of the fact that most of the members of the audience in the conference I attended were English teachers rather than researchers, I would have submitted something else more practice-oriented. (Interview 3)

After his presentation session, Andrew also attended other speakers’ presentations at the conference and then he observed and found those presentations with topics related to the practical applications of English teaching in the classroom contexts would be more popular among the audience. Andrew finally realized that if he has another chance to submit for any conference in the future, he would check what the themes the conference mainly intends to address and what the audience might be really interested in before he submits “instead of submitting to any conference of any kind, whatever it is.”

Andrew really learned a lesson from this conference presentation experience in 2011. The discrepancy between his research topic and the conference themes is a possible cause of this situation. Although Andrew felt embarrassed, he still learned from this experience. He knew next time he would choose the right community to participate in.

Story III: Building a vision for contributing to learners

In addition to the experience at the overseas international conference, another conference presentation was the research (OOCP3) presented at the on-campus conference in Andrew’s college during the spring semester in 2012. The topic of it was related to the language use of the professional communication in English, which was actually a course design to enhance the quality of the courses in Andrew’s college. Andrew had his own philosophy to conduct research for his college, as Andrew recalled:

> Once my senior asked me, "Why don't you make good use of the resources of your college and focus on the research of ESP? If your research is centered on students' major subjects, wouldn't it be so convenient?" I thought to myself that I have resources at hand, and the research results can be immediately applied to the college's courses for improvement. Yes, that's right! Why haven't I noticed the circumstances around me? There are plenty of resources available, so many students with their majors, so many teachers with expertise, and the research topics are really a hit. Why haven't I considered conducting research like that? (Interview 7)

Andrew was actually inspired by the talk with his senior. After their talk, he reflected further on his personal philosophy for conducting research. He thought that he would make good use of the resources available to conduct research on ESP and also contribute to subjects themselves, namely, the students in his college. Andrew remembered:

> She suggested that whatever research topics I would deal with in the future, all the benefits should pay back to the students. No matter what findings you have discovered, you should contribute to students. That is what we concluded. (Interview 7)

Clearly, Andrew's philosophy behind a series of on-campus research studies was revealed, even though those on-campus studies were originally the requirements of the department in his college. The talk between his senior and Andrew indeed helped to expand his visions for the future, and made the required research tasks meaningful.

Story IV: Changing the mindset and concentrating on the task at hand

Compared with the first four years, Andrew was not so productive in submitting papers for publication during the last two years of doctoral study, even though he was busy as usual. Despite that one of his journal manuscripts was under review and he was always struggling to keep on interacting with the journal editor and reviewers, it was actually impossible for Andrew to spare his limited time and energy for other research tasks because of the heavy loading from his dissertation research. Except for the above reason, there were still some other aspects that he might consider when making his decisions to withdraw from his regular track of submitting papers for conference call-for-papers or journal publication.

In the fall semester of 2011, Andrew was talking with a professor in his doctoral program, indicating his intention to streamline the process of making survey questions for his dissertation research by directly adapting questions from others' previous studies. Andrew wanted to save time, so that he might have more time to write other research papers for conference submissions and journal publications. However, the professor suggested a valuable concept to him, which indeed had a great impact on Andrew, as he recalled:

> He was an associate professor already. He said, "As a matter of fact, you need not be in a hurry to be shiny and bright now." He added, "You might regard yourself as the jewelry, but right now you do not have to be in a hurry to glow, to sparkle, or to glisten. When it is the time, when you get the sufficient energy and power, and when the time is really right for you, then naturally you would glitter, spark, glow, and brighten. Now you do not have to feel so eager to submit for publication only for the purpose to let others know what you are doing. What you have to do right now is to complete your dissertation attentively. After you have finished it, you would have time to go over your data again." He added, "Then, this would be enough." (Interview 6)

Andrew felt really illuminated by the metaphor mentioned by the professor. Just as the jewelry, one day, Andrew hoped he certainly would be shining and brightening when it is time for him. Actually, at that time, Andrew had had the intention to submit part of his dissertation for scholarly publication, but then, Andrew changed his mind and focused on the making of the research tools. He also interpreted what he had heard from the professor, as he recalled:

> That is, when I take this role as a doctoral student, I do not want to do anything that might overstep my authority with others in the program…[I guess] the professor wanted to suggest to me that I should keep the research data, and then I could work on my research with concentration. When I am done with the dissertation research, I may submit my paper as a whole…. I do not have to show half of my research work to others when I just have done half of it. The talk with the professor might be a good answer to my question about the conflict between the academic visibility and the humbleness. (Interview 6)

Before this talk, Andrew always had the inner conflict in his mind, especially when he was in the first four years of the doctoral study. He said:

> So, as for the issue of visibility that I often mentioned for my second and third years in the doctoral program…yeah, I mean academic visibility. On the one hand, you might hope to be a person with visibility in the academia, to let people know you are somebody, you are doing something, and you are conducting research. However, on the other hand, you do not want to seek publicity so blatantly for fear that the professors might notice my eagerness to submit papers and they might not regard it as appropriate. So, I am situated between the two sides. I do not know if I should pursue my academic visibility through scholarly publications or I should work on my research without attracting any attention, without cutting a swatch of my research, and just work silently and stay in the shade. (Interview 6)

During these years in the doctoral study, actually, Andrew was always struggling with this inner conflict, this sense of ambitendency throughout these previous years, and now in the last year of his doctoral study, he got the sense of release in his mind after he talked with the professor. Andrew said, “The professor really said something quite interesting. In fact, he also gave me good advice. I thought, as a doctoral student, he really gave me such good advice.”

Besides, in the fall semester of 2011, another talk with his senior also helped Andrew to change his mindset. At that time Andrew planned to submit his unfinished dissertation to the conference, AAAL 2012, but finally he cancelled his plan. He remembered:

> ...I thought it was a place for people to see you if your proposal abstract is accepted, and other people would know who you are. I thought that was a good timing, and at that time I talked to my senior and asked, “Since I am now under the guidance of my advisor to work on my dissertation. If I want to submit for conference call-for-papers, do I need to ask for the permission from my advisor? ” My senior replied, “You should ask for the permission.” She added, “You are now working on your dissertation, and you want to publish it while it has not yet been done. I don’t think it is good.” (Interview 6)

Andrew’s senior did not encourage him to do so, even if the permission is granted by the advisor. Then, Andrew’s senior explained to him why she did not agree with Andrew’s plan, as Andrew remembered:

> …The senior said, “Even if you submit half of your research for publication, the advisor would not permit it.” She added further, ”The reason is that others would always take faster steps than you because those famous international scholars have plenty of resources to utilize and plenty of colleagues to collaborate with. But, you are working alone, all by yourself. You might move step by step, but other scholars would publish two papers within a year. Why not finish conducting your research first and after that you can move faster in your writing if the rest of the task left is only the writing itself.” (Interview 6)

Andrew's senior explained her concern to him and indicated that Andrew's research ideas from the unfinished research might be absorbed by other professional scholars who might have better resources to proceed with their own research, which might outshine Andrew's original unfinished work. Andrew took the advice from his senior then, and in the spring semester of 2012, Andrew commented on his choice, as he said:

> So, this year till now, I have never thought it is wrong even I have not submitted any papers. I do not feel sorry or self-pity for myself just because I did not submit for any conference call-for-papers. On the contrary, I have got the sense of release because I know right now at hand it is an important task, and it will take me much time to deal with it. So, I do not waste my time on those conference papers. Of course, if my paper is accepted, and I'll present my paper on the round table session to let others see my presentation there. But, then… So what? I don't think to present at the conference right now mean anything to me. (Interview 6)

Andrew explained why he felt at ease even for almost one year long, from the fall semester of 2011 to the spring semester of 2012, he did not submit for any conference call-for-papers, especially while he was busy with his dissertation research. The meaning of submitting for publication for Andrew had already changed.

In addition, reflecting on his talk with his senior, Andrew indicated he would change his mindset for submitting for publication because he wanted to show his respect for his advisor and other professors, especially when he was now a doctoral student, as he said:

> … I am now a doctoral student. Above me, there are still my advisor and other professors. Maybe they do not care about I am publishing papers right now, but for myself as a doctoral student, with this identity, if I draw too much attention to

> myself, I don't think this is a respectful act. Maybe they do not think so, but for myself personally I don't think it is good to do so. I do not refer to any professor specifically, but, this [program] is as a whole a community. (Interview 6)

Being aware of his own identity as a doctoral student in the hierarchy of the TESOL academia, Andrew did not think it would be suitable to draw attention from others by publishing without showing his respect to his advisor and other professors in the doctoral program.

During the last two years of his doctoral study, Andrew did not publish so frequently as before. Although in the beginning he had the intention to present his unfinished dissertation research at a conference, Andrew finally changed his mindset. He would like to patiently wait for the right time to spark. He would take the practical step. In addition, he would like to follow the invisible influence that he perceives from the social hierarchical structure and attentively focused on his dissertation research. His inner conflict was gradually released during the last two years of doctoral study, which also led him to a deeper thinking about what doing research and getting papers published mean to him.

Narrative 5
Title: A Series of Strategic Decision Makings: Selecting the Right Journals
Stage & Time: All the Six Years of Ph.D. Study (Jun 2006 - Oct 2012)

There are actually more stories to tell than what the publication entries on Andrew's curriculum vita may reveal about his experiences in submitting for journal publications during his doctoral study.

In total, Andrew successfully published eight papers in peer-reviewed journals during these years from 2006 to 2012. His first journal paper was received when he was in the third year of master's study, but it was published after Andrew started his doctoral study in the fall semester of 2006. Then, in 2009, Andrew became a fertile younger scholar because he published five papers in peer-reviewed journals. Then, he published two journal papers in 2010 and 2011, respectively. In addition to the eight published papers, actually, during the last two years in doctoral study, Andrew was working on the submission for one manuscript. But, till he finished his doctoral degree, he was still waiting for the notice of submission status for his manuscript from the journal editor. All of these papers are derived from his term papers for seminar classes or from his master's thesis.

As to how Andrew struggled to achieve the total number of eight published journal papers as well as one under review, his busy life after work may be a good answer. In addition to the regular teaching hours in a college, he was busy with writing research papers for conference submissions and journal submissions after work almost every day. He often stayed in the fast food restaurant and typed his papers till the midnight so that he could concentrate on his research and writing papers without any disturbance. In other words, he was usually living simultaneously in several time cycles of writing papers, submitting papers, being rejected or revising papers, and resubmitting papers, which indeed took much patience and efforts, and there were always uncertainties that might cause much anxiety or uneasiness.

As the title "A Series of Strategic Decision Makings: Selecting the Right Journals," may convey, in order to get his papers published in journals, Andrew had to strategically choose the appropriate journals as the targets to submit his manuscripts to them, and during these processes, a series of decisions needed to be made. Andrew always had some priorities in his mind, and he processed some beliefs to keep him moving on and on.

Below, three stories related to Andrew's experiences in submitting for journal publication are offered to illustrate those processes about what happened to him, how he made decisions, and his reflections on his experiences.

Story I: Endeavoring to get his manuscripts published in journals

During the period of the third and fourth years in his doctoral study, Andrew always had the intention to pursue academic visibility through scholarly publications just like how he felt when he entered the doctoral program. In addition, Andrew had conceived a plan to apply for a scholarship and become a one-year exchange scholar in the U.S. in the near future. He always felt eager to become competitive by publishing papers. Luckily, at that time Andrew had some conference papers at hand and ready for submissions. Thus, during the year 2009, he submitted five papers to international journals (JP2, JP3, JP4, JP5, JP6), including three from his previous conference papers and two were his original term papers.

Recounting the decision making processes of submitting for scholarly publications, Andrew recalled his experiences of submitting his second journal paper (JP2) published in the early 2009, and he said:

> …It was originally written for a conference submission. Then, after I presented it I thought it could be submitted for journal submission, too. As for the reason why I chose this journal…I remembered at that time I was in a hurry to waive my qualifying exam…and I thought if I chose it, the result would come out only in

> three months and the editor said the paper would be published within five months…So, I tried to look for a journal which was fast and not bad…At least it was an international journal…. (Interview 18)

In order to waive the second qualifying exam from the doctoral program, Andrew needed one more international journal for its credit, and for this reason he intended to submit one of his conference papers presented in 2008 to an international journal as soon as possible. At that time, Andrew wrote to the editor to inquire about the regular time for review. Then, Andrew was informed that the average time to know if the paper is accepted is three months, and if accepted, the paper might be published within five months. Andrew decided to submit his paper to the journal, 'The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture,' because of its efficiency, which was satisfying to him. Andrew was in need of the credit of the journal paper to waive his required second qualifying exam, and he just wanted to get it published at that time. He did not care so much about the journal's academic prestige. When he recalled this experience several years later, he admitted that "in order to get the paper published earlier, I submitted it to the journal with less prestige." He thought that it would be easier to publish in a journal with less prestige, and he made a decision based on this idea.

After successful submitting of his second journal paper in the early stage of 2009 and successfully waived the required exam, Andrew continued to try the third journal paper, which was published in 2009. In recounting his experiences in submitting his third journal paper (JP3) for publication, Andrew stressed that it was accepted after he had been rejected by a previous journal. He remembered:

> Then, the third one…the JALT CALL…. In the beginning, I submitted my

> conference paper to the Journal of Second Language Writing. But, the content of the paper was regarded as too much and too complicated. For example, the reviewer gave their comments to me and suggested that my original paper could be divided into two individual small papers, rather than the original one with a Study One and a Study Two….So, after that, I submitted the part of Study One to JALT CALL, and got it published eventually. But, actually, my initial ambition was to submit it to a better journal. After I tried and it was rejected, then I changed my mind and hoped it would only be published as soon as possible. When the second time I tried to submit it again, I would choose an easier one. I mean, it should be an international journal, even though it is be less famous. Take the Japanese journal as an example. To us, it is an international journal, but actually it is also a more or less 'regional' international journal….In addition, I did not want to dwell on the processes of submitting, rejecting, submitting, and rejecting. Yes, I did not want to waste time on it. (Interview 18)

Because his submission was rejected by the Journal of Second Language Writing, he became less ambitious and he would like to try another journal which he considered to be easier to get his paper published. Finally, after he submitted his manuscript to JALT CALL, his third journal paper (JP3) was accepted and published.

Very soon after he published his third journal paper, Andrew continued to proceed with his fourth journal submission (JP4), which he had never presented at any conference before. He conducted this research in 2007 and then he sent this term paper directly to the journal in 2009 and was accepted. He remembered:

> As for the fourth journal paper, basically it was not…, when I was writing it, at that time it was not aimed for any journal. Then, the reason why I would submit it to this journal is…. In fact, I thought my fourth journal paper… I thought it was not a perfect research study…. Maybe I myself…I thought it had the limitation of its own and it had some weakness….so I knew it might not be able to be published in any decent journal… So, I thought I should at least try an international journal, and then I decided I should submit it to a somehow regional international journal. Meanwhile, I found the Journal of Asia TEFL at that time,

> and I thought it was OK. It has a paper edition, and it has the digital file. Then, I submitted my paper to it, and by the way, I wrote to the editor to ask how long the result of my submission would come out. He replied that it should be half a year. Actually, at that time, I was not under any pressure, because I had already got some publications of my own. So, I thought I would be fine with the time of half a year to wait for the result. Sure, I was not under much pressure then. (Interview 18)

Although Andrew perceived that the quality of his paper was not high enough, he still would like to try a good journal. Being under no time pressure, he was not eager to submit it and he could wait for it. Finally, the submission was accepted by “the Journal of Asia TEFL” as his fourth journal paper (JP4).

Compared with those experiences from the above, Andrew had a different strategy in developing his fifth journal paper (JP5). When he was conducting the research and wiring up the paper, he always kept what his targeted journal might require in his mind, as he said:

> As to my fifth journal paper, it was customized for the targeted journal…because at that time, before I was conducting the research, I had read papers from the journal. So, when I was conducting the research, I always intended to submit the completed paper to this journal. When I was writing it up, I followed the format of that journal because I felt I was fond of that journal. That is why I customized my paper for that journal. For example, I might consider the wording, the editing, and the research content. The content is what the journal usually would be concerned about. For instance, they might possibly deal with ‘social implications’ something like that. So, my fifth paper was somehow a customized paper for the targeted journal. (Interview 18)

By figuring out the norms and the preferences of his targeted journal in advance, like a tailor, Andrew submitted his paper by customizing his term paper based on the perceived features for this targeted journal, Discourse & Society, and got it published with his first try smoothly (JP5).

As for his sixth journal paper, it was quite encouraging to Andrew when one of his professors, after attending Andrew’s presentation in a conference session in 2009, suggested him that he should submit the paper (TWCP6) to any international journal for publication. Thus, in the beginning Andrew submitted his paper to an overseas international journal, but it was rejected. Then his paper was accepted by another local international journal in Taiwan (JP6), as he said:

> I presented this paper at a conference, and after that one of my professors encouraged me to submit it for a certain journal publication. He did not specifically recommend which journal to submit to. Then, I discussed with my friend and decided to target an international SSCI, I mean, a SSCI journal with a more regional focus. So, I chose one journal from the South Korea, named ‘Asia Pacific Education Review,’ which is with a lower impact factor value. But, they gave me the feedback that my research topic tends to be concerned about somehow the local issue, which is not suitable to their journal. They even did not review it but just rejected it directly. So, after I discussed again with my friend and we concluded that the same criticism might be given again if we submitted it to any overseas international journal. For this reason, we changed the target and submitted it to an international journal in Taiwan, English Teaching & Learning. (Interview 18)

Although the first submission to an SSCI overseas international journal was not successful, Andrew and his friend decided to resubmit the manuscript to a local international journal and it was accepted (JP6).

Moreover, in 2010, Andrew submitted his second on-campus conference paper (OCCP2) to an international journal, Journal of English for Specific Purposes, but it was rejected for the first try. He then tried another journal and then it was accepted (JP7). He remembered:

> Yes, when I was presenting this paper, it was about June. Then, it seemed to be in July or August. In about August or in September, I thought I would be able to finish writing up the paper….but from the experience of submitting for my sixth paper, I know, some research would be suitable for the local international journal. Yes, I submitted my seventh journal paper to the ESP journal first, the journal, ur…English for Specific Purposes. But, it was rejected. They thought the research study as less international. They thought it would be also hard for my research results to be applied to other countries. So, then owning to the previous experience from my sixth journal paper, I changed my target and submitted my paper to a local international journal, English Teaching & Learning. (Interview 18)

Andrew submitted his on-campus conference paper to ESP journal because he thought the research topic is related to English for specific purposes. But, it was not accepted because of the paper's limited scope and low generalizability that the journal editor commented. Andrew made a shift with what was on his hand and he submitted his paper to another journal, English Teaching & Learning, once again, like what he did for his sixth journal paper in 2009, and this time it was accepted (JP7).

In 2011, Andrew had submitted part of his master's thesis again for publication and this time he also tried two different journals before getting it published (JP8). He remembered:

> …Then, as for the eighth journal paper….actually, after I graduated from the master's program in 2006…I started to submit papers derived from the master's thesis in 2006…and for this I tried the Journal of Applied Linguistics first, but it was rejected. Then, my advisor thought it should be submitted to any overseas international journal…I thought the journal has a lower impact factor, so I

thought it might be easier to get my paper published there. (Interview 18)

For the eighth journal paper, Andrew submitted his paper to the Journal of Applied Linguistics in the beginning, but it was rejected. Then his master's thesis advisor suggested that he could still try another overseas international journal, so he chose another journal, the Foreign Language Annals. Because the paper's impact factor is low, Andrew regarded it would be easier to publish it there. As a result, the submission was accepted and published in it (JP8). Besides, the eighth journal paper is derived from Andrew's master's thesis and is also related to his second local international conference paper (TWCP2) and his first published journal paper (JP1). Andrew seldom talked about his first journal paper because it was an invited journal submission after he presented his second local international conference paper in 2006. He presented part of his master's thesis research at the conference. Then, the affiliated journal editor of the conference committee wrote to invite him to submit his conference paper. Undoubtedly, Andrew did not struggle to make it published. It was not a difficult job to successfully make it published then.

From the above story, there are two important points that can be derived from Andrew's experiences of publishing papers in journals. First, in order to achieve productivity, Andrew developed his terms papers or parts of master's thesis into various papers for conference submissions, abstracts for conference submissions, or manuscripts for journal submissions. As a result, there are connections among many of the conference papers or journal papers, as shown in the following, Table 4.2.

Table 4.1 Development of Andrew's Papers for Journal Submissions

Journal Papers	Descriptions of Development
1	Master's Thesis $_{\text{(Part1)}}$ => TWCP2 => JP1
2	Term paper A => TWCP3 => IntelCP2$_{\text{(abstract)}}$ => JP2
3	Term paper A => TWCP3 => IntelCP1$_{\text{(abstract)}}$ => JP3
4	Term paper B => JP4
5	Term paper C => JP5 / IntelCP3$_{\text{(abstract)}}$
6	Term paper D => TWCP5 => TWCP6 => JP6
7	OCCP2 => JP7
8	Master's Thesis $_{\text{(Part 2)}}$ => JP8

In the above table, the arrow symbol, =>, represents the literal meaning "developing into." As a result, in the description of development for the journal paper number one (JP1), *Master's Thesis* $_{\textit{(Part1)}}$ *=> TWCP2 => JP1*, it means that a part of Andrew's Master's thesis was firstly developed into a conference paper, TWCP2, and it was presented. Then the conference paper was revised and developed into a manuscript submitted to a journal for peer review, and finally it was accepted and published as a journal paper, JP1. In addition, three manuscripts for journal papers JP4, JP5, and JP7 were submitted directly based on his term papers or on an on-campus study, instead of on any previously presented conference papers. Besides, both JP5 and IntenCP3 are derived from the same study for a term paper. But, Andrew submitted the abstract for IntelCP3 to a conference submission and the manuscript of JP5 to a journal for review, and they were both accepted. After the notice of journal acceptance, Andrew travelled to present the study for IntelCP3 at an overseas international conference. Furthermore, the study, OCCP2, is an on-campus paper, and Andrew developed it into a journal paper, JP7. To sum up, these above descriptions of development above may indicate how strategic he was to achieve a high productivity in producing journal papers.

Second, four out of the eight papers (JP1, JP2, JP4, JP5) were accepted by the first tried journals to which he submitted his manuscripts, and the other half of the eight papers (JP3, JP6, JP7, JP8) were accepted by the second tried journals, as shown in the following, Table 4.1.

Table 4.2 Andrew's Manuscript Submission History

Papers	The First Tried Journals	The Second Tried Journals
JP1	Language Literacy Studies and International Studies (Accepted)	
JP2	The International Journal of Language, Society, and Culture (Accepted)	
JP3	Journal of Second Language Writing (Rejected)	The Journal of JALT CALL (Accepted)
JP4	The Journal of Asia TEFL (Accepted)	
JP5	Discourse and Society (Accepted)	
JP6	ASIA Pacific Education Review (Rejected)	English Teaching & Learning (Accepted)
JP7	Journal of English for Specific Purposes (Rejected)	English Teaching & Learning (Accepted)
JP8	International Journal of Applied Linguistics (Rejected)	Foreign Language Annals (Accepted)

While choosing which journals as targets to submit his manuscripts for publication, Andrew always had his personal considerations to be based on, for example, the prestige of a journal, the impact factor of a journal, the required duration for review, the rejection rate, or the specific features of a journal. During the first try for a manuscript submission, Andrew usually would choose his preferred ones, even though it might be difficult to achieve (e.g. JP3, JP4, JP6, JP7, JP8). But, he would choose one journal which is easier for him to publish but with a short duration for peer review (e.g. JP 2) because he needed the credit to waive the qualifying exam. He would choose a journal based on its features and customized his research (e.g. JP5) because he was really interested in its research themes. In addition, when his manuscripts were rejected, he submitted them to other journals during the second try. He chose the easier ones to submit his revised manuscripts and got them published (e.g. JP3, JP6, JP7). But, he still chose a difficult journal to submit for the second try and also got it published (JP8). All the other experiences indicate how strategic he was while selecting the suitable journals to submit for publication.

Story II: A prolonged duration of being under review

Besides, throughout a long duration for almost two years from August 2010 to September 2012, Andrew had been continually submitting one manuscript to an overseas international journal for review. Although it had not been published till the end of the narrative interview data collection, it can be regarded as the coming ninth journal paper (JP9), and it had been under review for a long time. The peer reviewing processes were quite torturing and time-consuming, as he remembered:

> To be frank with you, I think it is a time-consuming task. That is, I know the peer review process is very….But,…to be frank with you,….But, you have to be aware that the job done by those reviewers is unpaid. They will not be paid. Basically, it is, as many people say, a job of academic responsibility in the society. If you are able to step into the field, and you are capable of contributing to the society, to offer your contribution to this field…So I think, sometimes I think….If today I were the reviewer to review the paper, I would finish reading through the paper within three days. Why did they prolong the duration for three or four months, even over six months? It really makes the submitter wait, wait, wait, and wait for such a long time. I would like to know why they could not do the same way as I would do it. If I were asked to do the reviewer's job, I would settle down myself, and then one week or three weeks… Well, just forget about it. After all, they are editors and reviewers who are not paid. They are unpaid. So, I think I would take my time and wait. (Interview 12)

Andrew felt so powerless when the review process for his paper submission had been lasting for such a long time. Andrew just wanted to know why those editors and reviewers' efficiency could not be enhanced, and he imagined if he were the reviewer, he would make the review process more efficient. However, Andrew seemed to choose to forgive those reviewers because after all they are not paid to review his paper. Even he felt helpless, Andrew was still grateful to have these experiences and he appreciated the efforts of the editor and these reviewers.

From the above story, Andrew's experiences clearly indicate that it is impossible for him to get involved in the review process in order to make the process faster. All what he could do was to wait patiently for the notice from the journal editor. He persuaded himself to accept this situation with the reason that editors and reviewers are unpaid while doing the peer review job.

Story III: The personal definitions for a right journal

During the six years of his doctoral study, Andrew achieved his plans for scholarly publications. Reflecting on his experiences in making decisions for submitting journal publications, Andrew believed that he would always select the right journal. But, the definition of a right journal is not absolute; it always depends. He said:

> What is a right journal? The definition of it is quite personal. What is the definition of a right journal? Is it the status of the journal's academic prestige? Is it for your personal benefits? Or, is it for your academic career in the future? I think the definition of a right journal is basically very ambiguous. (Interview 17)

If Andrew had been asked what would be a right journal for him, he might say it depends on what you need. The definition of a “right journal” at that time to him was not only due to its academic prestige, like the impact factor, but also due to its efficiency of making his paper published. Andrew was in such a hurry to get his journal papers published because he wanted more papers to strengthen his curriculum vita.

In addition to the definition of a right journal in terms of its efficiency to get published, Andrew also explained his priority in choosing what journal to submit his papers based on their academic prestige status. He added:

> Basically this word, “right”, is very ambiguous. What does it mean to be right? I think this is from socio-meditation, too. That is, why would I submit to the overseas international journals? It is also under the influence of this community? I mean virtually its credit is higher. So, I would have a standard for myself. Although there are differences of quality among those local international journals in Taiwan and overseas international journals,…You know, there are good and bad overseas international journals and there are good and bad ones among those local international journals in Taiwan… I would prefer looking for the overseas international journals of a high intermediate level of the academic prestige to try submitting my papers. If it is not accepted, I would reconsider submitting to those local international journals in Taiwan. I would select the type of journal based on my research topic and I would investigate the topic trends of those journals. Take one of my papers as an example. At that time I selected ASIA Pacific Education Review to submit my paper, but it was not accepted. Then, I shifted to submit it to the local international journal in Taiwan, and the possibility of being accepted is higher. I would try those overseas international journals first and then try those local international ones in Taiwan. (Interview 17)

Andrew explained his beliefs in prioritizing the targeted journals for him to submit his papers. That is, he would prefer the overseas international journals to the local international journals in Taiwan because “the impact factor and the credit of those overseas international journals would be higher, which is good for looking for job positions in the future."

Moreover, Andrew explained why he would choose the SSCI overseas international journals by questioning the preferences of the academia in Taiwan, he said:

> …I mean the benefit refers completely to the personal merit. Some people would care about the compatibility between one's paper and the journal. But, the consideration might be related to your personal benefits. I mean if your paper is accepted, it might mean [something] to you. Why do you decide to submit papers to SSCI [journals]? Why do you want to try [submitting papers to] SSCI? Because from the perspective, in the context of Taiwan, if your [papers] are accepted by a SSCI journal, it would mean [your papers are valuable].But, I know scholars in Hong Kong would not brag about their SSCI publications. They might only indicate that their papers are accepted by certain journals. But, why do scholars in Taiwan would use parentheses to highlight that fact that their papers are SSCI papers? (Interview 17)

Andrew admitted that his considerations for making choices might be very individual because the benefits are the personal merit. In selecting journals to publish his papers, although he also chose SSCI journals as his priorities, he implied that the importance of the SSCI journals is overemphasized by scholars in the social context of Taiwan.

From Andrew's experiences, some strategies for him to choose a journal to submit his papers can be summarized. First, he would take the overseas international journal with a higher academic prestige as the priority to submit his paper. Then, if his paper was rejected, he would try another journal with a lower impact factor. Second, he would consider the required duration for reviewing his paper. If he was in need of the credit soon, he would prefer the journal with a short duration of peer review. But, if he was not under such pressure to have the credit, he would choose the journal with a longer reviewing duration but with a higher academic prestige. Third, he would consider if it was easy to get published in that journal. If he just wanted to get published and he did not want to waste time, he would choose the easiest one to try. Fourth, he would consider the features of the targeted journals and evaluate if his papers matched them. He would also customize his research based on his perceptions the requirements of the targeted journals.

In addition, from the above stories in this narrative, throughout the eight published papers and one on-going paper under review, several features of Andrew's experiences in submitting for journal publication are revealed, including his intentions, strategies, attitudes, and personal beliefs. Besides, Andrew's achievements and experiences in submitting for journal publications indeed benefited Andrew on many aspects, such as waiving the second qualifying exam, becoming more competitive on his curriculum vita for applying for the exchange scholar sponsorship, gaining the confidence for his academic career in the future, and most important of all, interacting with the editors and reviewers and learning from them through their comments as feedback.

Narrative 06
Title: Learning through Practice: The Dialogues with Experts
Stage & Time: All the Six Years of Ph.D. Study (Jun 2006 - Oct 2012)

As the saying that goes, "Behind every cloud the sun is still shining!" whenever Andrew reflects on his experiences in submitting for journal publications during his life as a doctoral student, he would tacitly nod his agreement.

From 2006 to 2012, Andrew had submitted eight published journal papers and one on-going paper under review. During these processes, he had some goals to keep in his mind at different stages. For example, he would like to pursue the academic visibility when he just entered the doctoral program. He had the need to get the credit to waive his second qualifying exams when he was about to take the second qualifying exam. He wanted to add more publications on his curriculum vita to be more competitive for applying for the exchange scholar scholarship when he was in the fourth year of the doctoral study. Also, he wanted to accumulate more publications for future career development/job positions when he was aware of the future requirements. Due to these goals, Andrew was always actively seeking chances to invest his time and efforts to get his papers published. Fortunately, Andrew indeed had achieved many of his goals. However, to him, the experience gained from these processes means more to him than what those above tangible benefits might bring to him because those encounters are opportunities for Andrew to interact with the editors and reviewers academically and learn from the TESOL academia. From these experiences Andrew also equipped himself with the needed abilities and information about resources to conduct his doctoral dissertation independently, to have the awareness as a young scholar in the TESOL academia, and to have the confidence to get ready for the future TESOL career.

Below are some stories about Andrew’s experiences in submitting his manuscripts to journals for publications, concerning what he learned and what these valuable experiences mean him.

Story I: Learning to negotiate with reviewers based on literature and theories

In order to get one of his research studies (JP9) published, Andrew submitted the first draft of his paper to a journal for peer review. In the beginning, two reviewers reviewed his paper. One just criticized his writing by indicating his problematic Asian writing style. The other reviewer severely criticized his paper about the statistics problem: the effect size. To make the decision, the journal editor then had a third reviewer to review his paper, and the third reviewer also just criticized his Asian writing style. Among the three reviewers, the first one and the third one thought Andrew's study were acceptable except the Asian writing style. However, the second reviewer was quite demanding and his opinions on the statistics problem in Andrew's study turned out to be the editor's concern. Andrew recalled:

> …. The second reviewer was very demanding. The comments from the second reviewer were to the point. He asked, "Why do you use this statistics tool? You should elaborate on it," and "There is something wrong with your statistics and you can't do that. You should justify it." I thought the editor referred to the comments from the second reviewer, and the editor decided to reject my paper. Even though the first and the third reviewers felt OK with my paper, the editor thought it would be important to refer to the second reviewer's comments. (Interview 1)

Finally, Andrew's paper was rejected. The editor replied to him, "We strongly encourage you resubmit your paper…." Although Andrew's paper was rejected, they still wanted him to resubmit his paper if he could deal with the problems which they indicated and revise the paper, as Andrew remembered:

> So, the editor rejected my paper directly. But, the editor replied to me and said, "Although we decide to reject your paper, we still encourage you to resubmit. The

> questions from the first and third reviewers are easy. But, you have to answer the questions from the second reviewer. It would be helpful to your paper." (Interview 18)

Later, to answer the questions from the first and third reviewers, Andrew asked for the help from the proof-reading service given by native speakers to help to enhance the quality of his writing style, and to react to the second reviewer, Andrew took efforts to figure out the statistics problems.

The second reviewer criticized that the effect size of Andrew's study was too small, as he indicated, "The results of the study indicated are associated not with just small effect sized but rather miniscule effect sizes." In order to respond to the reviewer's comments, Andrew read through some statistics books related to the definition of effect size, like the statistics book of the U.S. statistician named Jacob Cohen (Cohen, 1988), to support his reply to the reviewer in his form of general response to reviewers' comments that the effect size in his own study should be between small and medium rather than what the second reviewer had criticized as a miniscule size. Soon, after Andrew read more papers about the statistics knowledge of effect size, he realized there were indeed some problems with his statistics tools and the original interpretation for his research. He felt really grateful for the comments from these reviewers, as he remembered:

> I think I have learned a lot from the comments given by the reviewers, especially about my wording or about the experiment design. (Interview 1)

The comments from those reviewers and editors would usually lead Andrew to do self-study and understand more about his own study. They functioned as the guidance. With these experiences in replying to reviews' comments and meeting their requirements, Andrew also built up step by step his own inward guidance and standard for another research to come in the future.

Story II: Learning about the tips of theoretically making survey questions

It was surprising to Andrew when he read the sentences from the reviewer in a reply email with comments, "What is the theoretical foundation of your questionnaire? What is your rationale?" because he had never thought the survey questions he used in his own study would be criticized so directly. Actually, he had written up the term paper for a doctoral seminar class with the research, and he had presented the conference paper with a full paper (TWCP6) published in the proceeding. Even one professor encouraged him to submit the paper to an overseas international journal for publication. No one ever questioned him about the making of those survey questions. He remembered:

> …My friend and I collaborated with each other to conduct a study, concerning about grammar teaching or something, with the questionnaire related to teachers and students. I submitted the paper to one overseas international journal, and then the reviewer just rejected my paper directly, asking me a question, "What is the theoretical foundation of your questionnaire?" which means what your theory base is and how you come up with those survey questions. (Interview 14)

Not till then, Andrew had never paid attention to the word "rationale" when conducting research. Although he felt frustrated because of being rejected, he took the failure as a stepping stone to move on. He said:

> At that time, I suddenly realized and thought to myself, "Yes, the developing of

> the questionnaire should not be just based on my own personal preferences and imagination to come up with the survey questions. But instead, it should be based on the theoretical foundation.” (Interview 14)

Then, Andrew and his friend revised the paper, and resubmitted to another local international journal in Taiwan (JP6). The reviewer of this journal replied and questioned their ways of explaining the data in their study, and suggested a better way to deal with the data, as Andrew recalled:

> Then, we resubmitted our paper to another journal. The reviewer replied and indicated that there is something wrong with the ways we used to explain the features of the questions in the questionnaire. “If there are eighteen questions, how would you report about them? You are not supposed to report about the data one question by one question”. (Interview 14)

The reviewer sincerely shared the tips with Andrew for him to enhance the quality of the paper, especially to categorize the data for the first step. Andrew remembered:

> For example, the reviewer indicated, “You should not indicate that for the number one question, the agreement percentage is… Or, then another question has a disagreement rate, which is…. No way! You definitely could not explain your data that way.” The reviewer told me that when I have so many questions to report about, I should categorize them first. (Interview 14)

Later, Andrew followed the suggestions from the reviewer to deal with the data with the statistics method, the factor analysis. He said:

> The reviewer suggested to me and indicated, “Yes, you should use the statistics method, the factor analysis, to categorize your data and then run the statistics. Then, categorize your question items into different categories. Then, you go further to examine the data in a systematic way”. (Interview 14)

Finally, Andrew's paper was accepted by the second journal, and he also had acquired the concept of starting with the rationale and the ways to generate the survey questions based on the theoretical foundation and the statistics method to develop survey questions. The experience also means a lot to Andrew because while he was conducting the dissertation research later, he benefited much from this process.

Story III: Figuring out the essence of a research gap

In 2012, one night Andrew got an email of rejection notice from a journal editor (JP9) before he went to bed. He was so astonished to know that in his research, his research gap is not considered by the reviewer as a research gap. He remembered:

> In the letter, the editor mentioned one point from the reviewer's comments. The reviewer indicated, "In your article, you mention one thing, that is, no one has ever explored this topic, and so you would like to research it." The reviewers said this is not a gap. "Why not think about this matter in a different angle? If it has not been dealt with, doesn't it mean such a topic is virtually unimportant?" So, after I pondered over his words, I got nothing to say…. (Interview 15)

Andrew had submitted his paper to the journal for publications several months ago. He was so surprised again because his belief about the definition of a research gap was challenged. "Doesn't a research gap mean the research topic if no one has ever conducted research on it?" he thought to himself.

In 2007, while he was in a SLA seminar class, the professor always reminded them of the importance to "poke a hole" when they want to conduct research because they were doctoral students now. Andrew remembered:

> When I was in the second year of the doctoral study, I attended a SLA class. The professor mentioned an important concept, that is, "to poke a hole." "Only by filling the research gap, then the research can be conducted." When I was in the master's program, we would look for the research topic from any trivial phenomena and then explore it. But, now in the doctoral program, the professor said it is only by poking a hole first, and then it can be regarded as doing research. (Interview 3)

When Andrew was a TESOL master's student and when he was in the first year as a doctoral student in 2006, he always started with anything familiar to him or topics he was interested in then if he was searching for the research topics to explore, as he recalled:

> Before, my personal philosophy of doing research was based on my research interests, rather than from reading through the related literature. I would make a list of research questions, research methods, and ways to analyze the data and so on. All were derived from my research interests. I would table my brainstorming results. (Autobiography 2)

Now, in his second year of the doctoral program in 2007, he was reminded by the professor of the importance of it. But, what on earth is a research gap? During this period, Andrew would often "print out a reading package and then read through the materials, so as to come up with research questions to do research." Especially since 2008, he would always seek the research gap from the literature he had read through. He recalled:

> …When I was in the third and fourth years in the doctoral study, I started to look for the research gap …I think I searched for the gap from the literature and I explored it. Now I preferred this procedure to conduct research rather than just look for literature to support my argument. Before, I conducted my research in a reverse order, which was not solid. Now I kind of prefer this type of research

> procedure, to look for gap for doing research, filling the gap. It conforms more to the paradigmatic procedure of conducting research…(Interview 3)

After the SLA seminar class, Andrew started to conduct research and write up his research papers based on this belief that he would search for the gap from the literature to explore.

That night in 2012, after he unfolded the reject notice email from the editor and after he read it and pondered over the reviewer's words, he realized the essence of a research gap, as he remembered:

> To the reviewer, such a research topic that has not yet been done today does not mean it is the research topic which is of importance just because no one has ever conducted research on it. But, instead, you should think in a different way. No one would like to deal with it. Doesn't it mean that no one thinks it is worthy to explore it? (Interview 15)

That night in 2012, before going to bed, Andrew understood the essence of what a research gap would be, based on the reviewer's logic and based on Andrew's his own interpretations. That is, if the research gap is really a gap, of course, it should be the missing gap in the existing literature, which means the "lack of research in this area" But, another important thing is that it should be also a gap worth exploring because it might really contribute something to the field, like the valuable "implications." In other words, the research would be of value and has the significance. Then, the gap is a real research gap. Andrew really learned from the rejection notice email that night!

From 2006 to 2012, Andrew had successfully submitted eight journal papers, but actually he had submitted more than eight times because his papers were often rejected by the reviewers and editors. A variety of phrases below might exemplify why Andrew's papers were criticized or were rejected, such as:

> Not providing the rationale or theoretical foundation
> Not justifying the use of ANCOVA
> Not reporting the median of the data, but only the means and standard deviation
> Not based on a research gap acknowledged by the reviewer
> Overstating the importance of the study
> Not making his findings resonate or disagree with the literature
> The idiosyncratic ways of citing data from previous studies
> The Asian writing style
> Research limitations due to the low number of subjects/participants
> Research findings limited to a regional scope; too localized

Even though these examples are flaws, they still guided Andrew to seek resources to improve them. For instance, participating in the SSCI Workshop had benefited Andrew's skills in interacting with the journal editors and reviewers. With the proof reading service given by the native speakers, Andrew had enhanced his writing skills.

Although the frequency of those negative comments given by the reviewers and editors was high, his experiences as a new comer in the TESOL academia during these years are actually positive to him. Once he had a private talk with his friend about experiences in interacting with journal reviewers, as he recalled:

> ....Interacting with the reviewers is like filling the holes in the wall. Some fragments and flaws are gradually repaired. The comments from the reviewers are like the materials to overcome the shortcomings. Every challenge equals to the chance to grow up. There are just few chances to get published with the first draft. (Interview 1)

No wonder even though sometimes he felt frustrated when his papers were rejected, Andrew was always grateful for these experiences in interacting with journal reviewers and editors, he added:

> I think I have learned a lot from these processes. During these years, I have always been fumbling with a trial and error method when I was submitting for journal publications. Each time when I fell on the ground, the comments from the editor would be helpful like a remedy. (Interview 1)

Andrew concluded from his experiences that publishing papers is not only related to conducting research and writing up papers itself, but actually, it is a holistic process of communicating with the editors, reviewers, and himself as the researcher and writer.

All of the experiences that Andrew had gained from these processes, no matter they are positive or negative, finally turned out to be the fertilizer that nurture Andrew's development in the doctoral study and nourish the dreams for his future professional career in TESOL.

Narrative 7
Title: Going through Challenges: From Ideal to Practical
Stage & Time: The Last Two Years of Ph.D. Study (July 2010 – July 2012)

In July 2012, Andrew finished his dissertation and got his doctoral degree. Before that, during the previous twenty four months, it was like a journey through which Andrew had encountered different challenges and had managed to solve them with various resources and strategies.

During the last two years of his doctoral study, Andrew was concentrating on his dissertation research. The whole processes might be divided into three stages[8], including the first phase (Phase I: Aug. 2010-Sep. 2011), in which he was trying to figure out the scope of his research and complete his first three chapters for the proposal oral defense, the second phase (Phase II: Sep. 2011-May 2012), in which he was developing his research tools, collecting the data, and analyzing his data, and the third phase (Phase III: May 2012-July 2012), in which he was writing up the dissertation, doing the dissertation oral defense, and finally uploading his dissertation to get the degree.

In the beginning of the Phase I, Andrew always conceived the idea to conduct a magnificent dissertation study, but gradually he narrowed down the scope for his research and finally came up with the first three chapters of his dissertation as a workable and practical blueprint. During the processes, his interactions with others for academic purposes and his reflections on these events all contributed to his decisions for and realizations of the first three chapters of his dissertation. Then, finally, from the proposal oral defense, the suggestions given by the committee members also helped to enhance the quality and practicability of conducting his dissertation research.

During the second phase of completing his dissertation research, the Phase II, Andrew started to deal with related tasks for his dissertation research, including making the survey questions for the questionnaire, collecting the data, and analyzing the data. In making the survey questions, he referred back to his own experiences gained from submitting one manuscript for journal publication (JP6). While collecting the data from subjects, he was faced with difficulties from the uncooperative students

---

8 Please refer to Appendix IV: Development of Andrew’s Doctoral Dissertation Research

as subjects as well as the time and budgetary constraints, and he was applying his strategic solutions to solve problems. In analyzing the data, to have a better command of statistics, Andrew sought the guidance from a statistics tutor, but finally shifted back to the suggestions from his advisor.

In the third phase, the Phase III, Andrew endeavored to deal with other related tasks, including writing up his dissertation, taking the oral defense, and uploading his dissertation and get the degree. In writing up the dissertation, Andrew finished the writing task within a short time by referring to his previous rich experiences in writing for scholarly publication. While taking the oral defense, Andrew felt he was gaining the sincere and valuable supportive feedback from the committee members. In the end, when he was uploading his dissertation to the university library system, Andrew felt hesitative to immediately share the linkage of his dissertation through the worldwide Internet access.

Throughout the last two years, Andrew was attentively working on his dissertation research. In each stage, he encountered difficulties on various aspects, but each time he would manage to cope with them independently by himself or/and collaboratively with others, and then move on to the next step.

No matter what difficulties or challenges Andrew had been faced with, he would seek resources to tackle the problems and cope with any difficulties, including the advice or professional suggestions from others, the knowledge of statistics from books and the statistics tutor, the experiences absorbed from other's studies and his own previous studies, the comments from the journal editors and reviewers on his previous studies, the logic of writing style in his own journal papers and so on.

The completion of the dissertation means not only the results of the efforts made by Andrew himself but also the convergence of professional advice from others and resources available in the social context of TESOL. In the following, for each stage, some stories are offered to portray Andrew's experiences throughout the processes of completing his doctoral dissertation.

Story I: The changing research scope: from ideal to practical

In September 2011, Andrew had just finished his proposal oral defense, but when looking back at the previous twelve months before September 2011, Andrew had lots of stories to tell about the changing process of deciding his research scope. While Andrew started to stay in the U.S. as an exchange scholar in the fall semester of 2010, in the beginning, he was busy in writing his first three chapters and searching for some ideas from books and papers to write a rationale for building an English course because he wanted to use it as the sources of data for his dissertation research, as Andrew remembered:

> Actually, in the beginning, to design a course for my research was my favorite choice because I thought I felt so happy. When I was staying in the U.S., I was reading through those books and papers on theories of course design for teaching CC[9]. I really enjoyed it, so I felt like designing a course. I had already drawn the outline for it, but I had not proceeded with the design of it. I had just got a rationale already. (Interview 3)

At that time, Andrew was really fond of this research topic because he thought it was interesting to him. Once he was briefing one of the local professors in the university

[9] CC refers to the name of a certain subject.

where he was staying as an exchange scholar about his research ideas, Andrew got a positive feedback from the local advisor professor, as he remembered:

> Then I was staying in the T University in the U.S., and I had another local advisor there. I went to her office to have a talk with her and told her that I would design a course for my research to teach CC in English. Then, she said, "That's good. I'm so glad. This idea is quite creative." She said she was so glad to know what I was going to do, and she said she was happy for that. (Interview 3)

The positive feedback from this professor was quite encouraging to Andrew because it was Andrew that came out with the idea of design a course for the dissertation research after he had come to the U.S. and read through piles of papers and books. But, actually before he started to stay in the U.S. as an exchange scholar, he had an earlier edition of research proposal, which was intended to explore the correlation between CC and MM[10], as he mentioned:

> …In fact, in the early beginning, I just focused on the relationship of CC and the processing of MM. My proposal for the qualifying exam in the doctoral program was also related to this. Then because I had read more papers and literature related to CC, for a certain period of time, I had been considering to deal with the research concerning the efficiency of the training for CC in English language and enhancing the learners' English MM. (Interview 3)

Andrew had generated this early edition of research scope as the proposal officially submitted to his department in the doctoral program before he flied to the U.S. However, after he came to the U.S., he found he had more interests in the course design, even though later he found there were problems with the feasibility of the course design and there was a lack of related previous studies. He recalled:

---

[10] MM refers to the name of a certain subject.

> But, during that period of time, I found it would be a little bit difficult to design the teaching activities within a short time, and due to the lack of the related previous literature that can support my study, I was worried that the effect of the design activities would be none. As a result, being cautious, I still returned to the original research topic. (Interview 3)

Then, Andrew shifted back to his original research design but with a new purpose. That is, he would adopt the structural equation model (SEM) to understand the relationships among those factors in his research, and he had another talk with the local advisor professor again, as he remembered:

> …I said to her, "I've changed it and adopted the SEM because I thought this would be easier than my previous research design, the course design for my research."…Then, when I stopped, she replied, "I'm so glad you've made a change because I thought your previous research design, to design the course for your research, is too broad." In her angle, she felt that the doctoral dissertation…the goal to conduct the dissertation research is not to make it become a masterpiece in one's life. "The doctoral dissertation is just a beginning in your career as a researcher," she said, "so, you neither have to amplify your research purposes nor make your research topic too broad." She said she was happy for the change. (Interview 3)

The local advisor professor confirmed Andrew's decision again, but she told Andrew that the dissertation is just a beginning of the career as a researcher, and it should not be a masterpiece in one's life. Andrew took the advice from her and decided to return to the original design with the SEM statistics method to explore the factors involved in his research. At the same time, Andrew also contacted his advisor in Taiwan to get her conformation, as Andrew remembered:

> …Actually, when I decided to adopt SEM in my research, I wrote to my advisor

> in Taiwan and told her that I would like to change from the topic of course design to the original one with SEM, and my advisor replied to me that basically to adjust the research would be all right once my research could be related to the original research topic. (Interview 3)

Andrew thought his advisor in Taiwan really gave him much freedom to make decisions on his own, and he was determined to develop his first three chapters based on this research scope because after that he also discussed with another expert on language instruction about the adjustments that were made in his research. Thus, while Andrew was an exchange scholar in the U.S., he had many chances to discuss with others about his research design, including the local advisor and the language expert. Nevertheless, when he was back to Taiwan in August 2011, he was warned by his friend and another professor against his decision to involve SEM in his research, he remembered:

> I took a trip to Taichung and had a gathering with a friend and a professor. The professor said that what I was telling them was so brilliant, and it sounded not bad. The professor told me that judging my research questions, she thought the critical point was whether I could graduate and get the degree on time, that is, I should be able to graduate within the time limit. She said in my research the statistics part would become demanding in the end of the study and it would be hard to control it. Another friend, who is also a Ph.D. suggested that I should take a more practical method to analyze the data, and then after I graduate, I might develop the model on my own. It seems that currently I have directly omitted the first step, and jumped to this demanding part. (Interview 3)

Andrew was suddenly awoken by the words from his friend and the professor because he had never thought about the practical goal of this dissertation and the time constraint. At that moment, the talk between his friend and the professor in Taichung also reminded Andrew of the conversation between Andrew and one male professor in the U.S. several months ago, as Andrew recalled:

> In fact, in that year, when I was in the U.S., I attended a professor's seminar class, and he said there was only one goal for the dissertation research. He told me, "The ultimate goal of your dissertation research is to complete it and get the degree!... Only one goal for your dissertation, that is, to complete it and get the degree… If your research topic is too broad and you can't finish your research, it will be a big trouble!" I pondered over his words and thought they do make sense. (Interview 6)

Then after the talk with Andrew's friend and the professor in Taichung, Andrew adjusted his research design again, and he shifted his research back to the design with another related statistics method, the multiple regression, which is more familiar to Andrew, abandoning the use of SEM. His advisor also agreed with him about his decision to change the design again on the condition that the decision has a theoretical basis. After that, Andrew adjusted his research design and revised his first three chapters for the coming proposal oral defense.

From the above story of Andrew's experiences in the Phase I of his dissertation research, it is clear that Andrew indeed went through the changing process of determining his research scope, which also represents his changing attitudes towards his research. Before the research design was finalized, the focus of his study had been adjusted for four times, including (1) the correlation between CC and MM, (2) the efficiency of the course design and teaching, (3) the correlation among variables with SEM, and (4) the correlation among variables with the multiple regression. Each transition is derived from Andrew's considerations or concern about his research design. In terms of the feasibility of the research, Andrew was moving from the ideal to the practical, which also reveals his perceptions about his role as a doctoral student working on his dissertation. By referring to others' professional suggestions and his reevaluating his situation, all the way, he was negotiating with himself based on his understanding about the reality.

Story II: Developing the survey questions: learning from the previous experiences

It would never be an easy task to learn to develop survey questions for a research purpose, and this fact also echoes what Andrew had experienced in making survey questions for his dissertation research. In the spring semester of 2012, while Andrew was having a meeting with his dissertation research advisor, his advisor commented on the making of his survey questions, as he recalled:

> …My advisor told me that the most interesting part in my dissertation research is the processes of defining the construct. At that time, her words associated me with the memory that another professor had told me the same thing, giving me the same comments. So, I replied to her, "Professor! In fact, another professor also told me about that. He said that the merit of my research is not whether I've answered my research questions, but instead it is how the construct is defined." My advisor replied, "Sure, the tools that you have developed can help to explain…to explore several issues that everyone cares about. The development of your research tools is the most interesting part. As a matter of fact, whether your research questions are answered or not, I do not really care about that. What I care about is the whole process how you went through it." (Interview 6)

Andrew still clearly remembered the talk with another professor several months ago in the fall semester of 2011, as he indicated:

> On that occasion, the professor also conveyed a concept to me. He was quite frank with me. He said, "In fact, what do you think is the merit of your research? It is not the research questions that finally you will answer. The merit of your

> research is absolutely not whether you answer your questions or not, or if your research questions have the significance.” He added that in his own eyes the most interesting part of my research is the whole process of developing this research. So, he told me that I do not have to be in a hurry to complete my research. That is, I just have to be devoted to the middle part of my research, so as to make it more solid. That will be enough. (Interview 6)

In the professor’s view, the making of survey questions was what Andrew should focus on then because the processes of making them would be the merit of Andrew’s research. Both professors praised the design of survey questions in his research pretty highly.

As a matter of fact, however, Andrew’s previous experiences in submitting for journal publication in 2009 (JP6) had really benefited him in making survey questions. The first question he got from the reviewer is “What is the theoretical foundation of your questionnaire?” At that time, his submission was rejected, and then after he resubmitted to another journal, he was challenged again, “No way! You definitely could not explain your data that way.” These experiences had led Andrew to a full understanding about making survey questions. He recalled:

> Sure, you need the theory, and then you need to understand the reliability and validity. So, it turned out to be that the more I experience, the more I would understand. From then on, whenever I was reviewing others’ survey questions or making my own survey questions, I would immediately associate with the theory and the importance of it. (Interview 14)

Before, Andrew would not be able to come out with the above words because the approach he had used to generate survey questions was either adopting others’ questions from their studies or developing his own questions based on his intuition and general knowledge of the subject matter. Now, when he was developing the survey questions for his dissertation research in 2011, Andrew felt so confident in making a theory-based questionnaire, which was appreciated by these two professors. Andrew felt quite flattered then.

From the above story, it is no doubt that Andrew's efforts on the design of survey questions were praised by these two professors to be the merit of his dissertation research. Andrew's hard work to meet the requirements from the reviewers' comments really paid off when it was the time for his own dissertation research.

Story III: Learning from different approaches of analyzing the quantitative data

In the spring semester of 2012, after he was done with the data analysis and finished writing up the results chapter, Andrew had a discussion with his advisor. However, the statistics tool he chose to use was rejected by his advisor, he mentioned:

> On Monday, I met my advisor, discussing the results of the data analysis in my research and the interpretations for the results. I had been quite satisfied with the replacement of the original statistics tool for analyzing the data with the path analysis, but my advisor pointed out the discrepancy between the method and my research questions, and that between the method and my writing development when using this statistical method, suggesting that I should return back to the original method of multiple regression, which I had already reported to the committee members during the proposal oral defense. (Weekly Log 1)

Andrew was so surprised that his advisor disagreed with him about the statistics tool, the path analysis, because he had just learned from a statistics tutor in private lessons and he thought this is a more advanced statistics tool than his original one, the multiple regression. Andrew's advisor suggested that he should follow what he had stated in his research design presented in the proposal oral defense. Fortunately, the results that came out with the multiple regression were quite similar to those with the path analysis, as he remembered:

> I thought it would be more advanced and effective to run the path analysis, and that it would be a positive point to my dissertation. However, informed by my advisor, now I realized that there would be different principles behind different methods of data analysis. Due to the differences among the principles of the methods, even it is possible that the results from different methods of analysis look quite similar, what the assumptions that they would convey to the readers would be different. Therefore, my advisor suggested that I should return to my original method of analysis---the multiple regression, and I finally listened to my advisor and used the multiple regression analysis. Luckily, the results I got from the multiple regression analysis were quite similar to those I got from the path analysis. (Weekly Log 1)

Because of the different assumptions behind these two statistics tools, Andrew finally followed the suggestions from his advisor and reanalyzed the data based on his original choice. Although what he had learned from the statistics tutor was not applied, Andrew still had a positive attitude towards the knowledge that he gained through these processes, as he recalled:

> Conducting the dissertation research enabled me to learn or to review some statistics methods, including t test, ANOVA, ANCOVA, which I already knew before, and the factor analysis, the confirmative factory analysis, and multiple regression, which I just learned during the processes this time. I also learned something about the AMOS graphics. As for the SEM, now I did not have the motivation to go through it, or I should say I do not have the need to learn it now. But, I think through this dissertation research, I have learned plenty of new things, which would be the samples for my future research career. (Interview 14)

To Andrew's delight, he had many chances to apply what he had already known about the statistics knowledge to his own research, and by the way, he had the opportunities to learn new things from the private lessons given by the statistics tutor, which he thought would be beneficial to his future career as a researcher in the TESOL academia.

The above story indicates several aspects about Andrew's experience as a doctoral student working on his dissertation research. Andrew had a preference for quantitative research and he had the tendency to use statistics as the tools to deal with his data and answer questions. Maybe that is the reason why he had the perceived merits for the statistics tool, the path analysis, which he thought would be more advanced and should be adopted. However, he still had to follow the guidance from his advisor because of the different rationales behind these different statistics tools and the required consistency between his research proposal and the realization of his research. Andrew's advisor took the role as a gatekeeper by reminding him of the requirements to help him maintain the quality of his dissertation research. Besides, in order to acquire the statistics knowledge for research, Andrew took private lessons from a tutor by paying the tuition fees himself. This might also show the evidence that the statistics courses or resources offered in his university were still insufficient.

Story IV: A learning journey of writing up the dissertation

Writing up the dissertation is a complicated task, and to Andrew, his experiences mean more than that because the whole process is a learning journey of solving problems. When he was writing up the first three chapters, he had the problems in writing up his chapter two, the literature review. When compared with his writing style in the master's thesis, he remembered:

> I wrote over fifty pages for the literature review in my master's thesis. The advisor for my master's thesis is more traditional. I think it was due to the style of my master's thesis advisor. The advisor enjoyed reading a long length of literature review full of information. So, under the training of my thesis advisor, I wrote over fifty pages to meet the expectation from the advisor to make a fully developed literature review chapter. (Interview 3)

Andrew made it a habit to write a lengthy literature review chapter when he was a master's student writing up his master's thesis in 2006. He just summarized as many papers as possible to make the literature review chapter abundant. Later, once when he was submitting his paper for journal publication in 2009, his paper was commented by an editor that the cited papers were not related to his research, as he recalled:

> Before when I submitted for journal publication, I had a bad habit of citing papers, that is, in the parentheses I would include many papers which I thought were slightly related to the research…It turned out to be that I would cite lots of papers to put in the parentheses…I remember once an editor wrote to me, telling me to make sure those cited papers are really closely related, rather than just slightly related. Then, I would pay attention to it. I would make sure in my papers, those references and the papers I cite are related to my research. (Interview 4)

Without paying attention to the relatedness of those cited papers to the research itself, Andrew's paper was filled with information of other papers but just slightly related to his paper. The editor's feedback reminded Andrew of this flaw. But, when Andrew was writing his first draft for the literature review for dissertation proposal in 2010, he had a similar problem, as he said:

> At that time, for my first draft, I wrote forty-seven pages for my chapter two. I

> thought it was the style I had got used to. I wrote plenty of pages. Then, the advisor told me that the number of forty-seven pages is too many, and said thirty pages would be fine. She wanted me to make it concise, and get rid of those not related to the research…(Interview 4)

Andrew's first draft was finished based on his previous experience from his master's thesis, and he was corrected by the doctoral dissertation advisor. Then, with these previous experiences, when he was writing the literature review for his doctoral dissertation, he had a different style, especially under the guidance of his doctoral dissertation advisor, as he recounted:

> Then, when I was writing up my doctoral dissertation, I did not write so many pages as I did for my master's thesis. The reason is that although this previous writing style can make my chapter two abundant in information, it might turn out to be like a textbook chapter. It might seem to be writing a summary or to be summarizing plenty of materials, but it might not be directly related to the doctoral dissertation research. (Interview 4)

In terms of the writing style for the literature review chapter, Andrew indeed had made much progress and was able to write a concise review with closely related citations for the literature review chapter in his dissertation.

In addition, after he had analyzed his data, he had come across other problems in writing up those chapters of results and discussion, especially the ways to present the results from the qualitative data. He recalled:

> I had thought that the quantitative analysis would be more difficult, but recently I found that the qualitative analysis was really not an easy job, either. Due to the help from a statistics tutor, many problems were solved when analyzing the quantitative data. But, as for the qualitative data, even though there was not many,

> I was quite worried about them because I did not see what I had expected at the first glance and neither did I get any patterns from them as I had anticipated… But, to tell the truth, I was afraid that there would be too many parts that were very subjective when I was analyzing them, so I always managed to make the tone of my writing a little bit more indirect. For example, I would emphasize that my research is an exploratory study or sometimes I would use the word, like "may." (Interview 9)

It was hard for Andrew to understand the patterns from the qualitative data, and that led to a problem in presenting those data in writing because he was afraid he would be too subjective. To solve this problem, he used some hedges by referring to a handbook as he remembered:

> In fact, I was afraid that I would be too subjective. When I saw the data, I found they were really messy. It was really hard for me to find any consistency or a consistent finding. In the beginning, I would like to use "some of the high-achieved students...." to state the results, and then I used "a few, some, most of the…participants…. " However, I found it inappropriate to do so. But actually, such wordings were quite ambiguous, so I referred to a handbook and got the sample sentence, like "seventeen out of the participants…nineteen percent…" So, I thought it would be better for me to point out the numbers. Finally, I reported those numbers. (Interview 9)

Being afraid that his objectivity would be impaired, Andrew looked for the hedges to reduce his subjectivity, but the unintended obfuscation also made Andrew feel uneasy. Finally, with his inclinations to report data with numbers, while reporting those qualitative data, Andrew still resorted to the expressions of reporting numbers.
In another similar example, in reporting the qualitative results, Andrew also tried to lower his voice tone by using hedges, as he said:

> For example, in the fragment, "the differences between these two groups may

> come from," I would use "may" instead of indicating definitely what has caused the differences because basically I was not able to absolutely judge the differences. Somehow I would weaken my findings or tone down my voices in indicating the effects more or less might come from something. (Interview 9)

Thus, in writing the results chapter, Andrew always tried to avoid being too subjective in the writing style, and he referred to some handbooks to imitate some sentence patterns or hedges.

But, to his dismay, sometimes he was worried that he might commit plagiarism when he imitated so many sentence examples or hedges from the handbooks, as he recounted:

> In fact, when I was referring to these handbooks, I always had one question in my mind. In those handbooks, they would provide some sentence patterns from SLA papers…. The handbook authors highlight those sample wordings or the words used to compare something. When I use their sentence patterns, do I commit plagiarism?... So, I was wondering whether plagiarism means to plagiarize the content or to plagiarize the language. (Interview 9)

Andrew was always afraid that he might commit plagiarism while referring to those language samples, but finally he concluded that he just used those examples as the frameworks or triggers to help to develop and express his own thoughts.

Furthermore, in writing up his chapter four and chapter five, Andrew finished these parts very quickly, and he explained that he was influenced by his experiences in submitting for scholarly publication before and also he referred to others' works, as he said:

> As for the wording, I referred to the writing handbooks. They might tell me how to use the transitions in a more effective way, so I directly use them. Yes, as to the wording, I referred to them. But, as for the way to report the research results, I didn't refer to them so much. Because I had written some papers, and I got some experience, and I would report the data and the results based on my previous experiences. I did refer to some journal papers to understand how they reported the results, but I didn't refer too much. Because I knew the framework, I was able to finish the writing in a very short time. (Interview 10)

Andrew would refer to the expressions from the writing handbooks, but he would refer to the logic of reporting the results from his own experiences in submitting for journal publication as well as from some journal papers and one dissertation sample. He mentioned:

> First of all, when I was writing the chapter five, I referred to the dissertation of a professor from my university and the dissertation from a senior in my own doctoral program, for the purpose to understand the requirements of the format and page number. (Interview 9)

Thus, Andrew also made good use of those resources available to enhance the quality of his dissertation writing, no matter for the wordings, the logic behind the writing, or the requirements of writing format.

In addition, in emphasizing the importance of his research or the contribution that his research might make, Andrew was afraid that he might overstate the significance of his research, but his advisor encouraged him to self-praise the merits of his research, especially for the design and making of these research tools. He recalled:

> Originally, I wrote fourteen pages for my chapter five, but my advisor thought that

> I did not self-praise the merits of those research tools on which I had spent much time and efforts. So, then I wrote twenty pages to rewrite my chapter five. But, before when I was submitting for journal publication, I usually overemphasized the importance of my research. I was criticized by the journal editors and reviewers that I was too exaggerating. But this time for my dissertation, my advisor suggested that I should self-praise the merits. I felt hesitative because I was afraid I would be self-bragging or self-boasting. (Interview 11)

Andrew usually had the concern because in 2009 he was criticized by the journal editor and reviewers for his being self-boasting in writing about the significance and contribution of his research. But, this time, he was encouraged by his advisor to self-praise the merits of his dissertation research.

Moreover, after Andrew was done with his dissertation writing, he was always thinking about whether or not to ask for the help from native speakers to proofread and revise the texts in his dissertation by paying the money. Compared with his previous experiences in submitting his papers for journal publication, he had such afterthought, as he said:

> In the past, I would not ask for the help from any native speakers of English to proofread my papers, and I would submit my papers directly. I thought there would be no differences because I had so much confidence in myself about my writing skills. However, then I became aware there would be lots of other people to read my papers. If it is a conference paper, people would find my mistakes, and if I submit it to journals for publication, chances are the realistic problem is my paper might be rejected. So, I think as for my writing, I would rather improve it. On the one hand I might increase the possibility of getting my papers published. It is impossible to revise what I have published, but now I think I would have my papers proofread by native speakers. (Interview 11)

Before, Andrew would not have his papers proofread and revised by native speakers, but the price he needed to take was the embarrassing occasions people identified his mistakes on the spot in his conference papers or his submitted manuscripts might be rejected by journal editors. Because of these experiences, he thought it would be necessary to have papers proofread before submitting for publication, especially for the journal submission. However, as to whether to have his dissertation proofread or not, he had a different attitude, as he indicated:

> But, when it comes to my dissertation, whether I should have it proofread by native speakers or not, there is one realistic problem, that is, the money. It takes much money to do so, at least several thousand NT dollars, and I really do not want to spend so much money on it. Plus, one of my friends said he would not like to have his dissertation proofread by native speakers because he thought the dissertation is yours own work. If today you ask for the help from native speakers to proofread and revise your texts, then it is definitely not your work anymore. He would keep the authorship and the original flavor of it even there might be mistakes. Now I am always kind of trying to convince myself of accepting any mistakes I might make. No matter what they may look like, they are authentic and original. (Interview 11)

Due to the budgetary constraint as well as the influence from his friend to insist on keeping the originality and authenticity of the texts, Andrew disinclined to have his dissertation proofread and revised by any native speakers.

Through those experiences, Andrew finally finished the whole processes of writing up the dissertation research, and during these processes, he was referring to others' papers or dissertations, from handbooks, or some the advice from his advisors and editors and reviewers, so as to equip himself with the needed knowledge and skills to finish the dissertation writing processes.

Story V: Withdrawing from the online archive

In July 2012, after he had finished his dissertation oral defense, Andrew, as officially required, uploaded his dissertation digital file (PDF[11]) to his university's library online system, so as to get the degree. However, just few days later, feeling restless and uneasy about the immediate online open access to his dissertation digital file through the Internet, Andrew rushed to his university and applied for the suspension of the access to the full-text, digital format file of his dissertation. He did not want it to be viewed or downloaded from the Internet immediately. He wanted it to be suspended and he extended the duration of suspension up to four years long. After that, he took a deep breath and got a feeling of relief. Andrew seemed to be reluctant to share his knowledge through the library online archive, and he had some concerns. However, this behavior was not what Andrew would perform according to his generous personality and his image as a young scholar that he portrayed to the public. It seems that he should be willing to contribute to the knowledge field by sharing his dissertation through the library online archive, which is convenient, but he had his own philosophy behind his decision.

Andrew thought his dissertation is like a brain child because he had attentively spent two years on it and he knows the details of the rationale and processes behind this dissertation, , as Andrew explained:

> I feel that my dissertation is like a baby that I have gestated for two years long. It is really connected to me at anytime and at anywhere, and no one would be more familiar with the rationale behind every single step of the research than I am. So, I regard the dissertation as a real brain child. (Weekly Log 13)

[11] PDF refers to "portable document format", which is a file format developed by Adobe Systems.

Even though he regarded it as his brain child, Andrew thought the achievement of completing his dissertation is not out of his single person's efforts, but instead, he had been consulting his advisor, other professors, and experts, as he said:

> … I think during the six years I have grown up gradually and made progress step by step, and so I feel really grateful for many professors. During the six years, some of the professors gave me much help and shared their thoughts with me, which all have made me change a lot. (Interview 12)

Andrew acknowledged the guidance from other people he met during these years, and so he would like to share the copies of his dissertation with advisor and committee members, and those who had ever discussed with him about his dissertation research, as he said:

> I printed out several copies of my dissertation because I kind of felt like sharing my work with others. For example, I would give copies of my dissertation to several professors with a card in each copy….Even though some of the professors are not among the committee members for my dissertation oral defense, I still gave the copy of my dissertation as a gift to each one of them. (Interview 12)

Furthermore, he had the intention to get the recognition from both professors in the committee members as well as from scholars around the world. For this reason, he really wanted to share his findings through publication and give his insights if any, as he explained:

> In addition to the recognition from the committee members and my advisor, I would like to submit my dissertation to journals for publication as soon as possible, and let others…because I think the research issues in my study are still rarely explored, I hope through publication to make them recognized by others,

> and people might understand who has ever conducted research on this aspect, or might know who is the author of these papers, something like that. So, I would like to submit my dissertation research for publication. (Interview 12)

However, in July 2012, just few days after he had uploaded his dissertation digital file to his university's library archive, he started to regret. Feeling uneasy, Andrew had been annoyed by the apprehension about the Internet access to his dissertation for several days because he had signed the document and agreed to share the digital file immediately, as he said:

> During these two days, I have been haunted by one thought. In fact, it is related to my dissertation, that is, whether you choose to open the access to the digital file of the full paper or not. Isn't there a power of attorney inside the dissertation, right? Actually, at that time, I checked the "Immediate Open Access", but then after that I started to feel uneasy. (Interview 12)

Andrew also searched for his dissertation in that archive webpage through Google search engine, and he felt so astonished, as he remembered:

> Then, I intended to search for my own dissertation online, so I linked to the archive webpage of dissertation and thesis of my university. Then, I searched for my dissertation with the Google engine, and I got the download site. Then, just with a double -click on the hyperlink, the whole digital file was downloaded completely. I don't think this is good. (Interview 12)

Just within seconds, the full document of Andrew's dissertation was downloaded from the Internet archive, and that really made him feel so hesitative to share his research in this way. He thought to himself, as he recalled:

> I was pondering what on earth my dissertation really means. Should l I take it as a

> way to pay back to the society and let others know what I am doing? Or, I should…(Interview 12)

He had no idea about what to do, and then, he discussed with his friend about this. The words from his senior really awoke Andrew and helped him to make the decision to lock the access because this direct sharing access is actually an unpublished dissertation, as he said:

> Yesterday when my senior was talking with me, she told me that my dissertation is an unpublished dissertation. If today others have read my dissertation and if they submit their own papers on the same topic, then they will get the credit. So, I think I should be cautious. So, when I was in the library, I urgently told the librarian, "Would you please help me to lock it as soon as possible?" (Interview 12)

But, this is not the only cause for him to suspend the access, as Andrew said:

> I think the reason why I would suspend the access has nothing to do with my unwillingness to let other people read my dissertation, but instead, it is the time that I would need to go over these data. (Interview 12)

Actually, it is the time that Andrew might need in order to get his dissertation published, and he felt he was in such a hurry to get the job done. He said:

> Last week when I was aware of the mistake I made, I asked myself, "What should I do now?" I have to spend one year writing up my papers, and I need to hurry up because other people might have read my dissertation. So, I need to get my papers done as soon as possible. (Interview 12)

The anxiety caused by the immediate sharing and the limited time available for Andrew to write up his papers really made Andrew feel uncomfortable because he really needed much more time to get his papers published in refereed journals. For this reason, he would like to protect his own authorship, as he explained:

> Yes, my initial intention is good. I thought I need to pay back to the society after I have finished my dissertation. Maybe it would have a certain impact on others' research, or maybe there would be more people doing research on this topic. Then, I thought I should protect myself, so I just suspended it. But, I really felt the sense of relief in my mind. Yeah, I would have enough time to carefully go over those data… At least, for those international researchers with the same research field as mine will not be able to access my dissertation for the time being. (Interview 12)

Finally Andrew made his decision to close the access and came up with some plans to carry out in the following years. To share or not to share, that is not a question anymore to him!

From the above story, it is clear that Andrew's attitude towards his finished dissertation research is still positive because he would like to share his search with other people and he would like to contribute to the knowledge field. He felt grateful for the people who helped him to accomplish his research, and he would like to pay back to the world. However, he would like to share his research with others through his papers published in academic journals, instead of the library online archive.

In the last two years of Andrew's doctoral study, he worked attentively on his doctoral research, but he also came across some challenges. During the first phase (Aug. 2010-Sep. 2011), he was struggling to narrow down his research scope because of the feasibility and practicability, and in writing the literature review, he had to change his writing habits to make it concise. In the second phase (Sep. 2011-May 2012), Andrew benefited much from previous experiences in developing research tools, the survey questions, especially from the advice given by the journal reviewers on the flaws. Besides, while he was analyzing the data, he had hard time dealing with the qualitative part. As for the quantitative data, he sought the assistance from a statistics tutor, but it was finally denied by his advisor and he had to follow the original method for analysis. In the third phase (May 2012-July 2012), while Andrew was writing up the dissertation, he still had some difficulties in writing the results and discussion sections. For example, he had the concern that his voice was too subjective while writing the results. He was afraid of committing plagiarism because he was referring to the wordings and writing styles from others' works. He was also afraid of exaggerating the significance of his study in the chapter five. In addition, after he uploaded his dissertation digital file to the library archive, Andrew felt hesitative to immediately share his research through this approach. He regarded it as inappropriate for him. Finally, he determined to suspend the access to the digital file because he needed time to make his research published, which would be meaningful to him. Like a journey, from ideal to practical, during the processes, overcoming challenges and difficulties with strategies and utilizing the resources around, Andrew's life as a TESOL graduate student culminated in the completion of his doctoral dissertation and his future plans to share his research with the world!

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

During his nine years of being a TESOL graduate student situated in the social context of Taiwan, Andrew was engaged in various kinds of academic contexts and faced with different challenges in order to participant in the TESOL academic community. Meanwhile, in these processes, Andrew made efforts by seeking and utilizing resources available to overcome challenges or solve problems in order to achieve the tasks and accumulate his cultural capital in the TESOL academic community. On many occasions, he was social-culturally mediated by others to make decisions at different stages of his academic development. In addition, Andrew learned from different academic tasks in the processes of accomplishing them. All the above contributed to his success of finally becoming a fuller member in the TESOL academic community. Below, Andrew's experiences are discussed on many aspects by synthetically comparing and contrasting several issues of his experiences with examples from previous studies related to scholarly publications or by interpreting some of his experiences through the lens of the concepts from social learning theory. Various aspects of his experiences which are dealt with are related to his intentions and achievements, challenges and solutions, influences from others at different stages, and perceptions of his experiences.

Learning from previous research studies to improve the quality of research writing may be beneficial, while special attention should be paid to the risk of committing plagiarism. In order to customize his research study (JP5) for a targeted journal of which its research themes were interesting to him, Andrew carefully analyzed the contents of research articles published in it with the purpose to get familiar with the required features concerning research designs, research topics, and the writing style and format. Andrew's strategy use (Story I of Narrative 5) parallels with the experiences of the participant, Min, in Li's (2006), who was "modeling" on a journal paper of other researchers, for example initiating the expressions and the writing style, in order to get her paper published in a journal by "conforming to the norm of the target community" (p.169). However, Andrew's experiences of modeling on the research articles of his targeted journal did not cause any editor or reviewers to comment on his written texts as "textual plagiarism" (Pecorari, 2003, as cited in Li, 2006). On the contrary, in the example of Min in Li's study, the participant was judged by the researcher as committing the plagiarism behavior of a textual level without any awareness of it. Andrew did not indicate if he was aware of the situation that his strategy use might lead him to be accused of committing plagiarism of the textual level, but it is true that his paper (JP5) was accepted in 2009. It seems that following the required norms observed or analyzed from the targeted journals may bring about a good result. Nevertheless, while Andrew was working on his dissertation writing in May 2012 (Story IV of Narrative 7), he became quite alert to the possibility of committing plagiarism. Andrew referred to a guidebook on writing research articles, of which most of the sentence examples were derived from the discipline of second language acquisition (SLA). Andrew was conscious of this situation and he was worried if he might commit any type of plagiarism because he was imitating many sentence patterns and expressions from the guidebook to write the dissertation. Maybe Andrew's research topic is related to SLA, and it would be convenient for him to pick up some formulaic expressions to describe and analyze the features of language learning and teaching or report the results related to second language acquisition. He finally thought that he was just utilizing the language instead of the content, and he felt released. A similar example can be found in Li (2007), in which, the participant, Yuan, trying to seek the "textual mentorship" (p.67) through learning the "rhetorical argumentation" from previous studies as well as "borrowing" words from them (p.68). In that study, Yuan was described by Li (2007) as "interacting with the global specialist research community" (p.68) by imitating rhetorical patterns or expressions from others' work. He was aware of what he was doing, and he was not judged by the researcher as committing any level of plagiarism. Besides, Yuan also referred to his own experiences of research writing beforehand, for example, his own master's thesis, which had been criticized seriously by his advisor. He took them as good lessons to enhance the quality of his future writing tasks. Yuan's experience resonates with the experiences of Andrew while he was working on his master's thesis and doctoral dissertation. Andrew was also criticized by his advisor because of his bad performance of writing logic, the unity (Story III of Narrative 1); however, all the criticism from his advisor turned out to be the "salient reminders" (Li, 2007, p.66) to his future writing tasks. In addition, Andrew referred to his own experiences in publishing journal papers to remind himself of the appropriate ways to report the data and results (Story IV of Narrative 7) while writing up his doctoral dissertation, which indeed benefited the efficiency and quality. To sum up, by cautiously referring to previous research articles of others and of his own, Andrew surely enhanced the quality of his academic writing performance both for his research papers as well as his dissertation.

The processes of submitting manuscripts to journals for scholarly publication may be painful and time-consuming, but it may turn out to be a learnable and rewarding journey. In addition to learning from research articles of previous studies, throughout these years, Andrew learned much from the interactions with journal editors and reviewers, especially from their comments through the peer-review feedback. Andrew’s manuscript submissions to journals were often rejected and criticized due to some identified flaws (Story III of Narrative 6). Among them, four are worthy of discussion because of more opportunities of learning they brought about to Andrew, including the language problem, parochialism, not theoretically-based, and the lack of a research gap.

First of all, Andrew’s submissions were rejected for many times because of his Asian writing style, but Andrew never described in detail what his Asian writing style is like because when it was due to the language problem, journal reviewers would usually just give the comment and directly suggested Andrew should ask for the help from native speaker proof-readers to improve the quality of the texts. However, in Flowerdew (2001), one editor as the participant indicated that the “nativized varieties of English” of Hong Kong writers may look like ‘the discourse patterns” with “the Chinese rhetorical style or Japanese writers” (p.140). Although he was disappointed, he did seek for many times the assistance of proof-reading service (Story IV of Narrative 7) from native speakers to improve his writing performance. Compared with the challenge that Andrew had, in the study of Cho (2004), the four NNS participants as doctoral students had similar language difficulties while submitting for peer review. They sought the proof-reading assistance through collaboration with native speakers (p.58), but not all of them benefited the same from proof-reading assistance. Cho (2004) in her study argued that “working highly with an NS may be highly advantageous”(p.58). Andrew’s experience may be in line with Cho’s argument to have to the proof-reading assistance from or collaboration with native speakers, but Andrew would prefer the proof-readers to be with similar discipline background knowledge. This was the faith that Andrew built after he had the chance to seek the proof-reading assistance from an associate professor while he was an exchange scholar in the U.S. However, although Andrew did seek the help from the proof-reading service to overcome his Asian style writing and enhance the quality his manuscript, when he was working on his dissertation, he did not need any assistance from proof-reading service (Story IV of Narrative 7). Andrew's faith may resonant with what Leki and Sliva (2008) indicated about the ethical issue of ownership of the written texts, and with what Li and Flowerdew (2007) indicated about the high cost as the obstacle to seek the proof-reading service. In conclusion, it seems that seeking the assistance from native-speaker proof-readers was beneficial to Andrew, but due to the budgetary constraint and the concern for the ownership of the texts, Andrew would only ask for assistance from proof-readers with knowledge background similar to his when submitting manuscripts for journal peer review.

Another flaw, being too localized, or "parochial," (Flowerdew,2001) which means the research scope is limited or the findings are based on the local situation and may not be generalized to the international context. Both Andrew's two manuscripts submitted to two different overseas international journals (JP6, JP7) were criticized as too localized (Story I of Narrative 5) and were rejected. The reviewers either indicated that the research topic is only concerned the local issue or directly pointed out that Andrew's research is less international. But, Andrew was not frustrated and he made the decision to resubmit to another local international journal held in Taiwan, and both of them were accepted. Actually, Andrew gained the lesson from the rejection of JP6, and he applied this experience to make the immediate decision for JP7 after it was rejected. Andrew knew his two papers would have advantage if he chose the local international journal to submit because his two papers were all about the learning issues in the EFL context. Several journal editors in Flowerdew (2001) were interviewed as the participants to give their opinions about the parochialism problem.

Flowerdew indicated that the parochialism problem might not be just due to the research topic not “relevant” to the international community, but instead it might be due to the writer’s failure to point out ”how their research addressed current issues in the international community of scholarship” (p.135). One of the editor participant indicated that although one study from Hong Kong was related to the local secondary school level, the “applicability” of the study was pointed out, and it was accepted. Although Andrew successfully published both his JP6 and JP7 in the local international journal, little was known if he had been informed of any suggestions by the editors or reviewers who rejected his two papers about the possibilities to revise his papers to make the findings of his two studies become relevant to the international community or to the readership.

In addition to the first two flaws, Andrew’s submission was criticized to have the flaw that the survey questions in his study were not developed theoretically based on a rationale. There were just made by Andrew’s intuition without a rationale, and the editor and reviewers could not accept the paper (Story II of Narrative 6). A lack of a theoretical foundation caused Andrew’s submission to be rejected. However, Andrew was lucky when he resubmitted the manuscript to another journal. Even though the identical problem was detected, the reviewer, as mentor, suggested that Andrew should revise his questionnaire properly in a certain way. Andrew’s survey questions were refined and developed in a systematically way. For example, the statistics was applied to check the validity and reliability of the items on the questionnaire with an appropriate procedure. Finally, the paper was accepted and published (JP6). Such a process of interaction between the reviewer and Andrew was quite learnable to him, indeed. Then, when Andrew was conducting the research for his doctoral dissertation, he felt he benefited much from the experiences gained from the interaction with the journal reviewer. This flaw is not completely related to the problem of writing, but it is about the methodology, especially about the research tools. Andrew, as a novice apprentice scholar, in this process of submission, rejection, resubmission, and acceptance, he was guided by the more experienced oldtimers (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and he was negotiating his membership in the community of TESOL academia by enhancing the quality of his journal paper.

The last flaw was related to lack of a research gap in his manuscript for (JP9). In 2012, one day Andrew was noticed that his submission was rejected due to the lack of a research gap (Story III of Narrative 6). Andrew thought he did indicate the gap that he identified in the existing literature because he was always aware of that after he became a doctoral student and he did indicate the reason why he conducted his research. He indicated that so far no study has been conducted to deal with this issue. However, the reviewer indicated that the research gap that Andrew identified was not a research gap because it was not of significance. In other words, it may not contribute to the knowledge field and the research results may not meaningful. It seems that it was not that Andrew did not state a research gap, but it was the content of his statement about the research gap that did not conform to "the accepted norm of dealing with the question of the research niche" (Flowerdew, 2001, p.137). In Flowerdew's study, "failure to establish the niche" or research gap (p.136) was one of the most problematic sections of the research article. However, it seems that not all the journal editors as participants in Flowerdew's study had the agreed interpretations for what a research gap in a research paper should be like. As defined by Swales (1990), Flowerer indicated that it is the introduction section that a writer should present several "moves" in the introduction section and generate a "research space" for the study. One participant indicated in the literature review section of a paper, a writer should situate his research in the literature and provide the reason why this research is conducted. Another participant indicated that the writer should have a “position” or “purpose” (p. 136). Another participant indicated the discussion section in a paper is also related to a research gap because it is in the discussion section that a writer can display how much he has dealt with in order to fill a gap and then argue research claims. Another participant indicated that only a research gap is filled, then a significant contribution is made. Another two participants indicated they appreciate differences or welcome diversity.” Indeed, based on the stories about Andrew, during these years he has been working hard to follow the norm in searching for a research gap when conducting research. But, from the above, it seems that for Andrew to really have a research gap filled and contribute to the knowledge field, he still has to consider the multiple relationships among different sections (e.g. introduction, literature review, and discussion/conclusion) in his paper. As a novice scholar and a doctoral student, interacting with the scholars from the TESOL academic community or from the academia of other disciplines was meaningful to him. Andrew thought it was a process of learning to communicate holistically with editors and reviewers.

As a graduate student and apprentice scholar in the TESOL academic community, Andrew was influenced by others in the community. Below several examples may depict how Andrew was socially and culturally mediated by other members in the TESOL academic community at different stage. First, his eagerness to engage in academic tasks for scholarly purposes may be socially culturally mediated on several occasions. When he was a master’s student, he wanted to imitate other graduate students doing presentations at a conference, and he wanted to become more competitive for the document evaluation for the doctoral entrance exam. When he was a doctoral student, he was pursuing academic visibility and he wanted to accumulate more paper entries on his curriculum vita for application for scholarship to become an exchange scholar and for future job position. Second, when he was considering about which journals to submit his manuscripts to, he had his criteria of choosing the right journals as the targets. Andrew usually made the decisions based on the prestige of a journal, for example, whether it is an SSCI journal or with a high or intermediate Impact Factor. Andrew indicated he was socially-culturally mediated because he was aware of the value of these targets because other members in the TESOL academic community may acknowledge. Third, when he was working on his dissertation research, trying to narrowing down the research topic to establish the scope and focus, he was influenced by many professors and his senior in the TESOL academic community. Andrew was informed by professors and his senior of the feasibility and practicability for his dissertation research. Besides, when Andrew was suffering from the inner conflicts whether to submit for conference call-for-papers or not, he was persuaded by his senior and a professor, and then Andrew changed his mindset and focused on his dissertation research. Finally, when Andrew was hesitative to open his digital file on the library system, he sought the advice from his friend and made the decision. In conclusion, from the above examples, it seems that Andrew's intentions about whether to invest on various tasks to gain the cultural capital were socially and culturally mediated by other oldtimers in the TESOL academic community.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Addressing the Research Questions

Two research questions are addressed below based on Andrew's experience during his six years of doctoral study in a TESOL program.

Question. 1. As a doctoral student in a TESOL program, what kinds of academic tasks for scholarly purposes was the participant engaged in, and what challenges or problems did the participant encounter while fulfilling these tasks? How did the participant perceive these experiences?

First of all, in addition to attending the formal seminar classes offered by TESOL doctoral program, Andrew was engaged in various types of academic tasks for scholarly purposes, such as presenting his studies at conferences, submitting manuscripts for journal publication. Besides, he was busy with the required dissertation during the last two years of his doctoral study.

In the beginning, Andrew was not good at doing oral presentation and he was not good at reporting research with statistics tools. He felt inferior to other speakers at conference and he was questioned at a conference about his statistics knowledge. However, he thought these challenges turned out to be good lessons for his future development.

Being socially-culturally mediated by the concept of academic visibility, he was always eager to submit more papers for conferences or submit manuscripts for journal peer review for publication. Andrew had some intentions to engage in academic tasks for scholarly purposes by investing his time and energy. For example, he wanted to win the scholarship for becoming an exchange scholar, and he wanted to become a promising young scholar full of prospect for the future, especially for the job position by accumulating more research paper lines on his curriculum vita.

He was often under pressure while he was busy with conducting research and writing up papers, often living in a circle of submitting, getting rejected, resubmitting, and getting accepted and published. During these periods, he also had the inner-conflict about whether to submit conference papers or manuscripts for journals because he perceived he was the lowest in the social hierarchy of the TESOL academic community.

In order to submit his manuscripts for journal publication, Andrew had many opportunities to interact with journal editors and reviewers. His manuscripts were often criticized due to problems on various aspects, including writing skills, research design, and statistics knowledge. However, after Andrew overcame the challenges and got published his papers, he felt he was a young scholar.

During the nine years of being a graduate student, Andrew published in total eight journal papers, including five overseas international journal papers, three local international journals, and he presented totally seven local conference papers, four overseas conference papers, and three on-campus papers. At that time, he had another prolonged manuscript under review; however, till the end of this research, the result was still unknown.

To fulfill the required dissertation, during the last two years of his doctoral study, Andrew was busy with the dissertation research and writing it up. In the beginning, he was suffering from the processes of narrowing down the topic to get the scope and focus. Being informed by other professors and senior of the concepts of feasibility and practicability, he turned from ideal to practical.

While he was writing for the first three chapters, he experienced the different requirements of writing styles from his master's degree advisor. He was asked to make it concise. When he was working on the making of survey questions for his dissertation research, he applied the experiences gained from his journal paper submission to the design. While he was collecting data, he had a hard time due to the time and budgetary constraints as well as the uncooperative subjects in many classrooms. While he was analyzing the data, he felt he was short of statistics knowledge, and he asked for the assistance from as tutor. However, his advisor didn't agree with the adoption of a new statistics tool. Then, in writing up the dissertation, Andrew referred to his published papers for the logic of writing and the rhetorical structure, and he also referred to others' works and pick up some expressions from guidebooks of academic writing. But, he was afraid he might commit plagiarism. He also had a hard time in dealing with the qualitative data and reporting the results from them.

During the oral defense, the oral defense was smooth, and the atmosphere was supportive and constructive, and the feedback from the committee members was helpful to the improvement of quality for his research. He felt very grateful for this experience.

Then, after he uploaded and opened the access to his dissertation PDF file in the online library archive system, he felt regretted and he changed his mind to suspend the access for four years. He thought he would need time to write papers based on his dissertation research and submit them for publication. He would share his work with others only through the format of journal publication, instead of an unpublished PDF file downloaded from Google scholar.

In conclusion, during the six years as a doctoral student in the TESOL program situated in Taiwan, Andrew was eagerly engaged in various academic tasks for scholarly purposes. Being aware of the academic ability, he was investing his time and energy to accumulate his cultural capital as well as to participate in the TESOL community and obtain the membership. Although he encountered various challenges, including the criticism from the editors and reviewers and the psychological reactions, such as anxiety, pressure, and frustration, he still learned much from these processes. In addition, in fulfilling the required dissertation, he encountered some problems, but he overcame them and smoothly completed his degree.

Question. 2. What resources or strategies did the participant seek and utilize to overcome the challenges or problems that the participant encountered? How was the participant socially and culturally mediated while he was fulfilling related academic tasks? How did the participant perceive these experiences?

In order to enhance the productivity of conference papers and journal papers, Andrew utilized his term papers to develop a series of related conferences and finally journal papers. He used the same dataset to produce a series of papers for conference submissions and then develop them into journal manuscripts for journal peer review. He thought his strategy was help to the productivity; however, he was worried that his research topics were versatile and without focus of his expertise.

While he was submitting manuscripts for journal peer review, Andrew had his own criteria to select the targeted journals as the priority to submit because he wanted to accumulate more SSCI journal papers on his curriculum vita to gain more cultural capital. His decisions were socially and culturally mediated by the society he was in.

When he was collecting data for his dissertation, he was suffering from the time and budgetary constraints, and he adjusted the procedure of data collection to make it more efficient and to the point. Besides, to compensate the possible flaws in data gathering, he strategically applied statistics tools to enhance the quality of his data analysis.

Andrew often sought advice from people around him to help him make better decisions. There were many occasions he was informed of some good advice to help him overcome some challenges. For example, when he was trying to narrow down this research, he consulted many professors and his senior, and he was informed of a smart decision. Andrew became practical. When he wanted to rush out his survey questions for the dissertation research, the professor suggested him to be patient and focus on the task at hand. When he felt hesitative whether to submit for conference presentation while he was conducting his dissertation research, his senior persuaded him to change his mind. When he was worried that his research topics for all his papers were versatile and without any focus, his senior told him that Ph.D. is just a trial period for him. Andrew expected himself to develop his own expertise in the future.

In conclusion, Andrew was good at utilizing resources around him to help him to solve problems or to make decisions. In submitting for conference and journal publication, he made good use of his dataset and enhance his productivity. He was socially and culturally mediated by the society to choose his targeted journals.

Concluding Remarks

Employing the narrative inquiry to collect stories and critical events about Andrew's experiences, the researcher configured these stories and events into seven narratives to gain the narrative meanings for Andrew's experiences. Based on the findings from the analysis of the seven narratives, the researcher would argue some claims as follows:

1. Situated in the social context of Taiwan, Andrew as a TESOL doctoral student was investing his time and energy to make efforts in order to participate in the TESOL academic community by submitting papers for scholarly purposes and fulfilling the required dissertation. In order to meet the requirements and follow the norms, he was usually thinking globally and acting locally so as to gain the membership for certain discourse communities.

2. Andrew had many chances to get exposed to the processes of scholarly writing while he was engaged in the academic tasks for scholarly purposes. The experiences gained from these processes finally became beneficial to his dissertation research and writing. However, he still experienced some hard time

while he was completing his dissertation.

3. The challenges that Andrew encountered while he was submitting manuscripts for journal peer review include the criticism from the editor sand reviewers as well the feeling of pressure, anxiety, frustration, and inner-conflict.

4. The problematic aspects found in Andrew's manuscripts submitted for peer review may not be just limited to NNS researchers; however, the language problem may specifically led Andrew to seek for assistance from NS proof-readers.

5. Being socially and culturally mediated by the TESOL academic community, Andrew established some of his personal faiths for conducting research: (1) He prefers the quantitative research as well as writing for quantitative research. (2) He has a highly interest in learning statistics tools, and he would like to apply them to his studies. (3) He was a novice young scholar who would like to contribute to the knowledge field as well as to his students in the classroom with the findings from his studies.

Pedagogical Implications

There are two implications that the researcher would like to offer:

First, from Andrew's experiences, the benefits gained from submitting papers for presenting at conferences and submitting manuscripts for peer review and publishing in journals may contribute to Andrew's process of conducting the dissertation research as well as cultivate him to be an independent researcher. Doctoral students should be encouraged to take initiative engaging in academic tasks for scholarly purposes while they are in the doctoral study. Thus, while being novice scholars, doctoral students may have more opportunities to get exposed to the culture and norms of various discourse communities as well as to accumulate their cultural capital for the future.

Second, drawing on the concept of informal learning of the social learning theory, communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991, Wenger, 1998), this study would suggest that doctoral students should utilize resources available to form their communities of practice, for the benefit to have more opportunities to learn mutually in the informal context outside seminar classes.

Research Limitations

The first limitation pertains to the long duration of processes for data collection and data analysis. Although the prolonged engagement with the participant may beneficial to the researcher's understanding of the participant(s)' experiences, to deal with a large amount of data may not be an easy task.

The second limitation is rooted in the nature of complexity in human's life experiences. Although this research aimed to depict deeply and clearly the experiences of the participant, till the end of data collection and data analysis, there were still some details unexplored.

Finally, the third limitation is due to the consideration of ethics. Some issues found in the data are omitted and not selected as critical events to be discussed, even though they were used as the background information to assist the understanding of the participant's experience.

Directions for Future Studies

If a similar study is conducted, this study suggests that the researcher of the future study may invite the participant(s) to read some selected journal papers, which are related to scholarly publication or doctoral education, before or during the data collection period, so that both the researcher and the participant(s) may have more expressions to describe his/her experiences or more ideas as prompts for the participants to tell his/her own stories.

This study suggests that future studies may just focus on the participant's experiences of submitting manuscripts for journal publications, and the data collection can begin as the participant (s) begin to submit their manuscripts for peer review, so that the data about the development can be collected at the same time.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, C., & A. Lee. (2006). Research writing: Problems and pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education, 11* (3), 265–278.

Aitchison, C. (2009). Writing groups for doctoral education. S*tudies in Higher Education. 34* (8), 905-916.

Allison, D., Cooley, L., Lewkowicz, J., & Nunan, D. (1998). Dissertation writing in action: the development of a dissertation writing support program for ESL graduate research students. *English for Specific Purposes, 17*(2), 199-217.

Atkinson, R. (1997). *The life story interview.* (Qualitative Research Methods Series, Vol. 44). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Belcher, D.D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 1-22.

Braine, G. (2002). Academic literacy and the nonnative speaker graduate student. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*, 59-68.

Burrough-Boenisch, J. (2003). Shapers of published NNS research articles. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 223-243.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). "Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, materials resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication, 13* (4), 435-472.

Casanave, C.P. (2005). Uses of narrative in L2 writing research. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing: perspectives on the process of knowledge construction.* (pp. 17-32). Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Casanave, C.P. (2010). 'Taking risks?': A case study of three doctoral students writing qualitative dissertations at an American university in Japan. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 1-16.

Casanave, C. P., & Li, X. (Eds.). (2008). *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

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

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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.

Damen, L. (1986). *Culture learning: the fifth dimension in the language classroom*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Dollard, J. (1935).*Criteria for the life story.* New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Dong, Y,R. (1998). Non-native graduate students' thesis/dissertation writing in science: self-reports by students and their advisors from two U.S. institutions. *English for Specific Purposes, 17*(4), 369-390.

Flowerdew, J. (1999a). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 243-264.

Flowerdew, J. (1999b). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 123-145.

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

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions.

TESOL Quarterly, 35, 121-150

Flowerdew, J. (2005). A multimethod approach to research into processes of scholarly writing for publication. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: perspectives on the process of knowledge construction.* (pp. 65-77). Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Gosden, H. (1992). Research writing and NNSs: From the editors. *Journal of Second Language Writing,1*(2), 123–139.

Gosden, H. (2003). 'Why not give us the full story?': functions of referees' comments in peer reviews of scientific research papers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 87-101.

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R.B. (1996). Writing for professional purposes. In *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective* (pp.147-175). New York, NY: Longman.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.

Hasrati, M. (2005). Legitimate peripheral participation and supervising Ph.D. students. *Studies in Higher Education, 30* (5), 557-570.

Hasrati, M. & Street, B. (2009). PhD topic arrangement in 'D'iscourse communities of engineers and social sciences/humanities. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*, 14-25.

Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and research writing.* London: Pearson Education.

Kamler, B. (2008). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education, 33* (3), 283-294.

Kottak, C.P. (2007).*Window on Humanity: A Concise Introduction to General Anthropology.* Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Kourilova, M. (1998). Communicative characteristics of reviews of scientific papers written by non-native users of English. *Endocrine Regulations, 32*, 107-114.

Kwan, B. S. C. (2008). The nexus of reading, writing and researching in the doctoral undertaking of humanities and social sciences: Implications for literature reviewing. *English for Specific Purposes, 27*(1), 42-56.

Kwan, B. S.C. (2009). Reading in preparation for writing a PhD thesis: Case studies of experiences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(3),180-191.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation.* NY: Cambridge University Press.

Leahey, E. (2007). Not by productivity alone: How visibility and specialization contribute to academic earnings. *American Sociological Review, 72* (4), 533-561.

Lee, A. & Kamler, B. (2008). Bringing pedagogy to doctoral publishing. *Teaching in Higher Education, 13*(5), 511-523.

Leki, l., Cumming, A. & Sliva, T. (2008). Scholarly writing in L2. In *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. (pp.56-60). New York NY: Routledge.

Li, Y. (2006). Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: a doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 159-178.

Li, Y. (2007). Apprentice scholarly writing in a community of practice: An intraview of an NNES graduate student writing a research article. *TESOL Quarterly, 41* (1), 55-79.

Li, Y. & Flowerdew, J. (2007). Shaping Chinese novice scientists' manuscripts for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 100-117.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R. & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research: reading, analysis, and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, YS. & Guba, EG. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly,* 29 (2), 9-31.

O'Donnoghue, T. (2007). *Planning your qualitative research project.* NY: Routledge.

Parker, R. (2009). A learning community approach to doctoral education in the social sciences. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14* (1), 43-54.

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 317-345.

Pike, K. L. (1954). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior. Part I. (Preliminary ed.).* Glandale, Ca: The Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8* (1), 5-23.

Richard, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL.* NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Riessman, C.K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (1998). *Other floors, other voices: a textography of a small university building.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Community of practice: learning, meaning, and identity.* NY: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix I: The Timeline for Data Collection

<table>
<tr><th>Items / Years</th><th colspan="2">Descriptions</th><th>Data</th></tr>
<tr><td>2010</td><td colspan="2">2010.09 The researcher saw Andrew’s pictures on facebook as an exchange scholar in the U.S.
2010.10 The researcher invited Andrew to be the research participant.
2010.12 The first autobiography</td><td>pictures for reference only

emails/MSN

a written story</td></tr>
<tr><td>2011</td><td colspan="2">2011.02 The second autobiography

The narrative interviews (four in 2011):
(No.1) 2011.08-1
(No.2) 2011.08-2
(No.3) 2011.09
(No.4) 2011.10</td><td>emails/MSN

a written story

audio clips of narrative interviews

summary & transcripts

field notes & research notes</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012</td><td>The narrative interviews (eleven in 2012):
(No.5) 2012.02
(No.6) 2012.04-1
(No.7) 2012.04-2
(No.8) 2012.05
(No.9) 2012.06
(No.10) 2012.07-1
(No.11) 2012.07-2
(No.12) 2012.07-3
(No.13) 2012.08
(No.14) 2012.09
(No.15) 2012.10 (member check)</td><td>The weekly logs (fourteen in 2012):
(No.1) 2012.04-1
(No.2) 2012.04-2
(No.3) 2012.05-1
(No.4) 2012.05-2
(No.5) 2012.05-3
(No.6) 2012.05-4
(No.7) 2012.06-1
(No.8) 2012.06-2
(No.9) 2012.06-3
(No.10) 2012.06-4
(No.11) 2012.07-1
(No.12) 2012.07-2
(No.13) 2012.07-3
(No.14) 2012.07-4</td><td>audio clips of narrative interviews

summary & transcripts

field notes & research notes

written weekly logs

a revision list for journal editor and reviewers

a real C.V.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2013</td><td colspan="2">the narrative interviews (three in 2013):
(No.16) 2013.2 (member check) (abandoned)
(No.17) 2013.8 (member check)
(No.18) 2013.9 (member check)</td><td>audio clips of narrative interviews

summary & transcripts

field notes & research notes</td></tr>
</table>

Appendix II: Prompt Questions as Guidance for Writing the Weekly Logs

(Questions for weekly logs from No.1 to No. 12)
(1) What are the difficulties you have encountered in doing research? How about the processes of solving them?
(2) What are the difficulties that you have encountered in writing up your research? How about the processes of solving them?
(3) In doing research, which part do you feel content with? What are they? Why do you feel content with them?
(4) In writing up your research, which part do you feel content with? What are they? Why do you feel content with them?
(5) Within this week, what are the influences or impacts on conducting your research, gained from the people, events, or things around you?
(6) Within this week, what are the influences or impacts on writing up your research, gained from the people, events, or things around you?
(7) What are the other aspects worthy of mentioning?

(No.13)
Q: For your attitude toward the completion of the dissertation, do you feel content or disappointed? How do you look at the relationship between you and the dissertation research that you have worked on?

(No.14)
Q: What's your reflection of or how do you feel about your current state after you've finished your doctoral dissertation so far in your life?

Appendix III: The Overview of Andrew's Academic Development

Items / Stages	Scholarly Publication: Conference Presentations	Scholarly Publication: Journal Papers	Master's Degree / Doctoral Degree
2003.7-12 M1-1			2003.9 starting the TESOL master's study
2004.1-6 M1-2 2004.7-12 M2-1	TWCP0 (2004)		
2005.1-6 M2-2 2005.7-12 M3-1	TWCP1 (2005)		
2006.1-6 M3-2 2006.7-12 D1-1	TWCP2 (2006)	JP1(2006)	2006.6 master's thesis oral defense -- 2006.9 starting the TESOL doctoral study
2007 .1-6 D1-2 2007.7-12 D2-1	TWCP3 (2007) IntelCP1 (2007)		
2008.1-6 D2-2 2008.7-12 D3-1	TWCP4 (2008) TWCP5 (2008) IntelCP2 (2008)		
2009.1-6 D3-2 2009.7-12 D4-1	TWCP6 (2009) TWCP7 (2009) IntelCP3 (2009) ------------------- OCCP1 (2009)	JP2 (2009) JP3 (2009) JP4 (2009) JP5 (2009) JP6 (2009)	
2010.1-6 D4-2 2010.7-12 D5-1	OCCP2 (2010)	JP7 (2010)	2010.8-12 as an exchange scholar
2011.1-6 D5-2 2011.7-12 D6-1	IntelCP4 (2011)	JP8 (2011) JP9 (2010.10~?)	2011.1-7 as an exchange scholar -- 2011.9. proposal oral defense 2011.10-12. developing research tools /conducting data collection
2012.1-6 D6-2	OCCP3 (2012)		2012.1-3. conducting data collection 2012.4-5. analyzing the data; writing up the dissertation 2012.6. doctoral dissertation oral defense

Notes: CP = conference paper; TW. = Taiwan; OC = on-campus; 2012.1-6 = January through June in the year of 2012; M1-1= the first semester of the first year of master's study; M1-2= the second semester of the first year of master's study; D1-1= the first semester of the first year of doctoral study; D1-2 = the second semester of the first year of doctoral study; TWCP1(2005)= the first conference paper presented at the local international conference, which was held in 2005; IntelCP1 (2007) = the first conference paper presented at the overseas international conference, which was held in 2007 etc.

Appendix IV: Development of Andrew's Doctoral Dissertation Research

Phases		Descriptions	Notes
I	Starting the dissertation research	Continually searching for possible research topics for the dissertation research; changing from a variety of indecisive angles	Aug. 2010~ Sep. 2011 As an exchange scholar
	Working on the first three chapters	Finalizing the scope based on some professional suggestions; changing his mindset after receiving advice from others, from ideal to practical	Aug. 2010 ~ Sep. 2011 As an exchange scholar
	Dissertation proposal defense	Getting the feedback from the committee members; refining the research design with the suggestions from the committee members	Sept. 2011
II	Developing the research tools	Developing the research tool—the making of survey questions; skillfully pursuing reliability and validity	Sep. 2011~ Oct. 2011
	Collecting the data	Conducting the data collection in different classrooms; often felt annoyed by students with a less cooperative attitude; strategically adjusting the ways to collect the data due to the time constraint and the budgetary limit	Oct. 2011~ Mar. 2012
	Analyzing the data	Taking the private lessons from a statistics tutor in order to enhance the efficiency of analyzing the data; rejected by the dissertation advisor due to the different research assumptions	Apr. 2012 - May 2012
III	Writing up the texts	Skillfully writing up the texts based on previous experiences from writing up papers for journal submissions; referring to others' dissertations, books on academic writing, and his own previous studies	May 2012
	Dissertation oral defense	A smooth oral defense with lots of supportive and constructive comments	Jun. 2012
	Uploading the dissertation	Successfully completing the doctoral degree and uploading the PDF file; however, starting to feel hesitative to immediately share the dissertation with others by the Internet access around the world	Jul. 2012

Vita

NAME Tsung-yi Chiang (b. 7/11/1971)

EDUCATION

Ph.D. in English, July 2014
National Chengchi University
Taiwan, R.O.C.

WORKING EXPERIENCE

JUST

Lecturer in English (part time) Feb. 2006 -- present

Subjects:

Vocabulary & Reading
Listening & Speaking

NTUST

English Lecturer (part time) Feb. 2007 -- present

Subjects:

Vocabulary & Reading
English Writing
Oral Training