



# Scholarly Publication Trajectories of Early-career Scholars

---

## Insider Perspectives

---

*Edited by*

PEJMAN HABIBIE  
SALLY BURGESS

palgrave  
macmillan

# Scholarly Publication Trajectories of Early-career Scholars

Pejman Habibié · Sally Burgess  
Editors

# Scholarly Publication Trajectories of Early-career Scholars

Insider Perspectives

palgrave  
macmillan

*Editors*

Pejman Habibie  
Faculty of Education  
Western University  
London, ON, Canada

Sally Burgess  
Filología Inglesa y Alemana  
University of La Laguna  
La Laguna  
Sta. Cruz Tenerife, Spain

ISBN 978-3-030-85783-7      ISBN 978-3-030-85784-4 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85784-4>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

# Foreword

I am very pleased to have been asked to write the foreword to this book as it is on a topic that is close to my heart, early-career writers publishing in academic journals. Indeed, I was asked some time ago in an interview around my experience of being a journal editor ‘What is the best part of being a journal editor’ and I replied quite simply ‘Getting beginning scholars published.’ I know what it is like to think ‘All these other people have done it, but can I?’ There are, thus, many experiences recounted in the book that I and other readers can relate to. I remember the anticipation of waiting for reviewers’ reports and nervously opening them when they arrive. I remember the many kindnesses shown to me by reviewers and editors and bruising experiences of being rejected. In saying this, I think of the words of Becky Kwan who discusses the challenges that early career scholars face in dealing with reviewers’ reports. She says:

Many first-time writers are confused, discouraged or even shocked by the negative reviews they receive, and the substantial revisions requested ... Some never attempt to revise and resubmit their work that reviewers see as having potential for publication. (Kwan, 2010: 213)

This is discussed in a number of the chapters in this book when the authors talk about being wounded by negative reviews on a paper, even to the point that they sometimes didn't even notice that they had been asked to revise and resubmit their submission, and it was not actually a reject.

This brings me to the hardest part of being a journal editor. For me, this has always been writing rejection letters. I have never used publishers' template letters which say things like 'therefore I must reject you' or 'you have been denied publication in our journal.' I always tailored my rejection letters, remembering that there is a person at the end of the message who has been waiting anxiously to hear for me and who will be disappointed with what my message has to say. I had to make it clear the decision is no, but at the same time provide a way forward for the author/s. Sometimes I would sit on a rejection letter for days before sending it until I was sure I had got it right—if one can ever get a rejection letter 'right.'

Getting published in academic journals, then, is never an easy task. Nicola Johnson (2011) describes the process as 'negotiating a crowded jungle.' It can be a rewarding experience, but it can also be challenging, and it requires persistence. It is important, she argues, not to be knocked off the track by what seem to be insurmountable obstacles. These obstacles, she argues, are not as insurmountable as they might seem. While I was doing my Ph.D., I read the following comment by Ros Mitchell who, at the time, was one of the editors of *Applied Linguistics*. She said:

It is important to bear in mind that a rejection from one journal doesn't mean your paper is unpublishable. ... Rejection is common, it is normal, it is frequent and by no means means that the paper won't find a home somewhere else. (BAAL, 1993: 10–11)

This encouraged me enormously in my early attempts to get published. And as Robert Kohls points out in his chapter, rejection can, indeed, bring about positive change. In his case, he turned a rejection for a special issue of a journal into an idea for an edited book which is about to be published.

So, what we have in this book is a set of highly readable accounts of challenges faced by early career researchers in the process of publishing

their work, ways in which early-career writers get socialized into scholarly publication, and the networks and mentors that play a part in this. We also hear about the development of scholarly identity, voice, and agency in the process of getting published. The importance of self-care is also, movingly, brought out in the book. And we see how beginning academic authors have succeeded in getting their work published in academic journals.

Sydney, Australia

Brian Paltridge

## References

- BAAL. (1993). Getting published in academic journals. *British Association for Applied Linguistics Newsletter*, 43, 9–15.
- Johnson, N. F. (2011). *Publishing from your PhD. Negotiating a crowded jungle*. Gower.
- Kwan, B. (2010). An investigation of instruction in research publishing offered in doctoral programs: The Hong Kong case. *Higher Education*, 38, 207–225.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Scholarly Publication, Early-Career Scholars, and Reflectivity</b>	<b>1</b>
	<i>Pejman Habibie and Sally Burgess</i>	
<b>Part I Socialization, Networks, Mentorship</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Juggling Early-Career Demands: Research Publication Productivity, Strategies, Practices</b>	<b>23</b>
	<i>Oana Maria Carciu</i>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Writing Belonging with Critical Autoethnography</b>	<b>41</b>
	<i>Saskia Van Viegen</i>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Writing with, Learning from, and Paying Forward Mentorship from Early-Career Scholars: My Scholarly Formation into Academic Writing</b>	<b>59</b>
	<i>Matthew R. Deroo</i>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Misguided Allegiances, Misjudged Weaknesses, and Mixed Messages in Peer Review</b>	<b>77</b>
	<i>Oliver Shaw</i>	



<b>6</b>	<b>Pulling Yourself Up by the Bootstraps: An Insider's Perspective on Learning How to Publish in the Iranian Higher Education Context</b>	<b>95</b>
	<i>Hesamoddin Shahriari</i>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Learning to Be a Non-native Speaker: A Retrospective Autoethnographic Account of an Early-Career researcher's Publishing Trajectory</b>	<b>113</b>
	<i>Sally Burgess</i>	
<b>Part II Identity, Visibility, Voice</b>		
<b>8</b>	<b>"Will You Ever Write About This?": Diagnosis, Self-care, and Writing for Publication</b>	<b>133</b>
	<i>Robert Kohls</i>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Walking the Early-Career Researcher Path in an Adoptive Culture</b>	<b>151</b>
	<i>Pamela Olmos-Lopez</i>	
<b>10</b>	<b>The Digitally-Mediated Scholar: Online Identities and Investment in the Discursive Practices of an Academic Community</b>	<b>169</b>
	<i>Ron Darvin</i>	
<b>11</b>	<b>Socialization into Scholarly Publication as a Multilingual, Early-Career Scholar</b>	<b>189</b>
	<i>Ismaeil Fazel</i>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Becoming a Scholarly Writer for Publication: An Autoethnography of Boundary Crossing, Linguistic Identity, and Revising</b>	<b>207</b>
	<i>Naoko Mochizuki</i>	
<b>13</b>	<b>A Question of Balance: The Scholarly Publication Trajectory of a Dual Profile Language Professional</b>	<b>225</b>
	<i>Isabel Herrando-Rodrigo</i>	

**Part III Ideology, Power, Struggle**

<b>14</b>	<b>An Account of Bifurcated Senses and Spaces in the Pursuit of Early-Career Academic Publications</b>	<b>245</b>
	<i>Kevin Gormley</i>	
<b>15</b>	<b>Establishing a Track Record in an Age of Precarity</b>	<b>263</b>
	<i>Sharon McCulloch</i>	
<b>16</b>	<b>A Scholar's Efforts to Increase Margin: Reflection on a Journey of Academic Enculturation</b>	<b>281</b>
	<i>Tanju Deveci</i>	
<b>17</b>	<b>Thinking Beyond Ourselves: Career Reflections on the Trojan Horse of Hegemonic Discourses</b>	<b>299</b>
	<i>Pejman Habibie, Richard D. Sawyer, and Joe Norris</i>	
	<b>Index</b>	<b>321</b>

## Notes on Contributors

**Sally Burgess** is a Lecturer in English at the University of La Laguna, Spain. Her main research interests lie in inter-cultural rhetoric, the contribution of language professionals to the preparation of research publications, the teaching of writing in the university context, and the effects of research evaluation policies on Spanish scholars' publishing practices and professional trajectories. With Margaret Cargill, she organized the first PRISEAL (Publishing Research Internationally: Issues for Speakers of English as an Additional Language) conference in early 2007 and is the book reviews editor of the *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*.

**Oana Maria Carciu, Ph.D.** is a Lecturer in the Department of English at the University of Zaragoza, Spain. Her research interests are in corpus linguistics (phraseology, i.e., collocation, lexical bundles), EAP (English for Academic Purposes), quantitative and qualitative research methods, genre analysis and, communication and publication practices for research dissemination in the multilingual academic environment.

**Ron Darvin** is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at the English Department of The Chinese University of Hong Kong. A co-recipient of the 2016 TESOL Award for Distinguished Research, he has published in journals such as *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *TESOL Quarterly*, and *Applied Linguistics Review*.

**Matthew R. Deroo** is an Assistant Professor at the University of Miami. His research interests include the social and cultural contexts of transnational immigrant youth, critical, digital media literacies, language education, and community-engaged scholarship. Matthew's work draws upon his ten years of experience as a language educator in China.

**Tanju Deveci** is an Assistant Professor of English. He taught English for academic purposes at Bilkent and Sabanci Universities in Turkey. Since 2012, he has been teaching English and communication skills to engineering students at Khalifa University in Abu Dhabi. His research interests include academic literacies, pragmatics, and lifelong learning.

**Ismail Fazel** is a Lecturer at the Faculty of Education of Simon Fraser University. He has a Ph.D. in TESL and a sub-specialization in Measurement and Evaluation from the University of British Columbia. His main research interests are English for academic purposes, writing for publication, and language assessment.

**Kevin Gormley** is Assistant Professor of Music Education at Dublin City University. He holds a Ph.D. from the University of New South Wales, Sydney. Kevin's work, published in *Critical Studies in Education* and *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, is concerned with how the concept of creativity is constructed in education policy and practice.

**Pejman Habibie** is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at Western University, Canada. He is also a founding co-editor of the *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*. Plus, he is a founding co-editor of the book series "Routledge Studies in English for Research Publication Purposes." His research interests and scholarly publications focus on the geopolitics of knowledge construction and circulation, writing for scholarly publication, and academic literacies.

**Isabel Herrando-Rodrigo** is a Lecturer in the Department of English and German Studies at the Universidad de Zaragoza (Spain), where she teaches language and linguistics. Her research interests focus on written discourse analysis, writers' visibility, genre analysis, and digital genres. She is the principal investigator of the project JIUZ-2018-HUM-03, a member of the research group CIRES, and she is currently participating in the national research project FFI2017–84205.

**Robert Kohls** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English Language and Literature at San Francisco State University. His research interests include L1 and L2 writing, teacher written feedback, socio-cultural theory, and qualitative research methods in TESOL. He is an associate editor of *The CATESOL Journal*.

**Sharon McCulloch** is a senior Lecturer in the School of Language and Global Studies at the University of Central Lancashire in the UK. Her research interests lie in the ways second language student writers learn to write and the ways in which institutional and social contexts affect professional academic writers.

**Naoko Mochizuki** is teaching at a university in Japan after attaining her M.A. in the USA and Ph.D. in Australia. She had extensive teaching experiences in high schools in Japan. Her research interest includes ethnographic research and sociocultural approach to classroom teaching, especially genre learning and oral interactions.

**Joe Norris** Professor Emeritus, Brock University, is recipient of the 2015 Tom Barone Award for Distinguished Contributions to Arts Based Educational Research from the Arts Based Educational Research SIG of American Educational Research Association (AERA). He has focused his teaching and research on fostering a playful, creative, participatory, and socially aware stance toward self and Other, and has taught courses in drama in education, applied theater, research methods (qualitative and arts-based), and curriculum theory, among others at various universities. His and Rick Sawyer's pioneering book, *Understanding Qualitative Research: Duoethnography*, was chosen as the 2015 AERA Division D's Significant Contribution to Educational Measurement and Research

Methodology Award. While retired, Joe continues to be active in a variety of education projects.

**Pamela Olmos-Lopez** is a Lecturer at the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México. She holds a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from Lancaster University, UK. Her research interests lie in academic literacies in bilingual/multilingual writers with a specialization in authorial identity in academic discourse. Her research approaches include corpus-assisted discourse analysis, discourse analysis, autoethnography research, and linguistic ethnography. She has published on doctoral co-supervision, undergraduate L2 writing, writer's identity, bilingual writer's voice and stance, written academic genres, autoethnography, and team-autoethnographies. Her research interests include doctoral writing, the ethnography of literacies, academic writing, sociolinguistics, bilingualism, and multilingualism.

**Richard D. Sawyer** is Professor of Education at Washington State University Vancouver, where he chairs the secondary teacher certification program. He has published a number of books and articles on curriculum theory and qualitative methodologies, including duoethnography. He is co-editor of *the Northwest Journal of Teacher Education*. With Joe Norris, he was a recipient of The American Educational Research Association's Qualitative Research SIG's 2011 Outstanding Book Award.

**Hesamoddin Shahriari** is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, where he teaches undergraduate and graduate-level academic writing. His research interests include academic writing, learner corpora, and formulaic language.

**Oliver Shaw** comes into closest contact with academia in his role as in-house editor and translator for a biomedical research institute located in his adoptive city of Madrid, Spain. He has taught secondary-school Spanish, in-company English classes, and both English and Spanish for specific purposes.

**Saskia Van Viegen** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics, York University. Her research focuses on language in education, particularly bi/multilingualism,

language assessment, and language and content integrated instruction. Her recent book, with Sunny Lau, is *Plurilingual Pedagogies: Critical and Creative Undertakings for Equitable Language (in) Education* (Springer).

# List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	Research quality diagram	28
Fig. 10.1	Google Scholar profile (June 2020)	175
Fig. 10.2	Academia.edu profile (June 2020)	177
Fig. 10.3	ResearchGate profile (June 2020)	180





# 1

## Scholarly Publication, Early-Career Scholars, and Reflectivity

Pejman Habibie and Sally Burgess

### Introduction

The primary focus of this volume is the complex yet underrepresented topic of writing for scholarly publication by early-career researchers (ECRs). This initial chapter seeks to address several of the questions that render this area of inquiry as complex as it is. Part of the complexity we seek to address in this chapter and in the book as a whole arises from issues of choice of vehicular language, a choice that can be conditioned by a scholar's research education and training and the language(s) in which this education and training took place. When we look at our contributors, several of whom refer to their experience of publishing in

---

P. Habibie (✉)

Western University, London, ON, Canada

e-mail: [phabibie@uwo.ca](mailto:phabibie@uwo.ca)

S. Burgess

Filología Inglesa Y Alemana, University of La Laguna, La Laguna, Spain

e-mail: [sburgess@ull.edu.es](mailto:sburgess@ull.edu.es)

languages other than English, their research language backgrounds might be regarded as falling along a continuum. At one extreme, we might find those educated in Anglophone contexts whose exclusive language of research publication is English. At the other extreme, we would place those whose education and research training has taken place outside the Anglophone center and who regularly publish in languages other than English. In the middle ground, we would find those educated both in Anglophone and non-Anglophone settings, who publish in more than one language but whose dominant research publication language is English.

Given this continuum, we seek to contest what is often expressed as an Anglophone vs. English as an additional language (EAL) dichotomy, arguing that it fails on two counts as an explanation for the complexities of scholarly publication. Firstly, it leads to an overemphasis on the research publication needs and perceived difficulties of plurilingual scholars using English as an additional language at the expense of Anglophone scholars, many of whom also face challenges. Recently, Flowerdew and Habibie (2022) and Habibie (2019) have called for an inclusive and balanced approach to research in the field of English for research publication purposes (ERPP), where scholarly publication practices of both Anglophone and EAL scholars are explored and investigated.

A second and vital strand explored in this introductory chapter is the significance of reflective and dialogic research approaches (such as auto/duo/trioethnography) to scholarly publication practices of early-career scholars. We underline the affordances and capacities of such approaches for investigating the production and dissemination of scholarship. Additionally, we discuss the ways in which such paradigms involve early-career scholars in the research process as both researchers and as sites of research and excavation, showing how such approaches allow us to gain deeper insights into academic trajectories and lived experiences of those scholars. Last but not least, we provide an overview of the structural organization of the book and the constituent chapters.

## Academic Publication and Early-Career Scholars

Scholarly publication has become a dispositional characteristic of the academic habitus of many scholars in current globalized academia. Such is the extent of demand for publication success that even junior scholars and doctoral researchers are required or expected to possess the necessary literacies before graduating. To gain secure employment in the job markets of the current neoliberal knowledge economy, they are expected to have accumulated the required intellectual capital (see Habibie & Hyland, 2019). There is no doubt that an occluded or semi (occluded) aspect of the lives of many academics, irrespective of their geolinguistic differences, is writing and publishing in prestigious refereed academic venues in a bid to maintain their position or to increase visibility. In other words, as Belcher (2009) says, “[w]riting is to academia what sex was to nineteenth-century Vienna: everybody does it and nobody talks about it” (p. 1) This may have been the case in 2009, but in recent years academics have started talking about their experience of writing for publication more and more as is evidenced by the growing body of research and scholarship aggregated under the now established field of ERPP. This research looks at different dimensions of knowledge construction and dissemination, especially scholarly publication practices of academics in varied geolinguistic and geopolitical contexts. More recently, the pressures on junior scholars to provide evidence of scholarly productivity and awareness of their often peripheral and insecure position in the dynamics of the scholarly productivity game have led to a growing research focus on scholarly publication practices of novice scholars, early-career researchers, and doctoral students as a major domain within ERPP (see, e.g., Habibie, 2015, 2016, 2021; Habibie & Hyland, 2019; Li, 2006a, 2006b, 2007a, 2007b, 2014a, 2014b). The resultant scholarship has two overarching objectives: (a) on the one hand, it aims to bring to the fore the experiences of these emerging academics in navigating the construction, adjudication, and dissemination phases of knowledge communication, (b) on the other hand it seeks to help develop sustainable, structured, and research-informed policies and practices that can support and scaffold the socialization and literacy development of these

scholars, thus facilitating their transition into fully-fledged and productive academics. However, here we would like to draw attention to two major exigencies in the current research orientation in this domain that have also set the scene for the emergence of a naturalistically-oriented (Flowerdew & Habibie, 2022) volume like this. We will discuss the first exigency here and will address the second in the following section.

The first exigency concerns what is often expressed as the Anglophone vs. EAL binary. As discussed earlier, research in ERPP in general and in the domain of early-career scholars in particular has tended to focus on scholarly publication practices of multilingual scholars using English as an additional research publication language. To a large extent, left out of the discussion are Anglophone scholars, particularly those in the early stages of their professional lives. The “*Lucky Anglophone scholar discourse*” (Habibie, 2019) views linguistic competence in English as the most valuable capital in scholarly publication practices and dichotomizes the agents (academics) involved in academic publication field accordingly into native/non-native positions exclusively in relation to English. By the same token, on the one hand, it portrays multilingual scholars who use English as a language of publication as a geolinguistically homogeneous population who struggle to attain expertise in academic discourse and literacy and success in scholarly publication and who are consequently disadvantaged compared to their Anglophone peers. On the other hand, similarly, it presents Anglophone scholars as a homogeneous mass advantaged in academic productivity thanks to capacities that their first language (English) affords them without acknowledging the capacities and expertise of “native speakers” of other languages.

While problematization of the concept “native speaker” has a long history (Davies, 2002; Leung et al., 1997), the Anglophone vs. EAL scholar binary still amounts to what Curry and Lillis (2019) have recently termed an instance of “lore.” The many exchanges among scholars engaged in this debate (Flowerdew, 2019; Hyland, 2016; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2017) attest to the contentious and controversial nature of the polarization (see Burgess & Martín, 2020 for an account of the origins and development of the debate around this issue). As ERPP scholars, we have been involved in these discourses, debates, and discussions and have contributed to them one way or another. In this introductory chapter,

we seek only to draw a general picture of these continuing debates highlighting what we think are the key issues in these discussions that merit attention without going into detail.

What we think seems important at this stage of ERPP scholarship is to consider that many scholars irrespective of their first language are struggling with the requirements of the current academic world and especially its dominant publish or perish ideology. Many of the contributors to this volume and their peers seem to find it difficult to navigate the complexities of academic writing and scholarly publication. As a sizeable community in the global academic landscape, their scholarly publication practices and identities deserve attention and research focus, whether they are seen as advantaged or disadvantaged. Partly because of the above-mentioned counter-arguments and in response to the research gap, recent years have witnessed a growing research interest in both in Anglophone scholars and their scholarly publication practices (e.g., Fazel, 2019; Shvidko & Atkinson, 2019) and in plurilingual scholars publishing in more than one language (see Mur-Dueñas & Šinkūnienė, 2018). Such scholarship can provide us with a more nuanced and detailed picture of the experiences and challenges of all stakeholders in knowledge production and dissemination and can also provide us with a more reliable, multifaceted, and comparative picture of the realities of the field.

## Reflective and Dialogic Approaches

The second issue in ERPP scholarship concerns the underrepresentation of reflective and dialogic approaches in examining scholarly publication practices of early-career and novice scholars. Recent years have seen a growing interest in and research calls for more naturalistic and ethnographically-oriented approaches to investigating writing for scholarly publication (Habibie & Hyland, 2019; Paltridge et al., 2016). There is no doubt that the resultant scholarship can complement the knowledge base in broader fields such as English for academic purposes (EAP) that have largely focused, until comparatively recently, on the textual dimension of academic discourse and writing. In other words, naturalistic approaches can shed light on sociopolitical and situated conditions

in which scholarly practices are embedded and the socio-contextual and ideological dynamics that structure and constitute scholarly publication practices of academics, both established and emerging (see Canagarajah, 2002). Since those structures and dynamics usually evade the research gaze of those adopting textual approaches, naturalistic approaches bring an added value. With that in mind, studies with naturalistic and ethnographic orientations in ERPP have mainly had an etic or outsider approach to investigating writing for scholarly publication rather than an emic perspective (Flowerdew & Habibie, 2022). That is, scholarly publication practices and experiences of academics are filtered through the researcher rather than explored and inquired by the insiders themselves. This highlights the exigency for more and more reflective and dialogic approaches such as auto/duo/trioethnography in ERPP research and scholarship.

Autoethnography, both as a research process and a discursive product, means different things to different people. That is, there are different interpretations as to what an autoethnography should include and how it should be theoretically and methodologically framed (Chang, 2008; Ellis et al., 2011; Maydell, 2010; McIlveen, 2008). That is why autoethnographies are conducted and textually realized in different shapes and ways, orienting toward established evocative or analytical models (see Anderson, 2006; Ellis et al., 2011) or incorporating elements of both. Ellis et al. (2011) see autoethnography as “an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyze personal experience in order to understand cultural experience” (abstract). Pratt (1991, p. 35) characterizes autoethnographic texts as those

in which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them. Thus if ethnographic texts are those in which European metropolitan subjects represent to themselves their others (usually their conquered others), autoethnographic texts are representations that the so-defined others construct *in response to* [emphasis in original] or in dialogue with those texts.

Chang (2008) defines autoethnography as “a qualitative research method that utilizes ethnographic methods to bring cultural interpretation to the

autobiographical data of researchers with the intent of understanding self and its connection to others” (p. 56). That is, autoethnography as “the stories (...) reflected upon, analyzed, and interpreted within the broader sociocultural context” (Chang, 2008, p. 46). She highlights that autoethnography “should be ethnographic in its methodological orientation, cultural in its interpretive orientation, and autobiographical in its content orientation” (p. 48). To Reed-Danahay (2017), autoethnography is a “genre of writing that places the self of the researcher and/or narrator within a social context” (p. 145). In sum, in autoethnography, both the process and the product of research shape and are shaped at the intersection of the individual and the social.

Similarly, dialogic approaches such as duo/trioethnography bring together two or three researcher participants who juxtapose their (hi)stories, trajectories, and practices and use them as “research sites” (Oberg & Wilson, 2002) and excavation grounds in order to inform and ultimately transform each other. That is, through dialogue and exchange of ideas, the participants become “the foil for the Other, challenging the Other to reflect on their own life in a deeper, more relational, and authentic manner” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 10) and “interrogate and reinscribe [their] previously held beliefs” (p. 9). The flexible, amicable, and open nature of duo/trioethnography promotes the dialogic creation of emic meaning and understanding, and “[t]he conversations of duoethnographers assist readers in recalling and reconceptualizing their own stories” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 10). Just like autoethnography, duo/trioethnography provides the participants with the chance to examine their lived experiences within the constituting contextual and sociopolitical structures and domains.

But how can these reflective and dialogic approaches inform ERPP inquiry, and what are their implications for ERPP scholarship? First, they serve as a critical thinking tool and engage one in a unique metacognitive practice through “entailing knowing about one’s own knowing” (Filipović & Jovanović, 2016, p. 1443) and challenging “dominant forms of representation and power” (Tierney, 1998, p. 66). By focusing on our practices and experiences of academic publication from a personal perspective and by communicating our narratives and histories to others, we become more aware of ourselves, our struggles, and possible solutions

to the problems and challenges we face in the process and practice of writing for scholarly publication. Second, those approaches offer a more holistic, diachronic, and insider perspective on academic trajectories and (hi)stories of scholars and broader sociocultural and socioeconomic, and sociopolitical contexts within which scholarly publication practices are embedded and scholarly products are adjudicated, certified, and disseminated. In other words, reflective and dialogic approaches engage us in the “rigorous self-reflection” that helps us “identify and interrogate the intersections between the self and social life” (Adams et al., 2017, p. 1) as our trajectories and (hi)stories are “never made in a vacuum and others are always visible or invisible participants” (Chang, 2008, p. 69). Given the multicultural nature of globalized academic communities, such approaches encourage “cross-cultural understanding in a culturally diverse society” (Chang, 2008, p. 57).

Third, compared to etic and outsider views, reflective and dialogic approaches serve as a means to shed more light on lived rather than assumed experiences and practices of scholarly publication and showcase how scholars develop required scholarly publication literacies; are socialized into target communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991); participate in or resist dominant hegemonic structures, discourses, and practices; and develop and negotiate their identities within power dynamics and structures constituting those communities. Accordingly, they provide ERPP research and scholarship with an opportunity to paint a less biased and distorted and more real picture of scholarly publication practices of both Anglophone and EAL scholars in diverse academic contexts across the globe. This, in turn, helps further decolonize hegemonic discourses, problematize binaries, and modify assumptions about knowledge construction and dissemination practices of each and both of those scholarly demographics. In sum, such approaches invite further reflectivity and reflexivity for both scholars themselves and ERPP researchers.

The current volume aims to respond to these two major exigencies and practice what we have preached, so to speak. The book presents a collection of personal accounts to provide a multifaceted and nuanced picture of the situated realities of scholarly publication in different international geolinguistic academic locales and contexts. The chapters adopt



the methodological framework of self and dialogic study and use the elements of evocative, analytical, and critical auto/duo/trioethnography, including autobiography, self-reflective narrative, and creative writing to share, analyze, and interpret the trajectories and (hi)stories of early-career scholars. More specifically, they intend to shed more light on the practices and experiences of a small population of Anglophone and EAL early-career scholars in scholarly publication. They look at a range of topics and issues, including but not limited to: discursive and non-discursive challenges in scholarly publication; socialization into scholarly publication, and individual and networked mentorship and pedagogical practices that can scaffolded academic publication; the development of scholarly identity, voice, and agency; and ideology, power, and privilege as inherent factors that shape knowledge construction and meaning making in academic discourse and exchange.

By bringing together both scholars who fall along the various positions in the continuum proposed above, the book aims to adopt an inclusive orientation stepping beyond the reductionist Anglophone/EAL binary rather than further polarizing the divide. Additionally, it means to highlight streaks of similarity across the (hi)stories of these early-career scholars and look at individual, local, sociopolitical, contextual, and global issues that play a role in scholarly publication practices of novice scholars and early-career researchers. That is, a micro and a macro approach where the individual and the social, the local and the global intersect and shed light on each other. Needless to say, that difference is also an inherent aspect and characteristic of the narratives that the chapters share. Although we are not after positivist generalizations, we hope that the narratives of this group of scholars can both project a generic and also specific image of what is happening in the personal and socially-constructed academic life of other novice scholars and the global and local dynamics within their academic contexts. By doing so, the book aims to add to the scholarship obtained by the etic approach to the study of academic publication and ultimately inform and enrich the knowledge base of ERPP scholarship and inquiry. In the next section, we will take a look at the structure and organization of this volume and browse the content of the constituent chapters.

## Overview of the Book

Apart from this introductory chapter, this volume consists of sixteen chapters. These we have organized into three thematically-organized parts. The first brings together chapters that address the topics of socialization into a community of practice, the role of networks in that process and how those who take on the role of mentors contribute to an ECR's professional and research publishing development. The second part explores the ways in which ECRs establish and construct identities, how the various channels of communication play a role in the construction of these identities and in making a scholarly publishing trajectory visible to others. A third consideration in this part is how authorial voice(s) evolve(s) through time and changing circumstances. The volume concludes with a part devoted to questions of ideology and power in relation to the research publication trajectories of ECRs. The chapters in this part also explore some of the struggles scholars experience both within the institutional contexts in which they work but also in balancing the pressures to achieve neoliberal constructions of academic success with challenging circumstances in their personal lives, contextualizing these struggles in the negotiation of power relations.

Carciu's chapter opens the first part of the book. As a plurilingual early-career scholar of Romanian origin working in a Spanish university, Carciu charts her journey through the sometimes-conflicting demands of institutional recognition on the one hand and publishing productivity on the other. Her autoethnographic account makes use of two main theoretical concepts, "community of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and the "inventorying self" perspective (Canagarajah, 2012). Her exploration of the genres and venues for publication most likely to contribute to institutional recognition makes plain the vital role a community of practice can play in helping junior scholars unravel constructions of success in academia.

Van Viegen, in her chapter, the second in the part, draws on critical autoethnography (Aoki, 2003; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Pinar, 1994) to reflexively engage with narratives of the self and relations with others. She examines the way in which her privileged status as a white, first language user of English alongside her experience as a "first in family" student

both construct her trajectory as one entailing the negotiation of participation and belonging. Like Carciu, Van Viegen addresses the critical importance of mentoring relationships and social support networks and offers suggestions for faculty on how these mentoring relationships might better aid students and ECRs, particularly those whose full participation is constrained by marginalization or minoritization.

Deroo, in his account, provides an example of how a mentoring relationship can offer the kind of support called for by Van Viegen, Carciu, and many other contributors to the volume. He too draws on Lave and Wenger's (1991) theory of situated learning to highlight how his participation in various communities of practice provided him with the wherewithal to successfully navigate the challenges of academic writing and publishing. In tracing his learning journey alongside his advisor and fellow graduate students, Deroo highlights the way in which knowledge and learning about academic writing were mutually co-constructed and how aspects of the hidden curriculum associated with academic writing and publishing might be made explicit.

Response to peer review, an element in Deroo's hidden curriculum, is addressed by Shaw in his chapter. Shaw's account chronicles a failed first attempt at publishing an article from his doctoral thesis in a peer-reviewed journal. He draws on his correspondence with the journal editor and reviewers, a research journal, and emails exchanged with his support network to identify the "missteps" made along the way and to suggest how novice scholars might better interpret and respond to peer review. As a practitioner and academic, Shaw foregrounds the importance of continued support for early-career researchers, particularly those like himself who have more limited access to their communities of practice.

Shahriari gives readers of his chapter an intimate glimpse into the challenges facing emerging researchers in the higher education context of outer-circle countries such as Iran, among them the acquisition of the required research publication skills. Shahriari's Bourdieuan analysis of his experience helps shed light on the types of economic, social, and cultural capitals that shape the habitus at Iranian universities. His linguistic background and time spent at academic institutions abroad allow for the

creation of a narrative which invites comparisons across varied academic contexts, including those of the other four contributors to this part.

Burgess shares with Shahriari the experience of academic institutions in three geographical locations. Employed initially by her current institution on the basis of her privileged status as a “native English speaker,” Burgess struggled to acknowledge, accept, and embody a new identity as a multilingual, non-native speaker of Spanish fully engaging with the Spanish academic community. Applying the theoretical lens of legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) to the previously unexamined narrative of her publishing trajectory, she acknowledges the role of three mentors, each of whom contributed to the development and questioning of identities she adopted over the course of the early part of her publishing trajectory.

In the first of the chapters in the second part, Kohls examines his experiences as an older, early-career scholar teaching, publishing and fulfilling his professional obligations while coping with a chronic illness. Using evocative autoethnography (Ellis & Bochner, 2000), Kohls introduces the concept of “researcher self-care” as an approach to connecting life and research by writing with mindful intention about diagnosis, illness, and healing not only for oneself but for others who find themselves in a similar situation. Through his own process of writing about diagnosis, Kohls suggests that the powers of investigation and reflection can open up possibilities of understanding crisis, trauma, and risk in ways that create new knowledge and offer up new opportunities for research, collaboration, and mentorship. This chapter contributes to the growing call for autoethnographic scholarship of affective aspects of scholarly publication trajectories largely understudied in English for research publication purposes.

Olmos, in the second chapter in part two, centers her attention on the analysis of authorial identity in the articles published, accepted, and submitted over a three-year period applying Ivanič's (1998) framework to these published outputs. Olmos, like Kohls, uses autoethnography to explore affective aspects of research publication. She charts her feelings of satisfaction and frustration while writing the papers and her responses to acceptance and rejection of her manuscripts. Olmos embeds the account in her negotiation of two academic identities: as a returnee academic

regarded as a senior scholar in Mexico, her home country and as an ECR at home with the values and practices of UK academic culture acquired while a doctoral student.

The negotiation of academic identities through the use of online platforms such as Google Scholar, [Academic.edu](https://www.academic.edu), and ResearchGate is the focus of Darwin's chapter, the third in the second part. He examines the extent to which the designs of the platforms shape this process of negotiation, drawing on Darwin and Norton's (2015) model of investment. Competing and colluding ideologies, embedded in the sociotechnical structures and algorithms of these platforms, are shown to position scholars and accord symbolic value to their work in new ways. Darwin argues that for scholars to invest in the discursive practices of their academic communities and to claim their legitimate place, they will need to navigate these online spaces more strategically and understand how power operates in networked participatory scholarship.

Fazel's chapter also employs Darwin and Norton's (2015) model alongside the notion of academic discourse socialization as articulated by Duff (2010) and Kobayashi et al. (2017). Through these theoretical lenses, Fazel analyzes how his ongoing investments in writing for publication have contributed to and constructed his scholarly identity and how they have facilitated his socialization into scholarly publication. His autoethnographic account charts a period of 15 years in which he transitioned from being a novice Iranian writer interested in getting published to a published author and early-career scholar in Canada. Fazel thus shares with Olmos an exploration of the tensions involved between identities established in one's place of origin and then in an adopted country.

Mochizuki too discusses the crossing of borders, both geographical and symbolic, in her account of becoming a scholarly writer. In common with Olmos and Fazel, she identifies twists and turns in her trajectory. These twists and turns she sees as deriving from decisions she made in the course of her career, first as a secondary school teacher, later as a doctoral student in Australia and finally as an ECR at a Japanese university. She uses the writing of the chapter to illuminate for herself and others the essential role that social interactions and identity negotiations play in the lived experience of becoming a scholarly writer.

Herrando-Rodrigo reflects on what were originally tensions between two identities she shares with Mochizuki, namely that of a language teacher at a secondary school and an ECR employed by a university. Through the lenses of Legitimate Peripheral Participation and Identity, the chapter draws attention to the crucial role played by participation in different communities of practice in Spain and England. The analysis of her identity negotiation with colleagues, mentors, and reviewers, together with her publishing experiences, reveals that her dynamic multiple identities have fed into each other, crafting what has become a deservedly audible authorial voice. Like Mochizuki and Burgess, Herrando-Rodrigo reflects that the writing of an autoethnographic account allows one to see what might otherwise have remained beyond the reach of one's awareness.

Gormley, the first contributor to the third part of the book, observes that the neoliberal context in which we live and work, obliges scholars to negotiate multiple power relations. Framed as "middle ground" writing between analytical and emotional dimensions of autoethnography and drawing upon Foucault's idea of power/knowledge, Gormley's chapter provides a situated account of the contingency and constructedness of his writing. In common with other contributors to the volume, Gormley presents his account from the vantage points of the tensions arising from the cross-disciplinary nature of his research and his contractual obligations to publish. The chapter discusses how dealing with power relations, which are distinct to the position of early-career researchers, creates a sense of bifurcation. Criteria laid down by gatekeepers and the researcher's own writing style or preference are simultaneously navigated.

The tensions Gormley identifies as core to his experience of writing for publication in a context where neoliberal values and discourses hold sway are also addressed by McCulloch in her chapter. Her account covers the period from the final stages of doctoral study to the point where she became a senior lecturer. Grounding her analysis in literacy studies, McCulloch analyzes the sociopolitical factors that influenced her scholarly publishing trajectory. A particular focus is an exploration of the role that language, geographical place, and geopolitical forces, including the competitive academic job market and the pressures of research evaluation systems, can play in enabling or constraining early-career scholars'