



# Learning the practice of scholarly publication in English – A Romanian perspective



Mirela Bardi\*

Department of Modern Languages and Business Communication, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, 6 Caderea Bastiliei Str, Bucharest 1, Romania

## ARTICLE INFO

Article history:  
Available online

Keywords:  
English-medium journals  
Resources  
Publication strategies  
Participation  
International coaching

## ABSTRACT

This study explores the range of factors that motivate Romanian researchers to publish in high-profile English-medium journals, the main linguistic and non-linguistic hurdles they have experienced and the strategies they have developed in respect of managing the publication process and improving their abilities to communicate research in English. As shown in the sixteen accounts provided by lecturers in economics and business – followed by four interviews with the respondents who managed to publish in prestigious international journals – linguistic proficiency is one resource in the complex architecture of expertise required for effective research dissemination, alongside methodological versatility, critical writing abilities, awareness of editors' agendas, participation in wider research networks, and learning the practice of writing by more writing. I argue that development of research writing abilities can be better addressed if pedagogical instruments designed to enable researchers to perform this multi-level task are underpinned by the exploration of the wider set of factors that generate the need to write up research in English.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Romanian researchers' efforts to access peer-reviewed English language journals resemble the attempts of novice professionals to become accepted members of established communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). Experience and prolonged involvement in academia do not seem to matter. As the data reported in this study indicate, many researchers feel like novices in relation to prevailing academic conventions (Swales, 2004). Such conventions have been established and redefined in the process of participation in communities of practice, where participants engage in sharing and negotiating their ways of understanding the world, and in doing so they refine and redefine their practice. Within this view of professional development as fundamentally social and experiential (Candlin & Hyland, 1999; Hyland, 2007, 2011; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Mauranen, 2012), opportunities to contribute to the practice of communities are of the greatest importance. Romanian researchers in the field of business and economics – who are the focus of this study – did not, for a long while, interact with the wider academic community, did not learn from continuous social and professional engagement and did not take part in defining the conventions they now need to comply with. The reasons why that happened are beyond the scope of this study. The result is that we are now 'novice' and inexperienced in relation to the accepted research publication codes and practices of the international community.

\* 11 Alecu Russo Street, Flat 5, Bucharest 2, Romania. Tel.: +40 21 2106431, +40 726 193768.  
E-mail addresses: [mirela.bardi@incontext.ro](mailto:mirela.bardi@incontext.ro), [mamami2700@gmail.com](mailto:mamami2700@gmail.com).

In consequence, there is a wide gap to bridge for academics who try to play by the internationally accepted rules. They want to do so – when motivated by a genuine interest in research – and they have to do so – because of mandatory career advancement institutional requirements. This study sets out to explore the range of factors that motivate Romanian researchers in business and economics to attempt publication in English-medium journals and the main hurdles, linguistic and non-linguistic, they experience in the process. Linguistic difficulties can be better addressed if pedagogical instruments designed to develop research-writing skills of researchers using English as an additional language (EAL) (Flowerdew, 2008) are underpinned by an understanding of the wider set of factors that generate the need to communicate research in English. Within this holistic approach, the data derived from my exploration aim to contribute to the argument that academic texts can be better understood in the context of the socio-political processes in which they are situated (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Salager-Meyer, 2008; Swales, 2004; Turner, 2012), where text features and text-generating practices make a “synergistic spiral” (Turner, 2012, p. 19).

The reality of scholarly publication confirms the status of English as the language of scientific communication. By 1995 (as reported by Amon, 2003, cited in Ferguson, 2007), 82.5% of journal publications in the social sciences (sociology, economics) and 87.2% of publications in the natural sciences (e.g., biology, chemistry, medicine and mathematics) were written in English. More recently, Flowerdew and Li (2009, p. 2) note the existence of disciplinary differences within the dominant trend of “anglicization of academic publishing”, with a more pronounced preference for English language publication in the hard sciences, which have a more universal character, than in the humanities and social sciences where disciplines such as history, literature or politics are more locally relevant. Nevertheless, Flowerdew and Li (2009) discuss a complex picture rather than one displaying clear-cut disciplinary boundaries, a picture that takes into account variables such as the target audience academics aim to engage with and institutional policies. Indeed, thirteen of the sixteen journals in the field of economics published by the Bucharest University of Economic Studies, where this study is located, require submissions in English only, one publishes bilingual articles (English and Romanian) and two accept a wider range of languages – English, French, Italian and German.

Writing for international publication involves a lot more than writing accurate English and observing a certain structural pattern. Research reporting conventions are underpinned by a set of practices in conducting research and creating knowledge. Therefore, language proficiency should be accompanied by a whole range of competences pertaining to research planning, choice and use of appropriate methodological tools, critical writing, rhetorical awareness and constant practising of research writing. Such insights have emerged from the practice of training professional researchers in the field of economics and business within the framework of an MA programme in academic practice at the Bucharest University of Economic Studies where I work. The perceptions of participants in this programme about the factors that generate the need to write and publish in English as well as about their personal approach to improving their research-writing abilities are communicated in this study.

### 1.1. *The linguistic and non-linguistic challenges of international publication*

A large body of research has explored the development of second and foreign language academic writing skills of EAL researchers, together with perceptions about the challenges of disseminating research through the medium of English (Buckingham, 2008, 2013; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Flowerdew, 1999; Huang, 2010; Lillis & Curry, 2006; Moreno, Rey-Rocha, Burgess, López-Navarro, & Sachdev, 2012; Perez-Llantada, Plo, & Ferguson, 2011). Such studies have analysed primarily linguistic and textual difficulties scholars face in their attempt to communicate their research results to the international academic community. Other studies have looked at the contextual factors – cultural, economic, political as well as linguistic – that adversely affect dissemination of researchers' work and consequently their international visibility (Curry & Lillis, 2010; Flowerdew, 2008; Salager-Meyer, 2008, 2013). As Flowerdew (1999) pointed out in his study of problems encountered by Hong Kong writers, the complex array of factors that impact on publication success need to be explored from the perspectives of individual scholars who can reflect both on their own efforts and on the institutional context in which they operate.

A useful review of 39 studies on multilingual scholars' participation in global communities (Uzuner, 2008) reveals a range of challenges such scholars face. English language difficulties are accompanied by parochialism, inability to show the relevance of research, divergence from accepted research-reporting conventions, isolation from academic networks, insufficient research funding and unfair treatment by editors and reviewers. If one looks at the wider set of factors that affect international publication, it becomes apparent that the individual and institutional agendas are closely interconnected: academic institutions wish to strengthen their international profile in order to fare better in a highly competitive market and benefit from academics' efforts to become internationally visible (while putting pressure on them to become visible). Researchers may be driven by their genuine interest in research as well as by institutional pressure and career advancement plans. Whatever the situation may be in each individual case, the personal and institutional agendas influence each other and generate responsibilities for both parties. As Hyland and Hamp-Lyons note (2002, p. 4), the expectations are aligned to the international norms but tend to ignore the needs for support that derive from such alignment. All responsibility seems to lie with individuals who need to carry on their own battle, and to find their own channels, networks and resources in order to become internationally more visible. However, provision of training has been identified as the remit of educational and national authorities, with such provision ranging from the English language education of researchers (Salager-Meyer, 2008, p. 124) to programmes that train international scholars “to perform to adequate levels in their individual fields” (Flowerdew, 2013, p. 9).

This study aims to shed light on the kind of support academic staff expect their own institution to provide in order to achieve a more visible international profile for individual researchers who target English language scholarly journals as well as for the university itself.

Acknowledging the increasing participation of Non-Native Speaker (NNS) researchers in international academic events and experiences, Swales (2004) highlights the wide range of hurdles these researchers encounter. English proficiency alone is not enough to ensure research effectiveness. Publication success depends on a wider set of factors that include “levels of experience, support and networking, as well as location in the centre as opposed to the periphery” (2004, p. 58). Participation entails considerable learning for off-centre researchers, be it engagement in research networks (Curry & Lillis, 2010) or participation in the scholarly process of knowledge creation through writing and submitting manuscripts for publication (Hyland, 2011). The role of participation in research networks as a form of learning and socialisation into the global research community has been conclusively established by Curry and Lillis (2010). They note the extensive emphasis on the individual researcher’s cognitive and linguistic abilities and argue that personal efforts must be complemented with comprehensive research capacity building as a means of facilitating access to international publication. (Curry & Lillis, 2010, p. 282).

Engagement in the research activity of international networks could alleviate scarcity of resources, a complex problem highlighted in several studies that explore obstacles to publication encountered by off-centre researchers (Belcher, 2007; Flowerdew, 2008; Hyland, 2011). Often defined as “isolation from current literature” (Hyland, 2011, p. 62), the issue of resources is a major one. As the data reported in this study show, it involves more than a lack of access to well-provided libraries and to the very journals where researchers are expected to publish. In the widest sense, it may be unfamiliarity with the view of knowledge and knowledge creation underpinning the English-speaking world’s academic culture. Limited access to academic and linguistic resources would influence off-centre scholars’ awareness of editors’ expectations, research communication practices and implicitly chances of publication in English-medium journals (Lillis & Curry, 2006; Salager-Meyer, 2008). Engagement with wider research communities means opportunities to learn and reshape the practices of such communities and could result in production of better negotiated, better structured and more interactive texts.

## 1.2. Confidence-building through manuscript drafting and submission

Researchers’ perceptions of their own linguistic and methodological limitations as well as of the editors’ expectations may generate additional difficulties. Low self-esteem and confidence may deter researchers from targeting high-profile journals while perceived bias of reviewers against NNS submissions increases feelings of being at a disadvantage, even by researchers with a good publication record in ‘top-notch’ journals, as reported in the study of Cho (2009, p. 236). Buckingham (2013) reports the irritation of Omani researchers at the reviewers’ requests that manuscripts be proofread by native speakers, Spanish researchers interviewed by Perez-Llantada et al. (2011) reveal their frustration at not being able to express the complexity of their thinking with a limited range of linguistic resources, while Turkish researchers in the study of Buckingham (2008) complain about “not being able to write in more striking ways about the topic” (p. 8).

Writing and submitting manuscripts is a form of apprenticeship, the process whereby the repeated redrafting of a text is not to be regarded “just as the transformation of a text, but also the apprenticing of an individual writer into the knowledge constructing practices of a discipline” (Hyland, 2011, p. 60). As a result, researchers may increase their awareness of effective research communication practices and become more confident in their ability to write in English. Mur-Duenas (2012) reports the case of Spanish researchers who have abandoned translation of their texts into English in favour of writing first drafts straight into English themselves. Earlier research among Romanian academics involved in staff development training (Muresan & Bardi, 2013), showed that in order to improve publication-writing skills, awareness of generic elements is needed. While broad schema are developed through experience and reading of academic research articles, more explicit tackling of subtle, fine-drawn genre elements that are not readily accessible may be required. Indeed, Turkish researchers interviewed by Buckingham (2008, p. 8) point out the need to get “the tone and force of a proposition right” in addition to writing accurately, while Spanish researchers surveyed by Moreno et al. (2012) identify the Discussion section of articles as the most challenging because of the need to position one’s research in relation to other writing in the field.

## 2. Methodology

This study sought answers to the following research questions:

- R1: What motivates academics to conduct and publish research internationally?
- R2: What are the main hurdles researchers have to overcome in managing the publication process?
- R3: What strategies have researchers developed in order to improve English language proficiency?

The data were collected through completion of a reflection guide (Appendix 1), followed by semi-structured interviews with those participants who published in highly prestigious journals (interview guide in Appendix 2). The reflection guide was designed so as to invite participants to consider contextual factors and personal circumstances related to writing and publishing in English-medium journals. Such accounts and interpretations would be necessarily derived from the practical expertise researchers had developed in the course of coping with everyday situations, sometimes highly unpredictable and

uncertain. Accounts describing behaviour and decisions treat the respondents as “plan-making, self-monitoring agent, aware of goals and deliberately considering the best ways to achieve them” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2005, p. 293). Verbalising the behaviour related to establishing a research identity performs a self-clarification role and renders the experience intelligible to the respondent as well as to the researcher. Such accounts are interpretations of experience – people represent themselves and while responding they also represent their world to themselves.

The reflection guide takes the respondent through a ‘journey’ from wider issues concerning the role of research in their academic activity and career advancement plans to personal experiences of writing and publishing in English. The open questions seemed appropriate for the specific research objective of encouraging academics to reflect on the set of practices they have developed out of the need to strengthen their international profile. The study of Flowerdew (1999) on problems experienced by Hong Kong researchers when writing for publication in English, although with a much stronger focus on the use of English, was particularly relevant for my work and Questions 5 and 6 in my reflection guide that invite description of the publication experience and the process of preparing a manuscript for publication were inspired by the interview guide in that study.

At the time when the research was conducted (June–November 2012), all participants were graduates or students of the academic communication MA programme convened by the university. Through involvement in this programme they manifested their interest in research skills development and, as a consequence of attending the programme, they will hopefully have refined their understanding of rhetorical functions that articles need to communicate in order to be accepted by reputable journals. As I was interested in what motivates or prevents researchers from targeting prestigious English-medium journals, a variety of perceptions and experiences was considered relevant for my research purposes. While this study is more exploratory in terms of eliciting perceptions, understanding the strategies developed by researchers with a more reputable publication record would make a suitable topic for further investigation.

Sixteen reflection guides were self-completed by respondents with diverse academic profiles, publication productivity and preferences regarding target journals, as indicated in Table 1. All participants studied for their academic qualifications – both undergraduate and postgraduate – in Romania. As expected, most participants published widely in local journals. Two respondents preferred international journals as main publication outlets for their articles, while others did not target such journals. Of the eleven respondents who successfully published in international journals, only four disseminated their work in prestigious scholarly journals in their respective fields. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with those four researchers, aiming to obtain more details about the process of journal identification and text editing. The interviews were conducted in the respondents’ university offices and took around 50–60 min. All the data were collected in Romanian.

As a tutor on the MA programme, my role within the research setting is very much one of participant researcher (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). My “prolonged involvement” with the environment gave me “sufficient time to learn the culture, test for misinformation, build trust” (Robson, 1993, p. 404). It also provided access to informal “unsolicited accounts” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995, p. 126) and enabled me to construct a detailed understanding of the setting. I did not use my observation as a source of data, but I resorted to my “common-sense knowledge” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995, p. 18) in the interpretation of data, primarily to make connections between participants’ linguistic abilities and their publication experience.

**Table 1**  
Participants’ profile.

Discipline	No. of years in academia/position	Gender	Age	Publications in English in Romanian journals in the last 5 years	Publications in English in international journals in the last 5 years	Data provided	
						Reflection guide	Interview
1. Information systems management	18/senior lecturer	F	42	14	6	✓	
2. Public management	11/lecturer	F	37	7	0	✓	
3. Information systems management	22/senior lecturer	F	45	25	1	✓	
4. Finance	11/lecturer	M	35	19	10	✓	
5. Finance	12/senior lecturer	F	36	13	3	✓	✓
6. Public management	8/senior lecturer	M	42	12	4	✓	
7. Entrepreneurship	4/teaching assistant	F	28	23	12	✓	
8. International business	20/lecturer	F	55	14	0	✓	
9. Accounting	7/lecturer	M	31	6	15	✓	✓
10. Accounting	19/professor	F	44	12	6	✓	
11. Marketing	3/teaching assistant	M	27	18	0	✓	
12. Public management	14/senior lecturer	F	38	9	0/3 book chapters as co-author	✓	
13. Information systems audit	14/senior lecturer	F	39	7	4	✓	
14. Public management	23/professor	F	49	18	11	✓	✓
15. Knowledge management	20/professor	F	46	6	0	✓	
16. Marketing	8/senior lecturer	F	38	3	8	✓	✓

The reflection guides and interview transcripts were analysed through a recursive process of category identification and open coding, aiming to capture the respondents' ideas. Miles and Huberman describe data analysis as a process of data reduction, of "selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming the data that appear in written-up field notes or transcriptions" (1994, p. 10). The process involved the gradual emergence of tentative patterns and their subsequent alteration or confirmation as the analysis of the content proceeded. Codes were given to descriptive subcategories that illustrated the topics tackled by the respondents. These subcategories, that were checked across the whole set of reflection guides and interviews, were then grouped into conceptual categories, in their turn assembled under wider themes. As an example, the theme 'Improving research writing proficiency' is subdivided into categories such as 'Areas in need of improvement', 'Areas of perceived progress' and 'Strategies for improving research article drafting', each of these comprising several subcategories that illustrate specific elements mentioned by the respondents. The descriptive subcategories under 'Strategies for improving research article drafting' include: 'Exposure to target language', 'Extended writing practice', 'Creating a corpus of academic phrases', 'Reading and writing down ideas', 'Writing new ideas straight into English', 'Collaboration with literacy brokers' and 'Experience of learning other languages'. Relationships between categories were also identified, for example the overriding theme of Motivation, which can be related to several other themes such as 'Engagement in Research', 'Resources' and 'Barriers to publication'. The process of moving from simple categories to more complex concepts that could provide answers to my research questions is presented in [Appendix 3](#).

### 3. Results and discussion

The results will be discussed in terms of major themes, but it needs to be pointed out that the issues are interconnected and ideational links transcend the boundaries of separate themes.

#### 3.1. *Engagement in research – a vehicle for professional development*

Engagement in research is regarded as vital for an academic's career, which is underpinned by 'intellectual curiosity' (Reflection Guide 13). It is a self-motivating activity for some respondents who have set themselves high standards and aim to develop an international profile of their research work. Genuine interest in research is shared by both young, ambitious researchers determined to make their way to becoming known internationally and by more senior researchers for whom promotion is not a hurdle anymore once they have established their professorships. Interest in research is naturally accompanied by proficiency in international publication, with researchers having planned their route carefully, starting with national journals and moving onto international ones. The latter category of journals has been approached in stages, from lower-profile journals to average quality ones and eventually to high-profile English language journals (Reflection Guides 7, 9, Interviews 1, 2). Increased visibility and greater impact of their work on other researchers (Reflection Guides 14, 16, Interviews 2, 4), motivates participants to publish in international rather than local journals. In contrast, what seems to discourage researchers is the limited use and application of research results by either the private or the public sector. For respondents who see research as making a contribution to economic activity (Reflection Guides 4, 11, 14), lack of practical application of research findings tends to make them doubt the worth of research efforts.

Engagement in research has considerable developmental potential:

- 'Research has helped me discover issues and approaches I could never imagine.' (Reflection Guide 6)
- 'Research is a key component of my professional development. I am trying to plan my learning carefully and to take part, to the extent I can, in international research activity.' (Interview 1)

Not all respondents share the same interest in research, though. They regard themselves primarily as teachers.

- 'My sense of professional accomplishment derives from working with students ... that is the reason why I decided to embrace a career in higher education.' (Reflection Guide 15)

Research relevance for teaching is a motivating element for six respondents – both junior and senior – who highlighted the need for teaching in higher education to be informed by the latest research in order to respond to the fast and unpredictable knowledge creation in the respective domains.

- 'There is nothing much one can communicate in class unless lectures are underpinned by the latest research findings. My dream is to teach classes very closely related with my preferred research topics.' (Reflection Guide 7)

Apart from genuine interest in a research career, the need to comply with promotion criteria urges academics to engage in research and to target high-ranking journals for disseminating their research. Such promotion criteria set standards for both teaching and research activity, while taking into account professional prestige and participation in the life of the academic community. As early as 2005, the Ministry of Education issued a set of guidelines regarding evaluation of research productivity and visibility, stating expectations that academic staff should publish in high-profile international journals and introducing more demanding indexing procedures for journals published in Romania.

Universities, that enjoy a degree of autonomy and can set their own requirements, responded by drafting career advancement criteria that reward quality of publications rather than quantity. Each publication scores a number of points



depending on the journal indexing and some universities offer financial rewards as well. While respondents agree that rewarding quality is a necessary tool for enhancing institutional and personal research capacity, immediate compliance with the requirement to target high-profile scholarly publications does not seem possible.

- ‘Criteria that are aligned to international standards are necessary and they impact on curriculum and teaching. But they need to be implemented gradually if they are to contribute to building a solid academic culture.’ (Reflection Guide 7)

The general opinion (Reflection Guides 1, 3, 4, 7, 13, 14) is that criteria should not ignore the limited resources and opportunities available to Romanian academics to conduct and communicate their research. Focus on research at the expense of teaching is regarded as an undesirable outcome (Reflection Guides 1, 3) while some participants (Interview 3) put forward the suggestion that staff should be given the option of specialising in either teaching or research. Nevertheless, such criteria can encourage researchers to plan their career aiming for high standards and departing from the ‘approach that favoured quantity over quality’ (Reflection Guide 4).

Participants’ motivation to publish in prestigious English-language journals and by doing so to join “the global web of scholarship” (Hyland, 2007, p. 2) has diverse sources. Publication in scholarly journals is accepted as a means of increasing visibility and relevance of research conducted locally, of increasing participation of Romanian researchers in knowledge construction in their areas of interest (Interviews 3, 4), and of giving researchers a sense of progress as regards their own development.

- ‘I resent the feeling of isolation, I think we need to be better connected to what goes on in other parts of the world. Getting published in a high-profile journal is a means of alleviating this feeling of isolation and I think I did it more for myself than for fulfilling university criteria.’ (Interview 4)

### 3.2. The need for resources

All participants regard research as an activity that requires resources, training and practice. In response to question 4 in the Reflection guide (‘What prevents you from targeting high-profile English-medium journals for dissemination of your research?’), lack of appropriate resources is identified as a barrier to publication and the data provide a thorough definition of ‘resources’ by identifying specific components such as:

- access to international peer-reviewed journals in which Romanian academics are expected to publish;
- participation in international networks;
- ability to use a comprehensive range of methodological approaches;
- support from senior academics and PhD supervisors; and
- English language proficiency.

Barriers to publication, therefore, are both linguistic and non-linguistic (Belcher, 2007; Salager-Meyer, 2008; Swales, 2004). Scarcity of resources appears to hinder the genuine efforts of academics to conduct and communicate high-quality research by making accessing sources of data unnecessarily long and painstaking (Interviews 2, 3). Respondents adjust differently to lack of resources. Some are more proactive and purposefully seek opportunities for development (Reflection Guide 5 mentions the researcher’s efforts to identify suitable training courses abroad and to obtain funding for attendance), while others believe that it is the institution’s duty to provide support through training and facilitating encounters with international researchers, thus supporting its own progress towards a better international position (Reflection Guides 2, 3, 14).

Lack of guidance in planning and conducting a research project, particularly at the beginning of the doctoral process, makes many junior researchers experience considerable confusion about planning and managing research. Doctoral training and supervision is one type of resource whose appropriate provision has institutional implications and it may be regarded as one area where academic institutions can provide more pertinent support. Such data show the complex needs of researchers and the wide set of factors that eventually contribute to publication success.

- ‘... not knowing where to start, how to choose a topic, plan the research process and draft the paper ... this creates a state of confusion which may push a beginner researcher towards abandoning research activity.’ (Reflection Guide 7)

More senior researchers recollect the same kind of experience:

- ‘I was not properly trained for a research career ... my PhD training involved no teaching about research methodology or about the structural patterns of research papers.’ (Reflection Guide 15)

Participation in international research projects functions as a major resource, as respondents who have had the chance to be involved in international networks point out (Reflection Guides 4, 5, 6, 13; Interviews 1, 3). The belief is expressed that a writing partnership with a ‘big name’ or working with international colleagues with peer-review experience facilitates the publication process by increasing awareness of what that process involves. Direct participation, contact and collaboration with international researchers can increase publication chances by helping to align the vision of the researcher to that of the potential readership and peer-reviewers. The findings are in line with the view that participation in research networks

facilitates access to English-medium journals (Curry & Lillis, 2010: 293) and that improvement of the publication record does not depend exclusively on the writer's competence.

- 'For me, membership to a group of researchers interested in Management Information Systems has later on enabled me to publish in the journals of the School of ... A common vision of the researcher, target readership and editor is needed for publication success.' (Reflection Guide 6)

The value of familiarisation with international academic environments is reiterated by a respondent who held a post-doctoral research scholarship at a university in Europe. In terms of publication strategy, she learned that

- '... it matters to know the exact agenda and profile of the editor and the policies for reviewing and acceptance of articles. If the editor has a narrow research interest, there's no point in aiming to publish there unless your research is precisely for that niche.' (Interview 1)

The respondent also learned valuable lessons about the sharing of research in a more collaborative environment:

- 'I saw how research is shared and I have initiated similar roundtables for doctoral students here, where they present work in progress to peers.' (Interview 1)

### 3.3. *Inadequate methodological skills*

Textual conventions seem to be underpinned by a set of practices in conducting research. Indeed, one of the main non-linguistic barriers to publication, and also a barrier classed as a missing resource in that it is not tackled by training, is inability to use a wide range of methodological tools. Unfamiliarity with and lack of access to new data-processing software or lack of skill in developing increasingly sophisticated econometric models are some examples provided by respondents (Reflection Guides 2, 3, 5).

- 'Mathematical models tend to become more and more complex and sophisticated. We can only meet such methodological challenges if we conduct research in collaboration with or as part of international teams.' (Reflection Guide 5)

Inadequate research skills may generate a certain lack of self-confidence and strengthen perceptions about international standards being too high. As a result, attempts at publication in journals that are perceived as inaccessible from the outset may be forestalled and local journals preferred instead. One may assume that such a process is all the more possible in the presence of a local 'folklore' that the Romanian economy is not interesting and relevant enough globally for findings based on local data to be published (Reflection Guide 2). Such perceptions are reminiscent of the notion of 'parochialism' defined as "failure to show the relevance of the study to the international community" (2001, p. 135) and highlighted by the editors interviewed in Flowerdew's study of 2001 as a major drawback of non-native speaker researchers' submissions. Collaboration with international researchers seems to be once again the solution for improving the publication record, this time by alleviating fears and hesitation.

- 'There is such an aura around those journals ... probably not entirely justified. ... Matters are complicated by the fact that I cannot work with a better known researcher, somebody who published already in that particular journal,' (Reflection Guide 15)

Such data may be interpreted as throwing light on the expert–novice relationship: researchers from better-connected countries are assigned the expert role while local researchers assume the novice role. Local experience and seniority do not seem to matter much, either in terms of respondents' perceptions of their own chances of accessing high-profile journals, or in terms of their actual publication record displayed in Table 1. Participant No. 9, who published the highest number of articles in international journals, is a junior researcher determined to target primarily journals indexed in the Science Citation Index (SCI) or Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). His determination to target high-profile journals is clearly expressed (Interview 2) and his high English-language proficiency helps him in this endeavour.

### 3.4. *Learning the process of publication*

Respondents regard the attempt to publish in prestigious English-language journals both as a personal challenge and as a means of advancing their careers, while the process of publication is regarded as a learning experience. Hence, they undertake careful preparation, irrespective of whether the manuscript is intended for a local or international journal. The complexity of the publication process increases with the international profile of the journal, from immediate acceptance and no feedback by some journals published in Romania to a more elaborate process of feedback and review for SCI and SSCI-indexed Romanian and international journals (Reflection Guides 7, 9, 14; Interview 2). Familiarisation with editorial agendas and policies is perceived as a key factor. It is very much the attitude suggested in the literature (Cargill, 2006, p. 14), whereby researchers are advised to read papers in several journals related to the topic of interest and by doing so to build the confidence needed 'to enter a conversation'. Article rejection was sometimes related to journal editors judging submissions to be focused on unsuitable topics for the respective journal, to possess methodological flaws or to report too small-scale research. There is no case mentioned of rejection based on poor English, which shows agreement with experiences of Spanish academics reported

by Perez-Llantada, Plo and Ferguson (2011). However, perceived inadequacy of language skills has prevented several respondents from targeting high-profile journals.

Responses to questions 5 and 6 in the Reflection Guide (Q5. 'Please describe your personal experience of publication in high-profile journals and highlight the stages in the process that are memorable in a positive or negative sense. What have you learned from that experience?'; Q6. 'Please describe the stages in the preparation of a manuscript for publication') show that some of the lessons learned regard the need for more generally relevant topics – avoiding parochialism (Uzunur, 2008, p. 255) – and for keeping up with what are perceived to be ever more sophisticated methodologies. Article revision and redrafting are part of the writing and submission strategy (Reflection Guides 4, 5, 7, 11, 16; Interviews 2, 3), which indicates that Romanian academics are becoming knowledgeable about the need to approach writing as a process and to consider readership and the professional context in which their texts will fulfil their communicative purposes. A focused, disciplined approach is suggested:

- 'There is no culture – or routine – of building and polishing a certain writing style, we target many journals with different styles. But that is beginning to change, in the past couple of years we have read more and did better in terms of targeting the right journals for our articles.' (Interview 3)

The process of refining their writing practice supports the views that researchers need to learn the "knowledge constructing processes of a discipline" (Hyland, 2007, p. 6) in order to become accepted members of the community. The belief that successful publication in scholarly journals needs to be underpinned by uninterrupted research activity (Reflection Guides 1, 5, 7, 13, 14; Interviews 2, 4) comes out strongly from the data and the picture of an integrated learning process – learning to conduct research and learning to communicate research – is constructed.

- 'I learn by reading more and paying attention to how ideas and the sections of articles are linked, for example I am now aware that there needs to be a strong link between the theory in the literature review and the model I test or develop. But I have to be constantly involved in research in order to improve my writing, you cannot do it every now and then.' (Interview 4).

Descriptions of manuscript preparation indicate a major step forward in terms of refining publication strategies: becoming more critical thinkers and writers and more concerned about the quality and structure of the argument. Thus researchers seem to have taken into account the interactive value of texts (Candlin & Hyland, 1999) and the deeper-seated, meaning-related features of writing (Wingate, 2006).

- 'I ask myself: What do I want to achieve with this article? What is my main argument and where do I stand in relation to the literature? What elements of novelty are there in my work? Once this is clear, I can write the article observing the required structure.' (Reflection Guide 7)
- 'I try to monitor my writing by thinking of what I want to communicate beyond the content, things like highlighting my contribution, making certain claims based on my data, and finding the right tone for all of these.' (Interview 4)

Such views, to be found in five reflection guides and two of the interviews, indicate respondents' efforts to combine content with rhetoric and thus to depart from local academic culture practices where writing tends to be descriptive rather than critical. They also build a complex picture of research writing which combines "writing as text" with "writing as process and interpretation" and in relation to "the specific local circumstances in which writing takes place". (Candlin & Hyland, 1999, p. 2).

Reviewers' feedback can be both a learning opportunity and a source of confusion. Those respondents who published in high-quality journals comment extensively on specific aspects of the review process. The role of reviewers in enhancing the learning that can be derived from the process of publication is regarded as very important and reviewers' suggestions have been 'justified and relevant' (Interview 4). In particular, reviewers of niche publications give content-related feedback because they are specialised and competent for that respective domain (Reflection Guides 7, 16; Interview 2). Nevertheless, reviews can become a barrier to publication when responding to reviewers' requirements is too demanding.

- 'They asked for more information in certain sections and for clarification, which was fair enough although some of the ideas they found unclear were quite well explained, I thought. They picked on many details, some insignificant. But the tone of the reviews was not patronising so I did my best to comply. It was tedious, but once I started I carried on doing the work.' (Interview 4)

Respondents who have published in partnership with Romanian or international peers recognise the value of collaboration in addressing reviewers' requests and avoiding the temptation to abandon the process (Interview 3). Receiving contradictory feedback from different reviewers (from international journals) or poor quality feedback (from some Romanian journals) can be confusing, but despite the complex and contradictory process, the learning potential is considerable.

- 'There is a high level of subjectivity and arbitrariness in the review process. Multiple filters use different criteria. But the feedback can be very valuable if there is no blockage on the way.' (Interview 2)

Belcher (2007) suggests that a careful choice of reviewers, alongside clear correspondence with authors, are ways in which journal editors can support off-network scholars. She advises reviewers "to compose well-considered, constructively critical,



collegial reviews, even of papers that appear unlikely ever to be accepted” (2007, p. 19), thus enhancing the transparency and the learning value of the review process. As part of a thoroughgoing discussion of measures leading to increased visibility of peripheral scholars and publications, Salager-Meyer (2013) identifies an educational role for editors who “could act as educators or mentors by training novice journal editors and/or researchers and reviewers” (2013, p. 4).

### 3.5. *Improving the ability to write in English*

Linguistic proficiency is a key resource in the process of international publication. Responses indicate specific language aspects that need to be improved, as well as the set of strategies more proficient writers have developed in order to refine their language abilities. Researchers with low language proficiency admit that the need to write in English prevents them from targeting top-ranked English-language journals and that, despite professional help from proofreaders, they feel they are not in control of their writing and that they cannot express and communicate their ideas properly. When they did publish in lower-tier international journals, it was in collaboration with more linguistically proficient colleagues. They identify word order, syntactic sentence structure and redundant writing as the main problems. More proficient writers are concerned about a certain lack of accuracy and limited ability to handle the academic register, but at the same time they point out quite confidently the progress they have made in terms of handling discipline-specific vocabulary, making more cautious claims, or avoiding long, incomprehensible sentences. Some point out better ability to structure parts of their text, in particular the literature review section, which has become less descriptive. Despite linguistic proficiency disparities among respondents, they all acknowledge exposure to the target language – mainly but not exclusively through reading academic literature in their disciplines – and writing practice as the best way to improve and refine ability to write research articles in English. English language proficient respondents (Reflection Guides 9, 11; Interview 2) – who have also studied other languages – maintain contact with the target language through diverse media, such as the press, the radio and television.

The results indicate similarities between self-reported linguistic problems of Romanian researchers and Hong Kong researchers as reported in the study by Flowerdew (1999). Both groups of writers mention problems with “facility of expression” (1999, p. 254) and “a less rich vocabulary” (p. 255). Awareness of the need to “keep to a simple style” (p. 257) is also shared by both groups of researchers. The study of Buckingham (2008) on academic writing competence of Turkish scholars presents quite similar problems, with respondents agreeing that writing in English is difficult despite the fact that Turkish scholars in her study completed graduate studies in the United States and worked there for a number of years. Difficulty in refining expression and finding the right vocabulary, the inappropriate use of a formal register and writing long sentences together with a lack of “complex persuasion and complex structures” (Buckingham, 2008, p. 8) are but some of the difficulties experienced by both Turkish and Romanian writers.

Writing in a foreign language is a challenge for most respondents, but not for all. One researcher finds it easier to write in English than in Romanian. This finding can be explained through extended contact with English language literature – indeed, it may be easier to write about certain ideas in the language in which we encountered those ideas as readers.

- ‘Writing in English seems more natural, easier ... I write more fluently than in Romanian. At the moment I am writing my PhD thesis in Romanian. It’s an ordeal, I cannot find my linking words, constructing complex sentences is difficult. I’d rather do it in English.’ (Reflection Guide 11)

All respondents share the view that improved writing is the result of practice. Writing is learned through text drafting and revision, as well as through reading and language training. A certain pressure to write in English seems to be regarded as beneficial. Having to read in English and to write one’s own articles is one way of improving writing ability (Reflection Guide 4). Such findings support the view of Canagarajah (2007, p. 927) that “acquisition and use go hand in hand”.

Proofreaders are indicated as a feasible solution to improving text rhetoric and accuracy, although ‘they usually correct tenses and prepositions, but seldom make useful suggestions about text organisation.’ (Interview 4). Indeed, the literature has described a complex, both content- and text-oriented role of ‘literacy brokers’ (Lillis & Curry, 2006), as well as difficulties encountered by ‘convenience editors’ in performing this role due to their lack of familiarity with the conventions of scientific writing in a range of disciplines (Willey & Tanimoto, 2013). Some of the participants (Reflection Guides 3, 13, 16) expect proofreaders to provide quite detailed feedback on their writing by referring to text coherence, the link between ideas and the overall argument structure.

Extended collaboration between researchers and proofreaders (which the interviewee below describes as ‘interdisciplinary’) seems to offer a solution to both methodological and linguistic challenges. Only one of the participants in this study has brought up the need for closer collaboration with language and other specialists throughout the research process, but it is an important point which offers an alternative to the long-standing practice of requesting assistance of language specialists in the final stages of article drafting.

- ‘For most articles I have worked together with a statistician. In order to get published in a prestigious journal, collaboration with an English language specialist is necessary as well. I think that interdisciplinary research teams are the solution.’ (Reflection Guide 12).

Proficient English users are those who have developed, through prolonged engagement with the language, strategies to improve their language skills. Active engagement in learning means creating opportunities for learning – ‘listening to UK radio, picking words and phrases from the press and trying to use them when producing language’ (Reflection Guide 11). Such

data indicates an awareness of the need to be committed and dynamically engaged in the process of developing one's own language skills, together with the respondent's extended language-learning experience, of other languages as well.

Responses also differ depending on the respondents' publication record. High English language proficiency researchers who did manage to publish in top-ranked English-language journals have developed precise strategies for improving their writing, such as assembling a collection of collocations, phrases and language used to express certain rhetorical functions encountered in articles (Interview 4). Writing original ideas straight into English generates confidence (Reflection Guide 9) and several responses indicate a change of strategy in this respect, from writing in Romanian and then translating into English to writing the article straight into English and revising it subsequently.

- 'I read articles in English and paraphrase relevant points which I may want to cite in future articles. ... Ongoing revision includes reading aloud in order to avoid repetition and to make sure the rhythm is appropriate. Real progress occurred when I started writing new ideas straight into English.' (Interview 2)

Not all English-language proficient participants are interested in targeting high-profile journals, though. One impatient junior researcher, highly proficient in English, prefers to 'voice' his ideas in local, less reputable publications and make an immediate albeit limited contribution to a largely unexplored field of study like sports marketing.

- 'It simply takes too long to get published in a top international journal. Instead of spending a long time on one article in which I can put forward only one main idea, I prefer to publish more articles locally. And that is not because of any obsession with quantity but because I think I have many good ideas and I want to communicate them all.' (Reflection Guide 11)

The profile of participants who have not published internationally in recent years is diverse. The data and the informal accounts I had access to through my involvement with the participants over the course of their MA studies support the claim that international publication requires a solid combination of methodological, rhetorical and linguistic abilities. One participant has avoided international journals because of modest English language competence, while two others with considerably higher linguistic proficiency explain their reticence by insufficient knowledge of current research methodologies, in particular of interpreting and designing complex statistical models which seem to be preferred by high-ranking journals. Even some of the researchers who published in such journals are concerned about the value of the contribution they can actually make to the major debates in their field as long as 'the topics relevant for our context have already been discussed in the literature.' (Interview 3).

The complex blend of skills necessary for international English language publication calls for development of research-writing training tools. Such methods may not need to be particularly innovative – the literature provides examples that one can usefully draw upon – but rather to find the appropriate focus adapted to the needs of specific groups of researchers. Doubts have been expressed about the efficacy of teaching approaches that focus primarily on lexical and grammatical features of academic discourse while neglecting the non-linguistic dimension of international publication. "There is more to preparing young scholars in writing for publication than just the 'nuts and bolts' of lexicogrammar" (Flowerdew, 2013, p. 10).

Improvement of research publication skills requires, at the very least, "developing very specific skills in English as an additional language, ... and learning to meet the discipline-specific expectations of English-speaking journal referees and editors" (Cargill & O'Connor, 2006, p. 207). Cargill and O'Connor propose a training approach that draws on genre analysis and integrates guided analysis of sample texts followed by article-drafting activities. Highlighting the genre specificity of research articles and the language used to communicate structural elements provides a necessary link between structure, rhetoric and language, and may provide a strong foundation for "raising awareness of the ways language is used to most persuasive effect and encouraging reflection on writers' own preferred argument practices" (Hyland, 2007, p. 89). Similar aims of EAP instruction are proposed by the 'critical pragmatic' approach suggested by Harwood and Hadley (2004, p. 355) whereby learners are encouraged to learn the accepted conventions while constructing their own voice.

With a view to my own setting, a suitable training strategy may usefully combine understanding of dominant rhetorical functions communicated in research articles with using an expanding set of language resources for expressing researchers' intended meanings. Rather than become straightjackets, established conventions can thus offer a framework within which writers can be creative. If encouraging "creative reflection on the practice of science as well as its communication" (Cargill & O'Connor, 2006, p. 219) can be achieved in the EAP classroom, the focus on the production of text proposed by the same authors requires flexible training schedules. Nevertheless, engaging trainees in drafting and revising their own texts is definitely a worthwhile task that deserves adequate space in a researcher development programme.

#### 4. Concluding reflections

This study has explored the range of factors underpinning Romanian researchers' motivation to communicate their research in English-medium journals and the lessons they have learned in the process of publication. The interest in this topic has arisen from practice and the origins of the study have generated its limitations. The study is meant to explore practice-derived insights and thus it can only make a limited theoretical contribution. It does contribute, though, to understanding circumstances in which off-network researchers operate, the multiple layers of expertise leading to successful publication and the strategies researchers have developed in the process of approaching journals. Such data can contribute to informing practical decisions about how publication access can be facilitated. The richness of the findings opens up a whole range of future research topics that can be explored from individual, institutional and textual perspectives. Analysing the process of

learning the practice of international publication by researchers who managed to publish in high-profile journals is one such topic, as is understanding how writing practices change as off-network scholars progress their careers. Both of these avenues may further inform the development of appropriate teaching approaches. Comparing perceived linguistic and rhetorical difficulties with textual features may be another worthwhile research topic.

The wish for continuous development of research skills stands out as a key theme of these findings and highlights the need for individual and institutional action. While it is not within the scope of this study to discuss systemic change and the complex enterprise of research capacity development, the findings indicate the need for structural change based on integration of research and teaching, on building research capacity and enabling academics to fulfil their potential in research and/or teaching, without applying the same set of criteria indiscriminately. They equally call for a coherent provision of resources that includes access to international research networks and to the latest scholarly journals, revised PhD supervision practices, as well as methodological and linguistic development. These are all elements of a multifarious reality that calls for concerted action and presents considerable challenges to universities whose international profile depends on the performance of their academic staff.

All the areas indicated above could make suitable topics for training provision, probably one of the most immediate actions academic institutions can take. In addition to training, experiential learning through direct, hands-on involvement in research collaborative projects may be a useful form of research expertise development. Indeed, [Wray and Wallace \(2011, p. 241\)](#) justifiably claim that “expertise is a holistic attribute” and warn about the risk of “fragmenting recipients’ learning experiences” (p. 242). They propose an integrated system of training, mentoring and coaching whereby learning “can be stimulated and enhanced through collective engagement with other learners and facilitators, whether in formal training settings, informal networks or ‘communities of practice’” (p. 254). International coaching, whereby off-network researchers work together with peer coaches from research-intensive international universities, may be a suitable research capacity-building tool leading to increased awareness of research practices, greater access to research networks and indirectly to linguistic refinement. While several generous options for higher inclusion of peripheral researchers have been put forward ([Salager-Meyer, 2008](#)), I believe it is worthwhile reiterating the proposal for international coaching, which could possibly be achieved through more focused institutional planning of participation in international research projects within the framework provided by large scale European Union-funded projects.

## Acknowledgements

This study is dedicated to the Romanian researchers who participated in the EDURES Master programme at the Bucharest University of Economic Studies. Their commitment to continuously upgrading their English language proficiency and research writing abilities has generated valuable insights about the challenges and intricacies of writing and publishing in prestigious journals.

This article has improved in the process of revision and I am grateful to the reviewers and journal editor for their comments and suggestions. The review process itself was a source of learning and awareness-building about the standards and requirements of international publication.

## Appendix 1. Reflection guide

1. What is the role of research in your career advancement/professional development plans? What motivates you to engage in research/prevents you from getting involved?
2. Research activity features strongly among promotion criteria. Are such criteria suitable for our academic culture? Do they contribute to enhancing quality of higher education?
3. What motivates you to target high-profile English-medium journals for dissemination of your research?
4. What prevents you from targeting high-profile English-medium journals for dissemination of your research?
5. Please describe your personal experience of publication in high-profile journals and highlight the stages in the process that are memorable in a positive or negative sense. What have you learned from that experience?
6. Please describe the stages in the preparation of a manuscript for publication. (You can refer to any of the following aspects: journal selection, familiarity with articles published in that journal, awareness of structural and rhetorical conventions, collaboration with colleagues and feedback, text revision, communication with reviewers, any other aspects you find relevant).
7. With regard to writing an article in English, which are the structural, rhetorical, linguistic elements that you find most difficult? Which elements can you handle most confidently?
8. What strategies have you developed with respect to improving and refining your ability to write research articles in English to the standards expected by scholarly journals?

## Appendix 2. Interview guide

Interviews are to be conducted with those respondents who managed to publish in prestigious journals attempting to explore and understand their experience. Focus should be on specific experiences and lessons learned by researchers.

Issues to address during the interview:

1. International publication versus publishing in truly prestigious, usually Anglo-American journals. Maybe researchers avoid targeting such prestigious journals in the first place. Is this perception correct?
2. The main barriers that (a) prevent researchers from targeting prestigious journals and (b) prevent them from actually getting published. (To further investigate reflection guide data about little awareness of methodological options and ability to use/design complex econometric models, expectations of support).
3. The specific features of economics and business research field – implications for publication.
4. Learning the characteristics of the publication process and learning from practice (by doing) – key stages/episodes/people in developing awareness of the process, planning and progress over time, sources of learning, etc.
5. Dealing with reviewers' feedback – acceptance, learning, confusion?
6. Value of collaboration? With whom?
7. Specific article drafting strategies – any recent changes? What generated them?
8. Post-publication reflection – main lessons learned from publication success

### Appendix 3. Themes/Categories/Subcategories and codes for the Reflection Guide and Interviews

Themes	Categories	Subcategories/Description	Codes
1. Engagement in research (Motivation)	Personal reasons	Genuine interest to explore certain topics	ENG – Interest
		Intellectual development	ENG – Development
		Fighting isolation	ENG – Participation
	Career advancement Professional reasons	Liaise with researchers	ENG – Career
		Impact of research results	ENG – Networking
		Knowledge creation	ENG – Disseminating
		Relevance for teaching	ENG – Knowledge
			ENG – Teaching
	Financial reasons		ENG – Welfare
2. Role of promotion criteria	Focus on quality	Alignment to international best-practice	ENG – Teaching
	Immediate compliance impossible	Limited resources	CRI – Quality
3. Resources (Motivation)	Access to literature and databases	Neglect of teaching	CRI – Teaching
		Inadequate	RES – Literature
	Networking internationally	Inadequate	RES – Networks
	Research skills development	Inadequate – barrier to publication in reputable journals	RES – Methodology
	PhD Guidance	Inadequate regarding research planning	RES – PhD
4. Institutional support	English language proficiency	From inadequate to need for refinement	RES – EL Proficiency
	Expect support	Institutional duty	SUP – INSTITUTION
	Proactive attitude	Personal undertaking	SUP – PROACTIVE
	System overhaul	To integrate teaching with research	SUP – INTEGRATION
		Personalised career priorities	SUP – CHOICES
5. Confidence	Strong – sources	Good language skills	CONF – EL High
		Publication success	CONF – Publication
		Collaboration with international researchers	CONF – Collaboration
	Weak – sources (affecting motivation to target high-profile journals)	Poor research skills	CONF – Research
6. Frustration/Confusion	Doctoral support	Low EL proficiency	CONF – EL Low
		Reluctant editors	CONF – editors
	EL proficiency	High journal standards	CONF – standards
		Sophisticated methodologies	CONF – Research
		Inappropriate guidance generates confusion	FRU – Guidance
		Prevents communication of ideas	FRU – EL
		Lack of control on writing	FRU – EL
7. Learning experiences and processes	Reviewers' feedback	Contradictory	FRU – Feedback
	Disregard of research results	Business and/or public sectors	FRU – Use
	Focus on argument construction		LE – Critical
	Careful manuscript preparation	Awareness of editorial policies	LEPREP – Policy
		Article redrafting	LEPREP – drafting
	Constant involvement in research	Integration of doing and writing research	LEINTEGRATE – doing and writing

(continued on next page)

(continued)

Themes	Categories	Subcategories/Description	Codes
8. Improving research writing proficiency	Reasons for rejection	Narrow topics/small-scale research Inadequate methodology	LEREJTopic LEREJ – Method
	Reviewers' feedback	Mismatch with journal objectives	LEREJ – Objectives
		Valuable feedback from reviewers	LEREV – FeedbackL
		specialising in niche domains	
		Source of confusion if	LEREV – FeedbackC
		Loss of motivation	LEREV – FeedbackM
	Responding to reviews	To be accepted and resolved	LEREV – FeedbackAccept
		Joint authorship helps responding	LEREV – Collaboration
		Improving EL proficiency	LEEL – Control
		Gaining control of writing	
	Interdisciplinary teams	Collaboration with statisticians and linguists	LETEAM – Interdisciplinary
	Areas in need of improvement	Accuracy	ELIMP – accuracy
		Complex syntactic patterns	ELIMP – syntax
		Word order	ELIMP – WO
	Areas of perceived progress	Redundant writing	ELIMP – Redundant
		Mastery of academic register	ELIMP – AcRegister
		Mastery of specialised vocabulary	ELPROG – SpVoc
		Expressing claims (hedging)	ELPROG – Hedging
		Clearer sentence structure	ELPROG – sentence structure
		Better structure of sections	STRUCSECTION
		Link LitRev – models	STRUCLINK
		Link Findings-Conclusions	STRUCLINK
	Strategies for improving RA drafting	Collaboration/support from language brokers	ELSTRAT – LgBrokers
		Exposure to target language	ELSTRAT – exposure
		Extended writing practice	ELSTRAT – practice
		Creating a corpus of academic phrases (collocations, functional language)	ELSTRAT – corpus
		Reading and writing down main ideas	ELSTRAT – Read/Write
		Writing new ideas straight into English	ELSTRAT – ideas
		Experience of learning other languages	ELSTRAT – other lang
		Many ideas that deserve to be communicated	NOINT – Impatience
9. Lack of interest in scholarly publication	Time consuming		
10. Barriers to publication in high-profile journals (Resources/Motivation)	Low EL proficiency (perceived and real)	Avoid targeting prestigious journals	BAR – EL
	Inadequate methodological skills	Design of econometric models	BAR – METH
	Limited contribution to knowledge	Insignificant topics	BAR – TOPIC
	Incoherent/Opportunistic approach	Limited contact with the literature in the field	BAR – LIT
		Targeting many journals with different styles	BAR – OPP
	Attitude to reviews	Perceived as failure	BAR – REW

## References

- Belcher, D. D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 1–22.
- Buckingham, L. (2008). Development of English academic writing competence by Turkish scholars. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 3, 1–18.
- Buckingham, L. (2013). Building a career in English: Users of English as an additional language in academia in the Gulf. *TESOL Quarterly*, 124, 1–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tesq.124>.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua Franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(Focus Issue), 923–939.
- Candlin, C. N., & Hyland, K. (1999). Introduction: Integrating approaches to the study of writing. In C. Candlin, & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes and practice* (pp. 1–18). London: Longman.
- Cargill, M. (2006). Developing skills for publishing research articles internationally. In X. Hu, & Y. Hei (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second ESL teaching and research international seminar, September 2004* (pp. 1–16). Xi'an, P. R. China: Northwestern Polytechnical University Press.
- Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2006). Developing Chinese scientists' skills for publishing in English: Evaluating collaborating-colleague workshops based on genre analysis. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5, 207–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.07.002>.
- Cho, W. D. (2009). Science journal paper writing in an EFL context: The case of Korea. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28, 230–239.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2005). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2010). Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29, 281–295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2010.06.002>.
- Duszak, A., & Lewkowicz, J. (2008). Publishing academic texts in English: A Polish perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 108–120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.001>.
- Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: Questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Iberica*, 13, 7–38.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 243–264.
- Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an additional language: What can Goffman's "Stigma" tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 77–86.



- Flowerdew, J. (2013). Some thoughts on English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) and related issues. *Language Teaching*, 1–13 (FirstView Article). <http://journals.cambridge.org/LTA>.
- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 1–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.09.005>.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Harwood, N., & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: Critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 355–377. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2003.08.001>.
- Huang, C. J. (2010). Publishing and learning writing for publication in English: Perspectives of NNEs PhD students in science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9, 33–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.10.001>.
- Hyland, K. (2007). English for Professional Academic Purposes: Writing for scholarly publication. In D. Belcher (Ed.), *Teaching language purposefully: English for Specific Purposes in theory and practice* (pp. 1–27). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2011). Welcome to the machine: Thoughts on writing for scholarly publication. *Journal of Second Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 58–68.
- Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 1–12. [www.elsevier.com/locate/jjeap](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jjeap).
- Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication*, 23(1), 3–35.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London: Sage.
- Moreno, A. I., Rey-Rocha, J., Burgess, S., López-Navarro, I., & Sachdev, I. (2012). Spanish researchers' perceived difficulty writing research articles for English medium journals: The impact of proficiency in English versus publication experience. *Iberica*, 24, 157–184.
- Mur-Duenas, P. (2012). Getting research published internationally in English: An ethnographic account of a team of Finance Spanish scholars' struggles. *Iberica*, 24, 139–156.
- Muresan, L. M., & Bardi, M. (2013). A genre-based approach to teaching research writing in a Romanian EAP context. *Diversité et Identité Culturelle en Europe*, 10(2), 25–39.
- Perez-Llantada, C., Plo, R., & Ferguson, G. R. (2011). 'You don't say what you know, only what you can': The perceptions and practices of senior Spanish academics regarding research dissemination in English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30, 18–30.
- Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 121–132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.009>.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (2013). Writing and publishing in peripheral scholarly journals: How to enhance the global influence of multilingual scholars? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.11.003>.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J. (2012). Academic literacies: Providing a space for the socio-political dynamics of EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purpose*, 11, 17–25.
- Uzun, S. (2008). Multilingual scholars' participation in core/global academic communities: A literature review. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 250–263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.007>.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willey, L., & Tanimoto, K. (2013). 'Convenience editors' as legitimate participants in the practice of scientific editing: An interview study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 23–32.
- Wingate, U. (2006). Doing away with 'study skills'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), 457–469. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562510600874268>.
- Wray, A., & Wallace, M. (2011). Accelerating the development of expertise: A step-change in social science research capacity building. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 59(3), 241–264.

**Mirela Bardi** (PhD in Linguistics, University of Lancaster, UK), is associate professor of the Department of Modern Languages and Business Communication at Bucharest University of Economic Studies, where she teaches Writing for International Publication and Qualitative Research Methodology to MA students and professional researchers.