International Journal of Educational Research 111 (2022) 101917

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Educational Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijedures

From academic writing to academics writing: Transitioning towards literacies for research productivity

Ibrar Bhatt [a,*], Udi Samanhudi [b]

[a] School of Social Sciences, Education & Social Work, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK
[b] Faculty of Education, Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University, Banten, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
research productivity
academic literacies
Research writing
academic publishing
literacy studies
academic staff

ABSTRACT

This article examines how international shifts in research writing, including performance policies and competitive research evaluation regimes, are creating a new set of expectations upon academics in Indonesia. Utilising a social practice approach to literacy, and with a cross-disciplinary sample of twenty-two academics at both private and public universities, we explore how early-career academics in Indonesia transition to research productivity. We investigate the tools and resources academics draw upon, and how academic success, prestige, and internationalism are conceptualised. We note that academics must amalgamate new literacy practices to contend with multiple and conflicting demands on time, abilities, allegiances, the double-bind of local versus international research impact, as well as inequalities of experience constituting peripheries within an already existing periphery.

1. Introduction

This article examines how early career academics in Indonesian universities transition from writing as part of their doctoral study to writing for research productivity. Using a social practice approach to literacy, we draw from the accounts of academics employed within both public and private universities in Indonesia to investigate the specific features of: i) How knowledge is produced and distributed through the scholarly writing practices emerging in their current career stage; ii) How learning to write and becoming 'productive' academics are linked to expectations around doctoral training; and, more broadly, iii) How international shifts in higher education policy on research productivity are creating new sets of expectations upon academics working in Indonesian universities. The research attempts, therefore, to fill a key gap in the higher education knowledge base on how recent international shifts in university markets are creating a new set of expectations for academics in countries where managerialism and high-performance research practices are being newly applied in universities.

2. Academics writing in Indonesia

The research is situated within the context of Indonesian universities. Over the last decade, the Indonesian Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education ('Ristekdikti') has stipulated directives to improve the quality and quantity of academic publications emerging from the country's private and public universities (Ristekdikti, 2015). This is in line with an increase in government funding

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: i.bhatt@qub.ac.uk (I. Bhatt).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101917
Received 4 September 2021; Received in revised form 29 November 2021; Accepted 17 December 2021
Available online 22 December 2021
0883-0355/

with a proviso that Indonesian academics should manage their own research writing agenda through, among other things, increased use of academic publishing in top-ranking international journals (Ristekdikti, 2017a). Indonesian universities have responded, in many cases hastily (Sandy & Shen, 2019), with financial incentive schemes to encourage academics to publish, and the incorporation of policies which are characterised by market rationalities, including quantifiable output measures and performance targets.

The private sector, which constitutes by far the greater bulk of Indonesian universities, has been responsible for much of the expansion in the country's higher education (Welch, 2007). Part of this expansion is through public universities being made to adopt strategies, including managerialism, from the private sector (Harun et al., 2020). This echoes a trend across other parts of Asia (see Poole & Chen, 2009) but in Indonesia's case this is integrated with pre-existing statist models of higher education. Given that these reforms were meant to level the field in response to public-private disparity and the strong tradition of centralism in Indonesia, where power and resources emanate from Jakarta, there is a need to examine its effect on the writing practices and career paths of Indonesia's academics across the country.

The impetus is not just for Indonesia's academics to publish, but to publish in English and for a global audience, an imperative that is echoed in scholarly writing practices elsewhere, including across Eurasia, Latin America, and Africa (see Curry & Lillis, 2017). Academics working in 'peripheral' countries, that is to say, locations that are dependent on anglophone 'centre' countries in terms of knowledge production (Canagarajah, 2002; Lillis, 2012), now have to publish more articles in English than in their native language (Huttner-Koros, 2015). In Indonesia, as our research shows, pressures to publish research in English, and for a global readership, are uncomfortably contrasted with aims closer to home: to publish in Indonesian-medium journals to achieve an evidently local impact.

Concomitantly, there has been a massive increase in the number of international doctoral training scholarships for Indonesian students to attend global research-intensive universities (Ristekdikti, 2017b). Over the last decade, the Indonesian government has invested hugely in research training and initiated a number of scholarship schemes to send lecturers from both public and private universities to 'global top-200' universities for doctoral training. These schemes include the 'Indonesian Education Scholarship'[1], the 'Scholarship for World Class University Program'[2], a joint scholarship programme between the Indonesian ministries of Finance and of Education and Culture (BUDI programme), and, in order to develop the academic workforce from Islamic and Catholic universities, a scholarship scheme through the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA). In all of these schemes the emphasis is on currently employed lecturers undertaking a doctorate in a global top-200 university, usually ascertained through QS rankings, with the objective of bridging gaps in the quality of research and teaching at public and private universities. In line with Indonesia's strategic development goals, priority is accorded to the areas of STEM, agriculture, health and maritime studies.

How Indonesian academics, particularly new and early career scholars, respond to new pressures and learn to produce knowledge through research writing is now more salient to the enterprise of the Indonesian university system than ever before. Relatedly, there is a pressing need to examine the role of doctoral training in research-intensive universities, and how these new academic workers aspire to develop the skills to become '*publishable*' (and eventually, published) international scholars.

3. Literacy, social practice & academic work

Literacy has a significant but complex relationship with social life. In public debate, however, literacy is often talked about as being a skill, or a set of skills, belonging to an individual, divorced from context and easily transferred. But if we are to understand the culture of research writing in the lives of academics in Indonesia, and what they need to know to be able to thrive in their transforming workplaces, we have to think about academic writing beyond a skills-based notion. We need to foreground the social dimensions of their writing practices in order to understand the ways in which those practices instantiate value systems, identity work, and how they are closely connected to establishing and maintaining relationships.

This project is framed within this 'social practice' perspective to literacy, in which literacy is understood as being 'rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, being' (Street, 2005, 417). Methodologically, a social practice perspective takes an ethnographic commitment to context as the key starting point. This means that in our examination of the literacy practices of academic professional work in Indonesia, we have focussed on how these practices are developed and maintained through interactions that occur within specific social contexts, and how they emerge in entangled systems of people and objects. Informed by Bazerman (2008), in this research we are also sensitive to how academic literacy practices have specific histories, that they evolve over time in a cultural ecology (Selfe & Hawisher, 2004), and that they illuminate the ways in which power and social structure are organised (Brandt, 1995; 2009).

This research also links closely with the field of academic literacies and academic writing research. These areas of inquiry have increasingly begun to examine the impact of "evaluation regimes" and university rankings particularly on multilingual scholars writing in English. A burgeoning of recent edited collections documenting such studies include Curry and Lillis (2017), Cargill and Burgess (2017), and Habibie and Hyland (2019), and work that is both multidisciplinary and that which spans different geolinguistic locations and higher education systems (see detailed review by Curry and Lillis 2019). Analytic themes in these studies include the focus on English-medium publishing for multilingual scholars, writing practices and publishing conventions, and how these are set within specific national and institutional policy contexts.

For example, Lillis and Curry's (2010) long-term ethnographic study with multilingual scholars in different European universities highlights the challenges that multilingual academics face when writing in English for a global audience. Their research shows that academics in countries where English is not a dominant language, such as the context of our study, face difficult choices about

[1] *Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pemerintah*. See https://www.lpdp.kemenkeu.go.id/IN/post/kebijakan-beasiswa-lpdp-tahun-2019

[2] *Kementrian agama Republik Indonesia* program. See https://scholarship.kemenag.go.id/

publishing frequently in English for rewards such as prestige, salary and promotion, versus targeting a more direct and regional audience, echoing an account also given by Nygaard (2017). For peripherally located scholars, publishing in English for global scholarly exchange necessitates extra resources in terms of time and effort, and often means having to attend English-language events, read and review English-language papers, and have sustained interactions with academics in English. All of these inherently require a certain set of anglophonic linguistic norms as part of effective scholarly work.

An important study in the UK context is Tusting *et al*'s (2019) study of nine research sites across three universities in England. The study addresses how academics manage the daily task of writing within the large, bureaucratic regimes of modern universities. Their research supports the notion that writing as a social act is less about the solitary individual; rather, it is the product of an 'assemblage' of people and things acting together to produce not just academic 'outputs' that are measured by research assessment exercises, but that they also give rise to identities that characterise what it means to *be* an academic. They also found that research writing is hugely techno-bureaucratic with academics having to sometimes make important boundary-setting decisions between work and home, research and non-research writing, and use of social media to support writing. Notably, and importantly for our project, learning to write as an academic in Tusting *et al*'s study was more dependent on support within one's own network and informal relationships rather than formal training processes.

4. A project with Indonesian academics

4.1. Participants and methods

The project was funded by the primary author's institution and used a cross-disciplinary sample of twenty-two Indonesian academics over a two-year period. Participants were recruited via 'snowball' method, asking our professional networks in the first instance to participate, and then building on this initial set of contacts. With the primary author having networked extensively in Indonesia and the second author an Indonesia-based academic, this approach yielded the required mix of participants for the study. As highlighted in Table 1, we aimed to achieve a reasonable spread of participants in terms of gender, discipline area, institution type (e.g. religious ethos, technical), location within Indonesia, and academics employed at both public and private universities. Additionally, participants were either doctoral students while employed or had recently graduated (maximum five years since) from research intensive universities, thereby qualifying as 'early career' academics who were either at 'doctoral' or 'immediately postdoctoral' (ESRC, 2016) stages of their careers.

In line with our aims to investigate how academics are broadly responding to policies which are applicable to the entire Indonesian university sector, and to avoid saturation, we stopped recruitment when we had enough of a spread to assess commonalities across the fields and university types. We address the following research questions in this paper:

1 How is knowledge produced through the scholarly literacy practices of early career academics based at Indonesian universities?
2 How are scholarly literacy practices shaped and supported by new productivity mandates, doctoral training, and digital media use?

Overall, the study sought to examine how Indonesian academics are learning to write *as academics*, where systems of support can be better targeted, the role of doctoral training, and the extent to which it is a sufficient apprenticeship for changing scholarly expectations in Indonesian universities. Data collection was conducted over a two-year period via face-to-face methods within Indonesia and the UK, and through online interviews during the COVID19 pandemic, as outlined below.

4.2. Data collection

This paper reports upon the interview phase of the project, which involved interviews with all twenty-two participants, as outlined in tables 1 and 2. Upon the granting of ethical approval from the research ethics committee of the School of Social Sciences, Education & Social Work at Queen's University Belfast (Northern Ireland, UK), the participants were provided with an English-language description of the project and were asked for their consent. Where deemed necessary, project details were discussed in Indonesian.

Table 1
Interviewees from private universities.

Pseudonym (gender)	Discipline	Region in Indonesia
Aziz (m)*	Food Science	West Java
Budi (m)*	Linguistics	West Kalimantan
Dani (m)*	Chemistry	Bali
Tio (m)	Marketing	Aceh
Rani (f)*	Management	East Java
Ranti (f)	Maths	Central Java
Rio (m)*	Maths	Papua
Rita (f)	Management	East Java
Silvi (f)	Biological Sciences	East Java
Tri (f)	Computer Sciences	South Sumatra
Aunur (m)	Education	West Nusa Tenggara

Table 2
Interviewees from public universities.

Pseudonym	Discipline	Region in Indonesia
Danish (m)	English Language Education	West Java
Dika (f)*	Pharmacy	South Sumatra
Dina (f)*	Management	West Nusa Tenggara
Fajar (m)*	Food Nutrition	West Sulawesi
Girindra (f)	Linguistics	Central Java
Lisa (f)*	Education	West Kalimantan
Nuri (m)*	Education	Central Java
Munir (m)	Geophysics	Aceh
Suyanto (m)	Physics	Central Java
Tina (f)	Economics	West Java
Wayan (m)	English Language Education	Bali

*Participants also recruited for further phases of the study

Semi-structured interviews lasted about sixty minutes, were conducted in English, and had two points of focus: The first, *academic writing histories*, involved asking respondents about how they learned to write as academics, their perceptions of internationalism and collaboration, career path motivations, and how systems of support have developed up to this point in their careers. The second area of focus, *academic writing futures*, targeted issues such as career trajectory, future aspirations, developmental strategies for writing, and evolving academic identities. Participants were also sent a series of prompts in advance of the interviews to help them think about and prepare their responses.

4.3. Data analysis

The interview recordings were transcribed, anonymised in terms of university and participants' names, and other identifying details, and then forwarded to the interviewees for them to check and comment upon to establish the credibility of the data before analysis. This also allowed them to add anything further to what they had discussed. This was followed by a process of thematic coding which then evolved into a pattern-coded framework of analysis (Saldaña, 2013). This enabled us to identify the emergent patterns from the data which we have drawn together into the themes discussed within this paper. These themes, crystallised into the sections below, orient towards the specific features of: how writing is a means of becoming international; how knowledge is produced through writing practices; how writing for publication is learned; and how this relates to respondents' expectations during doctoral training.

5. Findings

5.1. Becoming International

Among the project's findings are important insights about how literacy practices for publishing are integral to differing perspectives about what becoming 'international' means for early career academics in Indonesia. In the context of changing incentivisation and reward systems, it has become increasingly important for our research participants to work and co-publish with colleagues outside Indonesia to yield higher citation rates and demonstrate prestige through a global network. In the interviews we asked the participants explicit questions about what it means to be an 'international academic' and if they consider themselves 'international'. Our participants answered by underlining their aims to publish their work in internationally renowned journals under the assumption that it will gain a wider readership and at the same time expand possibilities for networking with scholars overseas. Echoing Kwiek (2019), these benefits were often assumed and seen as contingent on doctoral training abroad. For example, Lisa, who had just completed her PhD in Education and works for a public university in Kalimantan, highlights that:

International identity is gained since, as I studied abroad, I got immersed in research-based knowledge and I worked on research supervised by an international supervisor. This situation leads me to feel like I am a part of international academia.

Relating these aims directly to her writing, she argues that '*being international means having international publications in indexed journals*'. These aims are not just about personal professional development through institutional requirements to publish in journals which are indexed within the Scopus database, regarded as a proxy for high quality across all participants, but are also related to the need to write for a global audience and achieving wider impact and repute. To this end, connecting and subsequently collaborating with academic colleagues abroad (discussed further in the section below) emerged as a key aim for the academics in this study, and is something which they hoped to have achieved through doctoral training abroad.

Most of the academics in this study who described themselves as 'international' did so on the basis that they had completed an 'international degree' and worked with an 'international supervisor'. Becoming international was therefore highlighted as contingent on collaboration opportunities, networking, and the prestige of international affiliation, as both Girindra and Nuri highlight:

I am not that international, because I do not have many opportunities to work together. So now I am focussing on Mandarin, and working more with Asian academics. 'International' for me means talking in the same language. (Girindra, Linguistics, public university)

I was invited as a consultant on a project in Saudi Arabia recently. To me an international academic is someone who is invited to teach or speak, as plenary speaker, in different universities. Being international in this way is important, as my university is pushing us to be visiting professors overseas. (Nuri, Education, public university)

Unlike Lisa, Girindra and Nuri highlight how their conceptions of being international are not dependent on their doctoral programmes abroad but by activities undertaken afterwards, particularly invitations to speak, teach, and exchange knowledge leading to more established connections with overseas partners. Girindra was one of several participants who leveraged networks more regionally, across East-Asia, through her knowledge of Mandarin, rather than universities within the Anglosphere-centre. For academics like Nuri, Girindra, and others, becoming international is also bound up with Indonesia's role as an important player amongst East-Asian economies closer to home; and, in the case of Nuri, another Muslim-majority country. Ideas of international prestige and status, therefore, have regional and cultural indicators, and also draw from academics' linguistic repertoires.

We found that an international research orientation was not always commensurate with institutional hierarchies of prestige where 'local' academics, who may have missed out on international scholarship opportunities and who may have published widely in their local language, find themselves competing against 'international' academics who return from doctorates abroad with a clear publication plan and an international network. Engaging in international activities also encountered obstacles and pressures upon academics who felt that their work has more local relevance. For example, Dina, in Management at a public university in West Nusa Tenggara, told us that:

The pressure is from colleagues. If I have a colleague who publishes many articles in international journals or in the Scopus Indexed journals, it will motivate me to publish myself. It's pressure from the university environment.

Those who struggled with international connections and networks usually set a different standard for what being international means to them, and often this was related to the demands of the discipline. For example, Munir, in Geophysics at a public university in Aceh, told us that in his field being international means: '*Doing scientific collaboration with international institutions. To this day, I have not achieved this*'.

This was echoed by Suyanto, another academic in physics, based at a public university in Central Java, and whose work centres on natural disasters within Indonesia:

I connect with Japanese and Australian academics, but some disasters only happen in our country. For example, Merapi Mountain is a unique type of volcano, and we have the specialist knowledge, but without the resources and technology from the Japanese and Australians.

International collaboration and productivity varied across academic discipline and academic institution type. Achieving an internationalist outlook for our participants was not so straightforward in departments where international work is non-existent, or only just beginning. Aziz, a Food Sciences lecturer in a private university in West Java, told us that his department published around five to ten papers a year all of which were in national publications:

There is no international publication. It is a huge problem that means that me and my friends are not ready to compete with others. Not because we don't know the field or the science, but because we don't know how to write, how to present our work, and achieve a good publication in an international journal.

Further obstacles to becoming international also emerged in the data. Some of these are outlined by Lisa as follows: '*The [English] language barrier, limited access to journals, limited funding from government (but this is now getting better), limited time to write as Indonesian lecturers handle many classes*'. But Lisa also notes that recent developments in university policies have alleviated these barriers, including allocated writing time as part of workload models for academics in some public universities. In this respect, Rani in Management at a private university in East Java told us: '*I don't consider myself an international academic because I am stuck with admin duties. This makes me so sad.'*

How academics transitioned from a perceived local to an internationalist perspective was also an important finding. Sometimes this was contingent on their discipline, as Wayan, in English Language Education told us: '*An international perspective is vital in English Language Teaching*'. Budi, a Linguistics lecturer at a private university in Kalimantan told us that he achieved such a transition through:

Reading international journals to see a different perspective from the local journals. Second, I discuss a lot with researchers and colleagues who have already published several international journals to develop a researcher view and how to present the findings. How to change from, for example, Indonesians' perspective to the international perspective.

5.2. Co-authorship and collaboration

One important dimension to becoming international is that of international collaboration and co-authorship. There is, of course, an important distinction to be made between doing research together as 'collaborating' and publishing through 'co-authoring'; our participants tended to underline their claims with the assumption that the former will be a pathway to achieving the latter.

Participants tended to see collaborating as part of broader work in their institution, such as establishing memoranda of agreement with universities in other countries, and inviting international guest lecturers – many of which are now conducted online (mostly via the Zoom platform) since the COVID19 pandemic. Co-authoring, however, was seen as serving individual career-oriented goals and in many cases dependent upon networks established during the doctoral process. In this respect, collaborating was closely linked to mentoring, as Lisa highlights: '*a collaborator plays a role as a reader who checks the clarity and alignment of my writing … and giving feedback on the quality of writing*' (Lisa, Education, public university). The period of doctoral training, as we shall see in the next section, is a key instigator for collaboration and sometimes co-authoring continued into the post PhD career.

Some academics have expectations around international collaboration and this can also extend into co-authoring, as Tio in Marketing at a private university in Aceh points out: '*I would like to co-author with academics who have at least associate professor status'*.

Similarly from Danish in a public university: '*I would like to work with someone whose knowledge is more than mine, but now that I have completed my doctorate I have more confidence in leading co-authorship*'. For Tio and Danish, this relates to what Lisa and others told us about co-authoring as a form of learning via 'literacy brokers' (Lillis & Curry, 2006), who mediate text production in a number of ways including supporting access to resources, assistance with crafting papers and, as evident in the below section on social media, responding to requests for feedback on writing.

For Munir in Geophysics, however, the practice of co-authoring is better carried out with students and serve teaching purposes: '*I try to publish with my students; the students' projects*'. Discussing a recent piece of co-authored writing, he told us that they: had submitted before three times and it was rejected. Based on the editors' comments we revised it and it was eventually accepted. We five authors divided the roles in the revision process. Each one of us had a different role in revising a part of it all together.

He outlines how, through the peer-review process, he was able to teach and guide his students through the specific genre and convention features of scientific articles, and also attain a publication for himself at the same time. His practice, however, stems from concerns that are not just about teaching but also linked to Indonesia's status in the global economy: '*I come from a developing country. We don't have good respect if we ask someone from an international university for our collaboration*'.

5.3. The role of the doctorate

In the current academic labour market in Indonesia, the role of academic mentors emerges as salient, and closely connected to the doctoral process. The intellectual support given during supervision was deemed by our participants to be something that would carry on beyond doctoral studies. Unlike in European universities where this mentoring is related to the transition period into university employment (Brechelmacher et al., 2015), for our participants, who are already employed, academic mentoring through supervision and beyond takes a different character: we found that the expectations of doctoral training are firmly intertwined with academics' professional commitments back home. For our respondents, therefore, undertaking a doctoral degree programme overseas primarily offers international networking, training opportunities, and a meaningful academic patronage.

This process begins, for most of our participants, through research collaboration work with supervisors who, at a later stage, would be expected to help expand this network to a broader scope by introducing them to learned societies and seminar programmes, with the aim of doing more substantive work (e.g. joint publications). This kind of 'indirect' expectation emerged as a central concern, as these respondents who were undertaking their doctorates at the time of the research observed:

Doctoral research has given me more opportunity to interact, to discuss with different academics, directly or indirectly. (Budi, Linguistics, private university)

Through the doctorate I can learn how to deal with people, how to communicate well, I can learn how to be a better researcher. (Tio, Marketing, private university)

Doctoral study provided me with opportunities to do a joint research with other doctoral colleagues, and to work collaboratively with my supervisor writing for publication purposes. (Tina, Economics, public university)

Linked to this is the expectation that the doctoral process will lead to further activities such as visiting scholar programs, research collaborations, and online lecturing programs. Respondents spoke about inviting connections that were made during the doctorate to Indonesia, as Nuri outlines:

I started collaborating and co-authoring during my PhD. My supervisor really shaped my academic writing in Australia. After my PhD, I published two papers with her in international journals, and two papers in a national journal. Since then, I have collaborated with a fellow PhD student. He helped me improve in writing during the PhD and we are now writing something together and I invited him for a keynote. I prefer working with people I know well. (Nuri, Education, public university)

For many, like Nuri, the doctorate was an important formative period when connections were made and writing practices flourished. But this did not always carry forward into the post PhD career.

Many respondents, especially those in remote locations and small private universities, spoke about how their departments have few doctoral graduates, and that maximising the potential of the doctorate weighed heavy, as Rio in Maths at a university in Papua told us: '*In my department we have only one PhD. We need to improve the department and one key is to increase the number of PhDs*'. Dika, in Pharmacy at a public university in South Sumatra, echoed similar sentiments:

The first thing that I have to think about is my profession. I'm a lecturer so I have to increase my knowledge and my ability, especially in pharmaceutical technology for my department. I had to take the PhD to fulfil my requirements to my university and my government.

The question emerges of whether the doctorate in its usual form – three or four years' focus on a research study, the production of a thesis, and occasional professional development events – provides adequate preparation for the changing demands being faced by new academic staff in Indonesia. In addition to the formal and structured aspects of their doctorates, the academics in this study adopted networked and collaborative learning strategies to develop in their publications writing. Much of this was informal, haphazard, and individualised.

5.4. Barriers and difficulties with writing

The most common barriers to academic productivity across most participants include the language barrier, limited access to research resources, and limited training and mentoring opportunities. Among strategies to cope were reliance on literacy brokerage. But even for those who had access to some support during their doctorates at the time of the research talked about how, upon their return, more practical challenges lay ahead. Lisa, in a public university in Kalimantan, told us that '*my university is lacking in the facilities for writing, like desks and rooms. Unlike in our Economics faculty where everyone has a desk*'. This is contrasted with what, in her view,

would occur if she were at a private university: '*This would not happen in a private university; they are more open and supportive of lecturers even sending lecturers to study abroad with their own funds*'.

In some cases, academics working in nationally reputed private universities are given more facilities and opportunities to develop their careers when compared with colleagues in smaller private universities. In the former, participants reported supportive facilities including individual rooms with workstations, access to international journals and library facilities – an overall more conducive academic atmosphere for them to be more productive.

Conversely, academics within public universities, particularly in islands other than Java, experience a more challenging situation in terms of facilities (including shortage of rooms and desks to work), opportunities to win scholarships for further study, and overall a lack of time for writing. The introduction of incentivisation has yielded mixed responses, as Munir in Geophysics highlights: '*MORA do not reward writing. If I were not in this [i.e. religious ethos and remote] university my situation would be much different*'. Suyanto, in Physics, also at a public university but in Central Java argued that: '*Private universities often give appreciation as financial rewards, higher than public universities. This affects the productivity. They also have writing workshops and so I join them*'. Tri, in Computer Sciences at a private university, suggested that one reason for differing conditions is that: '*There is a high expectation of research quality in a public university; you are a 'researcher' rather than simply being a 'teacher' in a private university*'. These comments highlight the salient issue of unequal experience at private and public universities, something that we shall return to later in the paper.

In terms of training and mentoring opportunities, academics were reported to have been left to fend for themselves, with their institutions providing only isolated guest lectures for staff on 'how to publish', as Wayan in English Language Education at public university in Bali highlights:

My university does not run writing workshops; they only occasionally invite speakers to share knowledge about writing, on 'how to publish', etc. The problem is we need a coach to supervise our writing.

5.5. Social media for writing

Almost all of the participants of the study report occasional engagement with social media, particularly through platforms such as academia.edu and ResearchGate, as a means for locating publications that are either not yet published or unavailable via their institution's library service. Aside from using these platforms as passive users, few participants undertook more sustained engagement through them. From amongst those who did, Suyanto (in Central Java) and Aunur (in West Nusa Tenggara) told us how they try to leverage the expertise of their online network to develop their writing, to make connections across international borders in order to alter the parameters of their current academic community:

I use ResearchGate and LinkedIn to find some meaningful topics and papers, then I try corresponding with the writers and sometimes they send their full papers to me and we discuss it. Sometimes I ask them to read my paper and they give some suggestions. We have even ended up co-authoring. They are usually from Australia, Europe, Turkey, Malaysia. (Suyanto, Physics, public university)

My plan right now is to make a collaboration with my friends in ResearchGate. But first I want to profile to them that I am qualified to do research. (Aunur, Education, private university)

Academic blogs are an increasingly important means of disseminating research and attracting new audiences to emerging areas of scholarly activity (Carrigan, 2016). But we found very few participants who engaged with blogs and other forms of 'grey literature'. One of those who did was Ranti, in Maths at a private university, who reported that '*a peer of mine uses Facebook Notes to share reviews on the journals he reads. I learn a lot from his writing*'. Instead, what emerges in the data are relatively mixed perceptions of the utility and benefits of different online platforms and social media in support of scholarly writing, as Rinta further told us:

I follow some academicians and other thinkers on Twitter. Through social media, I get access to their publications which I can read to improve my understanding of my own field. I listen to interviews on writers of academic books, and it helps me a lot in gaining ideas for writing.

When it came to using platforms for one's own visibility, we found that many participants had begun to see the benefits but lack the time and opportunity to fully exploit the potential of social media to enhance their academic profiles. Among them were those who told us that it was important that their work was visible to a large number of people and that this was a motivating factor. Fajar, at a public university, mentioned: '*It is important to see that my work is something that people need, so when I saw my recent publication had been read by 1000 people, it was the most interesting thing*'. For others, such as Dina, literacy practices online, including social media use, were connected to training and writing support groups: '*I join scheduled academic writing workshops and an academic writing group which is mentored by a credible Professor*'.

Overall, literacy practices with social media were viewed by many of our participants in instrumental terms, and most often engaged with when direct benefits were perceived to ameliorate the impact of being on the margins, such as locating articles, requesting feedback, and seeking training and development activities. However, the expectation that scholarly work be widely disseminated and publicised was not consistent across the participants of the study. This was due, in large part, to the potentially time-consuming task of developing and honing one's own academic profile online, in addition to the practical business of writing which seemed to occupy the most attention.

5.6. Learning to write as an academic

Learning to write for publication – in English – is another important transition for academics in Indonesia. The desire to learn to effectively write research articles in high-ranking journals was deemed a skill so vital that without this proficiency there is no hope for professional success. Yet most of this learning was expected to come via supervisor feedback and comments on work, as Tina highlights.

My supervisor helps to build my confidence in writing in English as he provides me with feedback that improves my academic writing. My supervisor shows me how to write critically and to write in an effective way like in terms of sentence structure and choice of words. (Tina, Economics, public university)

Beyond learning how to write from supervisors, participants also reported how they expected supervisors to provide reading lists and direct help navigating through the vast amounts of literature in their fields; as Budi, in Linguistics at a private university, told us: '*The supervisor also provided journals for me to read in order to help with my thesis*'. This points to how supervisors' *curation* work in the form of, for example, a readings list, while perhaps to some extent necessary in inducting a new researcher into the forms of knowledge representation within a given discipline, can constrain a new researcher's freedom to develop their own judgements through self-directed reading within the literature (see Bhatt & MacKenzie, 2019).

Learning to write was heavily dependent on plentiful feedback from doctoral supervisors both during the doctoral process and afterwards, if collaborating. This network of support was extended into the institutional environment, and includes fellow doctoral researchers, with whom many participants established connections to work together and collaborate as academic careers progressed, as already discussed. These continuous, and largely informal, networks of support were a central aspect of how the academics learned to write using the doctoral training environment as a vital facilitator.

As careers progressed, learning to engage with the kinds of genres necessary for successful academic productivity remained a challenge. In this respect, learning from the editorial experience of publishing proved vital, as often it is the only recourse the participants have to expert opinion:

The mistakes from previous submissions helped me to find what I should not repeat in the next paper. For example, a paper was not in a good structure, or the figures were in low resolution. I read the comments of the reviewers carefully and tried to improve. (Munir, Geophysics, public university)

When I am rejected, I learn from the editors' reaction letters. I collect them, and examine them step by step. (Suyanto, Physics, public university)

The need to learn how to write specific genre features of academic articles, and using models from the discipline, was a key learning strategy, as Tina highlights:

I learn a lot through modelling by comparing my writing with those published in high-ranked international journals in my field. I learn for example how writers in those journals structure their writing and construct paragraphs. (Tina, Economics, public university)

Participants also talked about the benefits of attending generic institutional writing support workshops, although these tended to be held more in Java-based universities. For some, particularly those employed at small private universities, such workshops, training seminars and webinars are usually held at public universities rather than their own and this proved to be one of several dividing lines between public and private universities, as highlighted already.

6. Discussion

6.1. Peripheries within a periphery

This research takes place at the intersections of policy and practice, and a complex nexus of supranational, national, and regional bureaucratic mechanisms which respond unevenly to the creeping hegemony of anglophone-centre journals and systems of research evaluation. We have found that one of the main features of everyday academic literacy practices is that there is disparity in terms of how academics transition to becoming research active, across different regions within the country, and between those who work at private and public universities. One such reported disparity concerns inequalities of opportunity to benefit from various development schemes for academic staff across public and private universities which, in turn, makes transitions to publishing difficult and unequal across the country.

Increased pressures and disparities are exacerbated through ties to financial rewards, as publishing in English can yield higher salaries and increased research funding (including conference budgets) for those who can leverage networks and mobilise resources to do this successfully, compared to those who have not yet had the chance or who strategise differently, by, for example, creating opportunities to publish with their own student groups and/or with academics located in other peripheral countries. Economic and professional mobility are therefore tightly linked with success in an English-dominated academic publishing market, favouring the symbolic capital possessed by those Indonesian scholars who have access to the best resources and opportunities, usually within the island of Java. This ultimately consigns other groups, including staff at smaller private universities, those outside Java, and who do not research in English and for an English-language readership, to peripheral positions in a country that is already itself peripheral.

That opportunities to undertake doctoral degree programmes abroad are given largely to lecturers within public and large private universities, creates further gaps in terms of international connections and research activity. Doctoral studies abroad opened up the possibilities for more opportunities for joint research through supervisor networks which was then followed by the co-authoring of papers in highly regarded international journals. Academics within small private universities appear to be missing out on these opportunities, resulting in negative impact on morale and confidence, quality of academic outputs, and the need for them to be exposed to more training and networking opportunities. While the various incentive schemes were designed to boost motivation, combat inequality and to 'level the field' of Indonesian higher education, our findings suggest that more ought to be done across the two university types, particularly for academics employed at smaller private universities beyond the island of Java. For these academics, being mandated to publish in an increasingly competitive, global, English-medium environment, but without being provided equitable support for the resources that such work demands, results in a form of literacy *accumulation* and in some cases *deficit*. On the one hand, everyday literacy accumulates as it is wedded to increasingly demanding and shifting geopolitical desires, for which failure to comply

can pose risks to livelihood. And yet, many struggle to manage their own research work and adaptation to changes in literacy demands. New expectations and digitisation have resulted in what Brandt (1995) described in her study as the "piling up and extending out of literacy…where once there might have been fewer and more circumscribed forms" (p. 651). Brandt's research concerned the literacy practices of communities experiencing industrialisation and migration in the upper Midwest of the United States. Our context is geographically far removed from Brandt's, but the conditions of economic transformations and resultant literacy upheaval, including shifts pertaining to which literacies are valued and why, make our context comparable.

6.2. Negotiating mandates with lack of support

The growingly supranational research evaluation systems based in Anglophone countries, as well as the "centripetal pull" towards Anglophone-centric academic practices (Lillis & Curry 2010: p.160), have had an impact on literacy practices of Indonesian academics at all levels of their research work, even when the medium of publication is not English. Consistent with Tusting *et al.* (2019) and Nygaard (2017), we found that academics in Indonesia transition to writing research publications through a series of complex negotiations between their disciplinary, institutional, regional and (inter-)national contexts, and that participants' literacies are dispersed and negotiated across them. These negotiations can be *discoursal*, as they relate to lexical, stylistic, rhetorical, genre-related features of English-medium research writing, but also *structural* in that they are literacy-related challenges that remain tied to broader sociocultural and sociohistorical conditions which compound the difficulties already inherent when operating academically in a foreign language. For many, digital and social media practices were vital in the development of networks for literacy brokerage.

Driven by the Indonesian government's policy to mandate academics to publish for international English-medium journals, incentivisation, and the concomitant human capital investment through doctoral scholarships, Indonesia has now reached the stage where it has surpassed all South-East Asian countries in terms of the quantity of research outputs emerging from its university system (Herlinawati, 2019). For some, this may be an indication of policy success, but our research complicates the picture somewhat. Firstly, there is the issue of quality versus quantity, about which this research has found that academics in Indonesia are given little opportunity to consider anything other than quantity. Quality is almost entirely perceived through proxy measures, usually through how a journal is indexed. This meant that our participants' efforts were almost exclusively placed on productivity as shaped by recent managerialist approaches to manage academic performance, through concepts originating in the private sector rather than disciplinary values inculcated through academic training and mentoring. Similar shifts have also taken place in anglophone and European universities (see Deem et al., 2007), and then later in Asia (see Poole & Chen, 2009), but Indonesia's 'new managerialism' is being applied wholesale to all its universities including those with little foundational research infrastructure and scarce language brokerage.

As universities in Indonesia adapt to a changing environment, the publication work and literacy practices of academics undergo their own set of reforms. Writing demands on academics in Indonesia have significantly increased as policymakers simultaneously expect more productivity without compromise to teaching loads. Our findings confirm that academic knowledge production in Indonesia not only hinges on performance facilitated by doctoral scholarship programmes, but also subsequent networking and collaboration. It is not enough for our participants to just develop their English academic literacy; they must also handle an administrative and bureaucratic burden which, in turn, restricts their opportunities for exposure to English academic literacy. This complicates the argument that academics in Indonesia simply have to master a kind of academic literacy that is used in the Anglophone centre for their publication efforts. Rather, as multilingual scholars, being 'productive' means amalgamating new literacy practices to contend with multiple and conflicting demands on time, abilities, allegiances and the double-bind of local/regional versus international research impact.

7. Conclusion

By providing in-depth accounts of the literacy practices of academics from private and public universities, this research makes an important contribution towards understanding the impact of new drivers for research productivity in Indonesia, and how these drivers are set against trends in the politics and ideologies of global knowledge production, particularly the movement of English language journal regimes into periphery countries.

The study found that academics in different disciplines responded in more less similar ways to policies about writing, with evidence of broad and important commonalities. We acknowledge that in order to attain a better picture of more specific disciplinary pressures on writing, and how writing is inculcated within different fields, would require deeper inquiry into specific disciplines. But our aim was to capture how academics are broadly responding to policies which are applicable to the entire Indonesian sector, and how, as peripherally located scholars, they have developed literacy strategies to cope with limited resources as part of their publication efforts. We have shown how faculty members navigate this deficit with varying levels of success, in their pursuit of professional recognition and to transition from novice to experts. We found that supranational expectations have created localised policies and geopolitical conditions in Indonesia that are giving rise to peripheries within an existing periphery, and an accumulation of academic literacy practices that warrant further research in an area which has received little attention.

We have also shown that a social practice approach to the study of research writing can add the much needed complexity necessary to complement current, largely quantitative, studies on research productivity. As with our study, these have shown that recent international shifts in university managerialism and high-performance work practices are creating a new set of expectations for academics which vary from one context to another and therefore require more in-depth inquiry to be better understood. What we propose is a reconstruction of the logic of incentive schemes in Indonesian universities, to move beyond writing for publication as an issue of 'training', and more towards the integration of intrinsic academic values through mentoring. This can begin with a need to re-examine

how the doctorate can be a more suitable apprenticeship for scholars working multilingually, at the edge of the Anglophone knowledge economy, and who work within university systems where writing for publication has become a core of the academic enterprise but embedded in institutional value systems which are not always supportive.

References

Bazerman, C. (2008). *Handbook of research on writing: history, society, school, individual, text*. New York: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Bhatt, I., & MacKenzie, A. (2019). Just Google it! Digital literacy and the epistemology of ignorance. *Teaching in Higher Education, 24*(3), 302–317.

Brandt, D. (1995). Accumulating Literacy: Writing and Learning to Write in the Twentieth Century. *College English, 57*(6), 649–668.

Brandt, D. (2009). *Literacy and learning: reflections on writing, reading, and society*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brechelmacher, A., Park, E., Ates, G. & Campbell, D. F. J. (2015). The Rocky Road to Tenure – Career Paths in Academia. In: Fumasoli, T., Goastellec, G. & Kehm, B. M. (Eds.) Academic Work and Careers in Europe: Trends, Challenges, Perspectives (pp. 13-40). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. London: Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press. Eurospan.

Cargill, M., & Burgess, S. (2017). *Publishing Research in English as an Additional Language: Practices, Pathways and Potentials*. Adelaide, Australia: University of Adelaide Press.

Carrigan, M. (2016). Social Media for Academics. *Sage*.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2017). Global Academic Publishing: Policies, Perspectives and Pedagogies. Bristol. *Multilingual Matters*.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2019). Unpacking the Lore on Multilingual Scholars Publishing in English: A Discussion Paper. *Publications, 7*(2), 27.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. I. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism: the changing management of UK universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ESRC (2016). Early career researchers. [cited 19 October 2020 Available from https://esrc.ukri.org/skills-and-careers/postgraduate-careers/early-career-researchers/ .

Habibie, P.e., & Hyland, K.e. (2019). *Novice writers and scholarly publication: authors, mentors, gatekeepers*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harun, H., Wardhaningtyas, S., Khan, H. Z., An, Y., & Masdar, R. (2020). Understanding the institutional challenges and impacts of higher education reforms in Indonesia. *Public Money & Management, 40*(4), 307–315.

Herlinawati, M. (2019). Kemristekdikti: Publikasi internasional Indonesia terbanyak di ASEAN, ANTARA News, 24 July 2019. [cited 20th October 2020] Available from https://www.antaranews.com/berita/974882/kemristekdikti-publikasi-internasional-indonesia-terbanyak-di-asean.

Huttner-Koros, A. (2015). The hidden bias of science's universal language. . The Atlantic, [cited 20 October 2020 Available from https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2015/08/english-universal-language-science-research/400919/.

Kwiek, M.a. (2019). Changing European academics: a comparative study of social stratification. *work patterns and research productivity*.

Lillis, T. (2012). Economies of Signs in Writing for Academic Publication: The Case of English Medium. *National" Journals. JAC, 32*, 695–722, 3/4.

Lillis, T., & 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.

Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: the politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

Nygaard, L. P. (2017). Publishing and perishing: an academic literacies framework for investigating research productivity. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(3), 519–532.

Poole, G. S., & Chen, Y.-c (2009). *Higher Education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the Professoriate*. Brill | Sense.

Ristekdikti (2015). Circular of the Directorate of Indonesian Higher Education No. 14/2015, Indonesian Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education (Ristekdikti). [cited 23 April 2020 Available from http://jdih.ristekdikti.go.id/produk-hukum/?id=4f58a015-6007-4663-acfb-83d2d64c0e6c>.

Ristekdikti (2017a). Circular of the Directorate of Indonesian Higher Education No. 20/2017, Indonesian Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education (Ristekdikti). [cited 28 April 2020 Available from http://lldikti12.ristekdikti.go.id/2017/02/01/permenristekdikti-no-20-tahun-2017-bersama-lampirannya.html>.

Ristekdikti (2017b). Pedoman BUDI Luar Negeri 2017, Indonesian Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education (Ristekdikti). [cited 28 April 2020 Available from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5-zT51ovLmLUGFVdzdNR2xDSEU/view.

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, [Calif.]; London: SAGE.

Sandy, W., & Shen, H. (2019). Publish to earn incentives: how do Indonesian professors respond to the new policy? *Higher Education, 77*(2), 247–263.

Selfe, C., & Hawisher, G. (2004). *Literate Lives in the Information Age*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410610768

Street, B. V. (2005). At Last: Recent Applications of New Literacy Studies in Educational Contexts. *Research in the Teaching of English, 39*(4), 417–423.

Tusting, K., McCulloch, S., Bhatt, I., Hamilton, M., & Barton, D. (2019). *Academics writing: the dynamics of knowledge creation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Welch, A. R. (2007). Blurred Vision?: Public and Private Higher Education in Indonesia. *Higher Education, 54*(5), 665–687.