

How Do Teacher-Educator Authors (TEAs) experience their Professional Development Through Writing for Publications?

Dedi Turmudi^a, Ali Saukah^b, Bambang Yudi Cahyono^c

^aDoctoral in ELT, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia, Lecturer Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro, Sumatera, Indonesia, ^{b,c}Postgraduate Program in ELT, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

Email: tdeditur@gmail.com, alisaukah@yahoo.com yudic2000@yahoo.com

Prior studies in writing for a publication focused on the teacher-researchers in Humanize Language Teaching (HLT) journal and focused on the successful authors. This study broadened the scope out of HLT journals. The objectives; 1) how the teacher-educator authors (TEAs) perceived themselves as authors, 2) what reasons they reported their writing for and publishing, 3) what they said as the contributions of the writing for publication to their own personal and professional development (PD), and 4) how long they got their article published. 112 TEAs were involved in participating. It is a descriptive explorative qualitative with the written interview questions as an instrument. The results have shown that mostly considered as sharing authors and beginners, minority recognized as middle writers and writing articles due to obligations. Majority readers are academicians and few as TEFL consultants and practitioners. TEAs wrote articles due to promotion and hobby. Ranges of publication times were four months to one year. They considered writing for publication as a pathway to PD. The present study has amended the prior research. They confirmed to have **authorship, authority, and authorization**. Thus, writing for publication promotes and propels their career development and professional writing with different phases, qualities, and distinctive self-efficacy.

Keywords: *Professional Development, Publication, Professional Writing, Writing for Publication.*



Introduction

Earlier studies in writing articles for publication as a tool of professional development focused on the teacher-researchers who wrote the manuscripts in Humanize Language Teaching (HLT) journal. They concentrated on successful authors only (Rathert Okan, 2015). Found gaps, this research broadened the scope out of the HLT journals such as IJAL, TEFLIN, the ASIAN EFL Journal, and ASIA TEFL, and so forth. Henceforth the objectives of the current study were to find the following evidence;

1. how the teacher-educator authors (TEAs) perceived themselves as authors,
2. what reasons they reported their writing for and publishing,
3. what they said as the contributions of the writing for publication to their own personal and professional development (PD), and
4. how long they got their article published.

On the other hand, the prior studies in professional development (PD) reported different concentrations. Nevertheless, they said similar commonsense that professional development in many types (Lengkanawati, Setyarini, Sari, & Moecharam, 2015; Mukeredzi, 2013; Mwangi & Khatete, 2017; Qasem & Viswanathappa, 2016; Van der Klink, Kools, Avissar, White, & Sakata, 2017). Thus, the current study is about PD through writing articles for the publication of teacher and teacher-educator. To some extent, writing for publication is projected as literacy brokers and text mediators (Luo & Hyland, 2016).

Learning Objectives

Along with this research, the learning objectives were to benefits writing as a way of knowing (Park, 2013), a complex concept of writing for publication (Rathert & Okan, 2015), and is to learn something from it in the maximum way (Thwaites, 2014). The roots of the challenge are merely from the implicit gaps found in some reputable journals in the specific area of writing (Burton, 2005; Flowerdew, 2019; Hyland, 2016; Perrillo, 2010; Whitney et al., 2012). Those sources are the spirit of the incoming arguments in this study with a hope to be a part of

We think it is essential to do this study since writing for publication has become and dominated the professional lives of academics everywhere with benefits and drawbacks (Flowerdew, 2019; Hyland, 2016). It is also essential for us because publishing scientific research is vital in contributing to the knowledge body of various disciplines. It is also indispensable to share the research results among scientists (Pho & Tran, 2016), especially publication in English from English teaching (Chien, 2019). This study shelters teacher-educator authors or lecturer authors in



any country who have ever published or at least have been trying to get their article published in the specific journal as mentioned. Lastly, this study is a further step to shape expertise in academic writing (Chernick, 2012; Turmudi, 2017).

Literature Review

In previous studies, the writing was reported to have different functions. Accordingly, it is worth knowing the full report of findings and gaps. The National Writing Project (henceforth NWP) in America, as cited by Rathert & Okan (2015), has resulted that through writing for publication, teachers profit three learning principles: **Authorship**: capable of creating ideas to be shared. **Authority**: enable them to gain power as they recognize their expertise and **Authorization**: projects, networks, or publication authorize teachers to move forward in developing sharing knowledge.

In the subsequent studies, it was found that the three outputs by NWP were dissimilar from the later study (Rathert & Okan, 2015). The teachers who wrote articles in the HLT were grouped into four types:

1. All teacher-authors in this study defined themselves as individuals who had something to share with others.
2. The participants felt that in general, HLT contributors were an enthusiastic, open-minded, and reflective teacher.
3. The reasons why they published were referred to three themes; personal, nature of HLT, and a strong motivation to share.
4. Participants perceived writing for publication as contributing to their professional development (Rathert & Okan, 2015, p. 369).

Thus, these results are believed to give contribution to this discipline.

Different findings were also found in that writing had various forms. Burton (2005) differentiates the four modes of writings: "private writing shared writing, published non-referred writing, and published referred writing ." (Burton, 2005, p. 2). Private writing stays embodied in a journal or a diary and functions as personal documentation and a reflection. **Shared paper** can be published in an interactive journal function as collaborative documentation and a reflection as well. **Published non-referred writing** can be personified in group journals, electronic mails, and services as collaborative documentation and a reflection. **While published, referred** literature must be formulated in articles (online or printed), books, or book chapters. They function as public access, a statement of knowledge, and an experience (Burton, 2005). Upon all, none of them can be out of any publication unless they are hoped to reach individual readers.



Unlike Burton (2005), Perrillo (2010) reported that writing for the public could be through teacher editorializing as part of Professional Development. It has made a new variant function of writing. Perrillo (2010) claims that his study has contributed very much toward PD through the project called the Editorial Project by “fostering a stronger sense of professionalism in individual teachers and for promoting their expertise and other educators in their community.” It has also afforded teachers new models and tools for teaching writing to their students.”(Perrillo, 2010, p. 10).

Several other researchers also reported other evidence of PD through writing. The Eisenhower Professional Development Program (EPDP) claimed that there were some crucial points to provide and make writing articles succeeded. " One of them is presenting a paper“ (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001, p. 926). This idea is believed to enable anyone not only is context United States but also for the rest of the academicians across countries.

A similar sense is reported by Loughran (2014) in that the professional development of teacher educators as demands, expectations, and requirements of teacher education increasingly come under scrutiny (Loughran, 2014). "...One of the main reasons to pursue PD is to be empowered—to have the opportunity and the confidence to act upon their ideas influence the way they perform in their profession.”(Murray, 2009, p. 3).

Thus, writing as a tool for publication can benefit multi-disciplines. In the Indonesian context, the publication helps the establishment of the Indonesian Association of Scientific Journal Editors (Wiryawan, 2019). This organization has empowered and boosted the existence of release in Indonesia. Further, Gong (2009) has claimed that the publication in an online journal is an answer to make what is called local research accessible to international users (Gong, 2009), internationalize a shred of local evidence through publishing in an online journal (Board of Editors TEFLIN Journal, 2012; Tardy, 2004). Subsequently, PD, through writing a scholarly article, plays an essential role and beneficial for teacher-educator authors or lecturers (Desimone, 2009), an inherent duty for academicians (Wiryawan, 2014). Lastly, the essences have emerged in professional development and teacher learning (Borka, 2004) that is proved by the product of writing for publication.

Lastly, writing and publication are meaningless for authors unless both individuals merged in writing and perpetuated in a publication. This tenet might promote the target of a publication to reshape the authority of any writer-author in various senses and depth (Ge, 2015; Whitney et al., 2012). Upon all previous findings and gaps underlie the current investigation. Therefore, the researchers intentionally did a replication study considering the demography of the subjects who



are located across countries. Thus, the study broadened the subject and segment of evidence that was absent in the prior studies. Therefore; the researchers have set the following research questions:

1. How do the teacher-lecturer-authors perceive themselves as authors in any target journal?
2. What reasons do they report for writing for and publishing in chosen Journal (e.g, TEFLIN, IJAL, *ASIAN EFL Journal*)?
3. What do they report contributions of writing for publication to their own personal and professional development, if any?
4. How long does each of them get their article published?

Methods

Research Design

This study is a repetition of previous research to some extent about that of Rathert and Okan (2015). Consequently, the design is similar in the sense of the data collecting technique and the types of data. So the plan is a descriptive explorative qualitative study.

Participant

One hundred twelve prospectus participants were identified. However, 15 respondents responded to take part in this study. They were the teacher-educator authors who were presenters and listed in the 10th Annual International Asian EFL Journal Conference's Book carried out in Manila in 2014, ASIA TEFL Journal, TEFLIN Journal, and list of postgraduate students in Indonesia who were enrolled from 2014 to 2016. They were purposively requested to take part in the study through email addresses. In return, they sent back their written answer sheets via emails at different times.

Instrument

The instrument of this study was the interview with eight open questions. The questions are directed to answer the four research questions. The data about gender and age ranges are included before the eight questions as needed. The formulated questions are adapted and adopted from Rathert & Okan (2015) with some minor modifications to adjust to the criteria of the subjects. Up to this point, the validity and reliability of the instruments are guaranteed. The questioned lists were on the framework of some aspects; an audience, authority, outcomes, and ranges of publication. The eight questions are affiliated with the four research questions.

All questions were informative and open-ended questions to track their potential data that would be analyzed by criteria content analysis (CCA) as proposed by Miles et al. (2014). The complete

prompts can be seen in appendix 2. Besides, the questions are mainly in English with Indonesian subtle to avoid confusion, since no recast of misunderstood questions. It is aimed at assisting the desired data from the respondents.

Data Collection

One hundred twelve email addresses of teacher-educator authors were identified. These emails were obtained from different sources. Further, they were requested to participate using open requests in the body of the sent emails (see appendix 1) and provided with an attachment of interview questions to answer. They were contacted by email since their origin was spread over many countries and locations. All emails were confirmed to reach the targets by the system of Google mail confirmation. Further, all targeted subjects were sent emails twice to three times successfully. Lastly, date when the emails were sent and when the responses received were administered. However, not all of them responded to the volunteer request.

Data Analysis

This study tried to get content data through an interview. However, the demography and number of the subject are found to make it impossible for the researchers to do a short time. Therefore, the only possible way to gather data was through emails. The procedures of data analysis were through the following stages;

1. As they responded and resent the data to the sender, we coded the email with the number of respondents (e.g., R-1, R-2, R3, and so forth)
2. All the gained emails were administered and coded;
3. All data were clustered and put them in a table of a category;
4. The content categories of identity were age and sex;
5. The content category of data was in the following types;
 - a) the teacher-lecturer-authors perceive themselves as authors (RQ-1) in answer no 1 and 2
 - b) reasons for writing and publishing in the chosen Journal (RQ-2) in response no 3,4, and 5
 - c) their contributions of writing for publication to their own personal and professional development (RQ-3) in answer 6 and 7
 - d) ranges of time of articles published (RQ-4) in response no 8.
6. When all the raw data were analyzed and clustered already, the category was arranged accordingly;
7. The categorization was followed by making percentage and qualitative interpretation as the final process.

All these processes were a specific approach in qualitative research called conceptual content analysis (CCA). It included an initial coding to identify concepts and encoding of ideas to establish categories. The contents were coded, categorized and clustered into an established theory and presented under themes (Miles, Huberman, Saldana, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014) or similar approach using qualitative criteria analysis (Elo et al., 2014). Thus, this understanding digested from the responses is the primary data before being concluded.

Results and Discussion

In the following sub-section, two main parts will be described: result and discussion. Although the requests were sent through emails repeatedly until three times, we found this evidence.

- approximately one-fifth of them responded within two months;
- Of 112 accessible participants, only 18 participants (16.07 %) responded in different times and answers;
- The 15 respondents (13.39 %) answered the question on the provided answer sheet, while the two respondents confirmed that they did not get their writing published so that they did not fill out the questions;
- Another respondent reported that he had become an editor since then, and thus he did not fill out the question either;
- They were identified as a man from the Middle East and a woman from the Philippines. Also, one of them was found to be a reviewer for the ASIAN EFL journal living in Manila;

Thus, the rest 15 participants responded to the emails by filling out the interview question attached to their emails. They sent back the questionnaire, and thus we collected and made them a basis of qualitative data. Among those who replied the emails;

1. Five participants are men (or 33.33 %), and 10 are women (66.66%)
2. One of them is identified from the Middle East, two of them are from the Philippine, and the rest fifteen are from Indonesia representing different provinces.
3. They also represented different ages;
 - a) One respondent is aged between 21-30 (or 6.66%);
 - b) Two of them are aged between 31 and 40 (13.33%);
 - c) Ten of them are aged between 41 and 50 (66.66%);
 - d) Two of them are aged over 50 years (13.33%);
4. They were also identified as
 - a) One of them is a graduate student in Indonesia;
 - b) Another one is a graduate student in Manila;

- c) The fourteen of them are postgraduate students in Indonesia;
- d) One of them is a master graduate at a university in Indonesia;
- e) One of them holds a doctoral degree or equivalent;
- f) All of them worked for tertiary educations, except one.

Further, the researchers analyzed critically all of the 15 respondents' written responses based on what they reported. The qualitative content data in English were categorized based on criteria content analysis (Miles et al., 2014) so that the following categories are lead-in showing the results;

1. the teacher-authors' perceptions of themselves as writers;
2. their perceptions of current selected Journal contributors and readership;
3. their reasons for publishing in selected journals;
4. the perceived significance of their professional development; and
5. the range time of their work to post in the target journal.

Result 1. The teacher-authors' perceptions of themselves as writers.

Since the subjects were teachers or lecturers, the researchers preferred to categorize them as higher-education teacher-author or tertiary educators. None of the respondents is a non-educator. Nine of the respondents are individuals who had something to share with others. They reflected as beginners. They constituted the third-fifth (3/5) of the respondents, and yet they expressed in different levels, *novice*, *junior*, or *beginner*. One of them highlighted her professional writing.

"Professional Writing is writing for a reward or as a profession. As a lecturer, I try to send abstracts and papers for national and international seminars such as Asia Creative Writing in UNESA, Icon Lateral in Universitas Brawijaya Malang, and TEFLIN in UNIPA Surabaya. Besides, I joined national seminars such as NELTAL in Malang State University and Elite in Islamic State University Malang. As a writer, I belong to a **beginner** level in writing articles. So, I need guidance from the expert."(R-2)

Similarly, another respondent reported her chronicle of professional writing:

"Yes, I have ever written two kinds of professional writings around two years ago. Both of them concerned about education or teaching techniques. My first writing was about classroom action research on students' writing ability and their learning attitude taught by the DLC technique. It was presented in ASIAN EFL Journal in 2015. And the rest was about the multiple techniques correlated with students' English writing outcome and their learning perception. It was presented and published in SHIELD Conference in 2016.[...] I realize that I am kind of a **beginner** in writing academic work. I found many mistakes in

my writing. They have mostly happened in the organization of paragraphs. I do wish, by writing over and over, I can revise my weaknesses by my self and certainly need other people to increase my writing ability." (R-3).

Further, three of them categorized as middle writers constituting one fifth (1/5), yet they named it in different ways; *madya*, *intermediate*, and *mediocre*. We categorize them as a *middle writer*. One of them narrated her sentence only:

"I had several experiences in journal writing, as well as seminar articles writing. Averagely I attend 2-4 seminars in a year and become the presenter each time. **I am not yet an advanced** writer. I am comfortable to label myself as "*madya*"(R-1)

Another one simply reported:

"It started since I became a lecturer (2003) when I started writing a paper for conference, seminar, or research reports, and this continues until now. [...] "Madya" (R-6).

Finally, the last person in this category considered himself as a **middle** writer;

"I usually write a paper for publication, for instance, when I need to present at a conference or when I need to have it published in a journal or other publication modes. I think I'm still **mediocre** writer" (R-11)

The rest of them do not mention if they belong to a specific category such as beginner or senior; however, they have the same common ground that they write for publication. It can be for both the national and international seminars or least for proceeding and journal to publish. Only R-7 is who said that writing functions as a personal hobby.

"I have no good history in my professional writing in English. I have published my English article on Journal in 2012. I write some Indonesian conceptual articles about character building, family education, ASWAJA (book chapters), and other topics since senior high school. I like writing a lot of poems rather than articles. I have published my Indonesia poems in '*Surya newspaper, Syir'ah Magazine, Real Tabloid, and Horison.*' [...] I am a **beginner** writer. I have no many publications in journals, seminars, or conferences. I just write about my hobby." (R-7)

All samples have indicated that they devised different perceptions regarding their writing, a beginner and middle writer, but none of them is an advance writer or author.



Discussion [1. the teacher-authors' perceptions of themselves as writers];

This study tries to answer the four research questions propagated by the eight items in addition to the two items of the interview. Henceforth, the findings in this study were grouped and interpreted, and then they were reflected in the previous empirical results based on the lead-in research questions. Since the subjects were teachers or lecturers, we preferred to categorize them as higher education teachers or tertiary educators as none of the respondents was a non-educator.

- Nine of the respondents considered beginner individuals who had something to share with others (three-fifth of the respondents).
- Three of them categorized middle writers (one-fifth);
- The rest of them do not mention beginner or senior; however, they have the same common ground that they write for publication for both national and international seminars or at least for proceeding and for any journal to publish.

Compared to that of Rathert & Okan (2015), the finding is that they perceived themselves as persons who had ideas to share with others. Besides, some claimed to have authority as they had expertise resulting from the classroom experience. A participant cast doubts on her identity as a writer and compared writing for publication with teaching (Rathert & Okan, 2015, p. 367).

In the current study, one participant reported to be an experienced writer for journal and seminar with at least 2-4 papers are written. However, his perception as a writer is to be *madya* (R-1, R-6, and R-11) or middle. He did not share what it means to be a writer. The precise point is that he keeps on writing for many purposes, including a report paper. About the other's findings by Hyland (2016), It is reported that writers perceived writing a scientific article in English as 24% more difficult and generating 21% more anxiety than writing papers in Spanish (Hyland, 2016, p. 60).

This finding is not exactly linear with the current study. However, it represents how a writer perceives him or herself as a writer in any English Journal. Other studies reported that "through their own experiences, the participants have perceived and recognized the merits and value of international journals and the benefits from publishing there " (Ge, 2015, p. 53). Besides, some participants viewed "the process of writing and bidding for publication there as a learning process." (Ge, 2015, p. 55).

It seems that the current study goes on the superficial of the beyond hopes of the responses from the casted questions. Thus, there is not enough data to judge the result is compared with the previous findings since the direction is not convergent. Nevertheless, to some extent, the finding



is convergent in that writing for publication perceived as a positive thing and as media to overcome challenges.

Result [2. Their perceptions of current journal contributors and readership.]

All respondents replied about this category. They answered the two questions leading to this part. [*What prompted you to work on your article published in the journal?*]

They responded differently based on their situation, and thus the answers were various such as **self-development** or **career advancement, rank promotion, or career**. It is a regulation from institution or values as credit point, required documents, prestige or self-achievement, self-satisfaction, obligation, professional demand, TRI DARMA PT." These mean that they write for a publication due to external factors or an obligation in contrast to internal motivation to share pieces of writing. Among them reported the multifunction of writing.

"Being an academic writer is my aspiration. However, many things motivate me to write some articles that could be published in the journal. First, self-achievement, I am a kind of ambitious girl to be a researcher in education. It fits with my future career as a lecturer that would be forced to write some articles as a requirement from the department. Second, university rule, in university in which I am studying now, requires the students to write and publish their articles to national or international journals for accomplishing the rule of graduation."(R-3)

Another respondent reported a shifted prompt of writing to another sense of writing.

"Professional demand (as a lecturer)[...]we are required to publish articles and for personal satisfaction." (Respondent 6).

Further question to this research question "*Who do you think of as the authors of articles in the journal you chose or to which you have ever sent your article? (e.g., ASIAN EFL Journal, TEFLIN, Oxford, AJER, and so forth).*"

Answering this category, they have common sense in that their thoughts are polarized in a word of "researcher, educator, lecturer, teacher, a language educator, master and postgraduate students, practitioner." *One of them mentioned them all.*

"So far, there were many authors who came into the journal I ever participated in. Just like in ASIAN EFL Journal, the authors mostly came from famous universities in Asia and had valuable capabilities in research (Professor and Doctor). Even, some of them had ever sent twice or three times in the same journal." (R-3)



While another informant defined it as a unique one among others, yet the information she reported is short. Further, she did not add her further information.

"The writers are researchers and educational practitioners. I sent my research group's paper to the Asian EFL Journal. That was our first experience sending the paper to the International Journal." (R-11)

The final question to answer the research question, "*Who do you think of as the readers of articles in the chosen Journal? (e.g., ASIAN EFL Journal, TEFLIN, Oxford, AJER, and so forth).*"

All of the respondents mentioned the common sense such as graduate students of and undergraduate programs, lecturers and researchers and educational practitioners, TEFL consultants, practitioners, and postgraduate students majoring in TEFL, and other majors. For example, one of them wrote:

"I think, generally, the readers are the students of graduate or post-graduate students who need references for their thesis and dissertation. However, many graduate students read the articles just for completing their studying tasks." (R-3).

Similarly, the others responded:

"Lecturers, teachers, researchers, postgraduate students of EFL" (respondent 6). "Most of the readers are the academics in ELT and the graduate students in ELT" (respondent 8). "Mostly students of graduate and undergraduate programs, lecturers and researcher" (respondent 10), "Any researchers in the world who are interested in the study of language about culture." (R-15).

In general, they think the same common ground in that the readers are academicians, TEFL consultants, and practitioners.

Discussion [2. Their perceptions of current selected Journal contributors and readership]

In summary, this study tries to reveal if the result will be revising, reconfirming, or different from the prior research concerning prior studies (Flowerdew & Wang, 2016; Ge, 2015; Rathert & Okan, 2015). Thus, we summarized this study in executive points.

Nine of the respondents (60%) is a **beginner**, and 20 % is **middle writers**. The rest of them do not mention if they belong to a specific category; however, they have the same common sense that they write for publication. Rathert and Okan (2015) reported that the contributors in HLT were



enthusiastic, open-minded, and reflective teachers. Further, the contributors to HLT articles were mainly as teachers because they also thought that the journal readers were primarily teachers. Contributors of HLT were perceived as reflective, innovative, and enthusiastic. Among the readers are assumed to be scholars and researchers (Rathert & Okan, 2015, p. 368). In this study, however, participants responded out of the context of what was being questioned. They replied and polarized their answers as a word of "researcher, educator, lecturer, teacher, a language educator, master and postgraduate students, and practitioner." In essence, they are also learners during their career development.

About Flowerdew and Wang (2016), it is clear that making the article published in the English journal is perceived as necessary for postgraduate students and as initial career academics to develop research professions (Flowerdew & Wang, 2016). Also, it is viewed as a learning process, understanding and acknowledging the merits and value of international journals, appealing to a broader audience, gaining high quality and rigorous academic standards (Ge, 2015). In brief, the current study implies that some findings are divergent and unjust from the prior results.

Result [3. Their reasons for publishing in the target journal.

All respondents reported that they write an article because of different purposes. Such as for promotion or career advancement, and hobbies, yet all of them also have common sense that they write due to obligation as higher education lecturers or locally called "*Tri Darma Perguruan Tinggi*." They reported in different terms such as for obligation, demand, a pressure of regulation, a must, promotion, and several tasks in doctoral study. All of these expressions are considered to be the duty of career promotion. However, two of them reported why they write manuscripts differently, which is due to self-esteem or hobby, and curiosity to learn and to conformability.

"Being an academic writer is my aspiration. However, many things motivate me to write some articles that could be published in the journal. First, self-achievement, I am a kind of ambitious girl to be a researcher in education. It fits with my future career as a lecturer that would be forced to write some articles as a requirement from the department. Second, university rule, in university in which I am studying now, requires the students to write and publish their articles to a national or an international journal for accomplishing the rule of graduation." (R-3)

While the other respondent reported similar sense in short sentences.

"Firstly, it is due to the requirement for my profession. Secondly, it is because documenting what I do in classes is important. So, I urge myself to write things I have done so that writing has become my daily routine."(R-15)

In summary, all respondents write journals due to external factors not because of internal motivation, except respondent 1 (for curiosity), respondent 6 (for personal satisfaction), and respondent 15 (for self-document) who thought that writing mode comes from their internal awareness.

Discussion [3. their reasons for publishing in selected journals]

The reasons why they reported their article for and publishing in the chosen Journal was issued in different tendencies; self-development or, career advancement, rank promotion or career, regulation from the institution or for credits, required documents, prestige or self-achievement, self-satisfaction, obligation, professional demand, and *TRI DARMA Perguruan Tinggi* (Three Obligation Service of Higher Education). One of them has told me to have a multifunction of writing, and another one reported as a shifted promptly of writing to another sense of composition. It seems that the current study is relatively different from that of the previous research.

The prior studies by Rathert and Okan (2015) revealed that they wrote for a personal reason such as teaching setting, the nature of HLT, which was suitable for them, and a strong motivation to share with others (Rathert & Okan, 2015, p. 368). It means that this study has similarities and differences with that of Rathert and Okan (2015).

Some similarities include prestige, self-development, self-achievement, and self-satisfaction (personal). While the differences comprise any leveled rank promotions or careers, regulations from the institution or for credits, required documents, obligations, professional demands, and *TRI DARMA Perguruan Tinggi* (as an external factor). None of them argued that the targeted journals were suitable for them.

The current finding is also in line with the study of Hyland (2016) called "career ladder." It is part of phases in which a higher promotion is a demand for lecturers begun from *Asisten Ahli, Lektor, Lektor Kepala, and Professor in the context of Indonesia Higher Education System* (Menpan RB, 2013).

Upon all, the researchers concluded that the findings are slightly different in that their external factors are dominant in this study. In contrast, their internal factors in the previous research are more reliable than the current result. Briefly, the researchers have concluded that the present

research is inconsistent with that of Rather and Okan (2015), yet some points are alike despite minor.

Result [4. the perceived significance of their professional development;

As the researchers reviewed all responses, the researchers found some respondents who were confused with the questions. Some of them did not answer but proposed a further detail of this question. One of them noted that:

“I am sorry I do not quite get the idea of the question [...] there are no differences at all unless the item is made more specific, e.g., from a particular point of view (R-13).

The rest respondents seemed to present the previous theories; authorship, authority, and authorization, which are parts of their perceived significance for their professional development. The majority of them enunciate their perception as **authorship constituting almost half of the respondents**, as reported by Rathert and Okan (2015). However, they articulated their sense in different language forms but ended in similar tenets. Some selected examples are summarized.

“It is worth for self-efficacy and career.” (R-2). “In my opinion, a publication is such a confession or admission of someone's work. As I able to say, I will be more motivated in writing articles if one of my articles could be admitted or published in some journals.”(R-3). “For me, a publication is for sharing ideas, concepts, and research findings.” (R-7) “The recognition is only for the sake of my professional development [...] and also for the accreditation of my institution—no financial and material identification. I get a promotion. I feel satisfied that my article can be published. It is like an intellectual "satisfaction for me.” (R-8). “Yes, for *"pangkat akademik (academic rank)* .” (R-10). “Yes, there is a policy on my campus that a financial incentive will reward every publication; the amount varies accordingly depending on the mode of publication and its level.”(R-11) “*Tanggungjawab TRIDARMA PT(responsibility for three public services of Higher Education).*” (R-12)

Considering all of those responses, they imply that authorship is essential for them.

Apart from this, yet it is still inline direction with the theory, they revealed their authority sense. The majority of them cast confidence in having authority.

This is even accentuated by the majority of respondents (66.66%). A summary of this category is noted below.

“Random incentive and credit points.“ “[...] Self-recognition.”(R-1).“ I can fill BKD (Lecturer working load) to get an acknowledgment from our institution.” : (R-2): “ Whether it contributes to my career or not, the main thing I wish to get is my better writing

and better research ability.” (R-3): "So far, it is recognized by my institution...and lately, I've noticed that we will be rewarded if we are able to publish our article in journals (good ones)." (R-4): "On my campus, if it is published in the Scopus-indexed journal, there will be an award. [...] For career." (R-6). No reward when I published my article in the Journal at that time. Nevertheless, now, my institution gives an award to the writers/lecturers who published their writing in Journal, newspaper (paper and online), and book." (R-7). [...] Publication is also essential for my future career and my professional development.” (R-7). “Publication means academic achievement, which then affects prestige, work satisfaction.” (R-11)“I published not in the predatory journal.” (R-14): “Formerly, the publication has meant for the job promotion, [...] but at present, it has become the need for me to develop my teaching skills [...] "There are no incentives for the articles I wrote. But they are used to fulfill the requirement for a job promotion."(R-15).

All of these various propositions indicate that their authority seems to be inseparable from their career.

Finally, they also uttered their perception as to gain authorization constituting the three-fifth portion. Among these, for example, are extracted below.

"Yes, it is. My school institution did not reward me, but it contributed to me financially before attending the international conference. And it was very mutual help because I could also raise the institution through that conference." (R-3). "I think it will someday show one part of our professionalism not only as teachers but also researchers." (R-4) “My institution will give a reward if the lecturers are successful in publishing an international journal. [...], and “ For my career and sharing knowledge/experience.” (R-5)“ [...] and prestige.” (R-6):, [...] but I prefer publishing for my hobby (just sharing ideas, writing poems, etc.).” (R-7). “Professional improvement, career.” (R-10)“ [...] and career.” (R-11). “ I do not write for any rewards, but more as a duty to develop expertise.” (R-13). [...] and to broaden my knowledge.” (R-15)

These responses have constituted their similarities with minor differences among respondents.

Discussion [4. The perceived significance of their professional development; and]

The common ground is polarized in many words of "researcher, educator, lecturer, teacher, a language educator, master and postgraduate students, practitioner.” Thus, they are categorized to have authorship, authority, and authorization.

The current study revealed to have **authorship**, which means that they perceived of creating ideas to disseminate with others as evidenced in self-expression. The authorship is represented by almost



half of the respondents. They seem to have **an authority**, which means that writing enables them to achieve **authority** as they recognize, acknowledge, and understanding as benefitting for dissemination (Rathert & Okan, 2015, p. 365).

They constituted almost the majority of the respondents. They also seem to have **an authorization**, which means that they consider writing as a reputation with good consequences to having many impacts on their prestige, such as moving forward in developing and sharing knowledge (Whitney et al., 2012, p. 392).

Nevertheless, they are represented by three-fifths of the participants. All of these aspects are alike with the previous study, but each of them shares a different level of quality and extent. Thus, they position themselves in a 'community of practice' (Whitney et al., 2012, p. 400). They gain authority through an exchange of ideas following a 'teachers-teaching-teachers model' (Borka, 2004, p. 10).

The prior studies revealed that writing for publication was a matter of their professional development. It is related to their satisfaction to share with the community, convenience for their classroom practices, increasing their theoretical expertise, and professional progression (Rathert & Okan, 2015, p. 370). Referring to Whitney et al (2012), satisfaction is a result of being heard by the international community through writing. It is useful for their class as a way to show their view upon their classroom practice and to elicit some hidden parts teaching practice from any readers of journals. It seems to be appearing in the current study despite various.

Increasing their theoretical expertise means that they have a tool for learning about research and academic writing (Rathert & Okan, 2015). The professional progression refers to a sense of getting more and more teaching chances as a result of the publication. In brief, the four positions, **author, authority, authorship, and authority**, are inherent in the current study, although they appear to be at different levels. Referring to those findings, we have concluded that professional development in this study is linear with prior studies despite differences in some invisible aspects.

Result [5. The range time of their work to publish in the target journal

All of the respondents answered the last questions about the range time they needed to get the journal published; therefore, their answer is grouped into several types, either mentioning the time or just confirming the status. Six of them confirmed that they did not make any publication or did not send any article to any journal to publish (two fifths). One of them in this category honestly responded that he did not get the answer but suggested a further question.



"I have not had experience sending an international journal article." (Respondent-5). While other informants wrote, "That depends on the time allowed and the availability, not sure exactly." (R-9).

Further, five of the subjects (33.33%) responded that it took 1-4 months to get their article published. The work included two weeks of revision and feedback from the editor of the target journal."

"4 months waiting time, two weeks revision [...] another 2-3 months before publication" (R-1). "2 months." (R-3) and another one; "I need three months for publishing in Journal. The duration of revision is only 3-4 weeks." (R-7). While still, other respondents reported, "I never published in the journals mentioned above. For other journals (*Jurnal Ilmiah Kopertis VIII* and Reference), it took me two months to revise the journal." (R-8).

Only one respondent did tell the time correctly.

"3 months in the EFL Journal" (R-14).

The whole type in this category is not the majority.

The next range of time is between 5-8 months. In this category, only respondent-3 (6.66%) did tell that sometimes it takes six months to get the journal published. It referred to her experience to publish in the EFL Journal. It means that she has experience in publishing a journal within two months and a journal within six months.

The next category is between 9-12 months. In this category, two respondents (13.33%) reported differently, yet they are in the same ranges of time.

"My experience when publishing at TEFLIN journal, it takes almost a year from submitting it, revising, to getting it published. happens because it takes much time to have the feedback from the reviewers." (R-6). While another one reported, "It took about one year to get it published." (R-11).

Discussion [5]. The range time of their work to publish in the target journal].

All respondents answered upon the last questions reporting the range of time they needed to get the journal published. As a result, their answer was grouped into several types, either mentioning the time or just confirming the status. This study revealed that 33.3 % of the range of times for publication was published in 1-4 months, 6,66 % was published in 5-8 months, and the rest 13.33% was published in 9-12 months.

The process covered some weeks' revision and feedback from the editor, revision again from the author, and final approval from the target journal." In the study of Flowerdew and Wang (2016),



it is reported that getting published in international journals is as vital as 'early academic career' for postgraduate students (Flowerdew & Wang, 2016). Consequently, the publication requires some sophisticated stages, such as a revision to meet the expectation of the editors and the high standard of English (Flowerdew, 2015). The implication is that it takes time and repeatedly revisions. However, the expectation of every editor varies from journal to journal. It makes the length of the publication differs as well.

It means that various challenges may arise depending on the types and reputation of the target journals. The prior study by Hyland (2016) argued that "the dominance of English in academic publishing, however, has raised questions of communicative inequality and the possible 'linguistic injustice' against an author's mother tongue." (Flowerdew, 2019; Hyland, 2016). Consequently, any non-native author has to experience not only to improve the quality and but also to spend more time to find appropriate and supported popular articles.

Hyland (2016) also has reported that "attitude surveys reveal that English as Additional Language authors often believe that editors and referees are prejudiced against them for any non-standard language." (Hyland, 2016, p. 58). The latest issue is inevitably influencing how much time for an author to revise their article to meet the scopes and focus and quality of the target journals.

Even though the range of time is not explicitly reported, it is clear that the range of publication started from submission to the officially published is different among the authors published in the HLT journal as digested. Means that academic publication requires a range of process called continuous negotiation among editor and original authors to gain the discourse levels which have become standard for publication (Flowerdew & Wang, 2016, p. 49).

Besides, Flowerdew and Wang (2016) required the process passes through "the five types of revision, i.e., substitution, correction, addition, deletion, and rearrangement, and four different lexico-grammatical levels, i.e., morpheme, word, group t and clause/clause complex" (Flowerdew & Wang, 2016, p. 39). Hence it is clear that the range of time in publication indicates the quality of manuscripts, the speed of any author on one side, and the idealism reputability of a journal on another side.

Conclusion

First, it seems that the current study goes on the superficial of the beyond hopes of the responses from the casted questions. Thus, there is not enough data to judge the result compared with the previous findings since the direction is not convergent. However, to some extent, the finding is convergent in that lecturer-authors perceived writing for publication as a positive thing and as media to overcome challenges.



Making the article published in the English journal is perceived as necessary for lecturer-authors as initial career academics to develop research professions. Also, it is viewed as a learning process, perceiving and acknowledging the merits and value of international journals, appealing to a broader audience, gaining high quality and rigorous academic standards. However, in brief, the current study implies that some findings are divergent and unjust from the previous ones.

Second, the reason why the lecturer-authors to published in the target journals are concluded to be slightly different in that their external factors are dominant in this study. In contrast, their internal factors in the previous research are stronger than the current result. Thus, the researchers have concluded that the present research is inconsistent, yet some points are alike despite minor.

Third, the lecturer-authors think that the contribution of writing for publication as personal and professional development in this study is linear with that of predecessor despite different in some invisible respects. *They are meant to have authorship, authority, and authorization.* It also is useful for their class as a way to show their view upon their classroom practice and to elicit some hidden parts teaching practice from any readers of journals. In brief, the four positions, author, authority, authorship, and authority, are inherent in the current study, yet it appears to be at different levels.

Finally, the range of time in publication indicates the quality of and speed author on one side and the idealism and reputability of a journal on the other hand. There is no fixed guaranteed that an article can be quickly published since every journal publisher has its criteria, focus, and scopes and trends in the topic of studies.

Limitation

This study is a replication of previous research. The research questions are modified with additional sub-questions. However, the subject was broader than the predecessor article. They were spread over different journal publishers and different countries. In the current study, only a written interview was applied. Therefore, further research is recommended by using an online questionnaire and interview as instruments.

Acknowledgment

As the first author, I thank you very much to the following parties. Firstly, it is addressed to BUDI-DN- LPDP Scholarship program that has funded me to take a Ph.D. program at Universitas Negeri Malang Indonesia. Secondly, it is dedicated to the Faculty of Teacher Trainings and Education,



International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net
Special Edition: Safe Communities, 2020

Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro Lampung, for supporting me to take a study leave at the Doctoral program. Finally, sincere thanks are also addressed to all of my classmates anonymously of ELT 2016 Universitas Negeri Malang, who voluntarily helped me find any related articles at no cost.

References

- Board of Editors TEFLIN Journal. (2012). Writing for International Publication : An Interview with Nugrahenny T.Zacharias,Handoyo P. Widodo and Willy A.Renandya. *TEFLIN Journal*, 23(2), 115–129.
- Borka, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033008003>
- Burton, J. (2005). The importance of teachers writing on TESOL. *Tesl-Ej*, 9(2), 1–18. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej34/a2.html>
- Chernick, V. (2012). How to get your paper accepted for publication. *Paediatric Respiratory Reviews*, 13(2), 130–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prrv.2011.02.004>
- Chien, S.-C. (2019). Writing for Scholarly Publication in English for Taiwanese Researchers in the Field of English Teaching. *SAGE Open*, 9(3), 215824401987018. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019870187>
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving Impact Studies of Teachers' Professional Development: Toward Better Conceptualizations and Measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140>
- Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Pölkki, T., Utriainen, K., & Kyngäs, H. (2014). Qualitative Content Analysis. *SAGE Open*, 4(1), 215824401452263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014522633>
- Flowerdew, J. (2015). Some thoughts on English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) and related issues. *Language Teaching*, 48(2), 250–262. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000523>
- Flowerdew, J. (2019). The linguistic disadvantage of scholars who write in English as an additional language: Myth or reality. *Language Teaching*, 52(2), 249–260. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000041>
- Flowerdew, J., & Wang, S. H. (2016). Author's editor revisions to manuscripts published in international journals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.03.004>
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What Makes Professional Development Effective? Results From a National Sample of Teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915–945. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915>
- Ge, M. (2015). English Writing for International Publication in the Age of Globalization: Practices and Perceptions of Mainland Chinese Academics in the Humanities and Social Sciences. *Publications*, 3(2), 43–64. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications3020043>
- Gong, G. (2009). An Alternative Question and Possible Answers: Making Local Research Publications Accessible Internationally. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(4), 5.



<https://doi.org/10.2307/27785052>

- Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 31*, 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005>
- Lengkanawati, N. S., Setyarini, S., Sari, R. D. K., & Moecharam, N. Y. (2015). in House Training (Iht) Model To Improve the Abilities of English Teachers in Developing Teaching Materials. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 36. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i1.829>
- Loughran, J. (2014). Professionally Developing as a Teacher Educator. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4), 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533386>
- Luo, N., & Hyland, K. (2016). Chinese academics writing for publication: English teachers as text mediators. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 33*, 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.06.005>
- Menpan RB. Menteri pendayagunaan aparatur negara dan reformasi birokrasi republik indonesia, 46 § (2013). Jakarta: MENKUM DAN HAM RI.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, M. a, Saldana, J., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/January 11, 2016>
- Mukeredzi, T. G. (2013). Professional Development Through Teacher Roles: Conceptions of Professionally Unqualified Teachers in Rural South Africa and Zimbabwe. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 28*(11), 1–17. Retrieved from <papers3://publication/uuid/E884448A-5D8B-46B5-A269-EE6336A225C9>
- Murray, A. (2009). Empowering Teachers through Professional Development. *English Teaching Forum, 48*(1), 2–11. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?q=empowerment+teacher&ft=on&ffl=subTeacher+Empowerment&ff2=dtySince_2005&pg=2&id=EJ914883
- Mwangi, M. I., & Khatete, D. (2017). European Journal of Education Studies TEACHER Teacher Professional Development Needs for Pedagogical ICT Integration in Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies, 3*(6), 634–648. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.802701>
- Park, G. (2013). Writing is a way of knowing?: Writing and identity. *ELT Journal, 67*(3), 336–345. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct012>
- Perrillo, J. (2010). Writing for the Public: Teacher Editorializing as a Pathway to Professional Development. *English Education, 43*(1), 10–32. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/762465932?accountid=17215%5Cnhttp://limo.libis.be/resolver?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&genre=article&sid=ProQ:ProQ%3Aericshell&atitle=Writing+for+the+Public%3A+Teacher+Editorializing+as+a
- Pho, P., & Tran, T. (2016). Obstacles to Scholarly Publishing in the Social Sciences and Humanities: A Case Study of Vietnamese Scholars. *Publications, 4*(3), 19.



- <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications4030019>
- Qasem, A. A. A., & Viswanathappa, G. (2016). Teacher Perceptions towards ICT Integration: Professional Development through Blended Learning. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 15, 561–575. Retrieved from <http://www.jite.org/documents/Vol15/JITEv15ResearchP561-575Qasem2879.pdf>
- Rathert, S., & Okan, Z. (2015). Writing for publication as a tool in teacher development. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 363–372. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv029>
- Tardy, C. (2004). The role of English in scientific communication: lingua franca or Tyrannosaurus rex? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(3), 247–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2003.10.001>
- Thwaites, P. (2014). Maximizing learning from written output. *ELT Journal*, 68(2), 135–144. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct098>
- Turmudi, D. (2017). Rethinking Academic Essay Writing: Selected Genres in Comparison. *Premise Journal*, 6(2), 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v6i2.1052>
- Van der Klink, M., Kools, Q., Avissar, G., White, S., & Sakata, T. (2017). Professional development of teacher educators: what do they do? Findings from an explorative international study. *Professional Development in Education*, 43(2), 163–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2015.1114506>
- Whitney, A. E., Dawson, C., Anderson, K., Kang, S., Rios, E. O., Olcese, N., & Ridgeman, M. (2012). Audience and Authority in the Professional Writing of Teacher- Authors Background. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 46(4), 390–419.
- Wiryawan, K. G. (2014). The current status of science journals in Indonesia. *Science Editing*, 1(2), 71–75. <https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.2014.1.71>
- Wiryawan, K. G. (2019). Establishment of the Indonesian Association of Scientific Journal Editors. *Science Editing*, 6(2), 148–150. <https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.176>