
webofscience.com/wos/woscc/full-record/WOS:001240570400007
Clarivate
English
Products
Web of Science
Smart Search
Advanced Search
Research Assistant
Sign In
Register
A Contrastive Investigation ... A Contrastive Investigation into the Non-native Speakers of English Academ...
Free Full Text from Publisher
Export
Add To Marked List
1 of 1
A Contrastive Investigation into the Non-native Speakers of English Academicians' Academic Writing Cognitions and Challenges in the First and Second Languages
By
Are you this author?
Canli, Z (Canli, Zeynep) [1] ; Yagiz, O (Yagiz, Oktay) [2]
View Web of Science ResearcherID and ORCID (provided by Clarivate)
Source
ARAB WORLD ENGLISH JOURNAL
Volume: 15 Issue: 1 Page: 117-131
DOI: 10.24093/awej/vol15no1.8
Published
MAR 2024
Indexed
2024-06-30
Document Type
Article
Abstract
Academic writing has been a focal point for research inquiry in the first and second languages. The present study aims to investigate non- native speakers of English writers' knowledge, opinions, and preferences regarding academic writing in the first and second languages for publications and to identify the possible challenges these writers meet in their research articles in the first and second languages. The results will help academicians be aware of difficulties in the article sections and challenges in language use to overcome these problems and alleviate their recent experiences since they may be influenced negatively during the writing and publishing of an article. Therefore, this study contributes to the field because the implications may guide academicians while they write. A convergent-parallel design of mixed method designs was adopted. Data were obtained from structured questionnaires filled out by 440 participants and semi-structured interviews conducted with 30 participants. SPSS
Citation Network
In Web of Science Core Collection
1
Citation
Create citation alert
1
Times Cited in All Databases
See more times cited
36
Cited References
View Related Records
How does this document's citation performance compare to peers?
Open comparison metrics panel
Data is from InCites Benchmarking & Analytics

Arab World English Journal
INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL ISSN: 2229-9327

Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume 15. Number 1, March 2024 Pp. 117-131
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no1.8

A Contrastive Investigation into the Non-native Speakers of English Academicians' Academic Writing Cognitions and Challenges in the First and Second Languages

Zeynep CANLI
Department of Foreign Languages
Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye
Corresponding Author: zeynepcanli@ksu.edu.tr

Oktay YAĞIZ
Department of English Language Teaching
Ataturk University, Erzurum, Türkiye

Received:10/02/2023 Accepted:02/14/2024 Published: 03/20/2024

Abstract
Academic writing has been a focal point for research inquiry in the first and second languages. The present study aims to investigate non-native speakers of English writers' knowledge, opinions, and preferences regarding academic writing in the first and second languages for publications and to identify the possible challenges these writers meet in their research articles in the first and second languages. The results will help academicians be aware of difficulties in the article sections and challenges in language use to overcome these problems and alleviate their recent experiences since they may be influenced negatively during the writing and publishing of an article. Therefore, this study contributes to the field because the implications may guide academicians while they write. A convergent-parallel design of mixed method designs was adopted. Data were obtained from structured questionnaires filled out by 440 participants and semi-structured interviews conducted with 30 participants. SPSS 21.0 was used to analyze the quantitative data using descriptive statistics and inferential analyses. Content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data. The results showed that the academicians felt more confident when they wrote in their first language. The academicians had positive views about academic writing since they had self-confidence, self-motivation, and awareness of their academic status requirements. The abstract and results were the most manageable sections of the research articles, while the discussion section was slightly challenging. These academicians had more language use awareness in their first language. The study underlined the advantages and necessity of explicit AW instruction.

Keywords: academic publication, academic writing, academic writing challenges, cognition of academic writing, second language writing, research articles

Cite as: CANLI, Z., & YAĞIZ, O. (2024). A Contrastive Investigation into the Non-native Speakers of English Academicians' Academic Writing Cognitions and Challenges in the First and Second Languages. *Arab World English Journal, 15*(1): 117-131.
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no1.8

Introduction

Considerable literature has grown up around the theme of Academic Writing (AW). According to Hyland (2005), the primary genre of academia is writing research articles. As a type of AW genre, the role of research articles in the academy has received increased attention across many disciplines in recent years. For academic writers, research articles are significant opportunities to publish and share their work (Çapar, 2014). This study is an effort to seek Turkish academic writers' cognitions and challenges related to the AW process and difficulties in language use. Consequently, this study will contribute to AW and academicians' current knowledge about AW. Despite the importance of AW and an increasing number of studies in AW (Zhu, 2004), AW challenges and cognitions of academic writers have still been neglected. The present study expects to fill the gap by conducting contrastive research investigating the cognitions and challenges in L1 and L2. Therefore, the following research questions will guide the study:

1. What are the actual knowledge, opinions, and preferences of non-native speakers of English writers when they write their research articles in L1 and L2?
2. What are the non-native speakers of English writers' challenges when they write their research articles in L1 and L2?

Academic writers are expected to possess AW cognitions, such as knowledge, opinions, preferences, and awareness of their challenges, while writing research articles in L1 and L2. Determining the awareness levels of the academicians in the process of writing articles can provide data for understanding their difficulties and for professional development practices to be adjusted accordingly.

Literature Review

Research has shown that studies have focused on sections of the articles; for instance, researchers generally select only abstracts, discussions, or conclusions. The researchers have not searched all sections and have investigated AW conventions in only one section of the RAs. Then, further studies into all sections rather than one selected part are required. Similarly, a few studies have related AW challenges among academicians, including interviews with few participants. To fill this field gap, quantitative and qualitative instruments were used in the study to obtain more detailed information related to possible challenges and language difficulties encountered by the academicians.

Academic Writing

Writing is a vital communication tool for human beings, and it is a complex and arduous process (Chamot, 2005; Lin & Morrison, 2021). AW is one of the significant types of writing that includes writing tasks performed at universities or institutes. It refers to norms and conventions exclusive to each discipline (Yağız, 2009). Likewise, Hyland (2009) plainly stated that AW was a way of "thinking and using language which exists in the academy" (p.1). AW has been accepted as formal text-based writing, and then it has gained a functional view that focuses on both the writer and the reader (Hyland, 2010). This change has guided the writers from writer-oriented writing, which aims to "think aloud" to reader-oriented writing.

Academic Writing for Publication

As a common belief, a research paper needs to be published to be considered a completed research article (Güney, 2015). The researchers need to "gain their significance not in the number of articles

they produce but in how they produce those articles, and why" (Mahon & Henry, 2022, p.12). Academic writing for publication (AWP) may cause academicians a stressful and challenging life in terms of limited time, lack of motivation, and existing circumstances (Murray & Moore, 2006). Many institutions and researchers think there is a strong relationship between AWP and becoming an academician. On the other hand, it may be challenging to deal with writing and publishing articles in situations such as intense class hours and administrative work (Aydin et al., 2023). Therefore, this thought makes the writers hesitate and feel exhausted, but this challenge may be manageable through their strenuous effort (Casanave & Vandrick, 2003). Notwithstanding, writers need to see the positive sides of their current situations to promote their writing and share their knowledge with their colleagues and readers.

As an advantage of writing for publication, writers may improve their quality of writing, and the readers may benefit from them and enhance their ideas related to the field. Consistent with this statement, Rathert and Okan (2015) support that writing for publication has the power to make the writers feel satisfied. However, AWP has some barriers. This issue has hitherto received scant attention in the literature (Murray, 2002), but following the approach above may be beneficial for writers to cope with these obstacles. Gea-Valor et al. (2014) found that Spanish academicians had challenges in AW because of insufficient knowledge of writing conventions. In another study, Moreno et al. (2012) made a contrastive investigation of Spanish researchers' difficulties in writing and publishing research articles in English as L2 and Spanish as L1. Their study endorsed that Spanish researchers found it more challenging to write for publication in international journals in English than to write in Spanish.

Writing Research Articles

Research articles must contribute to the research area and fill the gap in the literature. Researchers have a range of purposes in publishing their articles, such as exchanging their ideas, gaining their colleagues' appreciation, or globalizing their work owing to its value as it adds another brick to the wall. The generalizability of research on this issue is possible when presenting the steps of writing a research article such as AIM(RaD)C including abstract, introduction, materials and methods, repeated results and discussion, conclusions" offered by Cargill and O'Connor (2013, p.11, p.14). The article's design is as important as the topic and the language of the study (Güney, 2015). The conventions of writing a research article give a chance to the writers to practice the steps accordingly and feel organized in arranging their work.

Bram (1995) mentioned the importance of some writing rules. These rules made a valuable contribution to our understanding of how academicians can organize their articles: "writing paragraphs, overcoming sentence problems, understanding sentence varieties, right word choice, regarding meaning and grammar, drafting, finalizing, using a dictionary, usage of correct punctuation, and writing title" (pp. 9-10).

Writers' Cognition of Writing Research Articles in L1 and L2

Cognition refers to the understanding, belief, and knowledge shaped by the writers' ideas, preferences, and previous experiences in writing RAs in L1 and L2. There is a strong relationship between the writers' cognition and writing performance (Baaijen et al., 2014; White & Bruning, 2005). Hence, the writers' beliefs about AW may influence and enhance their self-confidence and ability in writing. The cognition of an academician about writing for an international journal may highly influence his perception of self-confidence and self-esteem among his colleagues in the

same field, as stated in the article of Flowerdew (1999); the participants in his study feel more confident in writing for publications in English than in their mother tongue, Chinese. In contrast, research shows that some scholars may not feel relaxed, and they may hesitate to write in a foreign language because of inadequate knowledge and inexperience in that language (Başaran & Sofu, 2009; Buckingham, 2008).

Research Articles Writing Challenges

Academic writers ought to know the importance of AW as an essential step (Olkun, 2006) as Murray and Moore (2006) state that AW "is a process that lies at the very center of academic performance and success"; therefore, "surely its dynamics and challenges need to be subjected to more thorough analysis" (p. ix). Flowerdew (1999) investigated the difficulties that Chinese academicians encountered during the writing process for publishing in English and why they felt more troubled than English native speakers in AW. Nevertheless, "AW in general is a skill that even native English speakers find difficult" (Gupta et al., 2022, p.6). Non-native speakers of English might have problems, which might lead the researcher to offer suggestions to them, such as starting a writing course. As another solution to these problems, it is suggested that finding a face-to-face supervisor may help academic writers who want to write and publish in English. Accordingly, Cheng (2006) claimed that the problems might stem from various causes. One may be the lack of experience in writing for publication and required training or courses in AW. The researcher emphasized that the findings of his study might be beneficial for academicians and raise their awareness of the effect of their culture and criticism of their academic papers. Besides, in the Turkish context, not all academicians have the experience of studying or teaching abroad, particularly in English-speaking countries. However, academicians may find writing for publication a problematic issue despite having teaching experience in Europe or the USA (Başaran & Sofu, 2009). Likewise, Buckingham (2008) assumed that academicians might have some difficulties in writing because of the lack of writing experience in their field. Similarly, Giridharan and Robson (2011) emphasized that there were three causes of the problems handled by the participants, as listed: common grammatical errors, structural errors, and syntactic errors.

Method

The researchers applied a mixed methods research design. Using the convergent-parallel design, qualitative and quantitative data are collected concurrently and analyzed separately (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). Then, the results of the data are interpreted together. Triangulation was applied.

Participants

The participants are selected among Turkish academicians who write research articles in L1 or L2. Purposive sampling is used. The sample of the participants is 440 Turkish academicians, including 220 Turkish writers of Turkish research articles and 220 Turkish writers of English research articles. They have been working at 54 different universities in the 2020/2021 academic year. Two hundred eighty-nine participants work in educational programs and 151 work in non-educational programs.

Table 1. *Features of the participants*

Gender	Age	Working experiences (years)	Attended AW course
234 *f*	25-56	3-32	145-Yes
206 *m*			295-No

The Structured Questionnaires

The questionnaires included 26 items. The questionnaires mainly involved five-point Likert-type questions. The first part covered demographic questions consisting of five items. The second section consisted of five items related to "*the opinions and preferences regarding AW*". and the third section consisted of seven items about "*difficulties in writing the sections of the article*". Finally, the last section comprised nine items about *"challenges in language usage*".

Interviews

The thirty participants in the interviews were selected among the volunteer academicians by providing purposive sampling; then, they signed a consent form. Semi-structured interviews include five questions. The interview participants were academicians working at universities in Türkiye who wrote RAs in English and Turkish. Their ages ranged from 25 to 56 with an average of 34.76 and their average working experience was 9.56 years.

The Research Procedures

Two questionnaires have been formed by adapting the questionnaires of Chou (1998), and the inventory of Lavelle and Bushrow (2007) used. Three ELT experts gave suggestions and feedback about the questionnaires for the study's validity (Bolarinwa, 2015). According to the experts' comments, some items were omitted, changed, or redesigned. Each questionnaire was piloted with 80 academicians -40 TAWTs and 40 TAWEs- to see the reliability of the study.

The researchers took the required permissions from the Graduate School of Social Sciences, Erciyes University in Türkiye, and other universities to conduct the questionnaires. Then, the questionnaires were applied in English to TAWEs. However, TAWTs replied to the questionnaires in Turkish as they could give more meaningful responses. Therefore, the questionnaires were translated into Turkish, and the responses were translated back into English. The researchers used a "back translation method" to confirm the congruency of translations. The reliability of the translated questionnaires was confirmed by two English lecturers working at the School of Foreign Languages.

Lastly, three experts analyzed the interview questions and commented on the practicality and availability of each question. A pilot interview was conducted with an academician, symbolic of the other academicians of the research, who had written and published several RAs in L1 and L2. Interviews were held at pre-organized time and place. They lasted approximately 30 minutes, and they were recorded.

Data Analysis

In quantitative data analysis, the researchers used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 21.0 to analyze the quantitative data collected by questionnaires on Writing RAs in English and Turkish by using descriptive statistics and differential analyses. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, an eminent and commonly applied test in SPSS, was utilized to find the normality assumptions regarding the variables considered in the present study. The outcomes were evaluated

regarding p > 0.05 (Pallant, 2013). Since the distribution is normal, parametric tests were applied. T-test and ANOVA were utilized to compare the groups and their results. In qualitative data analysis, content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data collected by semi-structured interviews.

Results

Quantitative Results

The quantitative results were categorized under two groups, the results of the questionnaires on Writing RAs in English and the results of the questionnaires on Writing RAs in Turkish. Then, the results of each questionnaire were divided into themes constructed according to the research questions, and the distribution of the choices was presented according to the features of the participants.

The Results of the Questionnaires on Writing Research Articles in English

The results of the questionnaires on writing RA in English were analyzed by SPSS and presented in the tables in this section. First of all, a pilot study was conducted to provide the reliability of the study before the main study, for this purpose, 40 Turkish academicians joined the pilot study. The score of the reliability statistics was calculated as .946, and it might be considered reliable since Cronbach's Alpha value needs to be above .70 to be measured as reliable. Cronbach's Alpha is "an internal consistency or reliability coefficient for an instrument requiring only one test administration" (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2001, p. 526).

The Results of the Questionnaires of TAWEs

In the theme of *"the opinions and preferences regarding AW among TAWEs",* 82% of the participants underlined the necessity of taking an AW course to write a well-developed RA. In the theme of "*difficulties in writing the sections of the article among TAWEs",* writing the abstract and method was found more manageable sections, and the discussion part was found to be more difficult. In the theme of "*challenges in language usage among TAWEs*", 72% of them claimed that they were aware of redundancy, and 97.3% of them would be able to cite a source easily.

Independent Sample T-test Statistics of TAWEs according to Their Departments

According to the KS test, the distribution was found to be p=.87 and was accepted as normal (p>.05). As a result, it was decided to apply a t-test. According to the independent sample T-test statistics of TAWEs in terms of their departments, there were no significant differences between TAWEs working in educational programs ($\overline{x}_a$=3.80) and TAWEs working in non-educational programs ($\overline{x}_a$=3.80) in the section of "*the opinions and preferences regarding AW*" (p>.05). TAWEs working in educational programs ($\overline{x}$b=4.21) and TAWEs working in non-educational programs ($\overline{x}$b=4.21) had approximately given parallel responses to the statements in the section of "*difficulties in writing the sections of the article*" (p>.05). However, TAWEs working in educational programs ($\overline{x}_c$=4.11) and TAWEs working in non-educational programs ($\overline{x}_c$=3.88) did not have similar thoughts about "*challenges in language usage*", and there was a significant difference between these two groups (p=.024).

Table 2. *Independent sample t-test statistics of TAWEs according to their departments*

Questionnaires' Sections	Departments	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	p
a. The Opinions and Preferences regarding AW	Educational programs	149	3.8000	.69126	218	.977
	Non-educational programs	71	3.8028	.60991		
b. Difficulties in writing the sections of the article	Educational programs	149	4.2157	.64288	218	.960
	Non-educational programs	71	4.2113	.53335		
c. Challenges in Language usage	Educational programs	149	4.1119	.67518	218	.024*
	Non-educational programs	71	3.8858	.72423		

**P<.05*

Independent Sample T-test Statistics of TAWEs in terms of attending an AW Course

According to the KS normality test, it was found that the normality assumption was met in attendance of an AW course (p>.05), as the distribution was found to be p=.92. There were significant differences between all sections of the questionnaires and the situation of attending an AW course. The opinions and preferences regarding AW in terms of attending an AW course showed a significant difference (p<.05), also the mean score of TAWEs completing an AW course($\bar{x}$=3.97) was more than those not attending any AW course ($\bar{x}$=3.68). The difficulties encountered by TAWEs who attended an AW course ($\bar{x}$=4.35) and had never attended an AW course ($\bar{x}$=4.11) were not similar in writing article sections (p<.05). TAWEs who participated in an AW course ($\bar{x}$=4.23) were found that they felt more confident in writing RAs in English than those who had never participated in an AW course ($\bar{x}$=3.90) as the significance level was calculated as .001 (p<.05).

Table 3. *Independent sample t-test statistics of TAWEs in terms of attending an AW course*

Questionnaires' Sections	Attended AW Course	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	p
a. The Opinions and Preferences Regarding AW	No	131	3.6824	.68157	218	.001*
	Yes	89	3.9753	.60138		
b. Difficulties in writing the sections of the article	No	131	4.1189	.63200	218	.005*
	Yes	89	4.3547	.54573		
c. Challenges in Language usage	No	131	3.9075	.74639	218	.001*
	Yes	89	4.2322	.57042		

*P<.05

The results of the questionnaires on Writing Research Articles in Turkish

These questionnaires were conducted on Turkish academicians writing RAs in Turkish. SPSS 21.0 was utilized to analyze the results of the questionnaires. Firstly, a pilot study was led to gain the reliability of the study before conducting the main study, to that end, 40 Turkish academicians joined the pilot study. The reliability statistics of 21 items of the Questionnaire on Writing RAs in L1 was measured as .901, and it might be considered reliable since Cronbach's Alpha value should be above .70 to be accepted as reliable (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2001). The score of the reliability statistics presented and supported the reason why this instrument tool was accepted as applicable in the main study.

The Results of the Questionnaires of TAWTs

In the theme of *"the opinions and preferences regarding AW among TAWTs",* 91% of the participants were self-confident when they wrote academic texts in L1. In the theme of "d*ifficulties in writing the sections of the article among TAWTs", writing* the abstract and results were found manageable, and the discussion part was found more difficult. In the theme of "c*hallenges in language usage among TAWTs",* 80% of them claimed that they were aware of wordiness, and 96.3% of them would be able to cite a source easily.

Independent Sample T-test Statistics of TAWTs according to their Departments

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used and the distribution was found .85, therefore, it was decided to apply the t-test. According to Table Four, there were no significant differences between TAWTs working in educational programs ($\bar{x}_a$=4.02; $\bar{x}_c$=4.26) and TAWTs working in non-educational programs ($\bar{x}_a$=3.96; $\bar{x}_c$=4.21) in the sections of "The Opinions and Preferences regarding AW" (p>.05) and "Challenges in Language usage" (p>.05). However, TAWTs working in educational programs ($\bar{x}_b$=4.39) and TAWTs working in non-educational programs ($\bar{x}_b$=4.12) did not have similar thoughts about "difficulties in writing the sections of the article", and there was a significant difference between these two groups (p=.001) as its significance level was found under .05.

Table 4. *Independent Sample T-test Statistics of TAWTs according to their Departments*

Questionnaires' Sections	Departments	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	p
a. The Opinions and Preferences regarding AW	Educational programs	140	4.0229	.60979	218	.464
	Non-educational programs	80	3.9650	.47068		
b. Difficulties in writing the sections of the article	Educational programs	140	4.3929	.54651	218	.001*
	Non-educational programs	80	4.1286	.58333		
c. Challenges in Language usage	Educational programs	140	4.2643	.56270	218	.520
	Non-educational programs	80	4.2153	.50481		

**P<.05*

Analysis of Variance Results of TAWTs in terms of Their Ages

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied and the normality assumption was met in terms of participants' ages (p=.65), and it was decided to use ANOVA. When the researchers analyzed variance (ANOVA), it was found that TAWTs in all groups of ages did not show any significant differences between two sections of the questionnaires (*difficulties in writing the sections of the article and challenges in language usage*) and their ages.

Inferential Statistics of TAWTs and TAWEs' Questionnaires Results

The study aimed to find out whether there were differences between the actual knowledge, opinions, and preferences of TAWs in Turkish and TAWs in English while writing their RAs. According to the KS test, the distribution was found p=.52 and it was accepted normal (p>.05). To this end, the results of the questionnaires were analyzed by using variance analysis (ANOVA). The P-value of the study showed that there were statistically significant differences between these two groups in two-thirds of the questionnaire sections.

Table 5. *Inferential statistics of TAWTs and TAWEs' questionnaire results*

Questionnaires' Sections	Language of articles	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	p
a. The Opinions and Preferences Regarding AW	Turkish	220	4.0018	.56277	438	.001*
	English	220	3.8009	.66470	426.399	
b. Difficulties in writing the sections of the article	Turkish	220	4.2968	.57319	438	.144
	English	220	4.2143	.60847	436.447	
c. Challenges in Language usage	Turkish	220	4.2465	.54171	438	.001*
	English	220	4.0389	.69782	412.632	

*P<.05

It was seen that both TAWTs and TAWEs did not have severe problems while writing the sections either in Turkish or English. That is to say, the inferential statistics of the results claimed that both of the groups had sufficient ability to write parts of an article in compliance with conventions and norms in both Turkish and English. However, their opinions and preferences differed from each other as TAWTs ($\bar{x}$=4.00) had more self-confidence than TAWEs ($\bar{x}$=3.80) in terms of beginning to write an article, publishing an article, considering the audiences' thoughts, and the necessity of attending an AW course. Furthermore, the analysis results showed a significant difference between TAWTs and TAWEs in the section "Challenges in Language usage". It was highlighted that TAWs were much more aware of the language usage in Turkish ($\bar{x}$=4.24) than English ($\bar{x}$=4.03). TAWTs had more knowledge of how to use grammatical rules in Turkish, and the results supported the idea that they could use formal, clear, and understandable language. They could connect sentences logically and correctly paraphrase and restate sentences in their own words. It was understood that TAWs of Turkish were better at preserving unity in their writing and were aware of redundancy and wordiness. TAWTs were found to be more successful than TAWEs in citing correctly in the articles.

Qualitative Results

The qualitative results were categorized under five themes constructed as regards the research questions, and the samples from the transcriptions of the semi-structured interviews were presented according to the features of the participants. These themes were AW experiences, writing RAs, language choice while writing RAs, difficulties in writing the sections of an article, and challenges in language usage (Appendix).

Discussion

1. What are the actual knowledge, opinions, and preferences of non-native speakers of English writers when they write their research articles in L1 and L2?

The study revealed that Turkish academicians stated that writing RAs in English is necessary for surviving in the academic world. They were aware of the importance of English usage in academia; this finding is consistent with the literature review as it is claimed that English has been the language of academia because of globalization, and it has also been broadly accepted as a language of publication in the international context. Some TAWs affirmed that English was a must since academicians at Turkish universities were required to publish articles in international journals. This finding is in accord with Olkun's (2006) study since he drew attention to the obligation of faculty members to publish in international scientific journals which was increasing daily. On the other hand, nearly all TAWTs stated that they felt self-confident when they wrote their RAs in Turkish. They did not have to search for new lexicons or grammatical structures as

they had already acquired them in their first language. Owing to the feeling of expressing their ideas without the need to use dictionaries, TAWTs demonstrated their enthusiasm for writing RAs in L1. They preferred to write RAs in L1, aiming to publish them. They agreed with Güney (2015) as they thought they needed to publish their papers to complete research articles.

On the other hand, academicians need to create positive rapport and productive relationships with their colleagues to support the improvement in their field. Consistent with this finding, Rathert and Okan (2015) expressed that writing for publication satisfied them. It gives a chance for the writers to assess their knowledge and even their writing ability. Getting an article published made them feel they were more productive, beneficial, and active academicians in the community of scholars through their engagement with manuscripts, nationally or internationally. They found the publication of an article as a success indicator in writing articles. Surprisingly, although academics writing for publication have some barriers, they have received limited attention in the literature (Murray, 2002). Some participants encountered adverse conditions while publishing a study, such as choosing the appropriate journals and accepting one; they created strategies to decrease the challenging and frustrating effects of the publication process on their own. The ways they tended to follow are consistent with the steps of an approach that Driscoll and Aquilina (2011) proposed.

Additionally, participants were aware of the need for AW courses for academicians to acquire the required AW knowledge and improve their writing skills and intellectual capacity to produce valuable new work in their fields. It was found that there was a significant difference in the responses of Turkish academic writers of English (TAWEs) and Turkish academic writers of Turkish (TAWTs). TAWTs had more self-confidence than TAWEs in terms of beginning to write an article, and publish an article, considering the audiences' thoughts, and the necessity of attending an AW course. This finding agrees with the Moreno et al. (2012) study results meaningfully. This finding may result from the authors' language proficiency in L2 and the feeling of first language confidence.

To conclude, there is a belief of the writers regarding AW, and it may influence and enhance their self-confidence and ability in writing since there is a strong relationship between the writers' cognition and writing performance (Baaijen et al., 2014; Moore, 2003; White & Bruning, 2005). According to the results of White and Bruning's (2005) study, the writers' beliefs about writing influence the worth of their articles. Moreover, Moore (2003) suggested that the cognition of the writers might influence on their writing, and they have their reasons to write and publish their work as this process is a cycle. It has an iterative nature in their academic lives. Taking the audiences into account, both groups attach importance to their readers. They felt confident about their readers' thoughts about their writing, which may result from the cultural characteristics of Turkish authors. As Hyland (2008) stated, writing "is always a social practice, influenced by cultural and institutional contexts." (p.561).

The participants diagnosed the influence of supervisors' support in assisting the apprehensions of the academic voyage, presenting parallelism with the results of Flowerdew's (1999) study in which the participants desire one-on-one supervisors to help them be able to write and publish in English. Academicians might endure and develop in strength through the reinforcement of their supervisors and by acquiring the practices and influences of cognition in AW.

2. What are the non-native speakers of English writers' challenges when they write their research articles in L1 and L2?

First, the study revealed that Turkish academicians were aware of the organizational pattern of writing RAs. They found "abstract and results" to be the most manageable sections. It is evident that for both TAWEs and TAWTs, writing discussion is more challenging and arduous than other sections in the articles. This finding is in line with the study of Moreno et al. (2012). The interview responses confirmed that TAWs tended to have some challenges while writing the discussion. English might be necessary for TAWEs and TAWTs while deciding and supporting the methods they want to apply.

Secondly, it may be anticipated that Turkish academicians write their articles following the AIM(RaD)C pattern offered by Cargill and O'Connor (2013). Similarly, Güney (2015) gave the article's design importance since it was as important as the study's topic and language. Correspondingly, the conventions of writing RAs allow the writers to practice the steps accordingly and feel organized to arrange their work. Thanks to these critical AW issues, academicians may stop feeling like novices related to general academic conventions.

Thirdly, it was emphasized that TAWs were much more aware of the language usage in Turkish than in English. The writers may feel more comfortable and flexible in using their L1. Nevertheless, TAWs might need to be supported by their supervising colleagues and by the attempts of their institutions to improve their English. These inferences corroborate the ideas of Gea-Valor et al. (2014), who suggested that writers need to train and learn more about how to write and publish their work internationally to overcome the difficulties stemming from insufficient knowledge of writing conventions and norms.

Regarding the inferential statistics, there was a significant difference between TAWEs working in educational programs and TAWEs working in non-educational programs in terms of having challenges in using English as the language of their articles. It can be argued that Turkish academicians working in educational programs might have spent more time learning and using English in their articles than in the latter group. They may have been exposed to studying English as a medium of instruction in their higher education. Lastly, participants tried to use and have knowledge of the organizational patterns in AW and linguistics issues as stated in Bram's (1995) writing rules.

One unanticipated finding was that some participants initially wrote their articles in Turkish, and then they translated their writing into English. This result may be accepted as an alternative strategy for participants to find a way on their own in writing English RAs. Furthermore, some participants found paraphrasing other researchers' sentences essential and challenging at the same time since they were afraid of changing their originality. This result is consistent with the study of White and Bruning (2005), who speculate that creating a successful paper is based on paraphrasing. They also support the inference that the writers' beliefs about writing generally affect the worth of their documents.

Conclusion

This study investigated non-native speakers of English writers' knowledge, opinions, and preferences regarding academic writing in L1 and L2 for academic publication and tried to identify the possible challenges these writers met in their RAs in L1 and L2. The present study finds that both TAWEs and TAWTs have self-confidence in writing RAs and do not have insuperable problems in the challenging parts of AW; however, some participants mentioned in the interviews that they encountered a few difficulties, particularly in writing the discussion parts of articles and writing RAs in English. In consequence, it may result from the fact directly or indirectly related to

attendance at any AW courses. Other possible reasons for this may stem from internal or external causes such as the lack of 'job satisfaction, learning desire, self-confidence, and interest' or the obligation of 'tenure of office, improving curriculum vitae, and appreciation' in the field of educational and non-educational programs in Türkiye. Therefore, academicians intensely underline the importance of explicit AW instruction and the need to do their best to write better articles. In sum, the RA writer in both languages must have self-confidence, be willing to write, follow trends and current issues, read books, read and write articles, collaborate with other academicians, aim to meet international AW criteria and contribute to the field.

Note: " This study was adopted from the first author's Ph.D. dissertation in 2022."

About the Authors
Zeynep Canlı is an instructor at Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Department of Foreign Languages in Türkiye. Her research interests are teaching writing and all aspects of L2 writing, especially academic writing. zeynepcanli@ksu.edu.tr
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1285-3364

Oktay Yağız is an Associate Professor at Atatürk University, Department of English Language Teaching in Türkiye. His research interests are English academic writing and educational research studies. He also teaches at undergraduate and graduate levels. yoktay@atauni.edu.tr
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7076-7774

Funding
None. This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
Conflicts of Interest
The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Authenticity
This manuscript is an original work.
Note: This study was adopted from the first author's Ph.D. dissertation in 2022.

References

Aydin, A., Yürük, S. E., Reisoğlu, İ., & Goktas, Y. (2023). Main barriers and possible enablers of academicians while publishing. *Scientometrics*, *128*(1), 623-650. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04528-x

Baaijen, V. M., Galbraith, D., & de Glopper, K. (2014). Effects of writing beliefs and planning on writing performance. *Learning and Instruction*, *33*, 81-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.04.001

Başaran, S., & Sofu, H. (2009). The process of writing research articles in English and getting published: A case study. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(2), 371-384. Available at https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jss/issue/24261/257169?publisher=gantep?publisher=gantep?publisher=gantep?publisher=gantep

Bolarinwa, O. A. (2015). Principles and methods of validity and reliability testing of questionnaires used in social and health science researches. *Nigerian Postgraduate Medical Journal*, *22*(4), 195-201. https://doi.org/10.4103/1117-1936. 173959

Bram, B. (1995). *Write well, improving writing skills*. Kanisius Publications.

Buckingham, L. (2008). Development of English academic writing competence by Turkish scholars. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 3,* 1-18. Retrieved from http://www.ijds.org/Volume3/IJDSv3p001-018Buckingham29.pdf

Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2013). *Writing scientific research articles: Strategy and steps*. John Wiley & Sons.

Casanave, C. P., &Vandrick, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Routledge Publication.

Chamot, A. U. (2005). The cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA): An update. In P. Richard-Amato, & M. Snow (Eds.), *Academic success for English language learners: strategies for K-12 mainstream teachers* (pp. 87-101). Longman.

Cheng, A. (2006). Analyzing and enacting academic criticism: The case of an L2 graduate learner of academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*(4), 279-306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.002

Chou, C. (1998). Evaluation and needs analysis of an academic writing course for international graduate students: ELI 83. https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu /handle/10125/20235

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.

Çapar, M. (2014). *A study on interactional metadiscourse markers in research articles*, (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University, Türkiye.

Driscoll, J., & Aquilina, R. (2011). Writing for publication: A practical six step approach. *International Journal of Orthopaedic and Trauma Nursing*, *15*(1), 41-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijotn.2010.05.001

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(3), 243-264. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80116-7

Gea-Valor, M. L., Rey-Rocha, J., & Moreno, A. I. (2014). Publishing research in the international context: An analysis of Spanish scholars' academic writing needs in the social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, *36*, 47-59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.05.001

Giridharan, B., & Robson, A. (2011). *Identifying gaps in academic writing of ESL students.* Presented in Enhancing Learning: Teaching and Learning Conference. Curtin University Available at Sarawak. https://espace.curtin.edu.au/handle/20.500.11937 /11979

Gupta, S., Jaiswal, A., Paramasivam, A., & Kotecha, J. (2022). Academic Writing Challenges and Supports: Perspectives of international doctoral students and their supervisors. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.891534

Güney, H. Z. (2015, March 4). Nitelikli bilimsel makale yazımı, editör ve yazar eğitim seminerleri-2, [Quality scientific article writing, editor and writer training seminars-2] *Turkish Academic Network and Information Center.* Available at https://ulakbim.tubitak.gov.tr/sites/images/Ulakbim/eyes2_ yazar_1.pdf

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2008). Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching*, *41*(4), 543-562. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005235

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. A&C Black.

Hyland, K. (2010). Community and individuality: Performing identity in applied linguistics. *Written Communication*, *27*(2), 159-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/074 1088309357846

Lavelle, E., & Bushrow, K. (2007). Writing approaches of graduate students. *Educational Psychology*, *27*(6), 807-822. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701366001

Lin, L. H., & Morrison, B. (2021). Challenges in academic writing: Perspectives of Engineering faculty and L2 postgraduate research students. *English for Specific Purposes*, *63*, 59-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.03.004

Mahon, Á., & Henry, S. (2022). But who are all these journal articles for? Writing, reading and our unhandsome condition. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *52*(1), 23-35. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2021.1933903

Moore, S. (2003). Writers' retreats for academicians: Exploring and increasing the motivation to write. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *27*(3), 333-342.https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877032000098734

Moreno, A. I., Rey-Rocha, J., Burgess, S., López-Navarro, I., & Sachdev, I. (2012). Spanish researchers' perceived difficulty writing research articles for English-medium journals: The impact of proficiency in English versus publication experience. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, *24*, 157-183. http://eprints.rclis.org/29319/

Murray, R. (2002). Writing development for lecturers moving from further to higher education: A case study. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *26*(3), 229-239. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770220149585

Murray, R., & Moore, S. (2006). *The handbook of academic writing: A fresh approach*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Olkun, S. (2006). Eğitim ile ilgili uluslararası bilimsel dergilerde yayın yapma süreci: fırsatlar, sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. Presented in *Sosyal Bilimlerde Süreli Yayıncılık Birinci Ulusal Kurultay Bildirileri*, (s.43-48). [Publishing process in international scientific journals related to education: opportunities, problems and solution suggestions. Presented in *Proceedings of the First National Congress on Periodical Publishing in Social Sciences*, (pp.43-48)] TUBİTAK-ULAKBİM. https://dspace.ankara.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.12575/41642/4238.pdf?sequence=1

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual.* McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

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

Wallen, N. E., & Fraenkel, J. R. (2001). *Educational research: A guide to the process*. Psychology Press.

White, M. J., & Bruning, R. (2005). Implicit writing beliefs and their relation to writing quality. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *30*(2), 166-189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2004.07.002

Yağız, O. (2009). *The academic writing of Turkish graduate students in social sciences: Approaches, processes, needs and challenges,* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Atatürk University, Türkiye.

Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(1), 29-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.004

Appendix

Challenges and experiences

Themes	Codes	*f*
AW Experiences	Advantages of taking explicit instruction from AW	16
	Experiencing AW by reading and writing articles	13
	The Necessity of AW Courses	22
	Contribution of supervisors in AW	8
	Self-developed strategies for AW	9
Writing Research Articles	Writing articles for publication	30
	Obligation to article publication	12
	Process of publication	14
	The difficulty in finding a proper journal	4
Language Choice While Writing RAs	Tendency to use L1 (Turkish)	11
	Indispensable role of L2 in AW	13
	Finding both languages important	4
	Feeling unconfident in both languages	2
Difficulties in Writing the Sections of an Article	Writing abstract	3
	Writing introduction	6
	Writing literature review	10
	Writing methodology	5
	Writing results/findings	3
	Writing discussion	18
	Writing conclusion	6
Challenges in Language Usage	Difficulty in Paraphrasing	6
	Finding appropriate lexicons	11
	Using grammatical rules	8
	Providing coherence and cohesion	17
	Need for proofreading	7
	The effort to be Reader-friendly	21