Doctoral Students and Writing Group Pedagogy for English Communication: Coaching Research Writing at a Japanese University

Hirsto, H., M. Enell-Nilsson & N. Keng (toim.) 2019. Työelämän viestintä II, Arbetslivskommunikation II, Workplace Communication II, Kommunikation im Berufsleben II. VAKKI-symposium XXXIX 7.–8.2.2019. VAKKI Publications 10. Vaasa, (123–136)

Doctoral Students and Writing Group Pedagogy for English Communication: Coaching Research Writing at a Japanese University

Karen Carter
University of Vaasa

Brett Walter, Micky Barbaloa
Hiroshima University

Zeinab Shrekerabi
University of Tehran

The student-advisor relationship is critical within the academic research environment in doctoral education. Like academic staff, doctoral students write papers, present data, and teach. As such, doctoral students communicate with academic staff to learn academic discourse as well as contribute to the output of research. In Japan, the relationship between doctoral student and advisor in a Japanese university context can be complicated by a lack of a common language between international doctoral students and Japanese advisors. Not all Japanese faculty are proficient in English and many international doctoral students are English Foreign Language (EFL) learners not proficient in Japanese. In addition, cultural traditions such as the senpai-kohai relationship that require deep respect of teachers by students can stifle communication between doctoral students and Japanese advisors. This qualitative study examines the use of English writing groups as a pedagogical tool and third-party facilitator as part of a communities of practice approach to improve English communication skills of doctoral student EFL learners in a Japanese university context. At a Japanese national university, we organized English speaking writing groups that consisted of eleven international doctoral students, three non-Japanese professors and one Japanese professor who met over a sixteen-week period. Despite the writing group's aim to produce a research paper in English, results from this study show improvement in workplace communication skills of dialogue, presentation, and the ability to ask questions.

Keywords: communities of practice, English as foreign language (EFL), international doctoral students, Japanese university, research writing, writing groups

1 Introduction

Communication between doctoral student and advisor is crucial in the teacher-student relationship for student intellectual growth (Wrench & Punyanunt 2004). At the same time doctoral students need to be comfortable discussing problems in research with their advisors as colleagues. In essence, advisors help doctoral students learn about the academic field, structure of research and writing and important aspects of being an academic professional. Thus, this relationship is vital for academic as well as professional success (Mccuen, Akar, Gifford & Srikantaiah 2009). To date, little research has been conducted in doctoral education in settings in which English is a foreign language (EFL), for both advisors and doctoral students, and in which oral communication is embedded within and subject to culture specific traditions. Therefore, we discuss the value of writing groups as third-party facilitators, using elements from writing group pedagogy to improve communication skills of doctoral students in a Japanese university context. Understanding the

value of third-party facilitation and writing group pedagogy necessitates an interdisciplinary approach that combines disciplines of rhetoric and second-language research to highlight the role of dialogue, presentation, and asking questions – pedagogical principles in teaching academic research and writing – to foster oral communication skills of EFL doctoral students. Through the community of practice approach (Wenger 1998), English-language writing groups were formed to discuss academic research papers in English. Pedagogical principles used in teaching writing facilitated research discussions in English so that doctoral students would learn to become more adept with tone and style when speaking in English to Japanese advisors. This study presents the writing group as a community of practice, demonstrating how it constitutes communication and acculturation to new workplace settings.

English is the common language among academics in many disciplines such as engineering, technology, business, physical and natural sciences, social sciences, and medicine. Yet Japanese is the primary language of instruction and communication at Japanese universities. Not all administrators or faculty are proficient in speaking or writing in English, let alone in mentoring doctoral students in English. While all international doctoral students could communicate in English, few could speak Japanese. For them English and Japanese were foreign languages. Thus, there were few opportunities for international doctoral students to engage in talk or reflect with peers and faculty while writing their research. The Japanese university in which this study took place, presents an illustrative example of division in English communication. The issue was problematic because the university was on a mission to improve the output of published research in English-language international journals (Yonezawa & Shimmi 2015; Hiroshima University 2017). Therefore, while these students had some ability to communicate in English – academic writing and discussion was challenging.

The situation at a Japanese university is further complicated by attitudes and beliefs by university faculty and advisors regarding teaching and learning. The senpai-kohai relationship is the hierarchical system based on seniority (Davies & Ikeno 2002; Takeuchi 2015) in which students (kohai) show deep respect to the teacher (senpai). Senpai are seen to have power and wisdom (Takeuchi 2015). Thus, with regard to asking questions, students find it difficult because it would be seen as a challenge to senpai and a potential loss of face. The hierarchical relationship between teacher and student discourages open dialogue and frowns on any kind of debate (Takeuchi 2015). However, academics globally recognize that debate is the hallmark of a good argument. The Japanese hierarchical power relationship has been shown to influence student learning negatively, because students do not ask for help when they do not understand (Takeuchi 2015) and student unwillingness to take part in collaborative discussion to foster their learning (Hays 2009 quoted in Takeuchi, 2009). Thus, while doctoral students need to learn the processes of structure and strategy of writing research in English, they also must frame their questions and inquiries according to Japanese social norms.

We utilize the community of practice theory (Wenger 1998) as a framework to explore how third-party facilitation through English writing pedagogy created a learning community based on mutual engagement. We used elements from writing group pedagogy as a teaching method to focus on those central to the creation of learning communication skills. The communities of practice framework provide structure to categorize the communication skills that transform and improve language learning within specific cultural contexts.

Prior studies show that writing groups offer a space in which a community interacts to bring meaning to an immediate experience. Academic writing groups have been researched as a social practice for graduate students (Aitchison 2009), in the promotion for faculty scholarship and development (Hampton-Farmer, Laverick, Denecker, Tulley, Diederich & Wilgus 2013), for emotional support for professional friendships (Ness, Duffy, Mccallum & Price 2014), as a method of inquiry for faculty researchers (Badenhorst, Hesson, Joy, Mcleod, Penney, Pickett, Li & Vaandering 2012; Penney, Young, Badenhorst, Goodnough, Hesson, Joy, Mcleod, Pickett, Stordy & Vaandering 2015), in support for interdisciplinary research among graduate students (Guerin 2013), in support for EFL essay writing (Mutwarasibo 2013), and identity development for graduate students as scholars (Lassig, Dillon & Diezmann 2013). In addition, speaking and writing assists with verbal and textual knowledge of academic discourse, analysis, and results of the research. Furthermore, these forms of communication in second-language instruction is not new. Previous research show support for both academic socialization and second language learning (Weissberg 2006; Kobayashi 2016). However, most writing group studies were conducted in the setting and context of an English-speaking country. There has been less attention in EFL research regarding writing groups as a pedagogical tool for oral communication that reflects local social context.

In this study we ask what effect the use of writing-group pedagogy and third-party facilitation would have on English language and cultural communication skill development of international doctoral students in a Japanese university context. To address this, in section two we discuss communities of practice as the theoretical framework, and in section three we discuss the research methods, data collection and analysis, and the pedagogical principles of teaching writing used in the research writing group. In section four we present the results of this study. In section five we conclude with pedagogical benefits.

2 Theoretical Framework

This study is situated within the framework of communities of practice theory (Wenger 1998). Since a writing group is a communal activity, using the theory of communities of practice reinforces the idea that learning is a social process (Wenger, McDermott & Snyder 2002) that assumes coherence in an activity that is gained through practice. English as a common language around the globe is always evolving and being shaped and

reshaped by both native and non-native English speakers. The practice of speaking English in a local EFL context manifests as dialogue in an exchange with peers to understand word meaning, visions and priorities. As a community of practice, the writing group operates as a space that might hold contradictions in English-language speaking and writing without rushing to quick conclusions that further static notions of how English should be used or understood.

Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern, set of problems, or passion about a topic and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area and interacting on an ongoing basis (Wenger et al. 2002: 5). The concept of communities of practice has been widely applied in academic settings that engage individuals in transformative experiences in scholar identity (Lassig et al. 2013; Nistor, Daxecker, Stanciu & Diekamp 2015) interdisciplinary collaboration (Henrich & Attebury 2010), English for Academic Purpose online assessment (Asoodar, Atai, Shahin Vaezi, Seyyedeh & Marandi 2014) and research in health sciences (Stevenson, Duffy, Somerville, Cooper, Hughes & Dziedzic 2014; Morley 2016). However, Wenger's attention to the primacy of practice is most applicable to English writing and communication in an EFL context. According to Wenger, coherence is gained from the fact of practice of a community pursuing an enterprise. Because social discourse in English is merged with writing practice, the effect of writing in an EFL context is not limited to the social discourse about writing, but also to the interweaving between EFL learners and their daily lived experience of learning to write for English publication and speaking in a non-English speaking context such as Japan.

Communities of practice offer EFL learners a space to create an expanded view of the English language because collaboration in English in an EFL context generates language knowledge through shared experiences while working on the writing process (O'Connor & Petch 2012). A dialogical and dialectical approach to writing that brings visibility to writing and communication is a social process and is in keeping with Mikhail M. Bakhtin's theories (1981:12) of the "dialogic imagination"--that there are multiple voices, viewpoints, and experiences embedded in any social context. Positioning the communities of practice in this light situates writing and communication more clearly as social processes. When the EFL writer writes, the moments spent in the writing group enhance intellectual discovery and experience in persuasive writing.

3 Background and Pedagogical Principles in Context

3.1 Writing Group Participants

As the Writing Advisor Fellow of the research planning office at a Japanese University, I established English writing groups in 2017. The ninety-minute group meetings were initiated in response to improving Japanese university world rankings by encouraging

Japanese faculty and graduate students to publish research in English-language journals. Together with the Institute for the Promotion of Global Education, two English-speaking teaching staff launched two groups that consisted of one Japanese university professor, five international doctoral students, and one Japanese doctoral student in the fields of English education, engineering, economics, and computer engineering. After eight weeks, it became clear that very specific writing needs were not being met in any capacity for graduate students. Typically, while they were expected to publish papers in English, English-language courses and English academic writing workshops were either not offered, or were inadequate to address the level of English needed for academic research and publication. A second eight-week session was initiated with three writing groups. Two groups were structurally the same from the first session. The third group consisted of six international doctoral students in the fields of mechanical, civil and computer engineering, forest science, Japanese as a second language, and one Japanese doctoral student in the field of English education. As a result, I facilitated all groups while the two English teaching staff each facilitated one group with me, in order to address specialized writing concerns experienced by students. We were also mindful that international doctoral students welcomed the opportunity to meet other students to talk about their research. The facilitators in this study were native English speakers and held PhDs in English and educational disciplines.

3.2 Research Methods, Data Collection, and Analysis

Data was collected from all participants via weekly journal entries through Google forms during the second eight-week session. In addition to the weekly journal entries, a mid-session and final survey was sent via print or electronic mail. First, journal entries were not collected during the first eight-week session because the university considered writing groups a pilot program and did not approve of research during the pilot. The rules for research during the pilot was relaxed after the first writing group session. Research was approved for the second eight-week session. With the approval of research, I gathered a range of data to foreground both student participants and my own observations. Silverman (2013:26) points out that for conducting qualitative research, naturally occurring data such as participatory observation and student journals capture ongoing conversations, interaction, and narratives that locate participant meaning to understand culturally and socially embedded phenomena. Therefore, a weekly Google form was sent to each student prior to the writing group meeting beginning in week three of the second eight-week session. Out of a total of 13 student participants, all responded to the weekly journal entry for five weeks during the session. Each Google form was titled "Journal entry for week ___." Students did not have to provide a name unless they wished to do so. In the first box on the Google form a question was posed to jog a response. The question for first week was, "What questions did you have that today's session answered for you?" Students were not required to answer the question. The second box was for students to write anything about their experience that happened in the writing group that week. Students

were aware that the objective of the journal entries was to gather and study perspectives about how writing groups facilitate learning about English academic writing. Student participants believed that regular social interaction around English text would help them to progress in their PhD dissertations and papers. Since most participants hoped to submit required papers to publications within 12–18 months, participants felt appreciative being guided by a "writing expert" as their facilitator. When asked what they appreciated most, the most common answer was the feedback from everyone in the group when engaging in critique of peers' text. Therefore, the weekly writing in journals through Google forms made writing about their experiences a worthwhile activity in order to justify the research to document for the university the need to maintain the writing groups. Second, a mid-session survey during the second session was given at week five via email and a final survey was given to all participants at the final meeting and sent via e-mail. All 13 student participants returned the mid-session survey and the final survey via e-mail or hand delivery. Surveys were collected for two reasons. First to understand how to improve and expand the program and second to use for research in this study. I will now draw from these data sets to explore how writing groups facilitated learning at a Japanese university. (See appendix for surveys).

3.3 Pedagogical Principles in Context

Scholarship in rhetoric and writing discourages a one-size-fits-all approach to teaching writing, because communication is a situated disciplinary activity (Breeze 2012; Dannels, Palmerton & Hously-Gaffney 2017: 13). Doctoral students particularly need to learn to to operate within the norms, values, and expectations that a particular discipline holds. This includes how questions are asked, what the rules of evidence are, and what the expectations are for quantitative or qualitative research or a combination of both. The question becomes, how are expectations for oral communication similar to and/or different from expectations for written communication in a particular discipline? In addition, are other forms of communicative competence valued in addition to writing and speaking? In the case of the EFL doctoral student in the Japanese university, senpai is the student's advisor and senior to the student, equivalent to a student-teacher relationship (Hays 2009: 591). In referencing tutors as teachers in a writing center, Hays says that North American tutors focus on collaborative learning in which tutors help to explain and share ideas but don't tell tutees what to do. In Japan the tutor (senpai) would likely tell the tutee what to do instead of creating an environment of collaborative learning. Therefore, the educational process is instructor-centered in which the teacher (senpai) is the wise sage (Roberts et al. 2008. In a Japanese university context, students might be expected to listen and not offer feedback. Within these hierarchical relationships, both parties know their specific role and adapt to it as enforced by societal norms (Roberts et al. 2008:.478).

Writing groups and writing pedagogy in the frame of communities of practice theory offers a platform from which a third-party facilitator can work with students to develop oral

communication skills in dialogue, presentation, and asking questions within Japanese academic and societal norms. The following principles in writing-group pedagogy were identified because they fit within the instructional emphasis of the writing group. The objective in addition to writing a research paper in English was to improve students' abilities to articulate research, think critically on approaches necessary for understanding the research question, and increase student critical awareness in the English language. Pedagogical principles identified below were necessary because students needed to learn communication within the Japanese context and its relationship to social norms.

Principle One, Dialogue: The focus of each meeting was based on one writing concept important for academic publication. Sub-topics were initiated by facilitators or participants. Discussions were led by participants or facilitators that created opportunities for group members to learn and share the management of a task at hand (Aitchison & Lee 2006: 272).

Principle Two, Presentation: At the first meeting and at the start of every meeting thereafter students articulated their research and their goals for that week. In doing so, participants discussed some of the barriers to writing in English and what aspects of English writing they enjoyed.

Principle Three, Asking Questions: Every participant agreed to share and read each other's work-in-progress. This provided the opportunity to gain confidence and practice speaking and writing in English, and to learn to ask questions. Participants were from different disciplines and different language backgrounds.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Dialogue

Despite this being a writing group, the role of the facilitator was to foster dialogue. Our observation during writing-group sessions showed that discussions about each participant's research in English increased word vocabulary and meaning to get primary points across to the listener. While sessions were scheduled for ninety minutes, a typical session extended to two hours because talk increased, and participants would continue speaking with facilitators. A substantial amount of research demonstrates a connection between speaking and writing as a holistic way to teach EFL (Aitchison 2009; Shahini & Riazi 2011). This perspective is in line with Wenger (1998) that holds learning as a social process and that social interaction is important in developing linguistic practices. Speaking and writing are initially separate but become interdependent during the act of writing. Discussion allows the writer to imagine, manipulate, and create new ideas with others. Discussion is a mental tool to organize thoughts. Thus, it enhances thinking which will in turn clarify what needs to be written. Through discussion we also show how writing groups ameliorate the rigidity of the senpai-kohai tradition.

Typically, participants collaborated with each other on a writer's paper and provided feedback to the writer. Each participant told the writer how they read and understood the writing and what he or she thought the writing meant as they understood it. The role of the facilitator was to enable a friendly environment to enable this type of discussion as well as to assist participants in clarifying and formulating ideas. Discussion on how a writing was understood by participants helped the writer to know if what was written was what he wanted to say. I observed growth in participant interaction. One Japanese participant stated, "I don't want to be wrong" to which participants responded, "You are not wrong, there is no wrong, it is your perspective so let's talk about it." In reflecting on experience another participant stated, "All these conversations are improving my writing and speaking skills."

One of the misperceptions about writing is that it is a top-down process in which the writer has pre-determined content that is simply put in words on a page, and that any problem with wording is due to language difficulty (de Larios, J. R. et al. 2014). In our groups, participants exhibited that writing was generated through discussion with others and in the production of the text. One student wrote:

> ...to receive the feed-back from people outside my field. It gives me a challenging feed-back and good advice in the way I am writing. ... outside [this] group, such as my Prof or my senior researcher, we just discussed the idea about what should we do and write, we seldom discussed in how should I write in order to make reader fully understand....

The writer above uses the word *challenging* to refer to the feedback received from other participants in the group. The phrase *good advice* follows in that the writer references the production of writing. For this writer the group offered the space for a discussion about his research that was challenging for thinking and to write about. By referencing his professor and senior researcher, he positioned his writing challenge in a relational sense to his research. Professor and senior researcher were the writer's senpai. Thus, the writer in this instance was challenged to articulate his ideas while producing the text.

The value of the writing group was that it was not subject to the senpai-kohai tradition. The hierarchy of power is embedded in the structure of the Japanese language (Takeuchi 2015: 115). English differs from Japanese in that there is no equivalent hierarchical system imbedded within the structure of English (emt. 116). Topics and sub-topics could be initiated by facilitators and participants. Discussions were sometimes led by participants or facilitators, creating opportunities for group members to learn and manage their time. Therefore, since facilitators were non-Japanese, and the mode of language was in English, dialogue was more relaxed given the language medium and non-Japanese cultural environment.

4.2 Presentation

Studies have shown that oral presentation aids in academic discourse socialization through participatory appropriation (Duff & Kobayashi 2010; Kobayashi 2016, 2003). This means that by the practice of oral presentation a student will learn the structure, strategies, and the rhetoric of academic discourse. At the start of every session students brought their work-in-progress to the writing group. At the start of meetings, each participant also had the opportunity to articulate their research by giving a short summary of the work they did that week. It could be about the research question, any aspect of methodology, sources or interpretation of results. These individual presentations were an informal way to explain research as well as deal with any problems they might have concerning the work. It is widely recognized that student talk matters to student learning (Dannels, et. al. 2017). Yet the reality is that our Japanese students didn't know how to use conversation for inquiry. The purpose of these short individual presentations was for participants to practice the talk of their work and to inform each other of their needs in helping to move the work forward. In effect, participants presented their work to others for feedback. In a final evaluation one participant wrote, "I have to compromise something to put my research together…" This participant was responding to the mid-session evaluation on what was learned. The use of the word "compromise" tells us that the participant learned to make choices on what was most important to focus in order to receive better feedback and guidance. Another participant stated, "[writing] is not about self-satisfaction, but about the clear entertainment of the reader." This participant realized that how they talk about and write about their work is for the benefit of the reader (or listener). Presentation allowed for writing group participants to practice how to be understood by an audience while learning the structure of academic discourse.

As stated earlier, teachers in Japan are given the utmost respect. Thus, giving a presentation in class or in a small group with a teacher present can be intimidating. However, a major challenge was not to read a script while interacting with the audience. One Japanese participant wanted to read a prepared script about his work. As the facilitator, I asked him to put down his paper and look at us. The action I took was not by accident. With knowledge of the social hierarchy, I--senpai--could ask the student to please tell us about his work without reading the script. After initial hesitation, the student did put down his paper, and he began to talk. Afterward, he wrote in his journal and told his advisor that "She made me speak without reading." His words, "She made me speak" illustrate that he did not feel agency in his decision. He was to take direction from his teacher without question. However, to "make" him speak in a presentation without aid allowed him to build confidence thereafter, and to dialogue with other participants.

In a final evaluation of the session a student stated, "Please keep these groups because I have no place else to talk about my research." This statement was in response to a question asking if the student would attend another writing group session if one was offered. The

statement "no place else to talk about my research" reflected that this student privileged the writing group as a space to talk about his work. In talking about his work, he implied he can better focus on objectives for writing. The very act of speaking about one's commitment to writing gives it a sense of permanence (O'Connor & Petch 2012). There is support for metacognitive knowledge such as goal setting during the planning stage of pre-writing that led writers to improve writing performance (de Larios, J.R., et al. 2014: 275). The space to give a short presentation at the beginning of each session allowed participants to gain socialization in academic discourse.

4.3 Asking Questions

The Japanese cultural norm in education is characterized as teacher-centered. Among the doctoral students in this study all had Japanese faculty advisors and thus accepted Japanese norms with regard to senpai-kohai. A key fact, however, is that Japanese faculty are not necessarily proficient in English. While some Japanese faculty have published in English, there was little evidence that Japanese faculty engage with their advisees in English writing or mentoring. Thus, at times discussion within the writing group was less about the writing and more about the research issues involved in developing the writing. This type of discussion required asking questions.

One participant stated:

> Because my research field is primarily focused on engineering and we came from the same field... most feedback is about technical matters... process data, determine the sophisticated method...

The statement above reflects that the writer felt comfortable in the group receiving and offering help to a colleague in the same disciplinary area. If the researcher is not yet clear on research processes such as methodology, research writing will lack clarity. In the above statement, the writer implied that first there needs to be clarity in the methodology to be sure that findings are based on a solid theoretical frame. The following statement illustrates that one participant's argument was not clear to other participants in the group.

> At the beginning, I thought the argument was not clear, but after a Karen's comment I saw the reaction [on participant's] face , it seemed she wanted to respect her advisor and do what her [advisor] says rather than doing her [own] discussion." In this statement the observer interpreted that another participant was reluctant to openly disagree with her advisor. Instead the other participant would dismiss her interpretation and follow the instructions of her advisor.

In the above excerpt a participant commented on how she viewed another participant's reaction to a comment from me. The statement, "it seemed she wanted to respect her advisor" implied that conflict was observed within the participant receiving feedback. The observer went further to state that since it would be difficult to disagree with one's advisor in Japanese culture, the participant receiving feedback would rather ignore the feedback than inquire further. The statement revealed that the observer was making a

judgment based on Japanese social and cultural norms. While we can't be sure the other participant felt conflicted about speaking to her advisor, the statement illustrates that the observer, an international doctoral student, was aware that communication is a situated activity informed by local and social cultural norms. Asking questions was difficult in the context of a Japanese university in which senpai-kohai is the social norm.

This cultural environment of the writing group as a separate space apart from Japanese social norms generally made it easier for international students to present and talk about their research. The following was in response to, "What question did today answer for you?" The participant responded, "It is necessary to show the reader what the novelty is. In which part an addition or an enhancement is proposed and why it should be conducted. So, keep asking Why? Why? and Why?" This repeated "why" was asked of every participant, but each would need to find their own way to ask senpai "why" if something was not understood or clear. As one participant wrote in the mid-session evaluation,

> I am not sure how my feedback could be effective because it seemed he was just taking note to consult with his advisor rather than thinking how these comments could improve the study.

The participant observed and made a judgment about how his feedback would be taken. But the statement illustrates that this participant clearly learned to ask questions, and that he recognized structures and strategies for academic discourse. Yet the environment inside the writing group was culturally and socially different from outside the writing group. Ultimately, participants would need to negotiate their learning when working outside the writing group with Japanese advisors.

5 Conclusions

As Japanese universities internationalize, the communities of practice approach can assist in the teaching and learning of writing in English. English is the common language globally in academic research, and like Japanese universities, the internationalization and global engagement of higher-education institutions must also include social and culture specific norms that can affect learning for an international marketplace.

In the writing groups we formed and studied, we demonstrated that learning to write occurred through interactions among many people, processes, and activities. Students learned by sharing writing, requesting feedback, and engaging in conversation. This qualitative analysis shows the value of the communities of practice approach, how learning occurs in real time, and the impact of culture-specific norms on teaching and learning. Future research can continue to analyze the communities of practice approach to examine the use of strategies on the quality of student-revised papers.

References

Aitchison, Claire & Alison Lee (2006). Research writing: Problems and pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education* 11(3), 265–278.

Aitchison, Claire (2009). Writing groups for doctoral education. *Studies in Higher Education* 34(8), 905–916. DOI: 10.1080/03075070902785580

Asoodar, Maryam, Mahmood Reza Atai, Shahin Vaezi & Seyyedeh Susan Marandi (2014). Examining Effectiveness of Communities of Practice in online English for academic purposes (EAP) assessment in virtual classes. *Computers & Education* 70, 291–300.

Badenhorst, Cecile, Jackie Hesson, Rhonda Joy, Heather Mcleod, Sharon Penney, Sarah Pickett, Xuemei Li & Dorothy Vaandering (2012). Faculty Writing Group Helps to Build Bridges in Academia. *Women in Higher Education* 21(1), 30.

Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Breeze, Ruth (2012). *Rethinking Academic Writing Pedagogy for the European University*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Dannels, Deanna P., Patricia R. Palmerton & Amy L. Hously-Gaffney (2017). *Oral Communication in the Disciplines. A Resource for Teacher Development and Training*. South Carolina: Parlor Press.

Davies, Roger & Osamu Ikeno (2002). *The Japanese Mind, Understanding Contemporary Japanese Culture*. Boston: Tuttle.

de Larios, J.R., F. Nicolás-Conesa & Y. Coyle (2016). 12 Focus on Writers: Processes and Strategies. *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing 11*, 267.

Duff, Patricia A. & Masaki Kobayashi (2010). The Intersection of Social, Cognitive, and Cultural Processes in Language Learning: A Second Language Socialization Perspective, 75-93. In: Sociocognitive Perspectives on Language Use and LanguageLearning. Ed. Rob Batstone. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guerin, Cally (2013). Rhizomatic Research Cultures, Writing Groups and Academic Researcher Identities. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies* 8, 137–150.

Hampton-Farmer, Cheri, Erin Laverick, Christine Denecker, Christine E. Tulley, Nicole Diederich, & Anthony Wilgus (2013). Growing a Faculty Writing Group on a Traditionally Teaching-Focused Campus: A Model for Faculty Development. *The Journal of Faculty Development* 27 (1), 56-62.

Hays, George (2009). Learners Helping Learners in an EFL Writing Center. In: *JALT2009 Conference Proceedings,* 589–596. Ed. A. M. Stoke. Available at: http://jaltpublications.org/archive/proceedings/2009/E013.pdf

Henrich, Kristin J. & Ramirose Attebury (2010). Communities of Practice at an Academic Library: A New Approach to Mentoring at the University of Idaho. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 36(2), 158–165.

Hiroshima University (2017). Hiroshima University Principles and Vision Splendor Plan. [cited 4.3.2017]. Available at: https://www.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/en/about/philosophy/SPLENDOR PLAN 2017

Kobayashi, Masaki (2016). L2 Academic Discourse Socialization Through Oral Presentations: An Undergraduate Student's Learning Trajectory in Study Abroad. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes* 72(1), 95–121.

Lassig, Carly J., Lisette H. Dillon & Carmel M. Diezmann (2013). Student or Scholar? Transforming Identities through a Research Writing Group. *Studies in Continuing Education* 35(3), 299–314.

McCuen, Richard H., Gulsah Akar, Ian Gifford& Deepa Srikantaiah (2009). Recommendations for Improving Graduate Adviser-Advisee Communication. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice* 135(4), 153–160.

Morley, Dawn (2016). Applying Wenger's communities of practice theory to placement learning. *Nurse Education Today* 39, 161–162.

Mutwarasibo, Faustin (2013). Promoting University Students' Collaborative Learning through Instructor-Guided Writing Groups. *International Journal of Higher Education* 2(3), 1–11.

Ness, Valerie, Kathleen Duffy, Jacqueline Mccallum & Lesley Price (2014). Getting Published:. Reflections of a Collaborative Writing Group. *Nurse Education Today* 34 (1), 1–5

Nistor, Nicolae, Irene Daxecker, Dorin Stanciu, Oliver Diekamp (2015). Sense of Community in Academic Communities of Practice: Predictors and Effects. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning* 69(2), 257–273.

O'Connor, Patrick & Melanie Petch (2012). The Embodied Writer: Merleau-Ponty, Writing Groups and the Possibilities of Space. *Writing in the Disciplines*, 75–97. Bingley*: Emerald*.

Penney, Sharon, Gabrielle Young, Cecil Badenhorst, Karen Goodnough, J Hesson, Rhonda Joy, Heather Mcleod, Sarah Pickett, Mary Stordy & Dorothy Vaandering (2015). Faculty Writing Groups: A Support for Women Balancing Family and Career on the Academic Tightrope. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 45(4), 457–479.

Roberts, Elizabeth & Elizabeth Tuleja (2008). When West Meets East: Teaching a Managerial Communication Course in Hong Kong. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 22(4), 474–489.

Shahini, Gholamhossein & A. Mehdi Riazi (2011). A PBLT Approach to Teaching ESL Speaking, Writing and Thinking Skills. *ELT Journal* 65(2), 170–179.

Silverman, David (2013). *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book About Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Stevenson, Kay, Helen Duffy, Simon Somerville, Vince Cooper, Rhian Hughes & Krysia Dziedzic (2014). Can Communities of Practice Assist the Implementation of Research Across the Academic Health Sciences Network? *Rheumatology* 53(1), i80.

Takeuchi, Hinako (2015). Peer Tutoring in Japan: A New Approach for a Unique Educational System. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal* 6(1), 112–119.

Weissberg, Robert (2006).*Connecting Speaking & Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Wenger, Etienne (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, Etienne, Richard McDermott & William Snyder (2002). *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A guide to Managing Knowledge*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.

Wrench, Jason S. & Narissra Punyanunt (2004). Advisee-advisor Communication: An Exploratory Study Examining Interpersonal Communication Variables in the Graduate Advisee-advisor Relationship. *Communication Quarterly* 52(3), 224–236.

Yonezawa, Akiyoshi & Yukiko Shimmi (2015). Transformation of University Governance through Internationalization: Challenges for Top Universities and Government Policies in Japan. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research* 70(2), 173–186.

Appendix

Final evaluation questions

1. What questions did you have answered through the writing group? What questions do you still need answers?
2. How do you feel about sharing your writing with others?
3. How do you feel when you are asked to share your writing with others?
4. If any advice from the facilitator was not helpful? Why was it not helpful?
5. What would you like to tell me about you as a writer; or what else would you like to tell me about your writing?
6. Would you be comfortable in a writing group without a facilitator? (meeting without a facilitator the group would meet on its own).
7. How likely are you to join another writing group if offered the opportunity? Circle: 1 least likely – 5 most likely.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Please describe your facilitator(s) strengths or weaknesses as a teacher/facilitator.

Mid-session evaluation questions

1. How well did this group work together? 1 is terrible, 5 is terrific.

1 2 3 4 5

Please state an explanation for your answer. Why was it terrible or why was it good. You may give an example of a situation.

2a. When I came into this writing group, I had hoped _____

_____

2b. This is what the writing group meant to me _____
2c. Name one or two practical things you learned that will help you to write and publish your paper._____
2d. I see myself as a (circle all that apply) researcher___author____writer_____other
Please explain your answer.
3. Here's what I still don't undestand_____
_
4. Please comment about things you disliked and what needs to be changed.
5. To what extent were your personal objectives met? 1 not met; 5 all met.
1 2 3 4 5
Explain what was not met and what could be done to meet your objectives next time?
6. How interested are you in joining another writing group with the goal of publishing your research in English? 1 Not interested; 5 Want to join again. 1 2 3 4 5