Journal of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University
วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์
Journal homepage: https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/liberalarts/index

Enhancing Research-Publication Competencies of EFL Doctoral Students in English Studies: A Follow-up Study on the Reframed Community of Practice Model

Saneh Thongrin*

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University, Thailand

Article Info

Research Article

Article History:
Received 15 January 2025
Revised 4 March 2025
Accepted 10 March 2025

Keywords :
Reframed Community of Practice (CoP), Disciplinary Writing Expertise (DWE) framework, research-publication competencies

* Corresponding author
E-mail address:
saneh.t@arts.tu.ac.th

Abstract

This follow-up study, the third phase of a longitudinal project, examined how the Research-Publication (Res-Pub) Training Workshop, grounded in the Disciplinary Writing Expertise (DWE) framework, influenced 20 doctoral students' self-efficacy in key areas of the Reframed Community of Practice (CoP) model, which is built on the perspectives of Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998). These students were in English Studies, whose research focused on areas within the Humanities and Social Sciences. It explored the participants' self-efficacy in six elements of the Reframed CoP model that characterized their scholarly development post-workshop: Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning, Participatory Learning Dynamics, Academic Identity Formation, Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices, Scholarly Professional Growth, and Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing. The data from a 2019 self-efficacy survey and 2022 follow-up interviews revealed high overall self-efficacy (grand mean = 3.32), with the strongest efficacy in Participatory Learning Dynamics (mean = 3.70), Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning (mean = 3.65), Academic Identity Formation (mean = 3.62), and Cognitive Mastery (mean = 3.38). However, moderate efficacy in Constructive Adversities (mean = 2.82), and Scholarly Professional Growth (mean = 2.79) suggests that the participants have yet to fully embrace independent scholarship due to limited access to global academic discourse. Qualitative findings complimentarily strengthened the quantitative data, highlighting roles of research knowledge and experienced members of the community, and knowledge construction fostered by the Reframed CoP model. The findings suggest the need for enhanced pathways to support early career scholars' development.

1. Introduction

The transition from doctoral students to novice scholars represents a critical phase in academic careers (Baker & Pifer, 2011), and markes the culmination of intensive research, writing, and the development of specialized expertise (Kamler, 2008). As students defend their dissertations, they embark on the journey toward independent scholarship, which necessitates autonomy in research (Jameson et al., 2021). Although doctoral programs often emphasize close collaboration with advisors on research design, data collection, and analysis, many students encounter challenges in completing their programs or producing research that meets publishable standards, even with significant institutional support (Jones & Smith, 2022; Li, 2002). These challenges highlight persistent gaps in training models that comprehensively prepare students for research quality and successful academic publication.

This three-phase study addresses these gaps by supporting EFL doctoral students in developing research and writing competencies. Based on the students' challenges and needs, I developed the Research-Publication (Res-Pub) Training Workshop underpinned by the Disciplinary Writing Expertise (DWE) framework as a structured approach to guide their academic growth.

In Phase 1 (2015–2016), I investigated the challenges faced by the participants (N=41). Results showed their difficulties in spontaneously translating their intended meaning into writing, writing to meet native speaker or editorial standards, and mastering research writing skills. The participants expressed their need for practical training and exposure to research articles acceptable for native speaker standards. The results then informed Phase 2 (2017-2019), where I implemented the Res-Pub Training Workshop to teach 20 doctoral students using the DWE framework, which consisted of three main models: (1) the Reframed Community of Practice (CoP) model for scholarly development, (2) the Scholarly Rigor and Expertise (SR-E) model for articulating research quality, and (3) the Scholarly Publication and Expertise (SP-E) model for academic writing and publishing. A t-test analysis showed a significant improvement in the participants' research logic and writing in the Introduction, Literature Review, and Methods sections.

As an invited Asian featured speaker, I presented the results from these two phases at the 2020 international conference (Thongrin, 2020), co-hosted by the New Korean Association of English Language and Literature (NKAELL), the Pan-Korea English Teachers Association (PKETA), and the Korean Association of Language Sciences (KALS), and incorporated comments and feedback from the conference into the design of Phase 3, conducted in 2022. This phase included qualitative interviews (N=8) to complement the quantitative self-efficacy findings (N=20) previously examined in 2019. The overall findings revealed the participants' high self-efficacy in certain

areas of the Reframed CoP, the SR-E, and the SP-E models, and thus validated the effectiveness of the DWE framework in enhancing research quality and fostering scholarly publication. The present study highlights the role of the Reframed CoP model in supporting the participants' holistic development as emerging scholars.

Through a self-efficacy survey with a mixed-methods analysis, this follow-up study examined how EFL doctoral graduates perceive their sustained development within the Reframed CoP model, by addressing a research question: How does a writing-publication workshop, grounded in the Disciplinary Writing Expertise framework, impact doctoral students' self-efficacy in key areas of the Reframed Community of Practice?

2. Literature Review

Given the lack of structured frameworks to support EFL doctoral students' research and publication competencies, there is a clear need for a well-defined model to guide both mentors and students (Cranwell-Ward et al., 2014). To address this gap, I developed the Reframed CoP model as a collaborative learning space for students. This model aimed to assess the participants' self-efficacy as an indicator of the workshop's effectiveness in enhancing their research-writing development. Accordingly, this literature review explores the foundational principles of the Community of Practice (CoP) framework, translated into the Reframed CoP model, along with research quality, research rigor, and publishability.

2.1 Community of Practice (CoP) and Its Applications

The concept of CoP was introduced by Lave and Wenger (1991) and expanded by Wenger (1998). It describes a social learning model in which individuals engage in collective learning within a shared domain of interest. CoP is characterized by three core elements: (1) domain, representing the members' shared knowledge or interest; (2) community, fostering relationships and mutual engagement among members; and (3) practice, encompassing shared tools, experiences, and resources used in learning (Wenger, 1998). Although CoP has faced criticism (see Tummons, 2012), it remains widely appplied across research settings. This study applies the CoP framework by integrating its practical features, such as collaborative learning and interactions among members. These elements help newcomers familiarize themselves with the norms and practices of the targeted academic discourse community, particularly in research and publication.

CoP emphasizes situated learning, where newcomers become full participants by acquiring the group's knowledge and practices. It has been applied in contexts like training non-native doctoral students for academic publication, where writing is seen as a situated practice. The CoP framework helps students develop tacit and explicit knowledge

to meet academic publishing expectations (Li, 2002), aligning with Lave and Wenger's works on Situated Learning (1991) and Wenger's Communities of Practice (1998). Wenger (1998) argues that learning occurs within communities sharing knowledge and practices. In CoP-structured training programs, interactions between doctoral students and experienced researchers allow students to learn academic publication conventions, develop research expertise, and enhance writing and communication skills (Kamler & Thomson, 2006), Studies show that such programs contribute to publication success.

Two key features support doctoral students' learning: participation is incremental, with students learning from experienced community members (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and students transition from peripheral to core roles. For example, students may start with tasks like literature reviews or data coding and move to core roles like research design, analysis, and manuscript drafting. As Lave & Wenger (1991) emphasize, doctoral students progress by engaging in practices led by experienced members, and later on shift roles, starting as apprentices and eventually becoming central members. In doctoral education, students are expected to publish to earn their degrees. Ideally, they learn from dissertation advisors, engage with departmental culture and participate in research activities. However, power dynamics may influence the extent to which doctoral students engage in group participation (Cotterall, 2011). While learning from experienced members is prevalent in sciences, where doctoral students often gain hands-on experience through principal investigator-led research, it is less common in the social sciences and humanities. This aligns with findings by E. Lee and Norton (2003), where participants gained expertise through interactions with journal and book editors rather than their advisors. Such findings suggest that working closely with experienced peers could better prepare doctoral students for publication while fostering independence as scholars. Also, the development of doctoral students' literacies, knowledge, and relational connections (Heron et al., 2024), and identity formation Robers's (2021) could be supported by participation with experienced members. However, students confined to local academic settings may acquire skills tailored only to local publications (Canagarajah, 2003). This underscores the importance of mentorship from experienced researchers capable of navigating both local and international publication contexts.

By integrating students into scholarly communities, CoP-oriented instruction offers opportunities for mentorship, peer collaboration, and engagement with authentic publication practices. This collaborative environment enables doctoral students to develop critical skills, such as understanding journal requirements, addressing reviewer comments, and refining their academic voice (Morita, 2004). While prior applications of CoP in research often focus on immediate skills, strengthening the CoP context involves leveraging Wenger's (1998) three modes of belonging: engagement, referring to active participation in the community that fosters shared understanding and coordination;

alignment, the coordination of practices and goals of the community ; and imagination, which entails “creating images of the world and seeing connections through time and space” (p. 176). These modes allow students to align their identities and contributions with broader academic contexts. However, the literature lacks theoretical discussion on these aspects, highlighting the need for a structured framework for mentors and students (Cranwell-Ward et al., 2014). This study consequently bridges the gap by translating key theories into a practical model.

2.2 The Reframed Community of Practice (CoP) Model

In this study, I translated the CoP framework into a structured learning space, which I called the Reframed CoP model, with relevant concepts applied to frame doctoral students’ engagement within the workshop. Detailed rationales for each element of the Reframed CoP model are provided to strengthen the model and its application in supporting their scholarly development.

Table 1

Reframed CoP Model as a Teaching Approach Supporting Participants’ Learning Engagement.

Item no.	Elements	Description	Rationale
1.	Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning	Students learn from: - interaction with experts (instructor guidance). - interaction with more experienced peers. - interaction with peers at earlier stages of expertise. - interaction with peers at a similar level of expertise. - published research articles.	- Highlights the teaching approach, using the structured mentorship and guidance by experienced scholars or peers (Aitchison, 2009; Maher, 2014; Thongrin, 2018; Vygotsky’s ZPD, 1978). - Working with more experienced members with social interaction can also serve as resources of newcomers’ learning.
2.	2.1 Participatory Learning Dynamics	- Receive ideas, feedback, and support from other members. - Offer ideas, feedback, and assistance to other members. - Engage reciprocally in community tasks.	- Captures active engagement and iterative learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Maher et al., 2013; Wenger, 1998). - Serves as learning process, and participating engagement.

Table 1

Reframed CoP Model as a Teaching Approach Supporting Participants' Learning Engagement. (Cont.)

Item no.	Elements	Description	Rationale
	2.2 Academic Identity Formation	- Power relation - Identity negotiation - Identity construction - Identity reconstruction	- Uses an established academic standard (Cotterall, 2011; Kamler & Thomson, 2006) to identify a process of building academic identity and its process of negotiation (Barnacle & Mewburn, 2010).
3.	3.1 Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices	Awareness of: - epistemic expertise - disciplinary knowledge - quality research - research rigor - argument in main sections of research articles	- Specifies intellectual and skill-based immediate learning outcomes (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Lea & Street, 1998). - Identifies learning product in terms of cognitive outcomes.
	3.2 Scholarly Professional Growth	- Novices in Thai contexts - Novices in the global discourse community - Experts in Thai contexts - Experts in the global discourse community - Contributions to group members - Contributions to Thai ELT - Contributions to the disciplinary community	- Refines focus to academic and professional skills (Kamler & Thomson, 2006; Maher et al., 2013). - Envisions long-term learning products closely associated with awareness in and development of professional expertise.
	3.3 Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing	- Conflict - Tension - Resistance	- Reframes challenges as opportunities for growth (Aitchison & Guerin, 2014; Boice, 1992). - Identifies learning product in relation to possible negative outcomes that, in turn, informs further development.

These six elements I reframed from the CoP principle are grounded in theoretical frameworks. The first element, Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning, emphasizes that learners or novices gain knowledge through social interaction and engagement with more experienced community members. This element highlights the teaching approach used in this learning environment, which involves structured mentorship and guidance from experienced scholars or peers (Aitchison, 2009; Maher, 2014; Thongrin, 2018; Vygotsky's ZPD, 1978). In this context, the researcher and experienced peers act as mentors, collaboratively coaching novice members of the community.

The second element, Participatory Learning Dynamics, and the third element, Academic Identity Formation, together represent the participants' engagement in the learning process. Participatory Learning Dynamics captures active involvement and iterative learning, facilitating the learning process through meaningful participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Maher et al., 2013; Wenger, 1998). Meanwhile, Academic Identity Formation focuses on building and negotiating academic identity in alignment with established academic standards (Cotterall, 2011; Kamler & Thomson, 2006), shaping the participants' roles within their academic disciplines (Barnacle & Mewburn, 2010). These two elements intersect during the participants' developmental processes, laying the foundation for the learning outcomes reflected in the final three elements.

The remaining three elements focus on learning outcomes**.** The fourth element, Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices, reflects immediate intellectual and skill-based achievements resulting from the learning process (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Lea & Street, 1998). This element encompasses the cognitive products of learning. The fifth element, Scholarly Professional Growth, represents sustained development through the refinement of academic and professional skills (Kamler & Thomson, 2006; Maher et al., 2013). It highlights long-term outcomes tied to enhanced professional expertise and self-awareness. Finally, the sixth element, Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing, reframes challenges encountered during academic publishing as opportunities for growth (Aitchison & Guerin, 2014; Boice, 1992). This element shows how overcoming setbacks can foster further development and resilience. As such, the Reframed CoP model was used to guide doctoral students in developing essential research competencies neccessary for successful publication.

2.3 Research Quality and Research Rigor

Research quality includes validity, reliability, originality, and the significance of findings (J. W. Creswell & Creswell, 2018). High-quality research is methodologically rigorous that adheres to methodological standards and thus offers new knowledge. It involves rigor (Holbrook, 2007), originality (Adunyarittigun et al., 2023; Erwee & Perry, 2018; Winter et al., 2000), and contributions to new knowledge (Adunyarittigun et al., 2023; Erwee & Perry, 2018; Kiley, 2009). Publishability relies on well-designed studies (Clarke & Lunt, 2014; Golding et al., 2013 ; Holmes et al., 2020) and research knowledge,

where researchers are required to design robust studies with appropriate frameworks and methods.

Research rigor is a key aspect of quality, as it involves the systematic and transparent application of methods (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), which leads to positive impact on publishability (Bryman, 2016). Research with rigor requires clear research questions, robust methodologies, and well-supported conclusions. Traditionally associated with quantitative methods (Cook & Campbell, 1979), rigor now includes trustworthiness, credibility, and transferability in qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Trustworthiness serves as reliability and validity, including credibility of findings, transferability (applicability to other contexts), dependability (process consistency), and confirmability (objectivity). However, non-native doctoral students often face challenges in achieving rigor due to limited resources, language barriers, and unfamiliar academic conventions (Paltridge & Starfield, 2016). Incorporating rigor into publication training—through workshops on research design, data analysis, and ethics, along with iterative feedback (A. Lee & Kamler, 2008)—ensures methodologically sound, contextually relevant, and impactful research. By aligning rigor with epistemic expertise and disciplinary knowledge, these programs support students in meeting journal quality thresholds.

2.4 Publishability

Publishability results from the interplay of epistemic expertise, disciplinary knowledge, and research rigor. Effective training programs integrate these elements to build the professional expertise of non-native doctoral students. Beyond publication, publishability reflects the ability to contribute meaningfully to scholarly discourse and advance disciplinary knowledge (Belcher, 2007). However, challenges in doctoral students' research publication have been widely documented across various disciplines, including doctoral studies (e.g., Golding et al., 2013; Lovitts, 2007), genre analysis (e.g., Lim, 2006; Swales & Feak, 2012), and dissertation writing (e.g., Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Kamler, 2008; Paltridge & Starfield, 2016). To help non-native doctoral students, existing training programs tend to put more emphses on language accuracy over research content, quality, and the integration of disciplinary knowledge and epistemic expertise. Consequently, there is a growing call for professional training that combines epistemic knowledge, critical evaluation of methodologies, ethical research practices, and effective scholarly communication. These skills enable sustained scholarly engagement and ensure rigorous, ethically sound research. However, many EFL researchers face challenges in methodological design, data analysis, and theoretical grounding, limiting their ability to produce publishable work (Casanave, 2011). Paltridge and Starfield (2016) emphasize embedding research skills training into academic writing programs to address these gaps.

Training programs grounded in CoP principles promote holistic professional development by fostering mentorship, collaboration, and continuous learning (Wenger, 1998). However, research gaps remain, particularly in the humanities and social sciences,

where nuanced epistemic practices and writing conventions pose unique challenges (Curry & Lillis, 2014). This study addresses these gaps by examining how the Res-Pub Training Workshop underpinned by the Reframed CoP model situated within the DWE framework, and research rigor can enhance publishability for EFL doctoral students in these fields.

3. Research Methods

3.1 Research Context

This study took place within a doctoral program in English Studies at a leading Thai university, where students conducted research dissertations within the areas of social sciences and humanities. The program was taught-based, with dissertations and international publications required.

3.2 Research Approach and Design

This follow-up study used a mixed-methods approach to explore the participants' sustained development fostered by the Res-Pub Training Workshop underpinned by the Reframed CoP model situated within the DWE framework. The mixed-methods design (J. W. Creswell & Creswell, 2018) integrated quantitative data from a self-constructed survey based on self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) with qualitative data from focus group and individual interviews. This combination provided a comprehensive understanding of how the workshop improved the participants' research competencies, and, consequently, their publishability.

The Reframed CoP model was grounded in the principles of Community of Practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), which emphasized the co-construction of knowledge within a social context, and research quality with research rigor, all of which could contribute to the participants' publishability. In this context, a follow-up survey was designed using self-efficacy to assess the participants' confidence in their disciplinary expertise and research quality, which are critical factors for producing publishable academic work.

3.3 Research Participants

The participants of this longitudinal study were twenty doctoral students (nineteen female and one male) in the English Studies program. They were included to this follow-up study during their doctoral studies though a convenience sampling method on a voluntary basis, following the completion of the second phase of the study in 2019, where two were in the final stages of publishing, fifteen were working on their dissertations, and three were exploring research topics. In terms of disciplines, four students were in social sciences, five in humanities, and eleven used interdisciplinary approaches.

In 2022, eight doctoral graduates, who had already taken part in the survey, participated in focus-group discussions and in-depth interviews through a purposive

sampling on a voluntary basis. These eight doctoral graduates demonstrated learning engagement essential for understanding the Reframed CoP model.

Both concenience sampling for the quantitative self-efficacy survey and purposive sampling for qualitative interviews were conducted on a volunatary basis to uphold research integrity and minimize bias. This combination ensures that participation was not compulsory. While these sampling methods may limit generalizability, measures were taken to mitigate research bias by ensuring transparency in data collection, anonymizing responses, and triangulating qualitative and quantitative data (J. W. Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Below are the profiles of the participants involved in the qualitative self-efficacy study.

Table 2

Participant Profile for the Interviews

No.	Participant	Participants' Fields of Research	Participants' Research Stage during the Quantitative Self-Efficacy Study
1	P1	Social science	Final stage of publishing
2	P2	Mixed	Final stage of publishing
3	P3	Social science	Candidature process
4	P4	Mixed	Candidature process
5	P5	Social science	Candidature process
6	P6	Mixed	Candidature process
7	P7	Humanity	Topic exploration
8	P8	Humanity	Topic exploration

By the time of the interview for this follow-up study, he participants had completed their doctoral degrees. They were teaching at the college level—four at public universities, two at private universities, one at a community college, and one at a vocational college.

3.4 Sources of Data

Data were collected from two primary sources. The first source was a self-efficacy survey administered during the participants' doctoral studies. This survey was self-constructed to explore their perceptionts of research and writing development within the Reframed CoP model after the participation in the Res-Pub Training Workshop during Phase 2. The second source consisted of focus-group discussions and individual interviews conducted after the participants graduated. Focus-group interviews encouraged the participants to build on each other's ideas, creating a dynamic discussion that generated richer data compared to individual interviews. Together, these data sources offered valuable insights into the participants' perspectives and challenges, providing a deeper understanding of the factors that influenced publishability. Individual interviews,

in particular, created a comfortable space for the participants to share sensitive or critical feedback without peer influence.

3.5 Research Instruments

In this study, I used two research instruments. The first was a self-efficacy survey (Bandura, 1997), self-constructed to align with the principles of Community of Practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Designed to assess the participants' sustained development, the survey measured their confidence in research-publication practices over time and served as a predictor of scholarly professional growth (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). In this framework, I reframed the community that supported the participants' learning process through six key elements: (1) Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning, (2) Participatory Learning Dynamics, (3) Academic Identity Formation, (4) Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices, (5) Scholarly Professional Growth, and (6) Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing. These elements, drawn from literature on building novice researchers' expertise in research and publication skills, guided the participants' learning processes in this research context.

The survey contains three sections: (1) demographic information, (2) the Reframed CoP elements, and (3) an open-ended section. The survey used a 4-point self-efficacy scale (I do not think I could do this, I might not do this, I could probably do this, and I am confident I could do this), and the data would be quantitatively analyzed. The survey was then validated through the Index of Congruence (IOC) and Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient with the values of 0.89, and 0.78, respectively. The IOC was achieved by three English teachers with over 10 years of research experience. To mitigate the issue of participant attrition (Gay, 2009), I administered the survey during the participants' doctoral studies.

The second instrument included qualitative semi-structured interviews used in focus-group and individual interviews, which were conducted to explore the participants' sustained development after graduation. With both interview types, I could understand how EFL doctoral graduates perceived their progress in engaging with the Reframed CoP model. This mixed-methods approach supported methodological triangulation, enhancing the credibility and validity of the findings (Patton, 2015). Focus groups captured a range of perspectives and facilitated discussion on how the participants collectively engaged with the framework, while individual interviews offered a deeper understanding of their personal experiences (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015).

3.6 Research Procedure

This longitudinal study included three phases: (1) a preliminary survey (2015-2016) to identify challenges in dissertation publishing, (2) the design of the Res-Pub Training Workshop underpinned by the DWE model (2017-2018) for scholarly training implementation (2018-2019) with emphases on epistemic expertise, research rigor, and publishability, and (3) a follow-up survey (2022) to assess the model's effectiveness.

The present study highlights Phase 3, which focused on how the participants' six areas of scholarly growth evolved based on the Reframed CoP model. The same participants who had taken part in Phase 2 (N = 20) were contacted to voluntarily participate in the follow-up self-efficacy survey, which was offered in both online and printed formats for their convenience. Following the survey, focus group interviews were conducted with eight participants, followed by individual interviews conducted in-person and via online platforms.

3.7 Data Analysis

In this study, I used two types of analysis. Quantitative survey data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, while qualitative data derived from focus-group and in-depth interviews were analyzed through thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In the qualitative analysis, I, first of all, reviewed transcripts and my research logs to explore the participants' engagement, skill development, and emerging themes. The data were then systematically coded to identify self-efficacy themes within the six areas of the Reframed CoP model. Next, a peer debriefing process with an experienced researcher in training programs at a Thai college ensured validity by validating data interpretation and coding until discripancies were resolved. This approach strengthened analytical rigor and enabled the findings to be consistent with the Reframed CoP model (Shenton, 2004).

4. Results

Research Question: How does a writing-publication workshop, grounded in the Disciplinary Writing Expertise framework, impact doctoral students' self-efficacy in key areas of the Reframed Community of Practice?

By focusing on the six elements of the Reframed CoP model used in the workshop, this research question captures the essential components of the model while addressing the social and collaborative aspects of knowledge construction among doctoral students. The data presented below show how EFL doctoral graduates perceived their developmental progress in engaging with the Reframed CoP model.

Table 4

Data on Participants' Perceptions of their Developmental Progress in Engaging with the Reframed Community of Practice Model.

Item	I can …	I am confident I could do this. (%)	I could probably do this. (%)	I might not do this. (%)	I do not believe I could do this. (%)	Mean	SD	Interpreted results
1. Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning								
1.1	learn from interaction with the instructor.	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	3.80	0.41	High S-E
1.2	learn from interaction with more experienced peers.	75.00	20.00	5.00	0.00	3.70	0.57	High S-E
1.3	learn from interaction with peers at earlier stages of expertise.	50.00	30.00	20.00	0.00	3.30	0.80	High S-E
1.4	learn from interaction with peers at a similar level of expertise.	70.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	3.65	0.59	High S- E
1.5	learn from scholars authoring RA samples.	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	3.80	0.41	High S-E
	Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning's Mean					3.65	0.56	High S-E
2. Participatory Learning Dynamics								
2.1	learn from members' ideas and feedback.	80.00	15.00	5.00	0.00	3.75	0.55	High S-E
2.2	offer ideas, feedback, and assistance to other members while on task.	50.00	35.00	15.00	0.00	3.35	0.74	High S-E
2.3	actively engage in the community tasks.	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	3.75	0.44	High S-E
2.4	learn from the instructor's ideas and comments.	95.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	3.95	0.22	High S-E
	Participatory Learning Dynamics's Mean					3.70	0.49	High S-E
3. Academic Identity Formation								
3.1	sense the notion of power between more experienced members and me.	70.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	0.47	High S-E
3.2	reflect on my academic identity when reviewing published works.	95.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	3.95	0.22	High S-E

Table 4

Data on Participants' Perceptions of Their Developmental Progress in Engaging with the Reframed Community of Practice Model. (Cont.)

Item	I can …	I am confident I could do this. (%)	I could probably do this. (%)	I might not do this. (%)	I do not believe I could do this. (%)	Mean	SD	Interpreted results
3.3	rethink about my academic identity while participating in the training with various members.	90.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	3.90	0.31	High S-E
3.4	change my academic identity when participating in the training with various members.	55.00	30.00	15.00	0.00	3.40	0.75	High S-E
3.5	sense some impact on my academic identity.	20.00	75.00	5.00		3.15	0.49	Moderate S-E
	Academic Identity Formation's Mean					3.62	0.45	High S-E
4. Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices								
4.1	learn from the training, with more awareness of epistemic expertise important for high quality research.	30.00	65.00	5.00		3.25	0.55	High S-E
4.2	learn from the training, with more awareness of disciplinary knowledge important for publishability.	25.00	75.00			3.25	0.44	High S-E
4.3	learn from the training, with more awareness of research quality influencing publishability.	45.00	55.00			3.45	0.51	High S-E
4.4	learn from the training, with more awareness of research rigor influencing publishability.	85.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	3.85	0.37	High S-E
4.5	learn from the training, with more awareness of arguments that lead to clear writing.	20.00	70.00	10.00		3.10	0.55	Moderate S-E
	Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices's Mean					3.38	0.48	High S-E

Table 4

Data on Participants' Perceptions of Their Developmental Progress in Engaging with the Reframed Community of Practice Model. (Cont.)

Item	I can …	I am confident I could do this. (%)	I could probably do this. (%)	I might not do this. (%)	I do not believe I could do this. (%)	Mean	SD	Interpreted results
5. Scholarly Professional Growth								
5.1	still become a novice within the Thai academic contexts.	55.00	35.00	10.00	0.00	3.45	0.69	High S-E
5.2	become a novice of the global academic discourse community.	15.00	65.00	20.00	0.00	2.95	0.60	Moderate S-E
5.3	become an expert within the Thai academic contexts.	5.00	50.00	30.00	15.00	2.45	0.83	Low S-E
5.4	become an expert of the global academic discourse community.	10.00	35.00	40.00	15.00	2.40	0.88	Low S-E
5.5	contribute to other group members.	15.00	65.00	20.00	0.00	2.95	0.60	Moderate S-E
5.6	contribute to Thai ELT.	15.00	65.00	20.00	0.00	2.95	0.60	Moderate S-E
5.7	contribute to the global disciplinary community.	10.00	40.00	45.00	5.00	2.40	0.73	Low S-E
	Scholarly Professional Growth's Mean					2.79	0.70	Moderate S-E
6. Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing								
6.1	have some academic conflicts with the academic discourse community.	5.00	15.00	55.00	25.00	3.00	0.79	Moderate S-E
6.2	have some tension regarding the unequal opportunities in publishing.	10.00	35.00	40.00	15.00	2.40	0.88	Low S-E
6.3	participate in the academic discourse community.	5.00	20.00	40.00	35.00	3.05	0.89	Moderate S-E
	Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing's Mean					2.82	0.85	Moderate S-E
	Grand Mean					**3.32**	**0.58**	High S-E

N=20

3.25 - 4.00: High Self-Efficacy 2.50 - 3.24: Moderate Self-Efficacy

1.75 - 2.49: Low Self-Efficacy 1.00 - 1.74: Very Low or no Self-Efficacy

Indicated by the Grand Mean (3.32), the workshop underpinned by the Reframed CoP model situated within the DWE framework was found to contribute to the participants' learning. The first four elements were identified as high self-efficacy, while the final two revealed a moderate level, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Ranking of the Reframed CoP Elements with Mean and S.D. Values

Rank	High Self-Efficacy		Moderate Self-Efficacy	
	Element with its Order in the Model	Element Mean and S.D.	Element with its Order in the Model	Element Mean and S.D.
1	2. Participatory Learning Dynamics	3.70 (0.49)	6. Constructive Adversities in Academic	2.82 (0.85)
2	1. Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning	3.65 (0.56)	5. Scholarly Professional Growth	2.79 (0.70)
3	3. Academic Identity Formation	3.62 (0.45)		
4	4. Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices	3.38 (0.48)		

Among the elements with high self-efficacy, ranked first is Participatory Learning Dynamics, the second element, which reflects the participants' highest engagement in the learning process and their active participation. The participants expressed the highest confidence in their learning process, which was supported by the instructor's comments and feedback (mean = 3.95), followed by contributions from community members (mean = 3.75) and their own engagement in the learning process (mean = 3.75). Notably, the participants' contributions to helping other community members were also perceived with high self-efficacy (mean = 3.35).

Ranked second is the first element of the Reframed CoP model, Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning. The participants expressed confidence in interacting with the instructor and learning from research article samples, both of which were rated highly (mean = 3.80 each). Interaction with peers who had more experience (mean = 3.70) and those with similar experience (mean = 3.65) were also rated positively. These aspects had greater mean values than those in other elements, suggesting that the participants felt more comfortable receiving help from more experienced coaches or peers rather than taking an active role in helping others, or having peer interaction in general (mean = 3.30). The participants appeared to trust both the instructor and their more experienced peers equally. Given the complexity of scholarly publication, the participants likely relied on those with more expertise to navigate the intricacies of the process. By interacting with experienced individuals, they gained valuable research experience and skills for

manuscript writing. The first element of the model supported their development in key areas necessary for publication.

These findings are consistent with the literature, indicating that working with more experienced members, such as the workshop instructor, provides mentorship and coaching (Aitchison, 2009; Vygotsky, 1978). In this study, interaction among the participants played a key role in developing research and writing competencies. With guidance from more experienced members, newcomers gradually integrated into the community and acquired the necessary skills.

Ranked third, Academic Identity Formation addresses the process of constructing academic identity, including power relations and the negotiation, construction, and reconstruction of identity. The participants felt most confident with aspects such as their academic identity being explored and reflected while reviewing research articles during the training (mean = 3.95) and the changes in their academic identity as a result of interacting with diverse peer groups (mean = 3.90).

However, the impact of the training on their academic identity was rated as moderate (mean = 3.15). This suggests that while the participants experienced changes in their academic identity during the training, the effect of the training itself was less pronounced. The findings indicate that the transition from doctoral students to graduates and independent scholars is a complex process that involves navigating the academic job market and securing a faculty or research position. This transition certainly requires doctoral students to demonstrate their expertise, publish their work, and have network with potential employers.

While in the workshop, the participants' academic identity could be reflected during their engagement with the literature review process. As they read research articles, examined the authors' perspectives, and reflected on their own academic selves, they began to construct their identities as readers. Then, this process of reflection and understanding influenced their writing. The participants' academic identities could be shaped by their engagement with research articles, which not only provided research knowledge, but also offered insights into the authors' worldviews.

Additionally, the data showed the participants' awareness of power relations in academia. They viewed the experts who authored the articles used in the training as powerful figures and saw themselves as non-native writers on the path to becoming expert-like writers (mean = 3.70). This perception was closely tied to their academic identity, as the participants felt that their identities as researchers and writers could be shaped by their engagement with the authors of research articles. This finding indicates the value of research articles as not only sources of knowledge, but also reflections of the authors' perspectives and attitudes, which, in turn, influence the participants' academic identity formation. This insight is particularly relevant for managing academic human resources in the fields of humanities and social sciences, where both research activities and the identities of researchers come into play.

All the findings discussed in the third aspect of the reframed CoP model can be triangulated with those found in elements four and five: Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices (immediate learning outcomes) and Scholarly Professional Growth (sustained learning outcomes).

Ranked fourth is Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices, the fourth element, where two major features and the findings followed a similar pattern. The workshop with the Reframed CoP teaching approach remarkably helped raise their awareness of research rigor related to publishability (mean = 3.85) and research quality, which also impacts publishability (mean = 3.45). The participants also gained awareness of epistemic expertise and disciplinary knowledge required for research projects (mean = 3.25). However, their self-efficacy was moderate regarding their ability to construct arguments in writing (mean = 3.10). This suggests that the participants may need more time to refine their writing skills to a level comparable to that of native speakers, which is a common challenge for those who view themselves as EFL learners.

As this research aimed to train the participants to be researchers with a strong awareness of high-quality research and effective writing based on disciplinary knowledge, the findings related to the model's fifth element showed that the Reframed CoP model moderately encouraged the participants to develop the skills and expertise necessary for scholarly publication, as explored in Scholarly Professional Growth (the element's mean = 2.79). However, the data revealed a shift in trends within this element. The participants exhibited high self-efficacy in only one area—becoming novices within Thai academic contexts (mean = 3.45). Their self-efficacy was moderate in terms of becoming apprentices within the global academic discourse community (mean = 2.95) and contributing to the Thai ELT community (mean = 2.95). In contrast, they showed low self-efficacy regarding becoming experts in both Thai academic contexts (mean = 2.45) and the global academic discourse community (mean = 2.40), with a similarly low self-efficacy in contributing to the global disciplinary community (mean = 2.40).

As the data indicated, the participants appeared to be more confident in their local context during the process of becoming experts. This critical point is well documented in the literature (Canagarajah, 2013), where non-native English-speaking scholars face unequal opportunities to participate in global academic communities due to linguistic and cultural barriers (Curry & Lillis, 2014). On the other hand, the data may serve as a baseline for further learning. The participants, transitioning from doctoral students to emerging scholars, will likely need additional time and effort to reach key milestones in their academic careers (Baker & Pifer, 2011).

In the context of this research, the participants need to learn more from experienced members of both local and global academic communities. In practice, they require both high-quality research content and advanced writing skills. Simply knowing how to write based on the rhetorical conventions of research articles does not seem to bridge the gap between existing knowledge and the future knowledge they need to

acquire in their research disciplines. The findings, therefore, align with my intention to help build disciplinary researchers and writers in the humanities and social sciences.

Ranked sixth with a moderate self-efficacy, Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing, the final element of the Reframed CoP model, was redefined with three features—conflict, tension, and resistance—and identified as exhibiting moderate self-efficacy (Element Mean = 2.82). This aspect was examined in light of a common challenge faced by both native and non-native English writers, who must publish in international journals. The participants moderately agreed that the training could lead to academic conflicts with the academic discourse community (mean = 3.00) and indicated moderate confidence in their ability to participate in this community (mean = 3.00). However, the participants did not perceive significant tension regarding the unequal publication opportunities between native experts and non-native novices (mean = 2.40). Overall, the participants seemed motivated to develop academically so they could engage effectively with both local and global academic discourse communities. With the support of the model elements, these novice, non-native English researchers can continue learning and expanding their expertise, which is essential for their academic disciplines.

To gain a deeper understanding of the participants' perceptions regarding their developmental progress in engaging with the Reframed CoP model, focus-group and in-depth interviews were conducted after the doctoral students graduated. The results of the self-efficacy survey administered during their doctoral studies were analyzed alongside the data gathered from the interviews conducted after their graduation. This integrative approach provided valuable insights into their developmental progress over time.

Since the Reframed CoP model translated from Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) emphasizes social learning, the focus-group interviews aimed to explore how the participants perceived their development within a group setting. Interaction among the participants helped reveal collective experiences and shared perceptions about engaging with the Reframed CoP model. The focus group began with the question: "How did you perceive your research knowledge before participating in the Res-Pub Training Workshop?" All eight participants acknowledged their needs and challenges in research knowledge and publication skills. Their responses focused on these critical points, with some reflecting on what they had learned during the workshop explored in the previous phases of the research. Two main themes were found—quality of research content, and the participants' research interest in relation research disciplines.

Quality of Research Content

The first theme showed the quality of research content the participants well percieved while in the workshop. Basically, all eight participants noted a lack of practical training that guided them in writing for actual publication, beyond merely describing rules or principles. Hands-on instruction, which allowed them to deepen their understanding of their research areas and transform that knowledge into publishable work, was particularly beneficial. The participants expressed that the research knowledge, or the content

knowledge they gained, played a crucial role in fostering the quality of their research projects.

> *Content is very important*. *I found from the workshop that research content is a good source for research*. My language mistakes could be ok as long as my content is good. I can ask someone to revise my mistakes. *But the content, I must do on my own*. (P1, focus-group interview, emphasis added)

> I think *I needed real opinions from real coaches who had experiences in doing research and publishing*. We share the same backgrounds. *In the workshop, we learned from real experiences with our topics for dissertations or some seemed to change their topic in final stages*. I was very happy when you gave me *some ideas to justify some problems or critical points* in research. (P8, focus-group interview, emphasis added)

> I had no training in research writing. Writing from genre knowledge was ok but *I still lacked research experience*. In the workshop, we had opportunities to practice. In *method part*, we start from *drawing research diagram*. Then *we learned a lot from all classmates' diagrams that gave a lot of knowledge about doing research for publication*. (P5, focus-group interview, emphasis added)

> I had *research knowledge* but I know that I just focus on my work. I did not care for *broader knowledge that would help me understand more about my work*. It is the concept you repeated many time. Disciplinary knowledge, yes. (P4, focus-group interview, emphasis added)

It is quite common for doctoral students to experience a lack of research knowledge. Based on my observations while supervising doctoral students, the participants often focus primarily on their current project and rarely explore works outside their specific discipline. As P4 expressed, this tendency results in a lack of epistemic expertise and broader research knowledge in their academic experience. This reminded me of those who planned to conduct classroom research but overlooked studies that could offer valuable perspectives, such as English as a lingua franca, critical English for academic purposes, or linguistic imperialism. A broader understanding of research within their own field and across related disciplines would be more helpful when they are developing their own research design.

Participant Research Interest in Relation to Research Disciplines

The final theme emreged from focus-group interviews highlighted a challenge some participants encountered—their research interest did not always align with specific fields or disciplines. Innitially passionate about religious studies, P7 faced several challenges. During the graduate students' research symposium, her interest in religious teachings was met with a significant question: “How can your interest be related to our program?” This led her to believe that she would be unable to pursue her passion. However, during the training, she learned about research methods in the social sciences and humanities, and ultimately developed a corpus-based approach to understanding religious teachings.

> *It was hard to connect my interest to the research in this program*. I was not interested to work on language or teaching although I’m a teacher. Then, your advice *connected my need by corpus analysis that would make readers understand religious teaching*. (P7, focus-group interview, emphasis added)

Although P7 was the only participant that could connect her research passion to the disciplines of the program, her experience could serve as a valuable example for other doctoral students who have highly specific interests. By applying grand theories or broader perspectives, they can deepen their understanding of their chosen topics.

In addition to the focus-group interviews, the participants’ personal accounts of their developmental progress were further examined through in-depth interviews. This approach allowed each participant to express his or her experiences without the influence of group dynamics (H. J. Rubin & Rubin, 2012), providing an opportunity to understand how each participant internalized the learning experiences that contributed to his or her individual growth. One of my interview questions, “In what ways did the instructional model influence your understanding of disciplinary knowledge and research rigor?,” offered three key themes—roles of experienced members in the workshop, the participants’ knowledge sharing and construction, and roles of the classroom as a community fostering novices’ learning.

Roles of Experienced Members in Developing Novices’ Research and Publication Skills

The first theme centered on the participants' learning and experiences with the elements of quality research as a result of the Reframed CoP model. Data from the focus group interviews indicated that all participants highlighted the first element of the framework, Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning, as having the greatest impact on their understanding of research. There are three sub-groups here.

In Sub-group 1, all eight participants expressed that they had gained skills in research rigor, research design, and identifying research gaps. The lack of research knowledge and epistemic expertise the participants mentioned in focus-group interviews probably contributed to the challenge found in the in-depth interviews, where the particpants still acknowledged more challenges. These included dentifying research gaps and framing their own research focus.

> *I learned a lot from everyone in the workshop*. I like the *knowledge that I learned more about research*. Actually *when I read literature review, I did not pay attention to the research thing*. *Then I could not see research gaps*. I just wanted to know about the works that support my dissertation. I rarely study research rationales or thinking behind the results. Now I'm more aware of these *research knowledge hidden in published research articles*. (P5, individual interview, emphasis added)

> *I learned research skills that are important for publications from studying the samples and having discussion with the instructor and peers about research designs and research gaps of the samples*. Before the workshop, I think following rhetorical moves of research articles is enough. *But now I realized that if we have high research knowledge, we can publish more easily*. The work should attract reviewers who may allow us to revise language again. *Now I focus a lot on essential research elements, and become aware of the design of my work*, writing convention and requirements for publication. (P6, individual interview, emphasis added)

In Sub-group 2, the participants developed a deeper awareness of research exploration and a better understanding of research landscapes relevant to their fields. P4, a particularly critical and attentive doctoral graduate, demonstrated a strong academic foundation and adopted a "dig-deeper approach" to her research project. Her case was notable in both the focus-group and in-depth interviews. P4 attributed her enhanced research and publication skills to the social interactions with the instructor and fellow members of the research community. As illustrated in her responses, discussions with the instructor and peers about the published research articles used as learning materials helped her gain a deeper understanding of epistemic expertise, disciplinary knowledge, and what is referred to in this context as the research landscape.

> As I said, I had no ideas about 'epistemic expertise' or 'disciplinary knowledge'. I just jumped to my research interest but never thought about its landscape that you emphasized in the workshop. ….. In the workshop, *I learned more from other projects*. I understand *the concept of disciplinary knowledge* that I had never realized before. In one session that you brought a very good work in medical science, I realized *that our research knowledge could make us understand other disciplines* and *understand again that I should know about our discipline too to help me understand my own research better*. *…We could see the landscape of our work more clearly*, although I did not see these concepts in most published articles. Your word '*understanding research landscapes' helped me a lot* to remind myself any time I planned for. (P4, individual interview, emphasis added)

The participants also developed a deeper understanding of the communicative functions of specific elements in research, particularly in the context of writing research articles. P1 examplified this point:

> It's true that *research for dissertation must be good enough for publication*. *I was asked about the measure of students' writing improvement, principle, criteria, etc*. A few comments, I did not have. But most of questions were right. *I revised my work based on their advice and sent another document of what I revised*. (P1, individual interview, emphasis added)

Sub-group 3 centered around the comments and corrective feedback provided by the teacher while the participants were working in the workshop. Being coached to write the Introduction, Literature Review and Methods sections, a significant amount of feedback the participants received during these sessions proved useful to them, as they adopted or applied the principles for writing these sections in their actual dissertations. P3, a novice participant, who appreciated both the feedback from the instructor and peers during the sessions, shared her thoughts on this process.

> We got a chance to exchanged experiences and ideas of writing with peer and also got *feedback as a scaffold that can lead us to be expertise in their work*. The training gave the *research principles and knowledge of scholarly writing* by focusing on I-M-R-D and sufficient writing examples. Additionally, the *knowledge and awareness of text patterns* can encourage us to use them in various types or styles of writing. Especially, *the training with environment with peers*, it affects our ability. (P3, individual interview, emphasis added)

As the participants noted, their understanding of research rigor, research design, and research gaps was improved through their interactions with the teacher and peers during the workshop. As Morse et al. (2002) argue, research with a rigorous design enhances the credibility and impact of scholarly work. The three aspects the participants mentioned in the in-depth interviews emerged as key benchmarks for producing high-quality research. Identifying research gaps through literature review can also increase the impact on publishability. Clearly, the participants recognized that through their interactions with experienced peers in the learning space, they learned from more experienced members about these crucial elements that are essential for publishability.

Knowledge Sharing Leading to Knowledge Construction

The second theme revealed the role of knowledge sharing which emerged in three sub-categories. In Sub-category 1, the participants recognized the value of sharing knowledge within the community, as it helped them gain insights into the real-world realities of academic practices. When those with prior experience shared their work processes, whether with their advisors or publication reviewers, the group members were able to draw on these shared experiences and apply some of the insights to their own work processes.

> *Listening to other students' problems or how they solve the problems* can stimulate us to reflect our own problems and how we solve the problems. *While sharing my experience and listening to other students and instructor's experience, it helped me learnt how to overcome the similar problems and learnt what worked and what did not work about my writing*. (P5, individual interview, emphasis added)

> I think providing *a sharing session* in class where students and teacher had opportunities to *share their problems, solutions and suggestions to each other very useful and an effective way of teaching*. (P8, individual interview, emphasis added)

In Sub-category 2 of knowledge sharing, the workshop's approach—the Reframed CoP model, also stimulated the participants' inductive learning process. In addition to discussions with more experienced members, the participants engaged with the published research articles used as one source of class materials. These works, selected from highly ranked, internationally indexed journals, were well-crafted in terms of research design, although some sections raised questions about research analysis. Through guiding questions related to disciplinary knowledge, rationale, and methods of these studies, the participants examined the work samples during workshop sessions. They discussed the quality and the logic behind these research elements, and concluded with my feedback, which helped validate their knowledge inductively derived. These discussions covered

research quality, allowing the participants to learn from both high-quality and simpler research examples. The well-designed works helped the participants in discussions about high-quality research elements. Conversely, the less rigorously designed works provided valuable lessons in improving research design for their own projects.

> *I learned about publication by studying the models of good and poor articles* when we had discussion with the professor and other classmates. During discussion, the professor linked the points from some classmates to the points that we learned; therefore, *this helped me connected what was learned with the real practices that the PhD students did in reality and this made me understand more*. (P2, individual interview, emphasis added)

> I like it when we found that published works in Scopus in a few fields still *had some research limitations. The researchers of these articles had good language but some points of research sound strange*. (P7, individual interview, emphasis added)

These two Sub-categories of knowledge sharing then lead to the third one, where both contributed to enhancing the participants' skills in scholarly writing, particularly in writing the Introduction, Literature Review and Methods sections, all of which are central to research and manuscript writing. Before the workshop, the participants struggled to indentify research gaps in the Introduction. Also, they tended to simply list information from individual sources in their Literature Review. These summaries, lacking analysis and synthesis, caused their drafts to fail in conveying a clear research argument and in presenting research gaps that connected to their studies. However, during the workshop, they were trained to conceptualize their research topic, identify critical points for a more focused approach, summarize and analyze relevant sources, and integrate key points to create a roadmap for their literature review. These steps were identified as essential components of research rigor (J. W. Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Sovacool et al., 2018), and the participants were able to apply them in writing the Introduction and Literature Review section effectively.

In the Methods section, the participants initially adhered to their traditional approach, which was typical for them—writing all sub-sections without providing specific context or rationale for their chosen methodology. This often led to confusion, as important information was missing. In the training, they were guided to write the Methods section with an awareness of global academic discourse communities. With the knowledge they received from the community members, the participants learned how to provide sufficient context for the research, including the background of the participants, justify the principles for data collection, and align their analysis perspectives with the research scope. Most

importantly, they were trained to offer a strong rationale for their research epistemology and methodology.

Roles of the Classroom as a Community Fostering Novices' Learning

The third and final theme highlighted the role of the classroom as a learning community that supported the participants in acquiring challenging skills, such as research and publication. The participants viewed the community, consisting of experienced teacher and peers with diverse abilities, as a safe academic space—'a training camp' that everyone had to go through. In this environment, they felt free to share ideas and knowledge. The small group of research activities the participants facilitated engaging group discussions, allowing them to address critical points raised by peers and revised problematic areas based on peers' suggestions. The workshop here functioned as a community where the participants worked together to complete learning tasks related to epistemic and research rigor, applying these principles to research activities. They were encouraged to ask questions whenever they encountered challenges in research or publication. The participants' diverse personal or research backgrounds were not seen as obstacles as they collaborated closely both during and outside research sessions. P6's example illustrated this well.

> Peers in the training were from different background, from most experience to inexperience, and this was not a disadvantage; on the other hands, I considered it became the most advantageous situation since all peers could learn from each other…. *I felt like I was trained in a training camp and I had to pass each dangerous station in order to survive*. However, I did not fight alone in the battle field because I had you to help and guide me and friends to help each other hand in hand fighting with those obstacles. The more difficult tasks were passed, the more skilled and strengthen I became eventually. ….. Therefore, this atmosphere counts for *developmental awareness and skills how to publish work*. I write spontaneously according to my thoughts that I accumulate ideas and thoughts, and these make flow for my writing. Then I can revise and add something later with the clear ideas. Cool and safe, yes. (P6, individual interview, emphasis added)

P6, humbly viewing himself as an inexperienced member, expressed his relief with the atmosphere of the instruction, which made him feel at ease. The supportive environment, of course, helped P6 and others learn about research challenges from all members as the core of the setting (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Although he might have felt "at risk" about the demands for successful publication discussed within the community, he appeared to remain positive about the challenges or difficulties encountered during the sessions. This atmosphere, in turn, seemed to contribute to the participants' learning

progress, their awareness of what constitutes quality work for publication, and the development of their professional skills (Kamler & Thomson, 2006; Maher et al., 2013). The participants' feedback convinced me that the social interaction among members with different levels of expertise plays a crucial role in helping community members learn and progress in their developmental process.

5. Discussion and Research Conclusion

This follow-up study examines how the Res-Pub Training Workshop, grounded in the Disciplinary Writing Expertise framework, influences doctoral students' self-efficacy in key areas of the Reframed CoP model. In turn, this reflects the effectiveness of the workshop, which is underpinned by the Reframed CoP model, one of the three models within the DWE framework. The results provide deeper insights into how they improved their research and writing competencies in Phase 2. The findings indicate the participants' high self-efficacy in four key areas of the Reframed CoP model: Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning, Participatory Learning Dynamics, Academic Identity Formation, and Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices, and a moderate high-efficacy in Scholarly Professional Growth and in handling Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing. The discussion examines the findings in relation to the workshop, which was underpinned by the DWE framework, with key elements of the Reframed CoP model that served as mechanisms for the participants' learning engagement and scholarly growth.

5.1 High Self-Efficacy and Improved Writing in Key Research Sections

The participants' high self-efficacy in four key areas of the Reframed CoP model was central to the effectiveness of the workshop, which was designed based on the students' needs (Phase 1) and structured around the DWE framework in Phase 2, where the significant improvements in participants' ability to write the Introduction, Literature Review, and Methods sections validated the workshop's impact (Thongrin, 2020).

Empirical studies have identified these sections as particularly challenging for doctoral students. The Introduction requires articulating the research territory, identifying gaps, and establishing research objectives (Swales & Feak, 2012). However, doctoral students often struggle with framing their research, identifying meaningful gaps, and establishing a compelling rationale (Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Paltridge & Starfield, 2016). Similarly, the Literature Review showed notable improvement, as the participants moved beyond merely summarizing studies to synthesizing key themes and constructing strong arguments (Kamler & Thomson, 2006). When writing this section, doctoral students tend to list findings from previous studies with a lower level in critically engaging with the literature or highlighting how it informs their study's focus, methodology, and data analysis. Likewise, in the Methods section, which requires a clear presentation of key elements of research rigor (J. W. Creswell & Creswell, 2018), doctoral students often encounter challenges, as they frequently struggle with articulating their research design,

linking methodological choices to research questions (Holbrook et al., 2007; Lovitts, 2007), and providing a well-justified rationale for their methodological decisions (Lim, 2006).

The participants' improvement in writing these three sections could be attributed to the effectiveness of the Res-Pub Training Workshop underpinned by the DWE framework, where the Reframed CoP model was used as teaching-learning approach to support the participants' learning during Phase 2 of this longitudinal study. The workshop started with the Literature Review, where the participants analyzed and practiced key elements of an effective review, including thorough engagement with literature, critical evaluation, argument development through synthesis, and coherent presentation strategies. With more critical perspectives, they deepened their understanding of research content, research gaps, and methodological gaps. By analyzing literature reviews of well-rated research articles taken from highly-ranked journals, the participants were able to conceptualize fundamental research elements, such as identifying research objectives and gaps, structuring study content, and justifying methods through transparent data collection and analysis. This approach to understanding high-quality research through the Literature Review laid the foundation for research logic, and writing in the Introduction, Literature Review, and Methods sections.

Clearly, learning within the Res-Pub Training Workshop underpinned by the Reframed CoP model, with expert guidance and collaborative discussions, could enable the participants to refine their research writing. These improvements highlight the model's effectiveness in addressing doctoral students' writing challenges. Through Expert-Guided Collaborative Learning and Participatory Learning Dynamics, the participants strengthened their Academic Identity Formation and Cognitive Mastery of Academic Practices, leading to more sophisticated and well-structured research writing. The findings of this follow-up study suggest that a structured, collaborative, and expert-guided writing approach enhances doctoral students' research-publication competencies. Equipped with collaborative learning, expert mentorship, and structured writing support, the workshop effectively helped doctoral students to write the Introduction, Literature Review, and Methods sections. Identified by a high efficacy in such areas of the Reframed CoP model, these improvements are likely to contribute to the participants' long-term academic development, fostering their ability to engage in high-quality research and academic writing.

5.2 Roles of Experienced Members in the Reframed CoP Model

The findings of this study indicate the important role of the teacher as both a coach and an experienced member of the Reframed CoP model, along with the contributions of more experienced peers. The data from the self-efficacy survey and semi-structured interviews—derived from both focus-group and individual in-depth interviews—indicate that the participants valued the teacher's expertise in providing targeted feedback and facilitating discussions that deepened their understanding of research practices. These findings are consistent with Heron et al. (2024), revealing that structured and intentional research groups facilitated the development of doctoral students'

literacies, knowledge, and relational connections. This also conforms to Robers's (2021) emphasis on the importance of the CoP participation that supported identity development of students as researchers and writers. Clearly, the guidance of experienced members fosters a dynamic learning environment, which promotes doctoral students' professional growth and scholarly identity formation.

The positive impact of the Reframed CoP model can be attributed to the role of experienced community members, including the teacher and more experienced peers. Their experiences, insights, guidance, and feedback were invaluable in shaping the participants' understanding of research rigor and improving their academic writing skills. The teacher's feedback on dissertation projects and research articles helped the participants internalize high-quality research principles and align their work with academic publishing standards. Likewise, peer interactions facilitated collaborative learning and provided diverse perspectives, which enriched the participants' understanding of research conventions and rhetorical strategies. As Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasize, legitimate peripheral participation within a CoP community enables learners to engage in meaningful activities with the guidance of more experienced members, progressively advancing toward full participation. These experiences contributed to the participants' high self-efficacy in both research and publication.

5.3 Moderate Self-Efficacy in Scholarly Professional Growth and Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing

The participants expressed moderate self-efficacy in Scholarly Professional Growth and in handling Constructive Adversities in Academic Publishing, particularly with regard to their lower self-efficacy in engaging with global academic communities. The participants may benefit from greater engagement in academic community by conducting research in their disciplines. Collaborating with peers also develops critical evaluation skills, which could help strengthen these two areas of moderate self-efficacy. These findings indicate a need for targeted interventions to address challenges related to linguistic and cultural disparities in academic publishing. As Flowerdew (2008) points out, non-native English-speaking scholars often encounter systemic barriers in gaining recognition within global academic spaces, which could help explain the participants' self-reported difficulties. Moreover, the data may reflect the ongoing tension between native and non-native English-speaking scholars. Curry and Lillis (2014) argue that academic publishing is often characterized by unequal opportunities, where non-native speakers frequently encounter disadvantages. The participants' moderate confidence in navigating these challenges indicates the need to build resilience and adaptability through focused training.

Also, incorporating discussions on global academic publishing norms and strategies to address systemic inequities could improve the participants' preparedness to engage with international scholarly communities. These findings indicate areas for further development. While the participants acknowledged the value of research knowledge within the Thai educational context, they expressed lower confidence in contributing to

global academic discourses. This is quite common for emerging scholars who may need to work more for established experiences. This underscores a persistent challenge for EFL researchers, who often struggle with linguistic and cultural barriers when trying to meet international publishing standards (Canagarajah, 2013). To address this issue, future studies of the model could integrate targeted training on how to navigate global academic expectations, including strategies for responding to reviewer feedback and aligning research with international priorities.

5.4 Research Implications and Recommendations for Educational Practice

This study offers insights for designing effective publication training programs for EFL doctoral students. The Res-Pub Training Workshop underpinned by the DWE framework that incorporated the Reframed CoP model and emphasized quality research for publishable quality can promote doctoral students' collaborative learning, academic identity formation, and scholarly growth, all of which provide a strong foundation for their scholarly development. To further foster their engagement with global academic communities, additional strategies could be implemented. First, mentorship programs should be developed to support doctoral students throughout their studies. These programs could facilitate collaborative learning, with experienced mentors who could guide students at various stages of their dissertations. This model can be applied in social sciences and humanities doctoral programs to enhance research journeys. Also, research-publication workshops based on the Reframed CoP model could expand mentorship opportunities, helping students connect with international scholars and gain exposure to diverse academic practices. These workshops would offer insights into global research trends and international journal reviewer expectations, enabling students to contribute to global academic discourse. Implementing these strategies would enhance students' research expertise and publishing skills, benefiting both the students and educational institutions.

5.5 Research Limitations and Recommendations for Further Studies

The self-efficacy survey could have been administered twice—once during doctoral studies and again post-graduation, but sample attrition could prevent this. As a result, the study used a redesigned approach, using a survey during the participants' doctoral studies, and combining the survey with qualitative data from focus group and in-depth interviews after participants earned their PhDs. This approach still provided valuable insights into participants' development.

Future studies could plan follow-ups 3-5 years' post-study to assess long-term effects. The findings of this study suggest that doctoral graduates' confidence in engaging with global academic communities could be supported through research on tensions between EFL doctoral students and global publishing standards. This could include workshops on research rigor, journal requirements, and manuscript preparation, as well as training on navigating global publishing norms and fostering resilience. These efforts could help non-native doctoral students enter global academic communities and address invisible barriers in academic literacies, areas that warrant further research.

Final Remarks

This study presents the third phase of a longitudinal research project. The first phase explored doctoral students' research and publication needs, while the second phase examined the impact of the Research-Publication (Res-Pub) Training Workshop using the Disciplinary Writing Expertise (DWE) framework containing three related models—the Reframed CoP model, the Scholarly Rigor and Expertise (SR-E) model, and the Scholarly Publication and Expertise (SP-E) model—to support the participants' research and publishing abilities. The third phase investigated the participants' self-efficacy after the workshop, emphasizing that EFL doctoral students or novice researchers need academic support from experienced members of their learning community to enhance knowledge and skills in research and publication.

This follow-up study highlights the effectiveness of the teaching framework, the Reframed Community of Practice (CoP) model I translated from Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) as a teaching approach in the 48-hour workshop that aimed to foster the research-publication competencies of EFL doctoral students. The Reframed CoP model provided insights into the participants' development from their doctoral studies to post-graduation. While significant progress was observed in research quality and publishing skills, challenges related to global engagement and systemic inequities in publishing were also noted. As such, addressing these challenges requires targeted training, mentorship, and collaborative networks, where findings could contribute to the ongoing discourse on EFL academic writing and offer more practical insights for designing effective publication training programs to support doctoral students in their publishing endeavors.

Acknowledgement

This longitudinal study was funded by the Faculty of Liberal Arts's Research Fund, Thammasat University, Fiscal Year 2015, Contract No. 5/2015.

References

Adunyarittigun, D., Thongrin, S., Sriharuksa, K., & Seenak, P. (2023). Thammasat University, Thailand. In M. Byram & M. Stoicheva (Eds.), *The experience of examining the PhD: An international comparative study of processes and standards of doctoral examination* (pp. 134-148). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003248569

Aitchison, C. (2009). Writing groups for doctoral education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *34*(8), 905-916. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070902785580

Aitchison, C., & Guerin, C. (2014). Writing groups for doctoral education and beyond. Routledge.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Allyn & Bacon.

Baker, V. L., & Pifer, M. J. (2011). The role of relationships in the transition from doctoral student to independent scholar. *Studies in Continuous Education*, *33*, 5-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2010.515569

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.

Barnacle, R., & Mewburn, I. (2010). Learning networks and the journey of becoming a doctor. *Studies in Higher Education*, *35*(4), 433-444. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903131214

Belcher, W. L. (2007). *Writing your journal article in twelve weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*. University of Chicago Press.

Bitchener, J., & Basturkmen, H. (2006). Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *5*(1), 4-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.10.002

Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member*. Jossey-Bass.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2003). A somewhat legitimate and very peripheral participation. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 233-248). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Casanave, C. P. (2011). *Journal writing in second language education*. University of Michigan Press.

Clarke, G., & Lunt, I. (2014). The concept of 'originality' in the Ph.D.: How is it interpreted by examiners? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(7), 803-820. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.870970

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Houghton Mifflin.

Cotterall, S. (2011). Doctoral students writing: Where's the pedagogy? *Teaching in Higher Education*, *16*(4), 413-425.

Cranwell-Ward, J., Bossons, P., & Gover, S. (2014), *Mentoring: A Henley review of best practice* (2nd ed.). Palgrave MacMillan.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2014). Strategies and tactics in academic knowledge production by multilingual scholars. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *22*(32), 1-25.

Erwee, R., & Perry, C. (2018). Examination of doctoral theses: Research about the process and propoased procedures. In R. Erwee, M. Harmes, M. Harmes, & P. A. Danaher (Eds.), *Postgraduate Education in Higher Education* (pp. 1-16). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0468-1_4-1

Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an additional language: What can Goffman's 'stigma' tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7*(2), 77-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.002

Gay, L. R. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Prentice Hall.

Golding, C., Sharmini, S., & Lazarovitch, A. (2013). What examiners do: What thesis students should know. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(5), 563-576. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.859230

Heron, M., Dippold, D., Gravett, K., Ahmad, A., Aljabri, S., Al-Adwan, R. S. A., Ghosh, P., Kabooha, R., Makram, M., Mousawa, D. T., Mudhaffer, A., Ucar-Longford, B., Wang, L., Zhou, J., Zhu, F., Dippold, M., Ahmad, K., Aljabri, A., Ghosh, S., . . . Zhu, J. (2024). Building a community of practice through a doctoral research group. *Studies in Graduate and Postdoctoral Education*, 15(3), 258-272. https://doi.org/10.1108/SGPE-10-2023-0098

Holbrook, A. (2007). Levels of success in the use of the literature in a doctorate. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *21*(8), 1020-1041. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v21i8.25757

Holmes, P., Reynolds, J., & Chaplin, M. (2020). Durham University, United Kingdom. In M. Byram & M. Stoicheva (Ed.), *The Doctorate as Experience in Europe and Beyond: Supervision, Languages, Identities* (pp. 52-88). Routledge.

Jameson, C. M., Torres, K. M., Mohammed, S. F. (2021). Virtual faculty strategies for supporting motivation of online doctoral students. *Journal of Educational Research & Practice*, *11*(1), 295-305.

Jones, A., & Smith, B. (2022). A comparative study of formal coaching and mentoring programs in higher education. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, *11*(2), 213-231.

Kamler, B. (2008). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*, 283-294. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802049236

Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2006). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision*. Routledge.

Kiley, M. (2009). Rethinking the Australian doctoral examination process. *The Australian Universities' Review*, *51*(2), 32-41. https://doi.org/10.3316/ielapa.159523534745605

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991), *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, *23*(2), 157-172.

Lee, A., & Kamler, B. (2008). Bringing pedagogy to doctoral publishing. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *13*(5), 511-523. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510802334723

Lee, E. & Norton, B. (2003). Demystifying publishing: A collaborative exchange between graduate student and supervisor. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for Scholarly Publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 19-46). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Li, Y. Y. (2002). Writing for international publication: The perception of Chinese doctoral researchers. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12, 179-193.

Lim, J. M. H. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 282-309.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage.

Lovitts, B. E. (2007). *Making the implicit explicit: Creating performance expectations for the dissertation*. Stylus.

Maher, M. A. (2014). Transparent transactions: When doctoral students and their supervisors write together. In C. Aitchison & C. Guerin (Eds.), *Writing groups for doctoral education and beyond* (pp. 82-93). Routledge.

Maher, M. A., Timmerman, B. E., Feldon, D. F., & Strickland, D. (2013). Factors affecting the occurrence of faculty-doctoral student co-authorship. *Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(1), 121-143.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *1*(2), 13-22.

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(4), 573-603. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588281

Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (2016). *Getting published in academic journals: Navigating the publication process*. University of Michigan Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage.

Roberts, L. (2021). “This is just what we do”: PhD students on becoming scholars in a Community of Practice. *Communications in Information Literacy*, *15*(1), 75-94. https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2021.15.1.4

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, *22*(2), 63-75. https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-2004-22201

Sovacool, B. K., Axsen, J., & Sorrella, S. (2018). Promoting novelty, rigor, and style in energy social science: Towards codes of practice for appropriate methods and research design. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *45*, 12-42.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.

Thongrin, S. (2018). Developing an instructional model to teach Thai research assistants to write English scientific research articles. *LEARN (Language Education and Acquisition Research Network) Journal*, *11*(2), 22-65.

Thongrin, S. (2020, October 24). Advancing scholarly publication skills for apprentice scholars of English. In *Proceedings of The 2020 PKETA, KALS, NKAELL International Conference*, “Nurturing English education through three branches: Linguistics, Literature, Education,” (pp. 21-60). Pusan National University, Online (ZOOM).

Tummons, J. (2012). Theoretical trajectories within communities of practice in higher education research. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *31*, 299-310.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Winter, R., Griffiths, M. & Green, K. (2000) The ‘academic’ qualities of practice: What are the criteria for a practice-based PhD?, *Studies in Higher Education*, *25*, 25-37. https://doi.org/10.1080/030750700115993

Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-efficacy regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*(4), 845-862.