Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching
Volume 9/Number 1 • May 2013

APPROPRIATIONS OF POLICIES RELATED TO L2 ACADEMIC WRITING PRACTICES IN AN INDONESIAN EFL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Joseph Ernest Mambu
Department of English Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287, USA

Abstract

The current study investigates state and local polices that regulate academic writing and how they are appropriated in an English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) teacher education program in Indonesia. The significance of the current study lies in its affirmation to the notion that policy appropriations are multi-layered. That is, government policies may or may not be translated into local de jure and de facto regulations, and in turn these local policies evolve as they are used and negotiated among colleagues and/or with students. In an attempt to understand the layers of appropriations, interviews with four local instructors were conducted. This research will pave the way for further praxes to provide quality academic-writing instructions, in the light of, or regardless of, the state regulations.

Keywords: policy appropriation, second language academic writing, publication, agency.

INTRODUCTION

The literature on language teachers' policy appropriation has flourished mostly in Western academia and/or has been investigated by Western academics (e.g., Brown [2010] in Estonia; de Jong [2008] and Johnson [2009] in the context of bilingual education in the United States; Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009; see also Bale's [2010] review of the concept in the context of heritage language education). Policy appropriation occurs when official policies, having been dispersed in diverse institutional settings, are "negotiated, … applied, interpreted, and/or contested by a

Direct all correspondence to:
joseph.mambu@asu.edu

multiplicity of multiple actors," (Levinson & Sutton, 2001, p. 2) such as (first or second/foreign language) teachers, students, parents, school principals, and "official" policymakers at a state level, in daily or regular basis. More strongly, Levinson et al. (2009) define policy appropriation as "the ways that creative agents interpret and take in elements of policy, thereby incorporating these discursive resources into their own schemes of interest, motivation, and action" (p. 779). Teachers are usually cognizant of official educational (and language) policies that govern a state or a nation, especially when it has a great impact on what students have to do (e.g., No Child Left Behind [NCLB] that requires English language learners to pass exams designed for students who are English native speakers in U.S. schools [see Menken, 2008]). NCLB does not explicitly regulate language policies, but it becomes apparent from its preference to "accountability" measured by test scores, language instructions favoring English use has a profound impact nationwide that has been subject of debates especially among teachers and language policy researchers. In her study Menken witnessed some New York-based teachers who appropriated NCLB by kept providing bilingual programs and/or exclusive instruction in high-school students' first language like Spanish in order to prepare them for the final English high-stakes testing.

In the following section, I will review educational and language policies in Indonesia in the light of policy appropriations that have been investigated in the United States, in particular. Research questions motivated by the review address the larger issue of policy appropriations in a university context: Whether, how, and why such policy appropriations occur in an ever-growing "accountability" demand imposed on by a recent Indonesian state policy stipulating more publications even by Indonesian undergraduate students. For such students in an English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teacher education program, academic writing (with/without publication in mind) is a site of struggle for negotiating whether first language (L1) use is ever justifiable.

SECOND LANGUAGE ACADEMIC WRITING IN RELATION TO STATE AND INSTRUCTORS' POLICIES

Similar to that in the United States, the accountability spirit seems to have pervaded in Indonesia, though it is not always related to test scores (but see Lie, 2007). In recent years, in-service teachers' portfolios (that include a component of publication) seem to be an instrument by which teachers demonstrate accountability to their institutions and subject matters they teach, including EFL. The necessity of producing academic works has

been regulated by the third article of *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2011 tentang Sertifikasi bagi Guru dalam Jabatan* (The Regulation issued by the National Minister of Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 11/2011 about In-Service Teacher Certification),[i] and *Surat Edaran Dirjen DIKTI tentang Publikasi Karya IlmiahNomor 152/E/T/2012* (A Memo Number 152/E/T/2012 issued by the Director of the Directorate General of Higher Education in Indonesia regarding Academic Publication).[ii] A high demand for (international) publication among academics, particularly lecturers or professors, so as to demonstrate their academic accountability has already been apparent in Indonesia especially in the past decade. These academics have had a challenging transition from the teaching paradigm to a research-and-publication (or "publish-or-perish") culture, which according to Canagarajah (2010, p. 661) has been the case in China, and as the Indonesian government policies mentioned above show, in Indonesia, too. Adnan (2009) has in particular discussed problems encountered by Indonesian academics, especially lecturers in Indonesian-based English departments who submitted their manuscripts to international journals. For these lecturers publishing in English is a must.[iii] If (very) young and inexperienced EFL faculty members, many of whom have master's degrees, find it difficult to get their work published in English, how much more daunting it is for undergraduate students to write with publication in mind.

How the accountabilityspirit translates into preparing EFL teachers completing their undergraduate studies to be published authors, in addition to becoming EFL teachers, has yet to be studied, especially in an Indonesian setting. In particular, "teaching to the publication in mind" – an analogy of "teaching to the test" – is worth investigating. It may be predicted that jumping on a publishing bandwagon, especially at an undergraduate level, only produces quasi-academic authors who publish for publishing's sake. This phenomenon seems to be worldwide among young faculty members (including assistant professors in a developed country like the United States).[iv] This problem may occur among graduate students in the United States, as witnessed by Matsuda (2003), and may even be more acute when a controversial government policy requires that undergraduate students coming from a third-world country like my own country, Indonesia, publish before they are granted their bachelor's degree. The question then becomes whether, and how, second language academic writing (henceforth L2 AW) instructors appropriate the imminent demand for publication in their classes.

With their own academic writing (and/or publishing) experiences, instructors seem to have some options within the context of a country where publication for undergraduate students has been a must. First, instructors

may frantically follow suit on the publication bandwagon, thus perpetuating the culture of publishing for publishing's sake, both for themselves and their students. From Levinson and Sutton's (2001) perspective, this option means dependence on, if not acquiescence with, "managerial [i.e., government] perspectives on policy" favoring top-down, you-do-what-I-tell-you, policies, lacking in "public deliberation" (p. 16). Second, instructors try to be "realistic." This seems to be a good option, but the question is what it means to be realistic; that is, to what extent instructors are aware of students' limited experience in research, what linguistic and academic literacy barriers these students encounter, and what feasible goals of academic writing they can feasibly expect from students at an undergraduate level, among others. This study hence attempts to sketch out what options instructors take and for what reasons. Academic writing with publication as the ultimate goal seems to be *the* reason for instructors embracing the first option. Attempts to be realistic, on the other hand, may push instructors to think why they ask students to write academically in a second language in the first place. Moreover, if "being realistic" is an option for some instructors, it is crucial for them to deliberate what processes and/or products of L2 academic writing at an undergraduate level are realistic for both instructors and students.

Based on the above discussion, the current study aims at finding out L2 AW instructors' stances regarding recent publishing demands at an undergraduate level. The stances will inform us to what degree and why these instructors appropriate and/or disregard government policies. It will also be valuable to see what L2 AW instructors believe and practice in an accountability era in Indonesia where publishing is required. My research questions are hence:

1. How do L2 AW instructors make sense of, and grapple with, current government Indonesian policy that requires (student) publications?
2. With their agency, how do instructors go about
    a. writing or using an AW syllabus,
    b. guiding students through the processes of reasoning in order to achieve certain AW goals, in light of, or regardless of, the current government policy?

Concerning research question 2, I find it necessary to view policy appropriation as one way of exercising agency. Ahearn (2001) provides a useful working definition of agency: "the socioculturally mediated capacity to act" (p. 112). In this study, the capacity is mediated by instructors' (1)

choice of using a certain L2 AW syllabus and (2) ways guiding their students to write academically.

METHODS

Participants

In this study two main sources of data will be collected to address my research questions: (1) interview data elicited from L2 AW instructors and (2) archives of Indonesian government's and the instructors' AW syllabus. Regarding the interview, a "stratified purposeful" sampling strategy is used. From Miles and Huberman's (1994, p. 28, as cited in Creswell, 2007, p. 127) perspective, this sampling strategy "illustrates subgroups and facilitates comparisons." Two main subgroups in this study include (1) two L2 AW instructors who are holders of a doctoral degree and have published quite extensively nationally and internationally, and (2) two L2 AW instructors who are M.A. holders (or its equivalent) and yet not very experienced in publication. The first two instructors are Dr. Waluya and Dr. Wati (pseudonyms). The remaining two are Mr. Lesmana and Ms. Rahmani (also pseudonyms). All of them are Indonesians. Dr. Waluya has had more than 25 years of teaching experience. His M.A. in TESOL was obtained from a North American university in the early 1990s, and his doctoral degree in English Language Teaching was completed in an Indonesian university in the early 2000s. With more than 10 years of teaching experience, Dr. Wati completed her master's and doctoral degrees in a South-East nation and North America respectively in the mid and late 2000s. Mr. Lesmana and Ms. Rahmani have less than 10 years of teaching experience and obtained their master's degrees from Australian universities in the late 2000s. All four instructors taught the academic writing course for third- or final-year undergraduate students in the same Indonesian EFL teacher education program. It will be interesting to see if there is any similarity or difference of viewing the government policy and of implementing their own AW policies among these faculty members who have different teaching, research, and publishing experiences.

As I know the site and the instructors quite personally, I will approach some potential participants via e-mail and ask for their consent to participate in my study. Researching into a familiar workplace is not without problems or risks. In particular, I need to be "self-reflexive" of my own stance as an insider who may take pedagogical policies and practices for granted (Heath & Street, 2008, pp. 122-125). On the other hand, I need to reconcile potential tensions when my research findings suggest that changes be initiated.

DOCUMENTS

Documents of policies that are collected include (1) a government policy that regulates publication and (2) L2 AW instructors' own de jure policy. The former is represented by *Surat Edaran Dirjen DIKTI tentang Publikasi Karya IlmiahNomor 152/E/T/2012* (A Memo Number 152/E/T/2012 issued by the Director of the Directorate General of Higher Education in Indonesia regarding Academic Publication). It is interesting to see whether L2 AW instructors in this study have been inspired by, or have incorporated ideas regardless of their knowledge of, the state policies. Closer scrutiny of instructors' policy document, with the main sample being their most current *Academic Writing* syllabus,and interviews with these instructors may help me answer this question.

CONTEXT

The institution where the research participants are working, in which I was once involved actively as an instructor, is an English Department in a private university in Java. It has been one of the oldest departments in the 50-yearish-old university. Having no graduate level of EFL teacher education program, the undergraduate department boasts its A grade for the latest 2010 accreditation. This achievement is mainly reflected by seemingly sound students' activities (e.g., annual English drama performances, involvement in English debating competitions), some academic activities (e.g., annual international conferences that feature world-class scholars including Suresh Canagarajah, Anne Burns, and Vijay Bhatia, among others), and community service. Its engagement in research and publication still needs much improvement, though. Only a few of its faculty members most hold master's degrees and few have a doctoral degree in TESOL or Applied Linguistics have actively published their work nationally or internationally.

L2 AW has been an inherent part of many English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teacher education programs in Indonesia, including the one whose instructors I interviewed. At an undergraduate level, it may be formally offered in one specific course, e.g., that labeled as *Academic Writing*, or other related names like *Research Methods, Proposal Writing*, and *Thesis*. The practice of turning an undergraduate thesis into a published article in national, non-accredited journals has been ongoing since I was a young faculty member in 2000, or even long before that.[v] However, the publishing culture is not very common among holders of *Sarjana Pendidikan* (S.Pd.) – an equivalent of Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) – who decide to become teachers in primary and secondary schooling. Furthermore, the EFL

teacher education program I will investigate here has had a long tradition of exercising teaching excellence rather than research excellence. It was not until the turn of the 21st century that the program management has aimed at more research and publication, though the move toward that has been considerably slow to date. If the number of published academics is still relatively low in the program, we can expect that graduates from the program, some of whom become EFL teachers in various primary and secondary schools in Indonesia, are not well-equipped with necessary research and publishing skills.

TRIANGULATING INTERVIEW DATA, POLICY DOCUMENTS, AND SOME PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS

I conducted an interview through Skype with one participant (Dr. Wati). A set of questions (see Appendix A) were sent to each participant via e-mail before an online talk with Skype. A Skype conversation (on October 27, 2012) with one of the participants was audio-recorded using the Audacity software installed in my PC laptop. Some portions of talk during Skype conversations that I consider highly relevant to addressing my research questions were transcribed. Other interviews with the other three participants were conducted through e-mail exchanges. In addition to a Skype conversation and e-mail correspondence, I have some personal observation based on my memory of my relatively considerable involvement in the department before I left for the United States in August 2011. Member checking was also done. That is, findings of the first round of my analysis were shared with the research participants. Comments on my preliminary analysis will also be included here.

Although I basically transcribed the Skype conversation verbatim, some parts of my participants' speech were "cleaned up" (i.e., false starts, hesitations like "uh:m," length of pause, and overlapping speech between me and a participant were not as meticulously transcribed as that in Conversation Analytic studies; but see Appendix B for some transcription conventions anyway). The transcription is such that it is sufficient for the current analysis that focuses on themes that emerge from our conversations (in a narrative form [cf. Riessman, 2008] or non-narrative form) and that will directly address my research questions. Some non-narrative information may involve my research participants' (1) degree of awareness of government policies on publication, (2) academic and professional knowledge that determines their decision-making (e.g., in writing their AW syllabus and implementing it in class, in guiding students develop their L2 AW literacy). By "non-narrative" I mean that their responses to my queries may be either their declarative statements of knowledge (e.g., of state

policies), or lack thereof, or their personal experiences (e.g., of having difficulty in bridging one's own insecurity in writing academically and asking students to write with or without publication in mind), or a combination of declarative statements and personal narratives.

FINDINGS

Instructors' Responses to Government's Policy on Academic Publication

Instructors' understanding of the government policy

Although some or all of them may not have read the policy themselves, the four instructors participating in this study state that they are familiar with the current government policy stipulating that undergraduate students publish their work before they are granted a bachelor's degree. Dr. Waluya provided the background of why the policy was issued: "The background issue of this policy is plagiarism cases and low rate of academic publications at the national level. This seems like a quick short cut to boost publications" (October 23, 2012). The issue of "low rate academic publications" echoes some portions of the policy:

Sebagaimana kita ketahui bahwa pada saat sekarang ini jumlah karya ilmiah dari Perguruan Tinggi Indonesia secara total masih rendah jika dibandingkan dengan Malaysia, hanya sekitar sepertujuh. Hal ini menjadi tantangan kita bersama untuk meningkatkannya. Sehubungan dengan itu terhitung mulai kelulusan setelah Agustus 2012 diberlakukan ketentuan sebagai berikut:

1. Untuk lulus program Sarjana harus menghasilkan makalah yang terbit pada jurnal ilmiah.
2. Untuk lulus program Magister harus telah menghasilkan makalah yang terbit pada jurnal ilmiah nasional diutamakan yang terakreditasi Dikti.
3. Untuk lulus program Doktor harus telah menghasilkan makalah yang diterima untuk terbit pada jurnal internasional.

Copied from Surat Edaan Dirjen DIKTI tentang Publikasi Karya Ilmiah Nomor 152/E/T/2012

[As we know that right now the amount of publications in our Higher Education is overall small compared to Malaysia; that is, our publications constitute only a seventh of those produced in our neighboring country. This is a challenge that should drive us to increase our publications. Regarding

this, as per August 2012 graduation, the following regulation will be effective:

1. To obtain a bachelor's degree, students should already produce a paper published in a journal.
2. To obtain a master's degree, students should already publish a paper in a national journal, preferably that which has been accredited by DIKTI.
3. To obtain a doctoral degree, students should already publish an article in an international journal.

A Memo Number 152/E/T/2012 issued by the Director of the Directorate General of Higher Education in Indonesia (DIKTI) regarding Academic Publication]

Interestingly, two instructors related this policy to that of the university and the English department in which they are working. Dr. Waluya said: "the university has not said anything yet about this regulation. So, I have not done any 'move' yet to meet this requirement."Similarly, in a Skype conversation, Dr. Wati replied:"Actually I don't see [our university] in general respond to that ((unclear))I don't know when exactly but many people (.) against that [...]many universities don't really pay attention to it" (October 27, 2012). Thus, the dominant policy appropriation for individual instructors (particularly Drs. Waluya and Wati) in response to the state policy at a macro level is that they have not bothered implementing it to the students, especially because policy makers at the bi-layered meso level (i.e., the university and the English department) have not addressed this. See the following section for further detail of this policy making at a meso level.

Instructors' attitudes toward the government policy

Asked whether they personally agree with the state policy, the instructors' responses somewhat vary, although overall they find it problematic. Mr. Lesmana said: "I tend to disagree, because only very [few] papers are prepared and ready for publication."Dr. Waluya's rationale behind not agreeing with the current policy is elaborate:

Given the present conditions and teachers' responsibilities – academic and administrative – I do not think that this policy can be implemented in the near future at least. The infrastructure for publication at both faculty and institutional levels are not ready. The university management, as far as I know, has not done anything yet as preparations for this policy implementation. Besides, publishing students' theses in a way that is professionally acceptable is not a 'copy and paste' work. It requires

professional commitments and hard work to edit students' theses to become manuscripts for an academic journals, not to mention the number of theses every semester that have to be edited into reasonably acceptable manuscripts, and ….the cost of publication. I personally do not agree to this policy to be implemented at S1 [i.e., bachelor's] degree program.

Seemingly knowledgeable about other government policies, Dr. Waluya even contested the memo issued by DIKTI: "Publication in a scientific journal is not required according to the guidelines of 'Indonesian Qualification Framework' produced by the ministry of education."

Ms. Rahmani hesitated to have a straightforward answer to my query about her attitude toward the government policy:

It's difficult to say. Ideally the idea is good. However, I don't believe that all students have the capacity or ability to do this. Also, not all students will work in an academic setting when they graduate. So, the experience of publishing writings may not really be useful for some of them. (November 8, 2012)

Dr. Wati's response is also nuanced. She even put forward the issue of practicality; that is, she doubted that publication venues (mainly through journal articles) are limited, not to mention reviewing processes, as what Dr. Waluya also pointed out.

Dr. Wati:	Uh I don't know if you can say that I agree or disagree Because I think (.) basically I agree. Because I think our English Department is an English language teaching department, so I think it's a good idea to give exposure to students how to publish in journals, things like that But (.) my concern (.) is related to the management issue of that policy I mean (.) like (.) what about the reviewing process? things like that And then does every student need to publish in that- in the journal I don't think it's possible.
Jos:	So I think uh the issue here is not whether you agree ya maybe you agree but then the issue is more on uhm what is it? whether or not it is realistic, right?
Dr. Wati:	Mhm Because also in addition to that if we want to be honest about it We have one journal ((name of the journal is deleted)) and it's really hard to maintain that journal. And the one who publish in that journal is lecturers, you know So you can imagine if it's like student, it will be- I imagine twice or three

times hard, right? So yeah

Whether or not students were made aware of the government policy

In some follow-up questions during the Skype conversation with Dr. Wati, I inquired into whether the government policy was introduced to students at all, and she said "no." Her initial response was somewhat surprising on the grounds that she is quite a prolific academic author who should, I assumed, introduce the notion that publication is one possible venue for self-actualization, especially when students decide to be English language teachers who need to publish if they want to be promoted (see *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2011 tentang Sertifikasi bagi Guru dalam Jabatan* [The Regulation issued by the National Minister of Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 11/2011 about In-Service Teacher Certification] I mentioned earlier). However, as our conversation went on, she explained the purpose of writing academically to her students (i.e., "to write their theses") and mentioned how she in her class attempted to distinguish AW from other writing genres. She also confirmed my impression of her answer to my question -- that she is more concerned with lying "strong foundations of how do [AW] instead of forcing them to publish."

Jos:	Do you think you have uhm told your students (.) once or twice or a couple times that they need to publish (.) somehow, later in their profession or for the graduation?
Dr. Wati:	No
Jos:	No?
Jos & Dr. Wati	((both laughs))
Dr. Wati:	Because to be honest, from the department, there is no mention of this at all. Okay so I don't think uhm whether this is to be taken seriously or not But what I usually do in my academic writing is I prepare them to ((unclear)) write their theses. And uhm how to write in academic way, you know Not necessarily published.
Jos:	Okay so you're more concerned with foundations uhm I think kind of strong foundations of how to do academic writing instead of
Dr. Wati	Yes mhm
Jos:	forcing them to publish, right?
Dr. Wati	Yes. How is it different from creative writing, or descriptive writing, or things like that.

Though Dr. Wati said "no" when I asked her if she ever mentioned the government policy to her students, her further explanation reveals her pragmatic stance, which was akin to Dr. Waluya's response that as long as the university does not have a say in this matter, he wouldn't "move" to meet the government's requirement. She even blamed the department for not deliberating the issue of publication in any staff meeting to date. Interestingly, unlike her doubt that the government policy is realistic, Dr. Wati basically agreed with the government's policy, the reason of which was related to the information she heard, if she was not mistaken, regarding the excellent status of accreditation of her department.

Dr. Wati: [...] I think uhm I don't think [publication is] the focus of the department (2.0) you know?
Jos: Do you think the foc- uhm being not focused on that, as a department is a good think or a bad thing in your opinion?
Dr. Wati: I think it's a bad thing.
I think we really need to really take this seriously because
One of the thing in that policy, in that document, ((unclear)) if I remember correctly, is that they would start implementing the policy to those uh for those departments who got A in the accreditation process
Jos: O:h
Dr. Wati: And we got A, you know
So I think we have to
No matter whether they are going to do it or not
I think it's a good thing if we prepare
At least uhm to make the students aware that, you know
In this profession you <u>have</u> to publish, you know
Even though it's in the simplest form.
I think it's beneficial, yeah.
But it's never raised in the staff meeting
It never (.) nothing.
Yeah so I don't see the point wha- why I need to focus that in my academic writing.
You know what I mean?
Jos: Okay you're just being pragmatic, okay?
Dr. Wati: Mhm ya
Jos: You do what you're supposed to do even though you know you are passionate about (.) uhm publishing yourself, right?

Dr. Wati: Mhm yup!

Just like Dr. Wati, Dr. Waluya and Mr. Lesmana did not seem to regard sharing the policy with the students as an important matter. Dr. Waluya, as mentioned earlier, stated: "I have not done any 'move' yet to meet this requirement." The latter simply tended to disagree with the policy, with less nuanced discussion about the matter, though, compared to Dr. Wati's. These three instructors' stance notwithstanding, I find it somewhat odd that the official policy that requires publication for students before they can graduate was not discussed in AW-related courses, especially in the *Academic Writing* course by these instructors. In fact, Dr. Wati, Dr. Waluya and Mr. Lesmana are involved in local journal publication. Either Dr. Waluya or Mr. Lesmana was once the chief editor of the journal. Even when I was still able to observe their workplace before I left for the United States in August 2011, I witnessed how they encouraged undergraduate thesis supervisors to suggest what theses were publishable, at least in the locally published journal. The de facto policy seems to be that students are not actively involved in the decision making of whether their theses are publishable and of whether they will be asked to edit their theses again once they are deemed publishable. Also interesting is the fact that in the syllabus (see Appendix C), this statement in the AW course description appears: "students are expected to be able to write an academic paper which complies to the standards of an academic paper in the field of education, linguistics, or literature." As to why this disjuncture (i.e., encouraging publications of students' "good" work and requiring them to comply to a certain academic standard, but not informing them the current government policy on publication) emerges, however, is beyond the scope of this study. It seems to me nonetheless that publishing good work after conforming to some academic standard is one thing, and yet requiring all students to get their work published is entirely a different matter. It would be (or have been) better anyway, in my opinion, to share with the students that publication in a journal is a possibility, regardless of the current government policy. Having read my preliminary analysis, Dr. Waluya concurred: "… I agree to this statement. As I see it, our present graduates have no need to get their work published, unless they will work as dosen [lecturer] later when publication is required for promotion" (25 November 2012).

Interestingly, Ms. Rahmani, who is not yet as established as Dr. Wati and Dr. Waluya in terms of publication, had the following opinion:

In the syllabus [see Appendix C], it does not say anything about this policy. However, I personally make students aware of the policy. At the beginning of class I tell them about this new policy. So, I encourage them to write a good piece of writing. At the end of the class, if I think their works are good

drafts to be published, I will give them an extra mark. I also plan to publish good pieces of writings in journals after editing the final result.

In response to my question of whether the AW current syllabus reflects the government policy (see my fourth question in Appendix A), Dr. Waluya only attached the current AW syllabus (see Appendix C) with no further explanation. It turned out to be largely developed by Dr. Wati. But it was Ms. Rahmani who explicitly stated students' publications, as long as they meet a certain standard, is desirable and will give some incentive if students' drafts are publishable. In a follow-up study it would be interesting to find out if such an incentive (i.e., "an extra mark") has ever been given at all to any of her (or other instructors') students.

How Academic Writing is Taught or Scaffolded, Regardless of the Government Policy

Whereas the previous sections are devoted a macro level of (language) policy at the state level and meso level (at the participants' department level), in this the following sections I will bring up some issues of more micro/local/personal policies in a classroom level as determined by an individual instructor. The AW syllabus (see Appendix C) covers contents (e.g., samples of academic articles to be read [see the readings in the weekly schedule], consultation on content), skills (e.g.., summarizing, quoting, citing with the APA format, organizing a paper rhetorically), and L2 forms (e.g., mechanics; see week 12 under topic in Appendix C). Instructors have different focuses when they responded to my fourth, fifth, and sixth questions (see Appendix A), especially when they related AW course with the idea of publication, despite their early hesitation about imposing publication on undergraduate students. Dr. Waluya did not have any stories to share in response to question #6. For questions #4 and #5, he asked me to see his attached syllabus (see Appendix C).

In terms of skills, Mr. Lesmana stated: "Regarding the policy of publication, the activities in my AW class accommodate their need on how to cite and put clear reference to avoid plagiarism." This seems to be a normative answer, which apparently is his main concern, as far as his response to my fifth question (see Appendix A) is concerned. Being normative here is not necessarily undesirable, though. In fact, Mr. Lesmana's response is one way of appropriating the L2 AW syllabus, which may in the long run help his students to write academically with or without publication in mind.

With regard to L2 forms, Mr. Lesmana drew upon his growing expertise in systemic functional linguistics (SFL), which he learned quite

extensively during her graduate studies in Australia. The following excerpt is his response to question #6 (a) (see Appendix A). Overall, his response below sheds some light on discourse structure, and is not normative.

In my writing class I always start with reviewing the notion of genre, register, and text types. I explain to them that they should write purposively, e.g to argue, to discuss, to propose and its each common generic structures (genre). Then, I explained that they can select the alternative text types that can be used in each genre (whether they want to use narration, comparison, etc. because two or more text types can be used to write academic paper). To help their language use, I selected appropriate grammar and clause structures to make them aware of the situation in their writing interaction (context of situation/register), so I employ a little bit of SFL theories as I grew up academically with this theory.

Ms. Rahmani also talked about forms, though less theoretically oriented than Mr. Lesmana. Overall, she responded to my questions literally (see questions #6 [b – on audience] and [d – on academic language] in Appendix A), which was fine but I hoped to listen to her more personalized and theoretically informed stories. Her answers were also relatively normative in terms of sentence structures and mechanics:

Especially related to language, I often tell students that they are not writing for themselves. The product of their writing will be read by other people. Therefore, they need to be careful on formulating their sentences, also to be more explicit (not making assumptions), so that the writing is clear for the readers later on. I also often remind students to use transitions which [are] quite important as well; I usually ask students not to abbreviate words, i.e. avoiding 'can't', 'don't', etc. in their writing. Also to remove words that seems to be too spoken. I hope that students will be able to write for a more formal 'audience'.

Ms. Rahmani's take on content was typical in that many instructors including myself, I believe, will agree with her. Regarding "purpose" (see question #6 [a] in Appendix A), she said:

[students] need to write an academic paper in which is opinion based/is an argument. Therefore, they need to be clear of the purpose of writing, that is, from the beginning, they need to have an argument to be developed in the writing.

Concerning overall content in a student's writing (see Question #6 [c] in Appendix A), she commented:

Sometimes I do this by asking 'critical' questions that make them think. I also suggest things, sometimes, because they may not have thought about it before. However, I always let students decide what is best for their writing. I suggest things but try not to make decisions for them.

Compared to other participants in my study, relatively more robust explanations on the intertwined relationship between content or substance (i.e., voice) and an academic writing skill (i.e., modeling established authors) emerged during my interview with Dr. Wati. Her mentions of some world-known authors must have been recalled from the syllabus she developed herelf, with Dr. Waluya, Mr. Lesmana, and Ms. Rahmani under her coordination (see Appendix C, under readings/assignments).[vi] She began with connecting the notion of "voice" to how established academic authors in the field of TESOL used their personal experiences in writing academically. Using these authors as role models, she assigned her students to read their work.

Dr. Wati: U::hm okay. I'm going to focus on the voice thing
What I usually did
is that I share some uhm writings.
So Canagarajah's writing that is published in TESOL Quarterly this June, I think
And then Kumaravadivelu,
And then my own writing,
And one by a Chinese author
It's <u>all</u> about using their own experience to find topics
So that's what I did with my students
And I asked them to read it, and then highlight the strategy that they used.

Dr. Wati encountered an interesting situation, however, as she reported that her students were not accustomed to using "I" as a tool for raising a personal voice.

But what is really interesting is that (.) many of them say .hh that uhm
in their academic writing, in their (.) thinking, they are not supposed to talk about themselves.
Uh because >we talked specifically about the use of the word "I"<, you know
I <u>think</u> it's okay to use the word "I" >to talk about yourself< ((rather than)) "we" or "our" or things like that
But they say it's because of their previous uh writing teachers
=And then ya that's what they say
And what they heard from their seniors
So they say if- because I use the word <u>narr</u>ative in your academic-
Little story just the title "personalizing your academic writing"

And they say, "academic writing (.) doesn't need to be personal."
"they need to be impersonal."
That's what they say.
So we have a lot of discussion on .hh on how to put yourself in it.
That's the first thing.
And the second thing they say, "I'm nobody."
That's what they say.
Why do- is it- is my voice matter (.) to- to put in academic writing.

In addition to not tabooing "I" in academic writing, Dr. Wati went on explicating the notion of voice. She believes that writing personal stories academically is one way of "interact[ing] with the literature":

Dr. Wati	And none of them say that uhm stories >are part of academic writing<
	Or themselves>is part of academic writing<
	They always write like [...]
	Citation
	Well-known authors, things like that
	Mhm Because I think academic writing also is different, right? in the past and now
	Now there are many stories that come into academic writing like Canagarajah's article in TESOL Quarterly, right?
	So ya
Jos:	So (.) how did you, or how do you usually (.) uh with the narrative in mind (.) how do you usually construct or teach your students to interact with the literature.
Dr. Wati	Uh:m it- it's still a struggle, to be honest

And engaging with the literature entails 1) active reading and writing and 2) "looking at theory with critical eyes." She also stated that this process has been facilitated by her struggle to provide many examples for the students.

Uh but one of the things that I ask them to do is to read a lot,
like to read the right model, I think
Like Canagarajah's article, Kumaravadivelu, and my articles.
I think it's also important-
I personally said "if you're an acad- uh a writing teacher or an academic writing teacher, I think it's really important to show your students that you also write (.) with that
Not just asking them to write but you don't write.

> Because many of my students said they really like when I shared my own process of academic writing
> How it's not always a happy journey or things like that.
> So that's one.
> Second is that uhm I tell them to really look at theory in a critical eye, with critical eyes
> Because many of the theory is uhm con- like originated in the West.
> .hh And you read- put that in our context,
> is not really working.
> Like you see from Canagarajah's article
> Or Kumaravadivelu's article where he talked about .hh hm one of them said that the stero- stereotype of Asian is like (.) silence, lack of participation (.) things like that
> But (.) actually that's not true.
> Right? Silence for Asians more complex than just an absence of knowledge
> So things like that.
> I give them a lot of example.
> Which I'm not saying it's successful, but you know I'm still struggling.

My impression of Dr. Wati's discussion about voice is positive. In her classroom policy that requires students to pay much attention to voice, she has made it clear how a form (e.g., the personal pronoun "I"), contents (e.g., critiques), and skills (e.g., active reading and writing, and modeling established authors) are inextricably linked. She is normative in setting a high bar for being engaged in academic writing (and reading), and yet realistic as she gave a lot of examples, used her own and other scholars' models. Interestingly, her emphasis on personalization of academic writing reflects her appropriation of academic writing policy by some instructors[vii] who oftentimes favors more in suppressing subjectivity or personal voices.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The main contribution of my research to the field of language planning and policy is that I affirm the notion that policy appropriations are multi-layered at micro, meso, and macro levels (McCarty, 2011, pp. 10, 16-17). They are not only about appropriating de jure state/government (i.e., macro) policies into local regulations, but also how local (e.g., a university and a department in the university at a meso level) and personal (or micro-level) regulations evolve as they are used and negotiated with students especially in real classroom settings. L2 AW instructors in the EFL teacher education program under study have their own agency (cf. Levinson et al., 2009), personal policies and agendas that may or may not be in line with the

publishing demand imposed upon by the present directorate general of higher education. But for these instructors nonetheless, regardless of their experience in getting their work published, the most important thing is not aiming at requiring all students to get their work published. Rather, they find it crucial and more realistic that students know what it is to write academically (e.g., Dr. Wati's take on personalizing L2 AW through engagement with the TESOL literature) and how it is taught and scaffolded properly with suitable contents, forms, and skills. These relatively unison stance of doing what is realistic is supported by, interestingly, current indifference about the state policy transpiring in the department and the university at a meso level. Despite the indifference, preparing students to write academically may somehow be beneficial for students who will be engaged in the EFL teaching profession. Dr. Wati provides a great example of role-modeling herself as a prolific academic author. Her agency in developing an L2 AW syllabus and in asking her students to have their personal voice in relation to the TESOL literature seems to support this academic role-modeling.

Interestingly, an individual instructor's policy (i.e., policy at a micro level) has indeed been subject to change. Dr. Wati, for instance, showed her nuanced and somewhat conflicting opinions. In an attempt to account for Dr. Wati's seemingly paradoxical stances regarding whether or not the government policy on publication is agreeable, I have at least one explanation. To use McCarty's (2011, p. 2) perspective, citing Heath, Street, and Mills (2008), I believe that L2 AW policy "is best understood as a verb; [it] 'never just 'is,' but rather 'does.'" What one (like Dr. Wati) does with a policy at the present time may not be the same as what s/he did in the past, and may even evolve in the future, depending on what works best for the individual de facto policy maker in a classroom at a certain moment or in an extended period of time. More broadly, Dr. Wati's case demonstrates how policy appropriations are not simply about "contestations" by "a multiplicity of multiple actors" (Levinson & Sutton, 2001, p. 2) but also of a single actor – an instructor whose view of a certain classroom policy may change over time. It is not unusual or undesirable for an individual teacher to change, and without an ethnographic view of such subtle changes of individual policymaking, we will never know how a seemingly "simple" or taken-for-granted policy (e.g., an English-only milieu) is highly contestable even for a language educator.

I cannot gauge if the Indonesian government will take heed of the current findings. It will be interesting if they are humble enough to acknowledge that the policy on publication is elusive and unrealistic at best, especially for undergraduate students in EFL teacher education programs

where they will be expected to publish in English.[viii] More importantly, however, this study may pave the way for further praxes on my part and on the part of my colleagues in their attempts to provide quality L2 AW instructions by any means (e.g., systemic functional linguistics as a theoretical underpinning that informs Mr. Lesmana's policy in introducing discourse structures to his AW students) in a climate where publish-or-perish has been officially ordained. How these (and more instructors) in the department under study reflect on their own and each other's beliefs and classroom policies is worth investigating in a follow-up study. Furthermore, I believe the current study may have some resonance in other similar contexts, especially within learning communities like universities in Indonesia (i.e., the meso level), where individual L2 AW instructors' policies at a micro level adapt or appropriate state and university policies at a macro level and meso level respectively. What is more, as undergraduate students and their parents are also university stakeholders, in further studies their voices concerning living a real and harsh, publish-or-perish academic life should be heard. These students are coming from various socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds, which inherently complicate their views of the importance of being university students who do not always regard academic asceticism as desirable at all.

THE AUTHOR

Joseph Ernest Mambu is a PhD candidate at the Department of English Arizona State University Tempe USA.

REFERENCES

Adnan, Z. (2009). Some potential problems for research articles written by Indonesian academics when submitted to international English language journals. *Asian EFL Journal, 11*(1), 107–125.

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30*, 109-137.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bale, J. (2010). International comparative perspectives on heritage language education policy research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 42-65. doi:10.1017/S0267190510000024

Brown, K. (2010). Teachers as language-policy actors: Contending with the erasure of lesser-used languages in schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 41*(3), 298-314. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01089.x.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2010). Internationalizing knowledge construction and dissemination. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*, 661-664.doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01105.x

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

de Jong, E. J. (2008). Contextualizing policy appropriation: Teachers' perspectives, local responses, and English-only ballot initiatives. *Urban Review, 40*(4), 350-370. doi: 10.1007/s11256-008-0085-y

Hawisher, G. E., Seife, C. L., Guo, Y-H., & Liu, L. (2010). Globalization, *guanxi,* and agency: Designing and redesigning the literacies of cyberspace. In B. Horner, M-Z. Lu, & P. K. Matsuda*, Cross-language relations in composition* (pp. 57-80). Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, D. C. (2010). The relationship between applied linguistics research and language policy for bilingual education. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(1), 72-93. doi: 10.1093/applin/amp011

Levinson, B. A. U., & Sutton, M. (2001). Introduction: Policy as/in practice – A sociocultural approach to the study of educational policy. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Levinson, B. A. U., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power: Theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options. *Educational Policy, 23*(6), 767-795.doi: 10.1177/0895904808320676

Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: Between the commitment to competence and the quest for higher test scores. *TEFLIN Journal, 18*(1), 1-14.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Coming to voice: Publishing as a graduate student. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 39-51). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCarty, T. L. (2011). Introducing ethnography and language policy. In T. L. McCarty (Ed.), *Ethnography and language policy* (pp. 1-28). New York and London: Routledge.

Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Riessman, C. K. (2008) *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action: A strategy for research and analysis.* New York: Teachers College Press.

APPENDIX A

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROMPTS

1. Are you aware of the current government regulation(s) that require(s) undergraduate students to publish their work?
2. What is your understanding of these regulations or the policy regarding undergraduate student publishing?
3. Do you agree with the current state policy?
4. Would you please tell me a little more about your academic writing syllabus? In what ways does it reflect, or relate to the publishing policy?
5. Can you describe in greater detail how the activities and assignments in your class reflect or relate to the policy, if any?
6. Would you tell me a story or a vignette from your interactions with students inside or outside of classrooms (e.g., through e-mail exchanges) where you guide(d) your students (a) to write with a purpose, (b) to write with some audience beyond yourself in mind, (c) to think further of a certain substantial aspect (i.e., content) of their draft that needs improvement, (d) to use the "right" academic language? Any other stories?

APPENDIX B
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

?	:	Rising intonation.
.	:	Falling intonation.
(.)	:	A very short pause.
(2.0)	:	A pause of measurable length.
.hh	:	An in-breath.
((smiles))	:	A non-verbal cue (e.g., smiling), or my English translation, or my comments.
Shut up!	:	The underlined word is stressed.
LOUD	:	A high volume.
º utterance º	:	A quiet utterance.
>faster speech<	:	An utterance between inverted angle brackets speeds up.
Fal- false	:	The dash denotes a false start.

(adapted from Wortham, 2001, p. 26)

APPENDIX C
SOME EXCERPTS FROM AN ACADEMIC WRITING SYLLABUS

ACADEMIC WRITING
Semester 1 2012-2013

Course Description

The course aims to provide knowledge and practice for students to write an academic paper. During the semester, the students will go through a process of developing a complete academic paper, including self-revision and editing, consultation on rhetorical organization and quality of language. By the end of the course, students are expected to be able to write an academic paper which complies to the standards of an academic paper in the field of education, linguistics, or literature.

Course Objectives

1. Students are able to use accepted rhetorical organization and quality of language in academic writing.
2. Students are being critical and reflective towards their own writing and development as second language writers.
3. Students are able to integrate their voices academically.
4. Students produce a piece of academic writing.

Weekly Schedule

Week	Date	Topic	Readings/Assignments
1	3-7 Sept 2012	• Introduction to the course. • What is Academic Writing?	Some excerpts from Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching Academic ESL Writing*.Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. • Most Common Student Written Academic Assignment and Task. • Features of Academic Genre & Text. • Types of Writing Tasks
2	10-14 Sept 2012	• Formal Rhetorical Organization. • Analyzing sample of text.	Canagarajah, S. (2012). Teacher development in a global profession: An autoethnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 258□279. **HOMEWORK**: Students find a topic for an argumentative essay, initial ideas for the essay, and tentative thesis statement.
3	17-21 Sept 2012	• Starting with What Others Are Saying. • Analyzing sample text	Graff, B. and Birkenstein, C. (2006). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic writing.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Problematizing cultural

		[...]	stereotypes in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 709□719. [...]
4	24-28 Sept 2012	• The Art of Summarizing • The Art of Quoting • Analyzing sample text	Graff, B. and Birkenstein, C. (2006). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic writing.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. [Dr. Wati's work] [...]
5	[in-class writing]		
6	8-12 Oct 2012	• Three Ways to Respond • Distinguishing What You Say from What They Say • Saying Why it Matters Analyzing sample text from either three texts used in the previous weeks. [...]	Graff, B. and Birkenstein, C. (2006). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic writing.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. [...]
7	15-19 Oct 2012	• **PRESENTATION**: Why what you say matters. • Academic Writing Doesn't Mean Setting Aside Your Own Voice.	Graff, B. and Birkenstein, C. (2006). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic writing.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
8	22-26 Oct 2012	• The Art of Metacommentary [...]	Graff, B. and Birkenstein, C. (2006). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic writing.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
9	29 Oct – 2 Nov 2012	• APA style of writing and citation.	[...]
[Weeks 10-14 are devoted to teacher-student conferences and subsequent draft submissions]			

ENDNOTES

[1]I downloaded one of its official websites in http://sertifikasiguru.org/download.php on October 28, 2011.

[2] This memo is published online (http://www.dikti.go.id/files/atur/SKDirjen152-E-T-2012KaryaIlmiah.pdf). This regulation, in particular, will be discussed in my findings below.

[3]Some English-literary- or EFL-related nationally accredited journals published in Indonesia like *k@ta, TEFLIN Journal*, and *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching* also require contributors to write their articles in English. Acceptance to these journals has already been a challenge for many Indonesian EFL academics, not to mention international journals published abroad.

[4]I thank Dr. Teresa L. McCarty for bringing this up to my attention.

[5]Since the late 2000s it has been impossible for a B.Ed. holder like myself in 2000 to be a university lecturer in Indonesia. The regulation stipulating this is *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 37 Tahun 1999* (The Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia's Government No. 37/1999; downloaded from http://unp.ac.id/files/peraturan/pp-dosen.pdf, last accessed October 3, 2012).

[6]The syllabus was developed by Dr. Wati, which was then used by Dr. Waluya. The *Academic Writing* course coordinator at the time of data collection was Mr. Lesmana but instructors have the flexibility of using either Dr. Wati's or Mr. Lesmana's syllabus. I thank Ms. Rahmani for telling me this.

[7]Dr. Wati did not mention any names of such instructors. I remember being told by some of my former instructors both in undergraduate and graduate

studies, with the latter being in Australia, that I should not use "I" or use it sparingly.

[8]Dr. Waluya agreed with my opinion: "A colleague from another state univ told me they would only post online the abstracts of stds' theses, not the whole work, as a pre-requisite for graduation. Publication of S2/S3 [master's and doctoral] dissertations would be more realistic and scientifically more worth it." (25 November 2012)