Beyza Björkman*

"This is not familiar to most people": navigating peer reviewers' comments and knowledge construction practices by PhD students in supervision interactions

Abstract: This paper focuses on the under-researched genre of PhD supervision meetings (but see Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2009a. Problems in the research problem: Critical feedback and resistance in academic supervision. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 53[2]. 185–201; Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2009b. Student-initiated advice in academic supervision. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42[2]. 163–190; Björkman, Beyza. 2015. PhD supervisor–PhD student interactions in an English-medium Higher Education [HE] setting: Expressing disagreement. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3[2]. 205–229; Björkman, Beyza. 2016. PhD adviser and student interactions as a spoken academic genre. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw [eds.], *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, 348–361. Oxon: Routledge; Björkman, Beyza. 2017. PhD supervision meetings in an English as a Lingua Franca [ELF] setting: Linguistic competence and content knowledge as neutralizers of institutional and academic power. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 6[1]. 111–139) and investigates knowledge construction episodes in PhD students' discussions with their supervisors on their co-authored papers. In these meetings, all supervisors and students use English as their lingua franca (ELF). Such supervision meetings are made up of "social negotiation" and "collaborative sense-making," providing a good base for learning to take place (Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), which in the present context is the "enculturation" of the PhD student into the research community (Manathunga, Catherine. 2014. *Intercultural postgraduate supervision: Reimagining time, place and knowledge*. New York: Routledge). It is precisely these negotiation and collaborative sense-making practices that the present paper focuses on, in order to investigate knowledge construction practices. While there is an abundance of research in disciplinary knowledge construction and academic literacy practices from cognitive and behavioral sciences, knowledge about novice scholars' knowledge construction practices is scant in applied linguistics (but see Li, Yongyan.

*Corresponding author: Beyza Björkman,** Department of English, Stockholm University, Frescativägen, 114 19, Stockholm, Sweden, E-mail: beyza.bjorkman@english.su.se

2006. Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15[3]. 159–178). Even less is known about how PhD students may negotiate knowledge construction and engage in meaning-making practices in interaction with their supervisors. The material comprises 11 hours of naturally occurring speech by three supervisors and their students where they discuss the reviewers' comments they have received from the journal. The predominant method employed here is applied conversation analysis (CA) (Richards, Keith & Paul Seedhouse [eds.]. 2005. *Applying conversation analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), which includes both local patterns of interaction as well as "the tensions between [these] local practices and any 'larger structures' in which these are embedded, such as conventional membership categories, institutional rules, instructions, accounting obligations, etc." (Have, Paul ten. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage 199). The analyses here aim to show how the PhD supervisors and students discuss the reviewers' comments with reference to (i) their own disciplinary community of climate science, and (ii) the domestic discourse community of the target journals (see also Li, Yongyan. 2006. Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15[3]. 159–178). The preliminary findings of the analyses show a tendency by the PhD students to focus more heavily on the domestic discourse community of the target journals, especially when justifying their methodological choices. The PhD supervisors, on the other hand, base their meaning-making on the conventions of the disciplinary community of climate science, pointing out broader disciplinary community practices. These findings, highlighting a need to focus on novice scholars' meaning-making efforts, can be used to inform PhD supervision in general.

Keywords: PhD supervision, naturally occurring speech, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), academic spoken discourse, knowledge construction

Abstrakt: Detta dokument fokuserar på den undersökta genren av doktorandhandledningsmöten (men se Vehviläinen 2009a och 2009b, och Björkman 2015, 2016 och 2017) och undersöker kunskapsuppbyggnadsepisoder i doktorandernas diskussioner med sina handledare på sina medförfattade artiklar. Vid dessa möten använder alla handledare och studenter engelska som sin lingua franca (ELF). Sådana handledningsningsmöten består av "social interaktion" och "gemensamt 'sense-making'", vilket ger en bra grund för lärande att äga rum (Vygotskij 1978), vilket i nuvarande sammanhang är "doktorandens" inkulturering i forskningen gemenskap (Manathunga 2014). Det är just dessa förhandlingar och samarbetsprocesser som det här dokumentet fokuserar på, för att undersöka

kunskapsbyggande metoder. Även om det finns ett överflöd av forskning inom disciplinära kunskapsbyggande och akademisk läskunnighet, är kunskap om nybörjarkunskapens kunskapsbyggande praxis svag, som tidigare påpekats (men se Li 2006). Ännu mindre är känt om hur doktorander kan förhandla kunskapsbyggande och engagera sig i meningsskapande metoder i samverkan med sina handledare. Materialet i denna studie omfattar elva timmar av naturligt förekommande tal av tre handledare och deras elever där de diskuterar granskarnas kommentarer som de fått från vetenskapliga tidskriften. Den övervägande metoden som används här är tillämpad konversationsanalys (CA) Richards and Seedhouse (2016), som inkluderar både lokala interaktionsmönster samt "spänningarna mellan [dessa] lokala metoder och" större strukturer "där dessa är inbäddade, såsom konventionella medlemskategorier, institutionella regler, instruktioner, etc. "(Har 2007: 199). Analyserna syftar härmed till att visa hur doktorandledare och elever diskuterar granskarens kommentarer med hänvisning till (i) deras disciplinära områden, och (ii) tidskrifternas diskursgemenskap (se även Li 2006). De resultaten från analyserna visar att doktorandernas tendens är att fokusera mer på den diskursgemenskapen i måltidskrifterna, särskilt när man motiverar t.ex. sina metodologiska val. Doktorshandledarna baserar sig däremot på meningsskapet på klimatvetenskapliga ämnesdiscipliner, och påpekar bredare disciplinära gemenskapspraxis. Dessa resultat, som lyfter fram behovet av att fokusera på nybörjarkollegiers meningsarbete, kan användas för att informera doktorsövervakning i allmänhet.

Nyckelord: Doktorandhandledning, naturligt förekommande tal, Engelska som en Lingua Franca (ELF), akademisk muntlig diskurs, kunskapsbyggande

1 Introduction

Academic settings have always been, and will continue being, home to high-stakes interactions where speakers need to communicate effectively in a variety of spoken academic genres. Among these speakers are PhD students who are expected to achieve a number of cognitively demanding tasks. So much more is expected from a PhD student however than the completion of their PhD project. Within the time they are given for project completion, they are also expected to engage in socialization to the research community, and join the knowledge construction practices of their research community, thus "[contributing] to the advancement of knowledge in their disciplines" (Delamont et al. 1994). While there may be differences in other geographies, we can safely suggest that this is the general picture for western and most parts of Europe. This process of socialization has been described as a "psychological transition" (Ziman 1993; cited in Larivière 2012: 464) from being in

a position where one is instructed on existing knowledge that is known to the research community to a state where one is expected to start contributing with new knowledge, thus joining in the community's knowledge construction practices. In fact, we can safely suggest that in most cases if not all, arriving at this second stage of practicing knowledge construction is the primary goal of a PhD program (Larivière 2012). In addition, doctoral research is a major source of new knowledge production in universities, and research students are pivotal in establishing international collaborative links (Siddle 1997).

Among the complex practices through which this knowledge construction and the socialization to the research community can take place is publication activities that PhD students engage in.

For PhD students in the western academic culture in many contexts, publication is undoubtedly one of the main ways of the enculturation of a PhD student into the research community, as it is through getting published, or not, that the "knowledge gets validated or rejected by the scientific community" (Larivière 2012: 464), especially in the natural sciences. So if knowledge construction has taken place, it will need to reach the research community through one of the main paths, be it academic publication, conferences or the digital platforms which are becoming increasingly popular especially in natural sciences. Our focus in this paper is placed on writing for publication in international journals only.

Whether in joint co-authored publication, or in papers where they are the sole authors, PhD candidates strive so their work sees daylight and can reach the rest of the research community. In addition to other socialization and enculturation practices such as labwork, seminars and coursework, supervision and other meetings at their departments, they need to learn how to get their research published through prestigious journals. This learning includes, among other things, becoming familiar with the epistemological characteristics of one's domain, and the conventions and expectations of the research community as well as the local, domestic discourse community of the target journal (see Li [2006] for a discussion of the different discourse communities). The value of a research paper is its contribution to the field through new knowledge, which can only be achieved if one is familiar with these necessary levels of discourse community. This novelty, however, is not understood by being "completely new" or "out of the blue" but by being "carefully tied to and shown to grow out of existing knowledge" (Kaufer and Geisler 1989: 160; as cited in Li 2006). This makes it all the more necessary to be familiar with what is known and not known to the general research community in the relevant domain and the domestic discourse community of the target journal, as mentioned here.

The present paper addresses knowledge construction practices by PhD candidates when they are working on joint publications with their supervisors. More specifically, it focuses on the interactions they have with their supervisors in

supervision meetings where they are working on interpreting and navigating peer reviewers' comments they have received from the journal. Using 11 hours of naturally occurring interactions between PhD students and their supervisors from the natural sciences domain, the paper uses applied conversation analysis as its main method to analyze these interactions, focusing on negotiations between the PhD students' and their supervisors on knowledge-construction related issues.

By doing so, the paper addresses multiple research gaps. First of all, this paper addresses an under-researched spoken academic genre, namely PhD supervision interactions, where PhD supervisors and students use English as their lingua franca. Equally little is known about PhD students' efforts to achieve international publication (but see Seidlhofer [2012] on academic striving for international pub-lication). Most research on PhD students' writing activities have considered the writing process in general and the production of the separate sections in PhD theses (e.g. Hyland 2005; Paltridge et al. 2012; Pecorari 2006; Shaw 1991) as well as students' and supervisors' perceptions of the PhD writing process (e.g. Belcher 1994; Bitchener and Basturkmen 2006). In addition, to date, no study to the author's knowledge has included interactions between PhD students and their supervisors on how the students interpret peer reviewers' comments when it comes to knowl-edge-construction related issues. In this sense, the data in the paper is unique, as it provides a window for us to have insights into the actual negotiations between experts and experts-in-the-becoming, taking both the local discourse community of the journal as well as the general scientific community in their domain.

The present paper follows from the author's three earlier papers on PhD student–PhD supervisor interactions. Unlike the foci in the earlier papers, namely expressing disagreement (Björkman 2015), genre qualities and the archi-tecture of PhD supervision interactions (Björkman 2016), and linguistic compe-tence and content knowledge as neutralizers of institutional and academic power (Björkman 2017), the point of investigation is in the present paper is on knowledge construction as negotiated between PhD students and supervisors.

2 Previous research on PhD students' writing practices for international publication: perceptions and factors contributing to successful publication

Learning how to produce the critical genres while practicing academic writing is undoubtedly key to the completion of a PhD project. A PhD student does not only

engage in data collection, labwork, fieldwork if applicable and learn how to apply a range of methodological procedures to the data; s/he needs to also learn how to report the research in the main genres of a PhD thesis and research articles. While the genre of PhD thesis has attracted considerable attention in the literature, not much is known about what happens when PhD students engage in activities aiming for international publication. Knowledge construction, being the focal point of investigation in the present paper, is mainly achieved through the genre of the research article, and across different domains, new knowledge reaches the scientific community via research articles. Most of the information on different aspects of the production of research articles comes from experienced writers (e.g. Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995; Hyland 2000; but see Swales [2004] Gosden [1995] on PhD students' knowledge construction in specific disciplines) and not novice scholars or PhD students. We will now turn to what we know about novice scholars' scientific publication efforts and the factors that seem to be influential in publication activity.

Despite being novice scholars, PhD students' contribution to knowledge has been described as having "a greater cognitive value" in comparison to senior researchers (Shinn 1988). This was explained by the stakes being higher for PhD students and their consequent precision when doing research. Doctoral research is considered broadly to be one of the main sources of knowledge production by universities (Siddle 1997; in Kamler 2008). However, far from all PhD students succeed in scholarly publication. In a large scale study in the United States, the findings show that while one in every two students achieves some type of publication (e.g. book chapter, conference paper), there is great disciplinary variation when it comes to publishing research articles. Engineering and science students seem to be named as a co-author in at least one journal publication throughout their PhD education, 47% and 44%, respectively. The percentages are quite low in social sciences and humanities (22% and 15%, respectively).

If we turn to what contributes to successful publication by PhD students, we see the role of the supervisor as a key factor (Gemme and Gingras 2008). In a survey looking at PhD students' research topics, over 90% of the respondents reported supervisor involvement in the selection of the topic of the research project. The percentage of involvement was lower for domains of pure sciences and mathematics; social sciences and humanities were below this percentage (86%, 88%, 92%, respectively), but higher in applied sciences and engineering (95%).

Other than supervisors' involvement in the choice of topic and their approval of research article topics, the actual critiquing process was experienced as the most critical factor in PhD students' understanding of the production of a scholarly piece of writing (Caffarella and Barnett 2000). Critiquing was found to be among the main factors helping PhD students understand the process of scholarly

writing and helping them produce a high quality piece of scholarly writing. The students who reported this to be the main factor in them gaining increased confidence as novice writers drew special attention to two aspects of critiquing, namely, personalized face-to-face feedback, and ongoing critiques they received on their manuscripts (Caffarella and Barnett 2000).

While receiving feedback both from the supervisor and fellow PhD students seemed to be the most important factor, it was not always associated with positive experiences. PhD students initially experienced anxiety over receiving negative feedback, and the peer feedback they provide for fellow PhD students became much less emotionally charged over time. Over a longer period of time, giving and receiving feedback resulted in "a sense of growth" (Caffarella and Barnett 2000: 48). It is interesting to note that their anxiety about receiving critiques in general (that is, not by their peers) was present long after they were done with the writing activity. Previous research seems to broadly ignore the emotional effects of emotional reactions when receiving feedback, providing only general advice such as that one should refrain from getting defensive (Rudestam and Newton Rae 1992). As we will see in the data in the present paper as well, working with feedback is both a cognitive process where the students need to show good scholarly judgment, as well as being an emotional process, also relevant in a novice scholar's identity (Excerpt [1] in Section 3) (Caffarella and Barnett 2000: 50).

The positive effect of active supervision when it comes to scholarly writing activity has been covered in several more studies. PhD students who have a mentoring relationship with their supervisors and those who get to co-author papers with their supervisors were significantly more productive than others who had not been in such a collaborative mentoring relationship with their supervisors (Paglis et al. 2006). This shows clearly the effect co-authorship has on students' scholarly publication activities. In addition, research shows that encouragement from PhD supervisors led to increased publication activity by PhD students. Also influential was support by universities and departments; students who attended departments that had clear policies for increasing publication activity published more.

Also critical in international publishing efforts is undoubtedly the language of publication. Scholars, both novice and experienced, who do not have English as their native language use English predominantly as the working lingua franca in their everyday research activities. While publishing in English may not be problematic for some, it can present serious challenges for others. Scholars from different first language backgrounds are under significant pressure to publish their research in English (Lillis and Curry 2010). Failing to publish in English would have serious consequences for them, such as not being able to contribute to knowledge construction in their fields and not making the impact they would

be able to make otherwise (Lillis and Curry 2010; Seidlhofer 2012). As Seidlhofer states, scholars who need to publish in a different language than their own need to take into account several parameters: they need to learn not only how to achieve a sufficiently high level of proficiency in English, they also need to be familiar with the conventions of the relevant written genres, which may differ greatly from the conventions in their own language (Seidlhofer 2012). It is often that research article submissions which do not comply with the expected language standards are returned for major revision if not rejected.

While the present paper will not consider written academic ELF as such,[1] we need to keep in mind that the subjects in the study are novice and experienced scholars who all write in a language other than their own, in English, which is the dominant lingua franca in academic publication. In the Findings and Discussion sections here, we will turn to whether publishing in English is topicalized in the interactions as being a relevant factor.

As can be gathered from the studies reviewed above, it is certainly not a given that PhD students publish research articles during their PhDs and upon completion of their degrees, having become novice scholars. Publication success depends on several influential factors, among them, supervisor support through a collaborative mentoring relationship where the supervisor walks the student through the steps of publishing. This brief paper will be an addition to the previous studies on two accounts: (i) with its data on supervisor and students' discussions, and (ii) with the interactions where we see the supervisors' collaborative mentoring role in their co-publications with their students.

3 The research context and data

The data in the present paper was collected at the Natural Science faculty of a large Swedish university between 2014 and 2018. The university is highly international with exchange program agreements with 54 countries. There are almost 30,000 students studying at this university, and approximately 1,800 of them are PhD students. This site is an international university where as much as 50% of the students and staff are from non-Swedish backgrounds. In this sense, the site is also a true lingua franca setting where all these individuals rely on English as their most dominant lingua franca. As stated in the author's previous papers from this setting, Swedish higher education has been one of the most internationalized in continental Europe. Sweden is in third place with over 800

---

[1] For studies on written ELF, see e.g. Carey (2013), Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2013); and the WrELFA corpus.

English-taught programs in 2014, following the Netherlands with 1,078, and Germany with 1,030 programs offered in English (Wächter and Maiworm 2014).

A few words are in order on the individuals' practices in the local language. PhD students acquire some Swedish through living in the country for at least four years until they bring their projects to completion, and supervisors who have achieved tenure learn the local language to varying degrees. Nevertheless, they rely almost entirely on English at their departments. While there are different practices in the Social Science faculty, where some subjects do require a good knowledge of Swedish, in the Natural Science faculty all operations are run in English with the exception of some social talk that would for instance take place by the coffee machine. It is also important to mention that all the PhD students in the study were working on compilation theses. In compilation theses, which are very common in Sweden, especially in natural sciences but increasingly in social sciences and humanities as well, the PhD candidate produces three or four journal articles. While requirements can vary across departments, in most cases, at least two of the articles need to get published and the other two accepted for a PhD project to be completed. A compilation thesis also needs to have an introduction, termed a "kappa," which needs to show the connection between the articles clearly.

The material used for the present study is made up of only naturally occurring speech, in total 11 hours of recordings. The definition of naturally occurring data here is data that exist regardless of the existence or presence of the researcher. The recordings have been analyzed for the most part by using the CLAN software (MacWhinney 2000), which is a helpful software where the transcript and the recording are tied together, allowing the researcher to stay focused on the actual recordings while being able to focus on the transcript simultaneously. A large part of the data was collected in 2014, with additional recordings in 2017 and 2018. The recordings have been transcribed in their entirety — although without complete notations, totaling around 61,000 words. The knowledge-construction related episodes that are relevant for the present analysis have gone through a second round of transcribing in order to fine-tune the transcripts.

4 Theoretical approach and methodological procedures

The methodology in the paper is applied conversation analysis. As McCabe (2006) states, CA is both a method and a theoretical approach. As will be well-known to many, CA adopts a social constructivist approach which argues that our experiences as human beings are not fixed; rather, they are constantly mediated through

language, culture and history (Burr 2003). In a new conceptualization of social constructivism, and as being particularly relevant to the present paper, there is an increased recognition of micro-level processes involved in the construction of knowledge (Gergen 1985). The present paper will provide a look into these micro-level processes as experienced in the interactions between PhD students and supervisors. In this view, knowledge itself is not what is salient; it is rather how knowledge is negotiated, "situated and tied to human experience" (Lester and O'Reilly 2018).

CA has been named as the most appropriate methodology for analyzing naturally occurring interactions, as can also be seen in the increasing number of scholars using CA in their analyses from ELF settings (e.g. Cogo 2009; Deterding 2013; Firth 1996; Kaur 2011). Specifically, the paper will draw on applied conversation analytic procedures (Richards and Seedhouse 2016), including both local patterns of interaction as well as "the tensions between [these] local practices and any 'larger structures' in which these are embedded, such as conventional membership categories, institutional rules, instructions, accounting obligations, etc." (Ten Have 2007: 199). The author has included a discussion of this earlier, in this very journal (Björkman 2017), arguing for the need to adapt mainstream CA procedures to account for interactive data, also referring to previous studies that have shown how this can be done (e.g. Santner-Wolfartsberger 2015; Deterding 2013). These studies carried out with ELF data have advocated for the same approach, namely the need to adapt CA to account for interactive data (Santner-Wolfartsberger 2015; also see Deterding [2013] for an adapted version of CA).

The present study however did not employ pure CA but followed procedures drawing on CA, using conversation analytic approaches.[2] As Seedhouse says, CA "normally tries to avoid making (premature) reference to background information such as institutional setting and personal details (age, gender, etc.) until after the initial analysis. This is so that it can be established which particulars are demonstrably relevant to the actors in the interaction, so that these particulars are manifest in some way in the details of the interaction" (Seedhouse 1999: 41, chapter 1). This has been the approach in the present paper. The analyses were first done, followed by anchoring to the speakers' institutional and academic roles. By doing so, one can first focus on what is going on in the interactions, and then do the linking to the speakers' roles. It needs to be kept in mind when taking into account the analyses and the findings here that the data here comes from an institutional setting. When working with institutional data, "individual interactional features have to be understood in the interactional (or institutional) environment in which they occur" (Seedhouse 1999: 62).

---

2 See Björkman (2017) for a discussion of mainstream CA and how applied CA diverges from mainstream with its inclusion of external information about the speakers.

This brings us to the question whether PhD supervision meetings would qualify as classroom or institutional discourse. Seedhouse tells us that as soon as the "teacher," in our case the supervisor, gives instructions on the expected outcome, the outcome will be institutional and not natural conversation (Seedhouse 1999: 63). In this sense, the definition of institutional talk in the present paper is in agreement with Lester and O'Reilly (2018), in that institutional talk is talk that takes place in institutional settings but also is about institutional tasks. In the case of the present dataset and context, we have institutional discourse, not free conversation. It is controlled by the expectations of the research community, and in the present dataset, also the local research community as the readers of the target journal. It is very much shaped by the shared assumptions of these two levels of research community about what knowledge is, how it is acquired and what purposes it serves. The core goal of the PhD supervisor–student interactions in the present dataset are to navigate the peer reviewers' comments for the more overall aim of getting published. Within this process of course, the PhD supervisors most likely consider their own pedagogical goals as supervisors, such as their students' enculturation into the research community.

5 Findings: navigating peer reviewers' comments and knowledge construction

In this section, we will be looking at a number of episodes of knowledge construction and meaning practices by two sets of PhD students as expressed in the interactions with their supervisors while they are interpreting the peer reviewers' comment they have received on a co-authored paper they had earlier submitted to a key journal in their domain. As will be clear from the following excerpts, the speakers' institutional and academic roles are relevant to the publication and writing activities that they are engaged in, specific to the common goal they have, which is for the paper to see daylight in the journal they are targeting for publication.[3]

In Excerpt (1) below, the supervisor starts the meeting by asking the student how he feels about the peer reviewers' reports, by asking his "overall impression" (line 1). The reviewers are broadly unhappy with the paper and have been very critical in the review, and the supervisor wants to see how the student has perceived the reports.

---

3 See also Drew and Heritage (1992: 4) for a discussion of when interactions are considered institutional and how speakers' identities become relevant in institutional talk.

(1)

1	Sp[4]:	first I want to know what is your overall impression
2	St:	from this↑
3	Sp:	yes, do you feel frustrated↑ or ↑
4	St:	°ehhh° it is tough actually it is tough really
5	Sp:	[hmm aaaa]
6	St:	[one one of] the ↑ reviewer is I feel he is relevant to what we have ↑ done
7	Sp:	hmm
8	St:	these comment(s) are useful and critical in the same direction but the other one is
9		(0.3) really far
10	Sp:	I think the other one actually this one who recommend for rejection but he also offered
11		several suggestions I think some of his suggestions are quite good and I feel that why
12		he rejected because he thinks this methodology we used to evaluate it's not right (XX)
13	St:	no I think not only (0.2) that he didn't like the whole idea
14	Sp:	yeah yes because he don't like that you compared the model results with one observation
15		station data with model data
16	St:	just no he's pointed that he's pointed that he's pointed he said that in fact this paper
17		brings no added value to the subject and the shortcoming of the RCMs in producing
18		rainfall doesn't allow proposing anyway like he want to say ok we know this
19	Sp:	[hmm]
20	St:	[is just] BAD and we have no way to FIX them and don't work with this

In line 6, we see that the PhD student thinks one of the reviewers has provided "useful and critical" comments that will help them revise the paper accordingly; however, the student feels the other reviewer, who has recommended rejection of the paper, has concluded that the paper does not contribute to the field with new knowledge on the topic (lines 16–18). The student says clearly that no revision will be able to please the second reviewer, and says "we have no way to fix them and don't work with this" (line 20). In other words, the reviewer says that knowledge construction has not taken place, and that the paper is not revisable.

As covered in the literature review section, PhD students feel anxiety about the negative critiquing they receive (Rudestam and Newton Rae 1992), and this can be seen in the PhD student's reaction in Excerpt (1) (line 4). Other than the emotional reaction, the excerpt shows how the supervisor and the student negotiate meaning about the reviewers' comments. The fact that the student does not hesitate to reject the supervisor's explanation is noteworthy, and the fact that he disagrees when necessary shows that they adopt the role of co-authors (see also Björkman 2017). In Excerpt (2) below, we see the supervisor and the student continue the discussion

---

4 "Sp" stands for supervisor, and "St" stands for student. See the appendix for the transcription conventions.

where the student tries to convince the supervisors that what the reviewer wants is simply not possible to do in the present paper.

(2)

```
1   Sp:  Yeah yea:h ↑because that's also he mentioned that later because the precipitation (XX)
2        regional model climate model it's the worst variable to compare to (valid) from this way you
3        can't suggest to make a conclusion or say that this model is not good
4   St:  Nooo
5   Sp:  I ↑think [I think] that's (xx)
6   St:  But      [yeah yeah] yeah but that is that NOT what we want to say we DON'T want to say
7        the model are bad we want to the precipitation is important there why we look after the
8        precipitation and we mention in this we said precipitation in the introduction we said
9        precipitation important for agriculture (xx)
10  Sp:  °Ah yes° (xx)
11  St:  And by far it is the main thing the main important variable (0.3) so we justified why we are
12       looking at the precipitation but he doesn't like the idea I think he is just h:e he I yeah I
13       didn't like it because he he could these these are good suggestions
14  Sp:  ↓Hmm
15  St:  But he trash our all work he [just he think]
16  Sp:  Yeah yeah                  [that's means] like he doesn't like this kind of evaluation work
17       that we have done for our work and he suggested some other things and he thinks more
18       interesting and he thinks if you go this direction then the paper maybe °better in his view°
19  St:  Yeah yeah but these suggestion can can be done as another paper
20  Sp:  Yeah yeah  [yes]
21  St:  this       [this is]
22  Sp:  What I fe:el we follow this suggestion then (0.2) we have to totally
23  St:  Go to something totally different
24  Sp:  Do the same do the work again I mean not this work but a new ↓work
25  St:  OK. I think let's start with the first one this one is
```

In Excerpt (2) above, the student tries to convince the supervisor that the changes required by the second reviewer cannot be made in this paper, and that it would take another paper to accommodate all the required revisions. The student says the reviewer was very critical ("But he trash our all work he [just he think]" in line 15), and the point the reviewer is critical and requires changes about is "the main important variable" (line 11). In this sense, the student shows good knowledge of the design of the study as well as good interpretation of what the reviewer is saying. This can be observed in the two instances he corrects the supervisor, first rejecting the supervisor's explanation of what the reviewer is saying, pointing to the main point they are trying to make in the paper ("yeah but that is that not what we want to say we don't

want to say the model are bad we want to the precipitation is important there why we look after the precipitation and we mention in this we said precipitation in the introduction we said precipitation important for agriculture", lines 6–9). The student shows a better understanding of the micro design of the paper and what the paper wants to convey than the supervisor, while the supervisor seems to be thinking of macro issues and general conventions in the domain (e.g. line 2, "regional model climate model it's the worst variable to compare to (valid) from this way"). So in line with previous literature (e.g. Shinn 1988), this excerpt shows signals of how strategic the PhD student is, who is prioritizing getting published in the journal. In this sense, we could suggest that the student takes the local discourse community of the target journal into consideration with the main aim to get published, whereas the supervisor tries to explain to the student what the disciplinary community has as their conventions about the issue in discussion.

Below we turn to Excerpt (3), from another PhD student–supervisor pair, the longest of the three selected to be a sample here. The supervisor and the student are talking about the method employed in the paper.

(3)[5]

1	St:	the the ↑[method]
2	Sp:	[like like you] you you compare with one sta↑tion (1.1) and with the ...(1.3) one
3		station data
4	St:	[hmm]
5	Sp:	[with] models one station that's usually not very convinced to people be- because the
6		model can be a little bit shift (then) ... (1.2) (there are) >(how to say) precipitation system<
7		can't: exactly corresponding to where the station really located
8	St:	hmm yeah >[but but but]< in in one of these paper
9	Sp:	[uh uh uh] hmm hmm
10	St:	if you that the one with the paper that we have cited and it's already published in ((journal
11		name silenced))
12	Sp:	hmm hmm hmm
13	St:	this guy
14	Sp:	hmm
15	St:	they have used
16	Sp:	(the) similar
17	St:	yeah a similar [also] they have used
18	Sp:	[yeah]
19	St:	model and station data

---

5 Note that parts of this excerpt was used in Björkman (2017) in this journal for another analysis, with another point of investigation.

20	Sp:	hmmm but I I I now I think maybe we can combine this this six station data
21	St:	with with [err]
22	Sp:	[into] one region or something like that (message beep) ... (2.1) but not err but
23		not
24		evaluate err one by one because (your) all your plots is all six stations
25	St:	[hmm]
26	Sp:	>[I think] maybe we tried (avoid this) people don't like that< especially people who do do
27		these
28		modellings don't like that kind of (0.4) they like the map
29	St:	[hmm]
30	Sp:	[they] like the map they like the whole region what the whole region looks like ...(0.5)
31		OR EVEN THIS kind of hmm how to say °single curve ↑plots° ... (0.8) it's better just
32		regional ave↑rage but not single station
33	St:	hmm
34	Sp:	>because single station compared with a grid box< or ... (0.3) in the model it's not very
35		appropriate way to do that ... (1.1) we all know that prob[lems]
36	St:	[Yeah]
37	Sp:	(and) we try: not to use that
38		kind of method
39	St:	hmm but °I think we°
40	Sp:	and then also next time I think we just er ... (0.6) NEGLECT that kind of °significant or
41		statistical test° ... (1.1) that one I think >they also £don't like that£< [h.h.h.]
42	St:	[Yeah but] but if
43		you don't have a statistical measure then you will just be hand waiving argument
44	Sp:	that's true but in the beginning I also tell you that that kind of statistical (1.2) [test]
45	St:	[XX] hmm
46	Sp:	>it's not familiar to most of the people< that that one you used in your pa[per]
47	St:	[yeah]
48	Sp:	[it's] quite not very like it's not like the (XX) t-test everybody knows that
49	St:	yeah but [but but]
50	Sp:	[uh uh]
51	St:	you you always ... (0.5) it is not just up to you you always use t test if your data is not
52		normally distributed and >precipitation is also not normally distributed< then you can't
53		>use a t test t test assume that you have normally distributed data [by default]<
54	Sp:	[Yeah that's true yeah]
55	St:	[And] then °if you don't°.
56		and and I I said this this guy we we pick it from here
57	Sp:	[hmm]
58	St:	[this] this is they they (are showing) it he[re]
59	Sp:	[They] they also use the same me[thod]
60	St:	[They use the]
61		same method yeah
62	Sp:	yes [hmm]

63 St: [And and] (it is a) paper published in the same journal [so]
64 Sp: ok   [I I] didn't read that paper and I
65   don't know maybe they they pre- present in a better way ↑or
66 St: I think the the trick is that: maybe they they have they the main thing that they have
67   different from us ... (0.4) they used one ↑model
68 Sp: hmm
69 St: and they drive the model with different:
70 Sp: boundary conditions

Although this is a joint publication where the supervisor and the student are co-authors, the supervisor is critical towards the method, which she also thinks is one of the reasons, if not the main one, that one of the reviewers is recommending rejection. She goes on to say that this way of working is not what the research community will expect ("that's usually not very convinced to people", line 5). We can suggest then that "people", in this context can only refer to the research community, or alternatively to the local discourse community of the journal. When we see the following turns in the excerpt however, we see more clearly that the supervisor must be referring to the wider disciplinary community. This becomes evident when the student mentions another paper published in the same journal that they have even cited (lines 10 and 11). The supervisor says clearly that she was not aware of this other paper, using the same approach (lines 13–19). Their discussion continues, but the supervisor repeats that using a "single station compared with a grid box" is not an "appropriate way to do that" and that "we all know that problems" (lines 34 and 35). By "we all", again she refers to the general scientific community. This excerpt shows repeatedly how the student is more strategic, taking into consideration the target journal and how to get published in the journal (thereby focusing on the local conventions of the journal), while the supervisor seems to repeatedly bring up points about the general expectations in the domain and what researchers in their domain would be familiar or unfamiliar with (e.g. "I also tell you that that kind of statistical test it's not familiar to most of the people that that one you used in your paper", lines 44–46; "it's quite not very like it's not like the t-test everybody knows that", line 48). While the supervisor does not spell this out in the utterances, it is clear that she refers to general pieces of knowledge in the domain. More support for this comes also from the fact that she seems less familiar than the student on what the journal has previously accepted and published; a few turns later, the PhD student mentions the other paper again that got published in the same journal, using the same method (lines 56 and 63). The supervisor checks her understanding ("They also use the same method", line 59), which the student confirms in line 63 ("and and it is a paper published in the same journal"). Following this, they together try to understand why the method was found to be acceptable in the other article that got published

in the same journal but not in the article they co-wrote (lines 64–70). Overall, we see a similar pattern to the one in Excerpt (2): while the student is focusing on strategic moves to get published in the target journal, the supervisor is focusing on broader issues regarding disciplinary conventions.

6 Discussion and conclusion

This brief paper provides a glimpse into the interactions between PhD supervisors and students when they navigate peer reviewers' comments. In a previous paper by the author (Björkman 2017), the author considered content knowledge and how good content knowledge tends to neutralize the present academic and institutional power asymmetries. In the present paper, we have seen examples of how the PhD supervisors and students negotiate meaning in the peer reviewers' reports as co-authors, together. According to Edwards and Westgate, experts will control knowledge by asking the "questions, evaluating and shaping the answers" (Edwards and Westgate 1994: 48). In the present study, we do see the supervisor in this role, partially in that she tries to question the PhD student, while also providing her interpretation of the peer reviewers' reports. While doing so, we do not see efforts to control knowledge, but it is clear from all three excerpts that the supervisors try to share with the student the general conventions in the scientific community, trying to convince the students to make the right methodological choices for the paper to be revised and then be resubmitted to the journal. Other than this, however, the supervisors and students in the present dataset seem to adopt the roles of equal co-authors, complementing each other with different types of information. While the PhD supervisors try to focus the students' attention on the conventions and demands of the scientific community, the student seems more strategic, with the immediate aim to get published in the journal. Taking this into consideration, we could suggest with some degree of certainty that the PhD student, aware or not, pays more attention to the local discourse community of the journal.

There seem to be still some noticeable differences in the practices of PhD students and their supervisors in the dataset. This, as discussed above, can be tied to the roles PhD students have as novice scholars who may need to be much more strategic about getting published. For PhD supervisors, especially those who are published and tenured, the stakes are not equally high, whereas for a PhD student, especially for those who are working on compilation theses,[6] getting published is

---

6 See Section 3 for an explanation of the compilation thesis, which is becoming increasingly more common in Scandinavian PhD education, especially in the natural sciences.

critical and plays a key role in the completion of a PhD project. PhD students consider the local discourse community of the target journal and display good knowledge of the subject, unlike PhD supervisors who seem to have more knowledge on the expectations of the general research community in their domain. Another difference can be seen in the emotionally charged reactions the PhD student has upon receiving the reviewers' reports on their submitted paper.

While it has not been a focus in the present paper, it is worth noting that language is nowhere discussed or topicalized in these interactions. This is interesting considering that there are many difficulties that non-Anglo scholars experience when aiming for international publication (see also Section 2) (Seidlhofer 2012). While achieving international publication is not about the native–nonnative dichotomy, it is a fact that a novice writer whose proficiency is not high enough will need to spend a considerable amount of time and effort when preparing his/her manuscripts for submission. It is also the experience of many non-Anglos scholars that their manuscripts get either rejected or turned down because of proficiency-related issues, resulting in them feeling a "lack of recognition of their scholarship" (Seidlhofer 2012: 394) . In the present paper, the supervisors and PhD students were all non-Anglo writers using English as their lingua franca. Nowhere in the interactions of the total of 11 hours is there any mention of language, their formulations, or their proficiency in English. We can suggest that this is because of the language not being an obstacle for the speakers in these interactions. As Turner (2010) states about academic settings, language is mentioned only when it becomes a problem, getting in the way of communication. We can suggest then that the speakers in the present dataset use English as a lingua franca successfully, thus resulting in language not being experienced as an issue. The reviewers' reports do not seem to include any language-related comments, either (as they are not topicalized in the interactions), and there is no trace of language regulation in the data by either the supervisor or the student (as defined by Hynninen 2016). As covered in Björkman (2017), the supervisor and students use English as their working lingua franca successfully, especially with their levels of proficiency being very similar.

It has not been the intention of the present study to claim generalizability when it comes to all supervision meetings, as also appropriate to the methodological procedures chosen here. The aim has rather been to provide a look into the selected excerpts to zoom in on how supervisors and PhD students identify patterns of meaning negotiation and navigate peer reviewers' comments when working as co-authors for journal publication. Since co-authorship has been reported as the most influential factor for PhD students in getting published in journals (Caffarella and Barnett 2000), it would be important to carry out more studies on the actual dynamics of interactions between supervisors and their students. The present paper

will hopefully spark more interest in the topic, alerting the readers of this journal to this genre where more work is desirable and being done.

Appendix: transcription notations

[	A left square bracket marks the onset of overlap.
]	A right square bracket marks the end of overlapping talk.
wor-	A hyphen marks a cut-off.
…(0.5)	A pause of 0.5 seconds and above
wo:	A colon marks a stretched sound.
°soft°	Speech that is softer than the surrounding talk.
(words)	Used to mark transcriber's uncertainty of the words produced
>word<	Section spoken faster
↑	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation
h.h.h.	Laughter
£word£	Section spoken with a smile voice
CAPS	Section spoken louder
((words))	Author's comment or elucidation
(xx)	Unsure transcription

References

Belcher, Diane. 1994. The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes* 13(1). 23–34.

Berkenkotter, Carol & Thomas Huckin. 1995. *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bitchener, John & Helen Basturkmen. 2006. Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 5(1). 4–18.

Björkman, Beyza. 2015. PhD supervisor-PhD student interactions in an English-medium Higher Education (HE) setting: Expressing disagreement. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(2). 205–229.

Björkman, Beyza. 2016. PhD adviser and student interactions as a spoken academic genre. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, 348–361. Oxon: Routledge.

Björkman, Beyza. 2017. PhD supervision meetings in an English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) setting: Linguistic competence and content knowledge as neutralizers of institutional and academic power. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 6(1). 111–139.

Burr, Vivien. 2003. *An introduction to social constructionism*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Caffarella, Rosemary S. & Bruce G. Barnett. 2000. Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques. *Studies in Higher Education* 25(1). 39–52.

Carey, Ray. 2013. On the other side: Formulaic organizing chunks in spoken and written academic ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2(2). 207–228.

Cogo, Alessia. 2009. Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. Anna Mauranen & Elina Ranta (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, 254–274. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Delamont, Sara., Paul Atkinson & Odette Parry. 1994. Disciplinary identities and doctoral work. *Postgraduate education and training in the social sciences: Processes and products*. 35–52.

Deterding, David. 2013. *Misunderstandings in English as a lingua franca: An analysis of ELF interactions in South-East Asia*. vol. 1. Boston/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Drew, Paul and Heritage, John. 1992. Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. In Paul Drew and John Heritage (ed.) Talk at Work. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–65.

Edwards, Tony and David Westgate. 1994. *Investigating Classroom Talk*. London: Falmer.

Firth, Alan. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(2). 237–259.

Gemme, Brigitte & Y. Gingras. 2008. The new production of researchers. A. Chan & D. Fischer (eds.), *The exchange University*, 70–89. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Gergen, Kenneth. J. 1985. The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American psychologist* 40(3). 266.

Gosden, H. 1995. Success in research article writing and revision: A social constructionist perspective. *English for Specific Purpose* 14. 35–57.

Have, Paul ten. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Hyland, Ken. 2000. *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman: Pearson Education.

Hyland, Ken. 2005. Digging up texts and transcripts: Confessions of a discourse analyst. P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction*, 177–189. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hynninen, Niina. 2016. *Language regulation in English as a lingua franca: Focus on academic spoken discourse*. vol. 9. Boston/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Ingvarsdóttir, Hafdís. & Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir. 2013. ELF and academic writing: A perspective from the expanding circle. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2(1). 123–145.

Kamler, Barbara. 2008. Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education* 33(3). 283–294.

Kaufer, David S. & Cheryl Geisler. 1989. Novelty in academic writing. *Written Communication* 6. 286–311.

Kaur, Jagdish. 2011. Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(11). 2704–2715.

Larivière, Vincent. 2012. On the shoulders of students? The contribution of PhD students to the advancement of knowledge. *Scientometrics* 90(2). 463–481.

Lester, Jessica. N. & Michelle O'Reilly. 2018. *Applied Conversation Analysis: Social Interaction in Institutional Settings*. London: SAGE Publications.

Li, Yongyan. 2006. Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of second language writing* 15(3). 159–178.

Lillis, Theresa & Mary Jane Curry. 2010. *Academic writing in a global context. The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

MacWhinney, Brian. 2000. *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk: Volume I: Transcription format and programs*. vol. II. The database.

Manathunga, Catherine. 2007. Supervision as mentoring: The role of power and boundary crossing. *Studies in Continuing Education* 29(2). 207–221.

Manathunga, Catherine. 2014. *Intercultural postgraduate supervision: Reimagining time, place and knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

McCabe, Rosemary. 2006. Conversation Analysis. *In Encyclopaedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, 153–162). Oxford, England: Elsevier Science.

Paglis, Laura L., Steven G. Green & Talya N. Bauer. 2006. Does adviser mentoring add value? A longitudinal study of mentoring and doctoral student outcomes. *Research in Higher Education* 47(4). 451–476.

Paltridge, Brian, Sue Starfield, Louise J Ravelli & Kathryn Tuckwell. 2012. Change and stability: Examining the macrostructures of doctoral theses in the visual and performing arts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 11(4). 332–344.

Pecorari, Diane. 2006. Visible and occluded citation features in postgraduate second-language writing. *English for Specific Purposes* 25(1). 4–29.

Richards, Keith & Paul Seedhouse (eds.) (2005). *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rudestam, Kjell Erik & R. Newton Rae. 1992. *Surviving Your Dissertation*. Newbury Park: CA, Sage.

Santner-Wolfartsberger, Anita. 2015. Parties, persons, and one-at-a-time: Conversation analysis and ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 4(2). 253–282.

Shinn, Terry. 1988. Hiérarchie des Chercheurs et Formes de Recherches. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 74, 2–22.

Seedhouse, Paul. 1999. The relationship between context and the organisation of repair in the L2 classroom. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 37(1). 59.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2012. Anglophone-centric attitudes and the globalization of English. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1). 393–407.

Shaw, Philip. 1991. Science students' dissertation-writing processes. *English for Specific Purposes* 10(3). 189–206.

Siddle, D. 1997. Submission to the committee conducting the review of Higher Education Financing and Policy from Deans and Directors of Graduate Education. http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/hereview/submissions.

Swales, John M. 2004. *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, Joan. 2010. *Language in the academy: Cultural reflexivity and intercultural dynamics*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2009a. Problems in the research problem: Critical feedback and resistance in academic supervision. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 53(2). 185–201.

Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2009b. Student-initiated advice in academic supervision. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42(2). 163–190.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wächter, Bernd & Friedhelm Maiworm (eds.). 2014. *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education: The State of Play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Ziman, John. 1993. Competition undermines creativity. The Times Higher Education Supplement (16 July 1993), 16.

Bionote

Beyza Björkman

Beyza Björkman is Associate Professor at Stockholm University, Department of English. Her research interests are the use of English as a lingua franca in English-medium instruction settings and spoken academic discourse in general. Her most recent research has focused on the genre of PhD supervision interactions, where she has investigated a variety of issues including power asymmetries, linguistic competence and content knowledge, as well as the architecture of supervision meetings.