*Academic Writing Across Traditions: How Doctoral Candidates Navigate Local and International Research Paradigms in Kazakhstan*

Askat Tleuov, KIMEP University, Kazakhstan

**Abstract**

In an increasingly globalized academic environment, doctoral candidates in Kazakhstan face the challenge of navigating parallel research paradigms—local scholarly traditions and international academic standards—particularly as the country aligns its higher education system with Bologna Process requirements. This study employs interpretative phenomenological analysis to explore how eight recent PhD graduates in humanities and social sciences, who have published in both local and international venues, reconciled these divergent expectations in their dissertation writing and publication endeavors. Data collected through semi-structured interviews in March 2024, analyzed via thematic and constant comparative techniques, revealed three interlinked themes: initial recognition of divergent writing expectations, development of adaptive writing strategies, and navigation of publication-specific challenges. Participants' strategies progressed from basic adaptations—such as creating separate sections for national policy references and international theoretical debates—to more sophisticated, integrative approaches that synthesized the practical and theoretical dimensions of their work. These adaptive frameworks enabled candidates to respond effectively to diverse supervisory feedback, satisfy local regulatory requirements, and position their studies within broader global research conversations, while meeting publication demands in both local and international journals. Ultimately, this negotiation process facilitated the emergence of integrative scholarly identities, demonstrating that navigating parallel research paradigms can strengthen doctoral candidates' writing practices and enhance their engagement with multiple academic audiences. The findings contribute to discussions on academic literacies, scholarly identity formation, and global-local knowledge dynamics, offering insights for doctoral programs in transnational contexts.


Keywords: Parallel Research Paradigms, Kazakhstani Doctoral Education, Academic Writing Development, Scholarly Identity Formation, International Publishing

**Introduction**

The landscape of doctoral education has transformed dramatically in recent decades, shaped by the forces of internationalization and globalization. This transformation has created new opportunities for cross-border collaboration and knowledge exchange while introducing complex challenges for doctoral candidates navigating diverse academic traditions. In particular, the demands of writing for different academic audiences have become increasingly significant as doctoral students engage with multiple research paradigms and scholarly communities.

The internationalization of higher education has reshaped doctoral education through enhanced mobility programs, cross-cultural partnerships, and evolving academic standards. These changes have fostered rich opportunities for knowledge exchange and intercultural learning (Cutri & Pretorius, 2019; Kraja et al., 2024). At the same time, this transformation has introduced complexities, particularly in contexts where traditional academic models intersect with emerging international standards. Doctoral candidates must now develop complex approaches to academic writing that accommodate diverse scholarly traditions and reader expectations (Brinkschulte et al., 2018; Golebiowski, 2018). This challenge is particularly pronounced in multilingual contexts, where scholars must navigate not only different languages but also distinct rhetorical structures and communicative goals (A. S. Canagarajah, 2006; Englander, 2014).

The evolution of doctoral education in Kazakhstan exemplifies these global-local dynamics. Since gaining independence, Kazakhstan's higher education system has undergone substantial reforms aimed at aligning with international standards while preserving national characteristics (Agbo et al., 2023; Nurgaliyeva et al., 2025). These changes have particularly affected doctoral education, as the country transitions from its Soviet-era system to a Bologna-aligned model emphasizing research-based PhD degrees. The transformation has introduced new requirements for doctoral candidates, including the need to publish in both local and international venues (Auanassova, 2023; Fimyar et al., 2023). This dual expectation creates unique challenges for doctoral students who must navigate parallel research paradigms and different academic writing traditions.

Despite growing scholarly attention to doctoral education in international contexts, gaps remain in our understanding of how doctoral candidates navigate parallel research paradigms in their academic writing practices (Kimmons & Johnstun, 2019; Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). While previous research has examined the challenges of working across different research paradigms, these studies have primarily focused on methodological choices rather than the lived experiences of doctoral candidates managing multiple academic writing traditions. Moreover, the experiences of scholars in Central Asian contexts remain largely unexplored, despite the region's unique position at the intersection of various academic traditions (Frick & Pyhältö, 2022; Waheed et al., 2021).

The present study addresses these gaps by examining how doctoral candidates in Kazakhstan navigate parallel research paradigms in their academic writing practices. This investigation is guided by the following research question: *How do doctoral candidates in Kazakhstan navigate parallel research paradigms in their academic writing practices across local and international academic contexts?* Through semi-structured interviews with eight recent PhD graduates who have published in both local and international venues, this investigation reveals how scholars develop strategies to navigate different academic expectations. The study's timing, coinciding

with developments in Kazakhstan's academic publishing requirements, provides insights into how doctoral candidates adapt to evolving institutional demands while maintaining scholarly integrity.

Drawing on academic literacy theory, scholarly identity formation frameworks, and perspectives on global-local dynamics in knowledge production, this study employs an interpretative phenomenological analysis approach to understand participants' lived experiences. This theoretical integration provides a framework for examining how doctoral candidates develop their academic writing practices while negotiating different scholarly traditions. The analysis reveals scholars' progression from initial recognition of divergent expectations through the development of intricate writing strategies to successfully navigate publication requirements in different academic contexts.

The findings from this investigation contribute to both theoretical understanding and practical applications in doctoral education. The project attempts to shed light into how emerging scholars navigate parallel research paradigms. Additionally, the study offers insights for improving doctoral writing pedagogy and support systems. It advances our theoretical understanding of academic writing development in contexts characterized by competing scholarly traditions. The focus on humanities and social sciences disciplines, where theoretical and methodological negotiations are particularly complex, provides insights for institutions supporting doctoral candidates across different academic traditions.

## Methods

This study employed a qualitative research design utilizing interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to examine how doctoral candidates in Kazakhstan navigate parallel research paradigms in their academic writing. The selection of IPA as the methodological framework aligned with the aim to understand participants' lived experiences while acknowledging the dual role of the researcher in making sense of participants' meaning-making processes (Smith & Osborn, 2015). This methodological choice facilitated a deep exploration of the complexities inherent in navigating multiple academic traditions.

### *Research Context and Participant Selection*

Situated within the context of Kazakhstani higher education institutions operating under the national regulatory framework for doctoral education, this investigation adopted a purposive sampling approach (Patton, 2017). Through this sampling strategy, I recruited eight recent PhD graduates (designated as Participants A through H) who had successfully defended their dissertations in humanities and social sciences within the past two years. The deliberate selection of this two-year timeframe served multiple purposes: it ensured participants could provide detailed accounts of their experiences while their memories remained fresh yet afforded sufficient temporal distance for meaningful reflection on their doctoral journey. Moreover, this period coincided with developments in Kazakhstan's academic publishing requirements, thereby offering insights into how doctoral candidates navigated these evolving expectations.

The selection criteria stipulated that participants must have defended their dissertations in Kazakhstani institutions and published both in local journals from the approved list of the Ministry of Education and Science and in international peer-reviewed journals with impact factors, as mandated by national regulations. The deliberate focus on humanities and social

sciences emerged from these disciplines' distinctive challenges in reconciling local and international academic traditions, particularly regarding theoretical frameworks and methodological approaches.

## *Data Collection*

The primary data collection instrument comprised semi-structured interviews, an approach that facilitated both coverage of key topics and exploration of emerging themes (Brinkmann, 2016). Through an iterative development process, the interview protocol emerged from pilot interviews with two doctoral candidates and incorporated feedback from senior researchers well-versed in the Kazakhstani doctoral education system. This carefully crafted protocol encompassed five principal thematic domains: demographic background, doctoral study experience, dissertation defense process, perspectives on research quality, and research dissemination practices. The questioning strategy progressed methodically from descriptive to increasingly analytical inquiries. This encouraged participants to engage in reflection about their experiences navigating differing academic expectations and research paradigms.

The data collection phase commenced in March 2024 and continues to evolve. From an initial pool of 42 potential participants meeting the established criteria, eight have thus far contributed through interviews. The ongoing recruitment and interview process adheres to theoretical sampling principles, proceeding until theoretical saturation materializes—that critical juncture at which new interviews cease to yield substantively novel insights into doctoral candidates' navigation of parallel research paradigms (Charmaz, 2006).

Each interview spanned 60 to 90 minutes and was conducted in the participant's preferred language (Kazakh, Russian, or English), acknowledging the inherently multilingual nature of Kazakhstan's academic environment. All interviews underwent audio recording with participant consent and subsequent verbatim transcription. For narratives captured in Kazakh or Russian, certified translators performed the English translation, with rigorous back-translation verification ensuring semantic fidelity.

## *Data Analysis*

The analytical framework integrated thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach, with elements of constant comparative analysis (Kolb, 2012). This methodological synthesis facilitated the identification of patterns in participants' navigation of parallel research paradigms. The analytical journey commenced with open coding of the initial three transcripts, from which emerged a preliminary coding framework subsequently applied to the remaining narratives. Dedoose, a web-based qualitative data analysis platform, supported the organization, coding, and analysis of the dataset while maintaining a comprehensive audit trail.

The pattern identification process unfolded across three distinct analytical planes. Initially, I identified recurring linguistic and conceptual elements across individual transcripts, generating preliminary descriptive codes. Subsequently, these codes underwent cross-case examination to unveil relationships and connections suggestive of broader patterns. Finally, through an iterative process of aggregation and refinement, related patterns coalesced into potential themes, continuously validated against the primary data.

In examining emergent patterns, particular attention was devoted to contradictory or divergent cases, viewing these apparent anomalies as opportunities for theoretical refinement rather than analytical impediments. When participant experiences deviated from established patterns, detailed comparative analyses clarified the contextual factors underlying these variations. This nuanced approach revealed that seemingly contradictory experiences often represented different phases in participants' developmental trajectories rather than fundamental inconsistencies.

The progression from raw data to theoretical constructs involved multiple iterations of increasingly abstract coding and analysis. Through axial coding, initial descriptive codes gradually consolidated into broader categorical frameworks, examining relationships between categories and their properties. Subsequently, selective coding facilitated the integration of these categories around core themes that captured the essence of participants' experiences. Throughout this analytical journey, meticulous documentation of decision-making processes was maintained, with regular returns to the primary data ensuring interpretative validity.

### Ethical Considerations

The investigation adhered to the ethical guidelines established by the American Educational Research Association (AERA Code of Ethics, 2011), which provides guidance for educational and social science research, particularly regarding the protection of participants in qualitative studies. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. Each participant received a detailed information sheet outlining the study's purposes, procedures, and their rights, followed by signing an informed consent form prior to their involvement.

Multiple layers of anonymity protection were implemented throughout the research process. Internal anonymity was ensured by removing all references that could identify participants within their institutions, including their specific departments, research topics, or unique academic trajectories. External anonymity was maintained through the use of alphanumeric codes (Participants A through H) rather than pseudonyms, as even fictional names could potentially reveal gender or ethnic background. All participating institutions were anonymized, with any potentially identifying characteristics (such as location within Kazakhstan, size, or specific institutional policies) omitted from the manuscript. All identifying information was removed during the transcription process, and any quoted material was carefully screened to ensure it contained no identifying markers. Institutional names, specific journal titles where participants had published, and other contextual details that could compromise anonymity were either omitted or replaced with generic descriptors.

### Findings

Analysis of interview data from eight recent PhD graduates (Participants A through H) reveals how doctoral candidates in Kazakhstan navigate the complex terrain of parallel research paradigms in their academic writing. Through thematic analysis of interview transcripts, involving iterative coding and constant comparison, three distinct but interconnected themes emerged from the data: initial recognition of divergent writing expectations, development of adaptive writing strategies, and navigation of publication-specific challenges. Together, these themes illustrate the progression from early awareness to elaborate management of dual academic writing contexts.

### *Theme 1: Initial Recognition of Divergent Writing Expectations*

Doctoral candidates in Kazakhstan first encounter parallel research paradigms through contrasting writing expectations and feedback on their early doctoral work. These initial experiences shape their understanding of how they need to approach their dissertation writing to satisfy different academic audiences.

### *Encountering Divergent Academic Writing Conventions.*

The first indication of parallel paradigms emerges when students receive conflicting feedback on their writing style, structure, and research framing. This phenomenon emerged clearly in Participant B's account: "I had never heard of the phrase 'theoretical gap' until I took a research methods course with a visiting professor. I realized later that my local mentor and my international tutor were talking about research in completely different ways." This observation highlights how fundamental writing conventions—even at the level of identifying research problems—differ between paradigms.

These divergent expectations manifest in multiple aspects of academic writing. Several participants described receiving contradictory guidance about essential components of their work. For instance, Participant C explained that "I had to include a special section on how my study aligns with a state policy document," while simultaneously addressing their international supervisor's requirement to "identify a current debate in international journals." This dual demand reveals how students must navigate competing priorities in structuring their written work from the earliest stages.

The clash between writing conventions becomes particularly apparent in the organization and presentation of research proposals. Participant A's experience illustrates this tension: "I was surprised by the tight departmental protocols," which prescribed specific formats for dissertation structure, even as her international supervisor emphasized that "structure was flexible and could be adapted to the research question." This dichotomy between rigid local formatting requirements and more flexible international standards presents an early challenge that students must navigate throughout their writing process.

Furthermore, these tensions extend to citation practices and engagement with literature. Analyzing the participants' responses shows a consistent pattern: local supervisors often emphasize practical applications and statistical evidence, while international mentors stress theoretical framing and critical engagement with global scholarship. As Participant C observed: "I was panicking. Which approach should I prioritize? If I disappointed my local committee, I might not pass the department review. But if I ignored international standards would I be able to publish in a high-impact journal." This quote exemplifies the anxiety that emerges when students first realize they must satisfy two distinct sets of writing expectations.

### *Initial Response to Writing Challenges.*

As doctoral candidates become aware of these parallel expectations, they begin to recognize the need for strategic approaches to their writing. While their initial responses may be characterized by confusion and anxiety, this recognition serves as a crucial turning point. As Participant D notes, "I eventually saw it as a chance to strengthen my thesis." This perspective shift marks the beginning of students' journey toward developing more sophisticated writing approaches that can bridge different academic expectations.

The early recognition of divergent writing expectations serves as a foundation for understanding how doctoral candidates in Kazakhstan approach their dissertation writing. These initial encounters not only shape their immediate writing practices but also prompt the development of more elaborate strategies that will be essential throughout their doctoral journey.

As participants moved beyond their initial recognition of parallel expectations, they began developing increasingly complex approaches to manage these divergent demands. Their strategies evolved from basic coping mechanisms into complex frameworks that effectively integrated multiple academic perspectives. While initial recognition of parallel paradigms marked participants' early doctoral journey, their subsequent development of adaptive strategies revealed a more advanced engagement with these competing demands.

### Theme 2: Developing Adaptive Writing Strategies

Building upon their initial recognition of divergent expectations, doctoral candidates begin developing refined writing approaches that bridge different academic requirements. These strategies evolve from basic coping mechanisms into complex frameworks that effectively integrate multiple academic perspectives.

### From Basic Adaptation to Strategic Integration.

The writing approaches that doctoral candidates devise tend to be straightforward adaptations to immediate challenges. An early challenge emerges in balancing theoretical engagement with practical applications. International supervisors typically emphasize theoretical framing and engagement with global literature, while local supervisors prioritize practical implications and policy relevance. This tension is eloquently captured by Participant G: "My local professor would ask, 'How does your research help Kazakhstan?' Meanwhile, my external supervisor kept pushing, 'Which global debates and discussions are you contributing to?'"

As students gain experience, their approaches become more elaborate. Rather than simply alternating between different writing styles, successful candidates develop what might be termed "adaptive writing frameworks." Participant F explains this evolution: "I moved from writing separate versions for different audiences to developing an integrated approach. I structured my thesis to include a national relevance chapter—citing governmental strategies—followed by a chapter emphasizing the broader theoretical debate." This strategic organization demonstrates how students learn to layer different types of academic discourse within their dissertations.

### Advanced Integration Strategies.

The development of adaptive writing strategies extends to methodological presentations, where students learn to present their research methods in ways that satisfy multiple academic audiences simultaneously. Participant H describes this approach: "I ended up coding and re-coding my data in two ways: first in purely statistical terms, to show that I had 'hard evidence,' and then thematically, to present richer narratives that connected my findings to wider theoretical debates." This dual approach reflects an advanced pattern where students learn to layer their methodological discussions, incorporating both the precise statistical reporting valued by local supervisors and the theoretical justification expected by international mentors.

The most nuanced strategy that emerges from the data is what Participant B terms "progressive integration." This approach moves beyond simple combination of perspectives to create a truly synthesized narrative. "I learned to weave together practical implications and theoretical insights," explains Participant G, "creating a narrative where each strengthens the other rather than competing for space." This represents the highest level of writing development, where students can seamlessly integrate different academic expectations into a coherent whole.

The progression from basic adaptation to strategic integration suggests not just a linear development of writing skills, but rather a fundamental transformation in how doctoral candidates conceptualize their role within multiple academic communities. While these adaptive writing strategies proved effective for dissertation writing, participants soon discovered that the publication process presented unique challenges requiring additional specialized approaches. The transition from dissertation writing to publishing demanded even more precise calibration of their writing strategies.

### Theme 3: Navigating Publication-Specific Challenges

Having developed strategies for navigating different publication requirements, participants began to see broader benefits beyond just successful publication. Their experience with managing parallel publication demands contributed to their overall development as scholars.

### Distinct Demands of Publication Writing.

Publication venues in Kazakhstan's dual academic context demand fundamentally different approaches to presenting research. As Participant E explains:

> A local journal submission focuses heavily on practical outcomes and policy recommendations, while an international journal requires extensive theoretical positioning and engagement with global debates. Unlike in my dissertation, where I could balance both, each article needs to be precisely calibrated for its specific audience.

Building on this observation, Participant C describes the specific challenges of reviewer feedback: "International reviewers pushed me to strengthen theoretical frameworks, while local reviewers wanted more emphasis on immediate applications. Unlike supervisor feedback, which I could integrate over time, journal revisions demand immediate and precise responses to sometimes contradictory requirements."

These distinct publication demands required participants to move beyond the integrative strategies they had developed for dissertation writing. While their earlier approaches provided a foundation, the specificity of journal requirements and the immediacy of reviewer feedback necessitated more targeted and flexible writing strategies. Participants responded by developing approaches that allowed them to maintain the integrity of their research while meeting diverse publication expectations.

### Developing Publication Strategies and Outcomes.

Participants developed strategies to navigate these publication challenges, moving beyond simple adaptation to create flexible approaches that could be deployed strategically across different publication contexts. Participant F articulates a common approach: "I developed a

core argument that could be framed either theoretically or practically, depending on the audience. The evidence and findings stayed the same, but the entry points and emphasis would shift completely depending on the publication venue." This strategic flexibility in framing research appear to point to an evolution of the integration strategies developed during dissertation writing.

The development of publication-specific strategies often involved careful consideration of how to position research for different audiences. Participant D notes: "By developing different versions of my research for different publications, I've actually strengthened my overall argument. Each version helps me see new aspects of my research that I can incorporate into future work." This reflection suggests that the process of adapting research for different publication venues can enhance rather than compromise the quality of scholarly work.

The effectiveness of these strategies became particularly evident in how participants managed the review process across different publication contexts. Participant B describes this strategic approach:

> For international journals, I learned to foreground theoretical frameworks and situate my findings within global debates, while in local journals, I emphasized practical implications and policy recommendations. The key was maintaining the integrity of my research while adapting its presentation.

This ability to maintain research integrity while meeting diverse publication requirements emerged as a crucial skill.

The path to publication success involved learning experiences for all participants. Participant H describes the process: "It took several attempts to find the right balance between theoretical sophistication and practical implications that different journals require." While international journals demanded extensive theoretical framing, local journals emphasized practical applications. As Participant A reflects: "Managing these different publication demands made me a more capable scholar, able to communicate effectively with diverse academic audiences." These experiences suggest that navigating parallel publication requirements, though challenging, ultimately may contribute to researchers' development as versatile scholars capable of engaging with multiple academic communities.

### *Synthesis and Theoretical Implications*

These three themes reveal a progression in how doctoral candidates develop their academic writing capabilities within Kazakhstan's dual-paradigm environment. Beginning with recognition of divergent expectations, they move through the development of adaptive writing strategies, and ultimately learn to navigate publication-specific challenges. This journey results in the development of elaborate writing approaches that allow them to contribute meaningfully to both local and international academic discourse while maintaining scholarly integrity.

The progression revealed in these findings reflects broader theoretical concepts about academic writing development and scholarly identity formation in contexts of competing academic traditions. The evolution from initial recognition through strategic adaptation to advanced integration mirrors what scholars have described as the development of academic literacy in multilingual contexts. However, the particular challenges of navigating parallel research paradigms in Kazakhstan's academic environment add new dimensions to our understanding

of how emerging scholars develop their academic writing capabilities. The strategies these doctoral candidates develop suggest that rather than simply choosing between competing academic traditions, they create innovative approaches that allow them to bridge different scholarly worlds while maintaining their academic integrity.

The findings from this study suggest that while managing parallel research paradigms creates additional complexity in academic writing, it ultimately leads to more robust and versatile scholarly communication skills. The strategies developed by these doctoral candidates not only serve their immediate academic needs but also contribute to their development as scholars capable of engaging with diverse academic audiences. Moreover, their experiences provide insights into how emerging scholars can successfully navigate the increasingly globalized landscape of academic publishing while maintaining connections to local academic communities.

## Discussion and Conclusion

### *Understanding Academic Writing in Competing Scholarly Traditions*

This findings explained academic writing development through an integrated theoretical framework that synthesizes three distinct yet interconnected perspectives: academic literacies (Lea & Street, 2006), scholarly identity formation (Gardner & Doore, 2020), and global-local dynamics in knowledge production (Alperin, 2011). Within contexts of competing scholarly frameworks, this theoretical synthesis reveals intricate interrelationships among literacy practices, identity construction, and power relations in transnational academic spaces. Through this multifaceted lens, our analysis revealed how emerging scholars' navigation of divergent academic expectations transcends mere linguistic or stylistic adaptation, embodying instead a fundamental process of academic socialization and knowledge construction.

### *Reconceptualizing Academic Growth.*

Our analysis reveals that scholars' navigation of competing academic traditions follows more intricate pathways than previously theorized. Whereas existing models often posit linear progression in academic writing competence (González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018), our findings point to a recursive, multidimensional process. The initial encounter with divergent expectations, rather than inducing cognitive dissonance, catalyzes what emerges as "adaptive metacognition" - a cognitive capability through which scholars actively reconstruct their understanding of knowledge creation and dissemination across diverse academic contexts.

This adaptive metacognition manifests not merely as awareness, but as a dynamic capability enabling doctoral candidates to strategically reconstruct their writing approaches while maintaining scholarly integrity. Nevertheless, this interpretation demands scrutiny through alternative lenses. Several participants' narratives suggest that navigating dual scholarly frameworks might initially constrain rather than enhance writing development, particularly in contexts of limited institutional support. This tension between enablement and constraint emerges as a critical factor in understanding how competing academic traditions shape scholarly development.

***Identity Formation and Agency in Knowledge Production.***

Our investigation unveils nuanced dynamics in scholarly identity formation that simultaneously reinforce and challenge existing theoretical frameworks. While extant scholarship emphasizes the potentially fragmenting effects of competing academic demands (Tran & Vu, 2017), our findings reveal the emergence of what we conceptualize as "integrative scholarly identity." This construct transcends mere adaptation, representing instead a fundamental reconceptualization of academic authorship in transnational spaces.

Our interpretative phenomenological approach revealed that scholars' exercise of agency manifests with greater complexity than previously documented in the literature. Moving beyond simple choice between traditions, doctoral candidates actively construct innovative forms of academic discourse that bridge established boundaries. Yet this manifestation of agency warrants examination alongside alternative explanations, particularly considering how institutional structures and power dynamics might shape these apparently autonomous choices.

***Global-Local Dynamics: Transcending Traditional Academic Hierarchies.***

The strategies developed by participants for negotiating publication requirements shed light on a transformation in global-local academic relations that extends current theoretical understanding. Transcending traditional center-periphery models (Alperin, 2011), our findings reveal the emergence of what we conceptualize as "transcultural scholarly spaces." Within these dynamic environments, the interplay between local and international academic traditions manifests as dialogic rather than hierarchical, fostering innovative approaches to knowledge creation and dissemination.

This reconceptualization of academic spaces emerges through scholars' strategic deployment of diverse discourse patterns. Through careful analysis of participants' experiences, we observe how these transcultural spaces facilitate not just the coexistence of different academic traditions, but their productive synthesis into new forms of scholarly communication. This synthesis manifests most prominently in how scholars reconstruct their research narratives for different audiences while maintaining intellectual coherence.

***Implications***

The emergence of adaptive metacognition and integrative scholarly identities suggests profound implications for transforming doctoral writing pedagogy (Gardner & Doore, 2020; Rahman et al., 2024). Central to enhancing writing pedagogy is the development of structured comparative analysis exercises, through which emerging scholars explicitly examine the underlying assumptions of different academic traditions (Lea & Street, 2006). This foundational approach, complemented by strategic integration workshops and dynamic peer learning communities, creates a framework for developing sophisticated writing capabilities (González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018; Woloshyn et al., 2024). To implement these pedagogical innovations effectively, institutions could establish structures that acknowledge and validate diverse academic traditions while actively fostering their integration (S. Canagarajah, 2022). Such institutional frameworks should include multilingual writing support systems that recognize linguistic diversity as an intellectual resource rather than a barrier to academic development (Brinkschulte et al., 2018; Englander, 2014). Additionally, institutions could actively cultivate mentorship networks that span both local and international academic communities, while simultaneously supporting faculty development programs that prepare

instructors to guide scholars through competing academic expectations (Frick & Pyhältö, 2022; Thao & Trut Thuy, 2024). These support structures ensure that doctoral candidates can develop the necessary skills to navigate multiple academic traditions effectively.

Building upon these pedagogical transformations, this study's findings also suggest the need for reconceptualizing academic publishing in transnational contexts (Alperin, 2011; Lei, 2023). The development of hybrid publication formats emerges as crucial, creating spaces where different academic traditions can productively converge rather than compete (S. Canagarajah, 2022; Stornaiuolo & Leblanc, 2014). This transformation requires changes in how academic communities evaluate and disseminate knowledge, particularly through the establishment of reviewer preparation programs that enhance recognition of diverse academic discourse patterns (Amirbekova et al., 2022; Kaztayeva, 2024). Such programs can help reviewers appreciate and evaluate different approaches to scholarly writing, thereby enriching rather than constraining scholarly dialogue (Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes, 2024). When coupled with mentoring networks and supportive institutional policies, these initiatives can foster more inclusive publishing practices that enhance global academic discourse (Dyussekeneva et al., 2024). The implementation of these innovations, working in tandem with the pedagogical transformations described above, could potentially create an ecosystem that supports doctoral candidates in developing truly transnational scholarly identities (Tran & Vu, 2017).

## Funding Information

# References

AERA Code of Ethics. (2011). In *Educational Researcher* (Vol. 40, Issue 3, pp. 145–156). SAGE PublicationsSage CA: Los Angeles, CA. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x11410403

Agbo, S. A., Pak, N., Abdrasheva, D., & Karimova, B. (2023). Modernizing Kazakhstan's Higher Education: Challenges of Policy Borrowing and Doctor of Philosophy Graduation Requirements. *International Journal of Educational Reform*. https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879231191500

Alperin, J. P. (2011). Academic Publishing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English (review). *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *42*(4), 545–549. https://doi.org/10.1353/scp.2011.0034

Amirbekova, D., Narbaev, T., & Kussaiyn, M. (2022). The Research Environment in a Developing Economy: Reforms, Patterns, and Challenges in Kazakhstan. *Publications*, *10*(4), 37. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications10040037

Auanassova, A. (2023). How PhD studies can be improved in Kazakhstan in view of advances in digitization and online education. *Central Asian Journal of Medical Hypotheses and Ethics*, *4*(4), 191–198. https://doi.org/10.47316/cajmhe.2023.4.4.01

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(December 2013), 77–101.

Brinkmann, S. (2016). *Qualitative Interviewing Conversation Knowledge Through Research Interviews*.

Brinkschulte, M., Grieshammer, E., & Stoian, M. (2018). Translingual Academic Writing Pedagogy at internationalised universities. *Journal of Academic Writing*, *8*(2), 150–160. https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v8i2.460

Calle-Arango, L., & Ávila Reyes, N. (2024). 'I always prefer to quote well-known people': identity negotiations while constructing Ph.D. students' intertextual repertoire. *Language and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2024.2343293

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers. *College English*, *68*(6), 589–604. https://doi.org/10.58680/ce20065039

Canagarajah, S. (2022). Language diversity in academic writing: toward decolonizing scholarly publishing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *17*(2), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2022.2063873

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2ThdBAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Charmaz,+K+Constructing+grounded+theory+&ots=f-lX3MszE-&sig=gHpcvimn3DQVHdrzX8oha9GX8vQ

Cutri, J., & Pretorius, L. (2019). Processes of Globalisation in Doctoral Education. In *Wellbeing in Doctoral Education* (pp. 209–218). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-9302-0_17

Dyussekeneva, I., Kalimova, Z., Soltanbekova, O., Turikpenova, A., & Tulekova, M. (2024). Academic research writing from an intercultural perspective. *Scientific Herald of Uzhhorod University Series Physics*, *56*, 652–659. https://doi.org/10.54919/physics/56.2024.65pdt2

Englander, K. (2014). *Variations in Different Languages and Cultures* (pp. 57–65). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7714-9_9

Fimyar, O., Kurakbayev, K., & Bridges, D. (2023). The Translation of 'World-Class' Academic Research Practices in Kazakhstan. In *Mapping Educational Change in Kazakhstan* (pp. 45–58). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009070515.006

Frick, B. L., & Pyhältö, K. (2022). Experiences of the doctoral journey: A cross-national perspective. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *59*(1), 70–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1811132

Gardner, S. K., & Doore, S. A. (2020). *Doctoral Student Socialization and Professional Pathways* (pp. 113–127). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33350-8_7

Golebiowski, Z. (2018). *Reshaping Academic Writing in Internationalised Higher Education: A Contribution from Contrastive Rhetoric* (pp. 55–72). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77655-2_4

González-Ocampo, G., & Castelló, M. (2018). Writing in doctoral programs: examining supervisors' perspectives. *Higher Education*, *76*(3), 387–401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0214-1

Kaztayeva, S. (2024). Publication practices of Kazakhstani scientists: Analysis of the impact of predatory journals and state policies. *Bulletin of Gumelev University*, *3*(148), 328339. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-6895-2024-148-3-328-339

Kimmons, R., & Johnstun, K. (2019). Navigating Paradigms in Educational Technology. *TechTrends*, *63*(5), 631–641. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00407-0

Kivunja, C., & Kuyini, A. B. (2017). Understanding and Applying Research Paradigms in Educational Contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *6*(5), 26. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26

Kolb, S. M. (2012). Grounded Theory and the Constant Comparative Method : Valid Research Strategies for Educators. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, *3*(1), 83–86. http://jeteraps.scholarlinkresearch.com/articles/Grounded Theory and the Constant Comparative Method.pdf

Kraja, G., Dedej, D., & Spahija, S. (2024). Navigating the Global Landscape: Dynamics and Impacts of Internationalization in Higher Education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development*, *11*(1 S1), 7. https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv11n1s102

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory into Practice*, *45*(4), 368–377. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4504_11

Lei, J. (2023). Doctoral Publication Practices: Competing Demands and Coping Strategies. In *Publishing during Doctoral Candidature* (pp. 51–77). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-0988-9_4

Nurgaliyeva, S., Zeinolla, S., Aben, A., Iskendirova, S., & Ismukhanova, G. (2025). Kazakhstan's universities: global challenges and local duties improving education quality. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *14*(1), 768–776. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v14i1.31852

Patton, M. (2017). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Rahman, M. A., Handrianto, C., Kenedi, A. K., Ilhami, A., & Ghafar, Z. N. (2024). Exploring the Interplay between Writing Practices and Identity Formation in Academic Contexts. *JOURNAL OF DIGITAL LEARNING AND DISTANCE EDUCATION*, *2*(12), 838–848. https://doi.org/10.56778/jdlde.v2i12.238

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2015). Interpretative phenomenological analysis as a useful methodology for research on the lived experience of pain. *British Journal of Pain*, *9*(1), 41–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/2049463714541642

Stornaiuolo, A., & Leblanc, R. J. (2014). Local literacies, global scales: The labor of global connectivity. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *58*(3), 192–196. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.348

Thao, L. T., & Trut Thuy, P. (2024). Enhancing the doctoral experience: factors influencing academic success and well-being of Ph.D. students in a cultural context. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *11*(1), 2391645. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2391645

Tran, L. T., & Vu, T. T. P. (2017). Mediating transnational spaces: international students and intercultural responsibility. *Intercultural Education*, *28*(3), 283–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2017.1333691

Vera E. Woloshyn, Sam Illingworth, & Snežana Obradović-Ratković. (2024). Introduction to Special Issue Expanding Landscapes of Academic Writing in Academia. *Brock Education Journal*, *33*(1), 3–9. https://doi.org/10.26522/brocked.v33i1.1118

Waheed, S. A., Gilani, N., Raza, M., & Ahmad, F. (2021). The Beginning of More Worries: Doctoral Candidates' Untold Stories After Submission of Dissertation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 537366. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.537366

**Contact email:** A.Tleuov@kimep.kz