38

ENGLISH FOR PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC PURPOSES

Diane D. Belcher,
Francisco Javier Barron Serrano and Hae Sung Yang

Introduction

While landing a job in academia may be a dream come true for many, keeping and thriving in the job bring a set of challenges that can be doubly daunting if they must be met in a language one is not entirely comfortable with. Functioning as a professional academic in English, as many even in non-English-dominant nation-states are now asked to do, entails engagement in a complex activity system of communicative academic practices, both oral and literate, pedagogical (in English-medium institutions) and research-oriented, many of which are discussed in other chapters in this volume (see, for example, Crawford Camiciottoli & Querol-Julián; Forey and Feng; Kuteeva, all this volume). This chapter on English for professional academic purposes, or EPAP, however, focuses on arguably the most high-stakes and stress-inducing of the practices that professional academics around the world are increasingly expected to master; namely, research publication in English. Thus, our specific focus is English for research publication purposes, or ERPP (see Flowerdew, 2013b).

"Publish or perish" may have become a truism, but it is perhaps truer now than ever before, or as Hyland (2012, p. 37) has put it, "never more cruelly applicable than today". Professional academics' visibility institutionally and in their disciplines, especially internationally, depends not just on the ability to address pressing research questions and real-world problems but also to persuade publication gatekeepers that the fruits of their research labor merit an audience of peers. Why the pressure to publish appears to be more keenly felt now than previously may have much to do with what critical applied linguists (e.g., Kramsch & Thorne, 2002) see as the growing prevalence of neoliberal ideology in academia, or an ever-more corporate-minded focus on global market forces and values. The marketization of academia (Fairclough, 2010), or commodity-like selling of institutions, is evident in universities' intense interest in, and publicizing of, their global ranking, which to a great extent is determined by faculty publications in high-profile indexed journals (Curry & Lillis, 2013a; Flowerdew, 2013b), an overwhelming number of which are English-only (Belcher, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010). For individual academics, this institutional competitiveness translates into a "carrot and stick" (Kwan, 2010, p. 55) scenario, where research must appear in high-visibility venues

to count for promotion, continued employment, or avoidance of much heavier teaching workloads. Even well before completing their graduate degrees, students may feel pressure to publish (Flowerdew, 2013b; Kwan, 2010; Lee & Lee, 2013) not only to smooth the path to an academic job but even as a degree requirement. What once was viewed primarily as a means of joining scholarly conversations and contributing to disciplinary knowledge may now be seen as a necessary exercise in personal professional branding.

While the publication pressure on individual academics may be difficult to see in positive terms, unless we count, as neoliberals do, incentivizing of a strongly competitive work ethic (Lee & Lee, 2013), from a knowledge production perspective there are clear advantages to greater sharing of research in a language accessible to ever greater numbers of readers (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Whether this increase in global distribution of knowledge is resulting in more equitable representation of knowledge from all over the world is much less clear. As many have pointed out (Flowerdew, 2013b; Swales, 2004), speakers of English as an additional language (EAL), especially those EAL users in the periphery—that is, in less economically developed or "off-networked" (Swales, 1990, p. 106) regions—face both discursive and non-discursive challenges (Canagarajah, 2002) that "native" English speakers in the "inner circle" (Kachru, 1982) with the material and intellectual support they need are not forced to grapple with.

On the face of it, the now 3:1 outnumbering of first-language English speakers by plurilingual EALs (Pérez-Llantada, 2012) would seem to aid in leveling the playing field; that is, in ushering in a new era of acceptance of "translingual practice," use of a diverse range and combination of multilingual/multicultural rhetorical strategies (Canagarajah, 2013), and of "alternative ELF [English as a lingua franca] versions of standard written English" (Mauranen, Pérez-Llantada, & Swales, 2010, p. 647). Translingual/transrhetorical tolerance, however, may be far from reality for those faced with First World gatekeepers, who may still insist that authors "go native" (Ferguson, 2005, p. 81) and meet not just center linguistic expectations, with the help of putative native-speaker proofreaders, but also center criteria for what counts as novel, significant, and relevant (Flowerdew, 2013b; on the "molding" of thought in accord with Anglo-linguacultural preferences, see Coulmas, 2007, p. 6). To meet these publication demands, EAL academics may find themselves reliant on whatever local and virtual networks of academic and literacy brokers (or supporters) they can assemble (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Curry & Lillis, 2013b). EAP professionals, interested and experienced in providing academic English support, would seem well poised to step into the breach and address EAL researchers' needs, yet as Hyland (2009b) has pointed out, EPAP pedagogical practice appears well behind the curve of relevant research on disciplinary discourses. Or as Flowerdew (2013b, p. 316) remarks, "there is an urgent need … for ESP practitioners to up their game." Kwan (2010) has noted that even in as well-resourced a setting as Hong Kong, there is quite limited instructional support for research publication efforts, and what exists mainly focuses on textual issues, not the crucial, often "occluded" social practices, or genres (Swales, 2004) of navigating the publication process. Other types of institutionally available support in EFL settings, such as English language consultants or writing centers (Willey & Tanimoto, 2012) or translation and editing services (Pérez-Llantada, 2012), are also most likely to focus specifically, albeit still helpfully, on the textual, mainly linguistic, aspects of research writing.

The goal of the rest of this chapter is to point toward ways in which EAP professionals might advance their own research-informed pedagogical practice in EPAP to meet the challenges of promoting more globally equitable research publication—not by helping EAL academics become more accommodationist, uncritically meeting First World gatekeeping

expectations (Feng, Beckett, & Huang, 2013), but by helping them become more effectively critically pragmatic (Harwood & Hadley, 2004), with a repertoire of strategies to negotiate publication hurdles and meet their own research visibility goals.

Research past and present

Flowerdew (2013b) has observed that ERPP theory and research can be placed in two broad categories—discourse analysis, or product-oriented, research, and social constructivist and situated learning theory-informed, or process-oriented, research—both of which are potentially informative for research writers themselves and the EPAP professionals who support them. We should note, however, that Swales (1990) and Hyland (2009b) have pointed out that product and process are not so neatly separated (and Flowerdew, 2013b, essentially agrees in his discussion of research on the rhetorical dimension of research articles). Published research products show abundant evidence of the social process of production, with authors positioning themselves in the context of their specific research areas and disciplines (Pérez-Llantada, 2012). Nevertheless, if we take a broad chronological view of ERPP research, we do, as Flowerdew (2013b) observes, see an early focus on text, or genre primarily as text types, with particular emphasis on the research article (RA), the most prestigious member of the research genre set (which includes grant proposals, conference presentations, proceedings papers, journal submission communications, etc.; see Flowerdew, 2013b). Swales' (1990) early research on the rhetorical move macrostructure of RA introductions known as CARS, or create a research space, launched a wealth of similar studies of RA introductions in numerous disciplines (e.g., Graves, Moghadassi, & Hashim, 2014) and of other RA-focused part-genre analyses—for example, of abstracts, methods, discussion, and results sections—still evident in the major ESP/EAP journals (e.g., Bruce, 2009; Kwan & Chan, 2014).

Recent incarnations of textual ERPP studies routinely merge genre analysis with corpus linguistics and have branched out, following Hyland's lead (2009a), beyond move structures to other still more conspicuously interpersonal aspects of research writing, such as stance and engagement. Genre and corpus approaches are also combined to inform an intercultural rhetoric perspective on ERPP, as seen in recent parallel corpora RA studies (e.g., Spanish and English: Pérez-Llantada, 2012), which serve to help uncover similarities and differences between RAs in different languages and cultural contexts, hence potentially empowering scholars who hope to straddle several linguacultural worlds or transition from regional to international publication. Even more explicitly pedagogically motivated text-focused RA studies are also increasingly in evidence, aimed at enabling novice research writers to employ corpus tools in their own analyses of discipline-specific RAs (Charles, 2012; Lee & Swales, 2006), and to utilize computer-assisted scaffolding in their own independent construction of RAs (Lo, Liu, & Wang, 2014).

Process-oriented ERPP studies, often employing ethnographic methods, are by no means new to the field (e.g., St. John, 1987), but have become more common of late, as seen in Flowerdew's (2000) own work, his work with Li (Flowerdew & Li, 2009), and Li's (2006; 2014) solo work, as well as Lillis and Curry's (2010) massive decade-long ethnographic research in southern and central Europe, and Hanauer and Englander's (2013) mixed methods study of 148 Mexican scientists. Much of this research takes what can be loosely termed an activity system (Bazerman, 2004) perspective (not looking at one writer's work with one genre in isolation), though without explicit mention of it in many studies, and is in line with the social practice orientation of academic literacies

(Lillis, forthcoming; Lillis & Tuck, this volume). More recent research underscores the intensely social nature of ERPP at many different levels.

Borrowing Robinson's (1991) and Huhta, Vogt, and Tulkki's (2013) micro (individual), meso (institutional), and macro (societal) perspectives (which they use for ESP needs analysis), we can see a broadening, increasingly complex focus on the social in ERPP, with growing interest in power/equity issues at all these levels. The micro perspective is evident in many of the earlier, as well as recent, process-oriented studies, which focus primarily on the individual writer's vantage point, with Li's (2006) case study of one Chinese student's many pre-publication revisions a prime example, clearly exhibiting the writer's progress toward academic socialization through the publication-navigation process. At a more meso level, we find a focus on journals and their gatekeeping processes: highlighting editors (Flowerdew, 2001) and reviewers (Belcher, 2007; Gosden, 2003). Lee and Lee (2013) also take a meso perspective in their focus on a Korean university, but their meso purview merges with a macro geopolitical perspective when they link institutional with national policy. Increasing concern about academic language attrition, or "domain loss" (Coulmas, 2007, p. 6), as more journals become Anglophone and more researchers choose Anglophone venues over those in other languages (Flowerdew, 2013b; Pérez-Llantada, 2012), is compelling interest in dual-language publication agendas and how to support them. Casanave (1998) was among the first to call attention to this topic (but see also Ammon, 1998; Banks, 1999; Crosnier, 1994), and more recently it is the focal area of interest of contributors to Curry and Lillis's (2013b) special issue of *Language Policy* on publication and "the consequences of linguistic policies." In that special issue, Gentil and Séror (2014) manage to address all three levels—micro, meso, macro—by autoethnographically focusing on the impact of institutional and national policies on their own commitment to publishing in French and English.

So far, few studies have focused as exclusively and intensively on the macro level as have Feng, Beckett, and Huang (2013; see also Min, 2014) in their examination of China's "going out" policy, which aims to internationalize Chinese journals by boosting their visibility abroad. Such national efforts may be exactly what's needed to bring about large-scale leveling of the playing field, raising the profiles of "national" journals (Salager-Meyer, 2014). At present, however, as Pérez-Llantada (2012, p. 39) has observed, EAL academics face an "increasingly stark choice" between devoting inordinate amounts of time and effort to international publication in English or publishing in home-language venues often devalued by their own national assessment systems. Some see a light at the end of the tunnel, however, in recent citation studies that indicate China's research output in Anglophone venues, given its current growth rate, is on track to surpass that of other nations (Feng, Beckett, & Huang, 2013; see also Englander, 2014, on the large Latin American Spanish-language citation counts now captured by Google Scholar). The publication landscape in the not-so-distant future may, thus, be radically different from the Western Anglo-dominated scene we see today.

Critical issues

In this section we provide a digest of critical issues related to EAL scholars' experiences writing for publication that underscores the need to frame the challenges identified in the literature not as those affecting a particular group of scholars, but as those confronting the academic world at large, understood as a linguistically and culturally diverse community of scholars.

Originality and identity

Originality is constantly invoked as a desirable feature of scholarly research. Expectations of originality relate to almost all aspects of research and how it is reported. However, what exactly constitutes original research, or an original contribution, is not always clear, leading at times to cynical interpretations from scholars who have faced the charge of lack of originality in their submissions (Canagarajah, 2003; Flowerdew & Li, 2009). Along social constructivist lines, Hyland (2009b, p. 89) has referred to originality as "not the expression of an autonomous self but of writing that is embedded in and built on the existing theories, discourses, and topics already legitimated in the community." Originality in terms of the research space is, thus, informed by research interests and agendas, and the larger ongoing disciplinary conversations. Additionally, writers need to be able to "sell" their research to gatekeepers and fellow scientific community members by framing it to (appear to) engage current lines of inquiry in the field, lest it be dismissed as "parochial' (Belcher, 2007; Flowerdew, 2001, 2007). Originality is, thus, not a purely disciplinary concern; it is also a selling point. On the other hand, parochialism, the perceived lack of relevance beyond the local context of production, is indeed one charge that EAL scholars need to develop discursive strategies for, and not always easy to overcome when the citation practices of EAL scholars may index them as parochial with some gatekeepers (Lillis and Curry, 2010).

One originality issue affecting EAL writers in particular concerns textual borrowing. Flowerdew and Li (2007) have documented an extreme case of textual re-use that led up to an investigation. The journal at the center of this case eventually published a statement condemning the practice of textual re-use without proper citation. Yet, as Flowerdew and Li (2007) observe, textual borrowing is common among both EAL and native-speaking writers. Indeed, recourse to textual models has been identified not only as a coping strategy by struggling authors, but as a matter-of-course strategy for all writers. Tardy (2009) has noted it is also used as a pedagogical strategy in disciplinary content courses and professional settings, where interaction with texts is part and parcel of developing genre expertise. In the case of off-network EAL scholars, the absence of a live disciplinary discourse community of reference leads to reliance on published material in the target disciplines that EAL writers can gain access to (sometimes painstakingly, as illustrated in Canagarajah, 2003), as a source not only for disciplinary content, but also as models for their own writing.

While excessive resemblance of a contribution or exemplar to another text is problematic, unusual departure from conventional disciplinary discourse usage may index writers not only generically as outsiders but also specifically as members of a particular national language community (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Contrastive studies of published texts have improved our understanding of what it means to write with an accent in academia. For example, Pérez-Llantada (2014) illustrates that while formulaicity is a common feature to English and Spanish scientific discourse, different rhetorical functions are associated with seemingly cognate lexical bundles. This difference, the author concludes, partly accounts for the hybrid flavor in Spanish scholars' EAL texts.

Learning the ropes of disciplinary activity can be a tortuous process not least because it so grippingly engages identity. For novice researchers, "[D]elving into a research culture and being accepted as a full member involves learning new modes of doing and behaving, in a process of academic enculturation and identity transformation" (Carlino, 2012). In the case of more seasoned, established researchers, such as those featured in the work of Curry and Lillis (2010), Lillis and Curry (2010), Englander (2009), Hanauer

and Englander (2013), and Pérez-Llantada (2012), identity may be contested primarily on linguistic grounds, where lack of linguistic resources and real or perceived generic constraints severely limit what EAL writers feel able to say (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Pérez-Llantada 2012).

Socialization, networking, and brokering

Socialization, the way "newcomers to an academic culture learn how to participate successfully in the oral and written discourse and related practices of that discourse community" (Duff, 2010, p. 169), is at the crux of disciplinary activity and the means by which a disciplinary community is able to develop a tradition. For EAL scholars, socialization takes on an additional critical role in overcoming linguistic and disciplinary hurdles pertaining to publication (Lillis & Curry, 2010). The critical nature of professional and academic networks to EAL scholars' productivity cannot be easily overstated, as literally illustrated by Lillis and Curry's (2010) participants' graphic sketches of the academic networks on which they rely for access to "resources," ranging from useful contacts to first-hand information, to publications, to collaboration opportunities. In a globally connected knowledge-based economy that increasingly emphasizes internationalization as a value, productive alliances between "core" and "periphery" research centers may be "brokered" by key mediators who are influential members of their disciplines. With respect to publication, Lillis and Curry (2010) use the term literacy brokering to refer to the range of mediational interactions between authors and the people—"literacy brokers"—who, in various capacities, contribute to shaping a manuscript into its final publishable form (see also Li & Flowerdew, 2007, on "shapers"). Knowledge about the range and nature of brokering practices, and their outcomes, could be used in the design of pedagogic interventions, as noted by Lillis and Curry (2010).

Geopolitics and decentering academic publishing

Critical theory has problematized the notion of scientific communication as neutral (value-free) and transparent. In order to demystify the order of discourse (Fairclough, 2001) within which EAL scholars faced with international publication pressures have to operate, Piscioneri (2011) argues for the need for EAL writers to cultivate critical awareness of a particularly Western reasoning tradition: a "grand narrative" or "history of ideas" with roots in the European Enlightenment. He outlines how such an awareness-raising project could be implemented that also addresses the development of macro skills (such as the rhetorical organization of texts, or citation conventions) and micro skills (such as word choice and cohesive devices), and critically engages notions of Western superiority by emphasizing the grand narrative's critical under- and counter-currents, such as Marxism, feminism, or civil rights.

Canagarajah's (2003) account of atypical strategies used by EAL scholars operating in extreme conditions of peripherality to overcome the discursive and material hurdles pushes the boundaries of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP), a notion he finds ultimately accommodationist in its original formulation. He suggests that while LPP evokes a community concentrically arranged and centripetally oriented, "more radical discourses [may lead] to the fissures and tensions that generate new interest groups and discourses" (2003, p. 247). Lillis and Curry (2010) similarly call for a decentralization of control over academic publication through a range of actions, including making brokering and mentoring services available,

taking up questions about powerful implicit ideologies governing knowledge production and merit assessment, and revaluing and promoting local research, local languages, and local journals. Salager-Meyer (2012) explores the advantages of different open access frameworks, which can offer affordable (or free) access to recent knowledge, and increased visibility for those who publish. Salager-Meyer (2014) also suggests that small national journals could join forces and go regional, and become legitimate alternative venues for publication.

Calling into question the use of the label *international* "as a proxy for English-medium" venues and practices, Lillis and Curry (2010, p. 6) propose adoption of internationality as a new criterion emphasizing plurality (of editorial boards, collaboration, authorship, etc.). The notion of plurality also needs to permeate the directionality of disciplinary conversations. Tupas (2011, p. 219) quotes Susan Strange, an international studies scholar, who has admonished American academics for being "deaf and blind to anything that is not published in the USA."

To conclude this section, we would like to add a final thought about consumption (or readership). The scientific community is admittedly a community of writers, but more fundamentally a community of scientific readers who also write. As Belcher (2014) notes, there is a need to cultivate a cosmopolitan readership who are able to appreciate the value of alternative forms of argumentation (cf. Canagarajah, 2013) and who bring that to bear in the range of literature that they consume and cite.

Recommendations for practice

Current understanding of publication as a socially-oriented networked activity suggests a pressing need for EAP specialists to go beyond a focus on textual conventions of RAs to provide support along the trajectory of writing-for-publication. Here, we suggest interventions and support for various activities throughout the pre-publication process, taking what can be termed a critically pragmatic approach (Harwood & Hadley, 2004).

We do not mean to imply, however, that pedagogical intervention at the textual level is not of value. Indeed, text-based pedagogical approaches that raise rhetorical consciousness among novice EAL academics may be crucial to their eventual success as published scholars. The goal of such approaches, if authorial agency is to be enhanced, would not be the teaching of rhetorical conventions per se, but scaffolding the ability to critically analyze and pragmatically use such conventions. Learning to view RA sections through the lens of Swalesian rhetorical move structure analysis can lead not just to awareness of the prototypical but also of variation within and across disciplinary communities, and hence of the possibility of engagement with hybrid discourses that "merge[s] the strength of local scholarly discourse with the dominant conventions of mainstream academic discourse" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 125).

More and more evidence is accruing of the value of corpus tools as enablers of critical consumption and use of research genres. Charles (2012) and Lee and Swales (2006) have documented how individualized, discipline-specific corpora can "build the field" (Rose & Martin, 2012, p. 66) for research writers, immersing them in relevant contexts of writing, disciplinary cultures, and topic-specific lexicogrammar. These user-constructed corpora, which can enable comparison of the writer's own text with a self-selected collection of online articles, may be especially valuable in under-resourced areas, where they may serve as virtual literacy brokers for EAL scholars, helping them determine how stylistically far or close they are, or want to be, from already-published texts.

Another promising recent pedagogical intervention at the textual level is the use of self-guided tutorial systems to support research writing. A trial-version tutorial called EJP-Write

(Lo, Liu & Wang, 2014) enables EAL writers to readily check move structures and collocations, view paragraph/sentence/phrase templates, as well as manage their citations and references. Like self-built corpora, such tutorials have the potential to scaffold rhetorical strategy and language use decision-making, and may be especially helpful for under-resourced scholars. While development of such online tutorial programs, especially if discipline-specific, requires substantial commitment and collaboration among EAP practitioners, subject-matter experts, and system developers, the learner autonomy benefits for those who can access such programs online also appear to be potentially substantial (Lo, Liu, & Wang, 2014) .

A daunting task for all EAP professionals, but especially those who wish to support research writing for publication, is that of becoming knowledgeable about a range of discipline-specific social practices. A social constructivist-informed pedagogy, however, would assume that learning to write for publication occurs in the contexts of publication through interaction, negotiation, and contestation. With such a view of learning, the role of EAP professionals then becomes that of mediator between writers and their academic and literacy brokers, and facilitator of negotiation of issues that arise in research/ publication contexts. Social-practice EAP support would ideally occur, as mentioned above, throughout the pre-publication processes. We suggest a few types of such support in what follows.

Support for positioning of EAL academics' research efforts within a discipline, a research area, and, more specifically, a journal should begin early in the publication trajectory (see Curry & Lillis, 2013b, for support strategies). While EAP specialists are not themselves in a position to choose a research topic or target journal for those they support, they can raise awareness of the need to establish a research niche in view not only of ongoing scholarly conversations but also of the writer's disciplinary, professional, and personal goals. They can also facilitate awareness-raising of publication venue possibilities (local vs. non-local; Anglophone vs. home language medium) and how these choices can affect, and be affected by, authorial positioning and identity.

Support for navigation of the research genre system (Tardy, 2003), not just the RA, should also be seen as an ongoing, multi-sequenced process. Since the RA is always part of a genre system, usually preceded by such antecedent genres as focused literature reviews, grant proposals, conference abstracts, and presentations, research writing for publication actually begins long before writing of the RA itself. Support can take the form of help with locating and scaffolding the critical reading of relevant literature, providing a safe space for rehearsal of conference presentations, and formative feedback on any antecedent and other research-related genres attempted.

Interaction with journal gatekeepers, a later stage in the publication trajectory, is only beginning to be addressed in the pedagogical literature (again see Curry & Lillis, 2013b). Novice scholars may find it challenging to interpret reviewer comments, which may be linguistically instantiated as questions, hedges, and indirect suggestions (Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002; Swales & Feak, 2011). Raising awareness of this "occluded" genre can start with exposure to real examples of reviews and responses locally collected or found in the EAP literature (Belcher, 2007). Instructional support can consist of menus of interactional strategies for responding to reviewer comments, contesting editorial suggestions, and explaining revision decisions (Swales & Feak, 2011).

Perhaps most critical of all to providing sustainable research publication support for EAL academics may be facilitating connection with other literacy brokers (translators, proofreaders) and academic brokers (senior researchers, potential mentors and collaborators, journal editors, and reviewers). Organizing a retreat or workshop in collaboration with

such brokers (Cargill, O'Connor, & Li, 2012; Moore, Murphy, & Murray, 2010; Murray & Newton, 2008), can, in addition to providing a supportive environment for discussion of ideas and issues, facilitate the formation of networks that offer many types of support beyond the expertise (or energies) of the EAP specialist. When such local support is not possible, EAL academics can be directed to virtual support such as that offered by AuthorAID, an online non-profit organization offering seminars, webinars, and mentoring to off-networked researchers (Englander, 2014).

As Cargill, O'Connor, and Li (2012) observe, the need for publication support for EAL academics is a worldwide dilemma. Institutions of higher education, rather than addressing it, are more likely to exacerbate it in their race to higher rankings. EAP specialists are among the few making a concerted effort to understand, meet, and even diminish (e.g., through open access advocacy [Salager-Meyer, 2012] and support for national assessment policy changes [Min, 2014]) this need.

Future directions

There are, of course, many different directions that EPAP research and practice could take to better address and alleviate English for research publication needs. Here we list a few that could be especially productive.

From homogeneity to hybridity

Further research is needed on hybridization and how hybrid discourses can constitute a bridge between dominant and peripheral discourses/modes, and, more specifically, on how scholars draw on their L1 discourse as a resource in their publication efforts. Fairclough (2010, p. 541) sees "a hegemonic shift [towards a more] favourable environment for … practices of academic writing which achieve a hybridisation of traditional academic styles and colloquial, informal, spoken styles." We need to explore how this shift is or could be realized in disciplinary and institutional communities.

From individuals to social networks

Although there is increasing awareness of academic publication as networked activity rather than individual accomplishment, publication practices within research groups are still under-examined. Further exploration of how novice EAL academics learn to participate as researchers and writers in research groups could reveal much about the nature of socially embedded practices. As the situatedness of research becomes more dispersed, and more researchers engage in global knowledge production through cross-border collaboration (Lillis & Curry, 2010), so too grows our need to better understand what it means to successfully collaborate across local, regional, and international communities.

From English text to multimodal, translingual practice

While much of the focus of EPAP research has been on textual features of RAs, we know that academics engage in a range of research-related literacy events that involve multiple semiotic modes and media, such as blogging, conference or virtual presentations, scholarly email exchange, informal talks, and other modes of research-related communication (Kuteeva, this volume). Further investigation of these multimodal practices, which are crucial to

social-network building, could illuminate much that is currently invisible in most RA-oriented research literature (Curry & Lillis, 2013b).

So far, EPAP has mainly focused on English medium publication in center journals. More attention to how EAL academics participate in local, dual-language, and translingual practices could help shed light on critical issues such as development of writer agency and identity, and provide insight into how to support plurilingual research practices. More research on such practices could also provide a space to discuss more equitable knowledge dissemination, nurturing of local research communities, and development of more ecologically sustainable language policies (Feng, Beckett, & Huang, 2013).

From data-based theory to data-and-theory-based pedagogy

While textual, corpus-based, and socially-oriented research and theory have expanded our understanding of academic publication, efforts to apply research insights to pedagogy are still surprisingly limited (Flowerdew, 2013a). The challenge for EAP specialists now is to further develop research-informed instructional support relevant to various disciplines and local settings, and capable of promoting the seemingly disparate goals of greater learner (author) autonomy and productive collaboration. To meet this challenge, we may need to move out of our comfort zones to collaborate with and be informed by, as well as inform, a range of brokers and stakeholders, including not only disciplinary experts and literacy brokers in other fields but also policymakers at institutional and national levels.

Further reading

Bennett (ed.) (2014). Explores such topics as the impact of English on various scholarly discourse traditions and the challenge of negotiating dual local and global academic identities.

Flowerdew (2013a). Outlines some of the most salient themes within the purview of ERPP.

Kamler (2010). Locates the review process in the larger context of brokering as social practice and illustrates pedagogic strategies by drawing on actual submission review cases.

Moreno (2010). Argues the case for cross-cultural academic discourse analysis studies – combining corpus, discourse, and genre analyses, and ethnography – informing pedagogical ERPP applications.

Lillis & Curry (forthcoming). Offers an overview of the traditions that inform the emerging field of scholarly writing in a multilingual context – noting that much of this research continues to be circumscribed to EAP.

Related chapters

3 Academic literacies
22 Critical perspectives
24 Lectures
32 Interpersonal meaning and audience engagement in academic presentations
33 Research blogs, wikis, and tweets

References

Ammon, U. (1998). *Ist Deutsch noch internationale Wissenschaftssprache?* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Banks, D. (1999). Becoming part of the network: French scientists and the use of English at conferences. *Anglais de spécialité,* 23–26, 209–220.

Bazerman, C. (2004). Speech acts, genres, and activity systems: How texts organize activity and people. In: Bazerman, C. & Prior, P. (eds) *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Belcher, D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 1–22.

Belcher, D. (2014). What we need and don't need intercultural rhetoric for: A retrospective and prospective look at an evolving research area. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 25, 59–67.

Bennett, K. (ed.) (2014). *The semiperiphery of academic writing: Discourses, communities and practices.* London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Bruce, N. (2009). A genre analysis of the results sections in sociology and organic chemistry articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28, 105–124.

Canagarajah, S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

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

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Writing to learn and learning to write by shuttling between languages. In: Manchón, R. (ed.) *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Cargill, M., O'Connor, P. & Li, Y. (2012). Educating Chinese scientists to write for international journals: Addressing the divide between science and technology education and English language teaching. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 60–69.

Carlino, P. (2012). Helping doctoral students of education to face writing and emotional challenges in identity transition. In: Donahue, C. & Castelló, M. (eds) *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies.* Bingley: Emerald.

Casanave, C. P. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 175–203.

Charles, M. (2012). "Proper vocabulary and juicy collocations": EAP students evaluate do-it-yourself corpus-building. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 93–102.

Coulmas, F. (2007). *Language regimes in transformation: Future prospects for German and Japanese in science, economy and politics.* The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Crosnier, E. (1994) Enquête sur l'évaluation de l'anglais par les anglophones dans les publications scientifiques français: Critères linguistiques, résultats et perspectives. *Anglais de specialité,* 3(février), 41–55.

Curry, M. J. & Lillis, T. (2010). Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes,* 29, 281–295.

Curry, M. J. & Lillis, T. (2013a). Introduction to the thematic issue: Participating in academic publishing-consequences of linguistic policies and practices. *Language Policy*, 12, 209–213.

Curry, M. J. & Lillis, T. (2013b). *A scholar's guide to getting published in English: Critical choices and practical strategies.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 30, 169–192.

Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English-speaking scientists as a consequence of the social construction of revision. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8, 35–53.

Englander, K. (2014). *Writing and publishing science research papers in English.* Toronto, Springer.

Fairclough, N. (2001). The dialectics of discourse. *Textus*, 14, 231–242.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). New York, Longman.

Feng, H., Beckett, G. & Huang, D. (2013). From "import" to "import–export" oriented internationalization: The impact of national policy on scholarly publication in China. *Language Policy*, 12, 251–272.

Ferguson, G. (2005). "Is English really a *Tyrannosaurus rex*?" Scientific communication and the global spread of English. In: Aguado De Cea, G. & Roldán Riejos, A. M. (eds) *Reflections on language use in the academic context.* Madrid: Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 243–264.

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 127–150.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly,* 35, 121–150.

Flowerdew, J. (2013a). Some thoughts on English for research publication purposes (ERPP) and related issues. *Language Teaching*, FirstView, 1–13.

Flowerdew, J. (2013b). English for research publication purposes. In: Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (eds) *The handbook of English for specific purposes.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Flowerdew, J. & Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). Genre analysis of editorial letters to international contributors. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 463–489.

Flowerdew, J. & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics*, 28, 440–465.

Flowerdew, J. & Li, Y. (2009). The globalization of scholarship: Studying Chinese scholars writing for international publication. In: Manchón, R. (ed.) *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research.* Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Gentil, G. & Séror, J. (2014). Canada has two official languages—Or does it? Case studies of Canadian scholars' language choices and practices in disseminating knowledge. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 17–30.

Gosden, H. (2003). "Why not give us the full story?": Functions of referees' comments in peer reviews of scientific research papers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 87–101.

Graves, H., Moghaddasi, S. & Hashim, A. (2014). "Let *G = (V, E)* be a graph": Turning the abstract into the tangible in introductions in mathematics research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 36, 1–11.

Hanauer, D. I. & Englander, K. (2011). Quantifying the burden of writing research articles in a second language: Data from Mexican scientists. *Written Communication*, 28, 403–416.

Hanauer, D. I. & Englander, K. (2013). *Scientific writing in a second language.* Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Harwood, N. & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: Critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 355–377.

Huhta, M., Vogt, K. & Tulkki, H. 2013. *Needs analysis for language course design: A holistic approach to ESP.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2009a). *Academic discourse.* New York: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2009b). English for professional academic purposes: Writing for scholarly publication. In: Belcher, D. (ed.) *English for specific purposes in theory and practice.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2012). "The past is the future with the lights on": Reflections on AELFE's 20th birthday. *Ibérica*, 24, 29–42.

Kachru, B. (1982). *The other tongue: English across cultures.* Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kamler, B. (2010). Revise and resubmit. In: Aitchison, C., Kamler, B. & Lee, A. (eds) *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond.* New York: Routledge.

Kramsch, C. & Thorne, S. L. (2002). Foreign language learning as global communicative practice. In: Block, D. & Cameron, D. (eds) *Globalization and language teaching.* London: Routledge.

Kwan, B. S. C. (2010). An investigation of instruction in research publishing offered in doctoral programs: The Hong Kong case. *Higher Education*, 59, 55–68.

Kwan, B. S. C. & Chan, H. (2014). An investigation of source use in the results and the closing sections of empirical articles in information systems: In search of a functional-semantic citation typology for pedagogical purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14, 29–47.

Lee, D. & Swales, J. (2006). A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available specialized corpora to self-compiled corpora. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 56–75.

Lee, H. & Lee, K. (2013). Publish (in international indexed journals) or perish: Neoliberal ideology in a Korean university. *Language Policy*, 12, 215–230.

Li, Y. (2006). A doctoral student of physics writing for publication: A sociopolitically-oriented case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 456–478.

Li, Y. (2014). Seeking entry to the North American market: Chinese management academics publishing internationally. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 41–52.

Li, Y. & Flowerdew, J. (2007). Shaping Chinese novice scientists' manuscripts for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 100–117.

Lillis, T. (forthcoming). Academic literacies. In: Leung, C. & Street, B. (eds) *Routledge handbook of English language studies.* London: Routledge.

Lillis, T. & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English.* New York, Routledge.

Lillis, T. & Curry, M. J. (forthcoming). Academic writing for publication in a multilingual world. In: Manchón, R. M. & Matsuda, P. K. (eds). *The handbook of second and foreign language writing*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Lo, H.-Y., Liu, G.-Z. & Wang, T.-I. (2014). Learning how to write effectively for academic journals: A case study investigating the design and development of a genre-based writing tutorial system. *Computers & Education*, 78, 250–267.

Mauranen, A., Pérez-Llantada, C. & Swales, J. (2010). Academic Englishes: A standardized knowledge? In: Kirkpatrick, A. (ed.) *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes.* London: Routledge.

Min, H.-T. (2014). Participating in international academic publishing: A Taiwan perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48, 188–200.

Moore, S., Murphy, M. & Murray, R. (2010). Increasing academic output and supporting equality of career opportunity in universities: Can writers' retreats play a role? *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 4, 21–30.

Moreno, A. I. (2010). Researching into English for research publication purposes from an applied intercultural perspective. In: Ruiz-Garrido, M. F., Palmer-Silveira, J. C. & Fortanet-Gómez, I. (eds) *English for professional and academic purposes.* New York: Editions Rodopi.

Murray, R. & Newton, M. (2008). Facilitating writing for publication. *Physiotherapy*, 94, 29–34.

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2012). *Scientific discourse and the rhetoric of globalization.* New York, Continuum.

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2014). Formulaic language in L1 and L2 expert academic writing: Convergent and divergent usage. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14, 84–94.

Piscioneri, M. (2011). Walking the tightrope: An inquiry into English for academic purposes. In: Phan, L. H. & Baurain, B. (eds) *Voices, identities, negotiations, and conflicts: Writing academic English across cultures.* Bingley: Emerald.

Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today: A practitioner's guide.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Rose, D. & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School.* London: Equinox.

Salager-Meyer, F. (2012). The open access movement or "edemocracy": Its birth, rise, problems and solutions. *Ibérica*, 24, 55–74.

Salager-Meyer, F. (2014). Writing and publishing in peripheral scholarly journals: How to enhance the global influence of multilingual scholars? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 78–82.

St. John, M. J. (1987). Writing processes of Spanish scientists publishing in English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 6, 113–120.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. & Feak, C. (2011). *Navigating academia: Writing supporting genres*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Tardy, C. M. (2003). A genre system view of the funding of academic research. *Written Communication*, 20, 7–36.

Tardy, C. M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Tupas, T. R. F. (2011). Afterword: Crossing cultures in an unequal global order—Voicing and agency in academic writing in English. In: Phan, L. H. & Baurain, B. (eds) *Voices, identities, negotiations, and conflicts: Writing academic English across cultures.* Bingley: Emerald.

Willey, I. & Tanimoto, K. (2012). "Convenience editing" in action: Comparing English teachers' and medical professionals' revisions of a medical abstract. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 249–260.