

Second Language Learning and Teaching

Andrzej Łyda
Krystyna Warchał *Editors*

Occupying Niches: Interculturality, Cross-culturality and Aculturality in Academic Research

 Springer

Introduction

Andrzej Łyda and Krystyna Warchał

Abstract This volume looks into culture-specific features of academic communication, with a particular focus on communication conducted in English as an Additional Language (henceforth EAL) and directed at multicultural audiences. It brings together selected papers which emerged as a result of presentations delivered at PRISEAL2, the second conference on Publishing and Presenting Research Internationally: Issues for Speakers of English as an Additional Language, and the many discussions that followed. The main objective of this conference, held at the University of Silesia in Sosnowiec/Katowice (Poland) in June 2011, was to look at the activities of the international academic discourse community in terms of niches occupied by users of EAL. In this volume we take the niche as a frame of reference for discussion of what is culture-bound, culture-sensitive, and culture-free in the academic community and its practices.

1 Academic Niches: Introductory Remarks

This volume looks into culture-specific features of academic communication, with a particular focus on communication conducted in English as an Additional Language (henceforth EAL) and directed at multicultural audiences. It brings together selected papers which emerged as a result of presentations delivered at PRISEAL2, the second conference on Publishing and Presenting Research Internationally: Issues for Speakers of English as an Additional Language, and the many discussions that followed. The main objective of this conference, held at the

A. Łyda (✉) · K. Warchał
University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland
e-mail: andrzejlyda@gmail.com

K. Warchał
e-mail: krystyna.warchal@us.edu.pl

University of Silesia in Sosnowiec/Katowice (Poland) in June 2011, was to look at the activities of the international academic discourse community in terms of niches occupied by users of EAL. In this volume we take the niche as a frame of reference for discussion of what is culture-bound, culture-sensitive, and culture-free in the academic community and its practices.

In his revised and highly influential create-a-research-space model of article introductions, Swales (1990) developed an ecological metaphor for situating one's own work in relation to the body of prior research done in the field. In particular, he recast his former preparing-for-present-research and Introducing-present-research moves (Swales 1981) as establishing a niche and occupying the niche—rhetorical movements which serve to demonstrate the significance of the research problem for a given field of knowledge, to indicate the place the present research claims in this field, and to show “how this niche in the wider ecosystem will be occupied and defended” (Swales 1990: 142). Publishable scholarly attempts became construed in terms of successful competition for space, where a niche must be found and populated by indicating a gap in or adding significantly to the existing knowledge (Hyland 2000; Swales 2004).

Since *Genre Analysis*, niche has become a prominent concept in academic discourse studies, including those aiming at a better understanding of (Anglophone) academic rhetoric (Bhatia 1993, 2001; Samraj 2002; Lorés 2004; Yang and Allison 2004; Thompson 2009), those striving for increased awareness of cross-cultural differences in the perception of the author's and reader's roles in academic contexts (Duszak 1994; Čmejrková 1996; Ahmad 1997; Martín-Martín 2003; Adnan 2008), those preoccupied with problems that arise from these differences for international scholarly communication (Dudley-Evans 1995; Golebiowski 1999; Shaw 2003; ElMalik and Nesi 2008; Belcher 2009; Pérez-Llantada 2010), and those concerned with second language pedagogy (Swales and Feak 1994; Aranha 2009; Cargill and O'Connor 2009). From these various strands of research there emerges another sense of niche as a confined space or periphery, where scholarly activities continue but do not always manage to step outside, or if they do, they often appear attenuated, muffled or distorted, meaning either not what they did inside the niche, or received not in the way niche audiences would receive them. Paradoxically, if research in today's world has grown into an increasingly collaborative activity, and multinational research teams and projects are becoming the norm rather than exception, writing still remains a solitary process, practiced by individual scholars in their own linguistic, cultural and institutional research spaces. Writing is thus an attempt to communicate something to those outside this niche, to make oneself heard and understood beyond the limits of one's own immediate environment. From this perspective successful academic communication is an act of capturing a research space and leaving a niche delimited by one's language, status, cultural background, educational tradition, and geopolitical situation. The aim of this book is to offer some insight into these mutually related, interacting academic spaces.

This book continues the long-standing tradition of inquiry into cross-linguistic and cross-cultural issues in academic and other professional discourses, well documented by such volumes as Ventola and Mauranen (1996), Aijmer and Stenström (2004), Zhu (2005), Fløttum et al. (2006), Crawford Camiciottoli (2007), Connor et al. (2008), and Suomela-Salmi and Dervin (2009). It is different from its predecessors in explicitly addressing and being centred upon the concept of research niche understood as a space to be captured and populated, as a temporary location to move or grow out of in the course of individual professional development from a novice to an expert, and as a space to consciously reach beyond, delimited by one's linguistic, cultural, educational, and geopolitical background. It is this broader understanding of niche and a perspective on academic discourse as an act of moving, or communicating, across niches that, in our view, gives the collection a sense of unity and makes it different from other volumes addressing similar problems.

Another important point of difference is that the present volume contributes data from a wide range of academic genres, including written and spoken public professional genres, student writing, occluded genres, and non-research institutional text types. By bringing together the results of investigations into research articles, conference proposals, conference presentations, student genres, electronic letters and academic job announcements, it may be informative of the ways in which these various genres interact in broader academic contexts and of the variety of roles members of the academic discourse community assume at different stages or in different moments of their professional life. In this sense it can provide data on genre systems or networks (Bazerman 2004; Swales 2004) which operate in the community and which reflect its internal hierarchy, patterns of interaction, and preferred ways of recycling and restructuring information. Moreover, the findings presented in this volume will offer additional insights into the linguistic variation in academic discourse related to the mode (written or spoken), the status of the participants (novice or expert), the type of interaction (public or occluded), and its general purpose (research-related or research unrelated).

It is also an important characteristic of this collection that while maintaining a focus on EAL, it provides data from a variety of cultural and linguistic contexts. The contributions explore international scholarly communication against the background of a number of first languages, including French, Spanish, Polish, Turkish, and Indonesian, with some additional insights from Indian and Japanese users of EAL. The disciplines covered include: technical sciences, linguistics, biomedical sciences, and social sciences, to name but a few. Finally, the studies included in this volume represent different approaches (such as mixed methods approach, ethnographic approach, intervention, and multimodal analysis), adopt different methodologies (among others, corpus linguistics, genre analysis, and discourse analysis) and employ different research tools (e.g., audio-video recordings, questionnaires, and text-analysing software). They demonstrate the effectiveness of these methods and instruments in academic discourse studies, their strengths and limitations, and the ways the results they bring can mutually give support to, limit or challenge the findings.

We hope that this book may be of interest to scholars who study culture-based rhetorical patterns in academic discourse, including those investigating disciplinary rather than ethnic cultures, and to researchers who are concerned with EAL, English as a Lingua Franca, World Englishes, and multilingualism in academic contexts. We also believe that it might provide some useful information to younger scholars who are beginning to present their research findings to international audiences, to teachers of English for academic or specific purposes, especially those working with international students, and to designers of teaching materials for such courses.

2 Interculturality, Cross-Culturality and Aculturality in Academic Discourse Practices

The publication of Kaplan's essay on cultural thought patterns (Kaplan 1966, 1987) sparked interest in the impact of native culture on the manner of exposition, patterns of argumentation and rhetorical strategies applied by L2 writers. Research in the emerging field of contrastive rhetoric has shown that discourse expectations of L1 tend to be transferred to L2 writing in spite of the fact that the languages often rely on different forms of discourse organization and different rhetorical models. This practice has been found to result in culture-specific patterns of organisation in L2 texts, which may influence the text reception, poses a challenge to teachers and writing tutors, and offers an invaluable source of insight into different epistemologies, heuristics, and world-views, thus inviting broader cross-cultural analyses. Many studies that followed have focused on specific difficulties writers face when communicating in a language other than that of their habitual use, on cross-cultural comparisons highlighting the existing differences (and similarities) between the discourse organisation, rhetorical models and concepts used by writers of different L1, and on L2 pedagogy (see, e.g., Clyne 1987b, 1994; paper in Connor and Kaplan 1987; Kachru 1987; Xu 1987; contributions to Belcher and Braine 1995; Connor 1996). A considerable amount of research done into the cultural lining of writing has involved English as the main language of international communication and as a lingua franca of the academic discourse community.

Important inspiration for contrastive studies into academic cultures, styles and practices has come from Clyne's (1987a) analysis of English and German articles, which revealed significant differences with regard to the distribution of information in text (e.g., the placement of definitions) and the degree of linearity. The same study drew attention to the fact that English and German writers represent two academic cultures, which differ fundamentally in the approach to knowledge, the status of the writer, and the set of purposes the text fulfills.

Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural investigations that followed have shown that differences in the rhetorical traditions tend to be the norm rather than exception. Research into English and Finnish academic rhetoric demonstrated that Finnish authors tend to contextualize their claims in a broader context of what is already

known instead of confining them to the immediate goals of the text in hand and to use fewer metatextual markers than their English colleagues (e.g., Mauranen 1993a, b). English-Czech contrastive analyses revealed that Czech authors tend to use fewer advance organizers, to be less explicit in the definition of key terms and to avoid direct statement of their goals (e.g., Čmejrková 1996; Čmejrková and Daneš 1997). The last observation was also found to apply to Polish writers (Duszak 1994). Other contrastive studies involved the use of hedges by English and Bulgarian academic authors (Vassileva 1997) and various discourse features in English, French and Norwegian academic writing (e.g., Dahl 2004; Fløttum et al. 2006; Vold 2006), in English and Swedish (e.g., Ädel 2006; Melander et al. 1997), and in English and Spanish (e.g., Martín-Martín and Burgess 2004; Mur Dueñas 2008; Lorés-Sanz 2009). What all these studies seem to have in common is the assumption that the differences in the textual organisation and specific discourse features may reflect deeper differences in the philosophy of knowledge, responsibilities of the discourse participants, and culture-specific politeness rituals.

The works mentioned above represent all three approaches to the study of the role of culture in the structure and dynamics of discourse enumerated by Clyne (1994: 3): comparing native texts across cultures, examining L2 discourse, and “examining and comparing the discourse of people of different cultural and linguistic background interacting either in a lingua franca or in one of the interlocutors’ languages.” While all three perspectives are amply represented, and while it is not always possible to draw a sharp line between them, it seems that in view of the widely acknowledged role of English as a lingua franca of science, the exploding mobility of academics around the world, and the now recognised nature of academic communication as an intrinsically dialogic type of discourse, the third “interactive inter-cultural approach” is gaining increasing currency. This tendency is also reflected in the contributions to this volume.

The choice of the first two terms which appear in the heading of this section, interculturality and cross-culturality, has been inspired by Grundy (2008), who interprets them as labels for two types of trans-cultural communication: the case of discourse participants communicating in a lingua franca on the one hand, and the case of an L2 user communicating with a native speaker in his or her cultural context on the other. The term aculturality calls for a more detailed explanation and justification, though. If the awareness of the existing differences between culture-specific models of text organisation and rhetorical patterns has perhaps never been so acute as it is now, it may be worth reconsidering how far this variety is indeed reflected in EAL used today by scholars of different cultural or linguistic background or, in other words, to what extent English used as a lingua franca of the academic discourse community is in fact culture-marked, bearing identifiable traces of the many non-Anglophone cultures of its users. This question is prompted by two groups of factors. The first, which involves the internal diversity of English, the proliferation and the dynamic rise of world Englishes, and the related problem of the cultural model(s) one takes as the discourse norm, is not our present concern (see, e.g., Brutt-Griffler 2002; Kachru et al. 2006; Sharifian 2009; Dewey and Jenkins 2010). The second, directly related to our interests and of more recent

origins, comprises the unrivalled position of English as the most popular and most frequently studied second language, the increasingly multinational character of the academic discourse community, the unprecedented mobility of its members, the rise of English as a lingua franca in academic settings, the massive increase in the number of academic publications in English both inside and outside the Anglophone “centre” countries, the institutional policies encouraging publication in English in countries where English has no official status, and the development of electronic media which have made English language scholarly publications more accessible, offered access to electronic data-bases, and encouraged direct co-operation and exchange between individual scholars from different parts of the world (see, e.g., Swales 1990, 2004; Crystal, 2003; Mauranen 2007; Hyland 2009). All these factors are conspiring to prepare an international scholar to use EAL as a reliable and effective tool to exchange information, to set up hypotheses, to weigh arguments, to make his or her case, and to win the audience, in other words, as a tool to become a legitimate member of the international academic discourse community. So, in view of this growing exposure to and almost daily contact with academic English, are there any signals that the cultural differences, so abundantly documented by past research, may be levelling out in time? Is cultural background becoming just another individual, personal characteristic of the author, next to gender, age and status, that influences his or her linguistic and rhetorical choices, rather than a stamp borne by texts originating in the same part of the world? Can we thus speak of emerging aculturality, or cultural neutrality, of academic discourse? Although not directly addressing these questions, some of the contributions in this collection may suggest that they are worth asking.

3 Contributions to the Book

This volume comprises thirteen chapter arranged in four sections: Expert writers, Novice writers and readers, Conference participants, and Non-research academic genres. The first section opens with **Elizabeth Rowley-Jolivet** and **Shirley Carter-Thomas’s** analysis of citation practices of French scholars writing in English. Citation situates the reported research in the body of prior work done in the field and helps to construct a niche by indicating a gap in the existing knowledge. Appropriate use of attribution makes a text rhetorically effective and publishable; incompetent use may obscure the author’s point and render the text ineffective. The authors argue that while citation is naturally difficult for novice writers, citations in English as an additional language is not without problems for expert writers either and that the problems experienced by expert scholars are likely to be different from those encountered by their less experienced colleagues. The study is based on a three-part corpus of research articles in engineering, science and computational linguistics, composed of a subset of pre-publication draft paper in English by French writers, a comparable sub-corpus of published research articles by native English scholars, and a subset of research articles

published in French by French researchers. The authors focus on four citation-related structures: reporting verbs, *according to*-construction, *would*-conditional, and concessive *if*-clauses to show that effective use of attribution does pose problems to expert French writers in English and that these problems, some of which may lead to a lack of clarity and influence the strength of the argumentation, are not unrelated to the mother tongue and culture of the writer.

Oana Maria Carciu studies authorial references in a section-coded corpus of research articles in biomedical and health sciences. Interpreted as an act of populating a research niche, asserting one's identity and establishing a voice, author reference fulfills also a number of discourse roles. Both its realization—with related problems of frequency and distribution—and its interpersonal functioning have been shown to be subject to cultural variation, which may, on the one hand, present a challenge to scholars writing in L2 and, on the other, produce tensions related to the identity of the writer as a scholar coming from a particular cultural background and seeking own voice outside his or her language niche. The study is based on two subsets of biomedical research articles: written in English for international audience by Spanish scholars, and published in Spanish as L1 in national scientific journals. The author analyses first person plural references in terms of their frequency, distribution and discourse function to demonstrate that the author reference patterns are strongly related to the disciplinary conventions and the national language.

Grzegorz Kowalski undertakes an analysis of self-promotional work in a three-part corpus of linguistics research articles involving articles in L1 English, articles in L2 English by Polish scholars, and articles in L1 Polish. Self-promotion aims at creating a favourable representation of the research done, the text which reports on the research, and the writer, who competes for publication space with other scholars. The focus of the study is on two complementary self-promotional strategies: positive self-evaluation and negative other-evaluation, and in particular on the frequency, grammatical category, and dynamics of their markers across a 20 year time span. The author shows that while in the case of positive self-evaluation markers the language used seems to be the major source of existing differences, in the case of negative other-evaluation the variation correlates with the cultural background of the writers, irrespective of whether they write in L1 or L2. The results of the analysis also demonstrate that the language- and culture-dependent differences tend to level out in time, which may perhaps be symptomatic of a growing uniformity of disciplinary discourses.

The authors of the next paper, **Maizura Mohd Noor, Jean Mulder and Celia Thompson**, seek to develop a methodology for identification of devices for establishing writer-reader relationship which could effectively supplement the approaches based on predetermined lists of items. The authors draw attention to the role of context in establishing which linguistic items function as stance markers and present a list of criteria which may help identify the strategies writers adopt to hedge their claims and to mould the interaction with their readers. The paper shows that although computer assisted analyses of large text corpora can tackle amounts of data which are beyond the reach of manual processing and yield

valuable results, any study of multifunctional items, multi-word units or open-class elements, such as, e.g., stance markers, will benefit from instruments designed for context-driven interpretation and manual coding.

The first section closes with **Zifirdaus Adnan's** discussion of across discipline variation in Indonesian research articles with a view to identifying those rhetorical strategies which may act as obstacles if the writers decide to submit their manuscripts in English to international journals. The paper adds to the understanding of specific problems encountered by writing scholars whose local academic cultures rely on different sets of norms and values and give preference to a different rhetoric than the international academic community in which they seek space. The author focuses specifically on strategies of winning the audience, such as establishing the significance of the research on a global scale; taking critical, dialogic approach to the reviewed literature; occupying the niche by explicitly pointing out faults or omissions in previous studies; and highlighting the contribution the piece of research makes to the discipline as a whole. The study looks into research articles in two groups of disciplines: humanities and hard sciences. It shows that, on the whole, Indonesian writers in hard sciences, especially medical sciences, seem to be more aware than their colleagues of the need to convince the readers that their paper reports on an important piece of research which will fill in a gap in the existing knowledge and add significantly to the development of the field. The fact that scholars concerned with humanities use these strategies less frequently may indicate that they will find it more difficult to adjust to the norms of the "Center" and expectations of editors who represent international journals.

The focus of the next section is on novice writers and readers, and on specific problems which may arise as a result of two mutually reinforcing factors: lack of academic experience and lesser exposure to academic texts on the one hand, and their status as EAL users on the other. The section opens with **Ursula Wingate's** paper reporting on the results of a writing development project which aimed, among other things, at finding a balance between explicit, text-centered writing instruction and a less normative, practice-oriented cultivation of students' awareness of academic cultures to most effectively assist novice writers in the development of their academic literacy. The author evaluates three models of writing guidance: discipline-specific online writing instruction with minimal involvement on the part of the subject lecturer, literacy instruction embedded in the regular curriculum and involving individual lecturer-student sessions, and genre-focused writing instruction designed as a collaborative undertaking of the subject lecturer and the writing tutor. The results indicate that the writing instruction is more effective if it directly involves the subject lecturer. It is also shown that in the initial stages of writing development, genre- and text-based approaches correspond more closely to the students' needs, forming a basis on which a critical perspective on academic values and practices can further evolve.

Rhetorical choices made by authors of MA theses are further explored by **Erdem Akbas**, who looks into interactional metadiscourse in Discussion sections of diploma paper in the field of education. The starting point for the analysis is the observation that application of the interpersonal model of metadiscourse to

cross-linguistic and cross-cultural studies may shed some light on the differences in the rhetorical traditions and perhaps draw attention to potential difficulties that these differences may produce for international academic communication. The study of interpersonal resources in L2 writing may in turn show which L1 argumentation strategies and rhetorical patterns tend to be transferred to L2 and, conversely, which L2 norms and practices are more readily adopted by the writers. The study is based on a two-part corpus which includes texts written by Turkish students in their L1 and in L2 English. The author shows that in spite of the cultural differences which influence the argumentation strategies of Turkish students writing in English, the writers are aware of the need to engage the readers and establish an authorial voice when writing in L2.

In the last chapter in this section, **Isabel Herrando-Rodrigo** reports on the results of a survey conducted among Spanish medical doctors and students of medicine on the perceived effects of the uncontrolled dissemination of medical knowledge in English. The paper draws attention to two interrelated phenomena: the established status of English as an international language of science and the wide availability of information—both scientific and pseudoscientific—in the electronic media. This combination of factors exposes the lay public to data which they are often unable to critically evaluate in terms of relevance, reliability and completeness. The overestimation of popular, grossly simplified sources by non-specialist readers may have negative effects especially in the fields of knowledge which relate directly to human health and safety. This chapter demonstrates, however, that experienced practitioners and undergraduate students of medicine tend to perceive the potential overestimation of popularized medical information in English by patients in a very different way. While students seem to be more distrustful of this source of knowledge and more concerned about the possible negative effects the access to it may have on the treatment, practicing physicians often perceive it as a way of filling a niche left by the severely limited time they have for face-to-face contact with their patients.

Section 3 is centred upon conference genres: conference proposals, oral presentations, and discussion sessions that follow. The paper by **Teresa Morell** presents the results of a multimodal analysis of conference talks from the fields of social and technical sciences. The author focuses on the ways in which effective speakers of EAL integrate the various modes of communication, such as speech, body language, non-verbal material, and written text, to present their research results to international audiences. The analysis of data, supplemented by interviews with the presenters, shows that successful speakers consciously combine and sequence modes of communication to transmit their message and to compensate for possible limitations of their linguistic competence. Moreover, the results indicate that while presentations in soft sciences tend to be perceived as culture-specific genres, more closely connected to national cultures and their distinctive rhetorics, presentations in technical sciences tend to be viewed as discipline-defined and therefore showing less cultural variation. Still, the author observes that there is a reason to suppose that in time presentations in soft sciences may become disciplinary genres, with the cultural variation gradually disappearing.

A multimodal approach is also taken by **Francisco Javier Fernández Polo**, who looks into two strategies of establishing a rapport with the audience: self-mentions and humour, as used by native and non-native speakers presenting their research results in English at international applied linguistics conferences. If a conference presentation is viewed as an act of occupying a niche, both in terms of the findings and in terms of the time allotted for their presentation, then self-mentions and humour serve the purpose of legitimizing the seizure of research space, the former by increasing the credibility of the speaker and adding to the importance of the research, and the latter by mitigating potentially face threatening acts, eliciting solidarity, and compensating for occasional slips of the tongue or minor inconsistencies in the data. The analysis, based on transcriptions and audio and video recordings, shows that EAL speakers tend to use humour less frequently than their Anglophone colleagues. With regard to self-mentions, the author reports no significant numerical differences between the two groups of speakers, which may indicate that EAL scholars gradually adopt English language interpersonal strategies, although non-native speakers were found to prefer more formal verbs after the first person singular pronoun than native speakers.

In the next chapter, **Hacer Hande Uysal** discusses indirectness and hedging devices in conference proposals submitted in English by Indian, Turkish, Japanese, and Anglo-American scholars. Conference proposals can be viewed as on-the-record claims to a niche: their communicative function is to convince the referee to accept the paper proposal as a legitimate contribution to knowledge. Thus, any cultural difference in communicative strategies or persuasive devices used by EAL writers who submit their proposals to international conference committees is a factor which may affect the chances of the proposal being accepted. The author demonstrates that there are well-marked differences in the use of indirectness and hedging markers both between native speakers and EAL speakers and within the latter group: between non-native speakers coming from various cultural backgrounds. In particular, the results indicate that in conference proposals Japanese and Turkish scholars rely to a greater extent on indirectness and hedging than their Indian colleagues.

The last and shortest section of this volume is devoted to non-research academic genres. **Adam Wojtaszek** studies linguistic features of electronic mails—conference, current research or publication-related—exchanged by scholars affiliated at different academic institutions around the world and relying on English as their lingua franca. The principal focus of the analysis is on the ways the interactants encode their relative status and mould the social distance to the addressee, especially by means of addresative forms and politeness formulae. The author also makes an attempt at identifying those features of the interaction between EAL users which stand in contrast to the patterns known from native-speaker exchanges. The discussion calls attention to the cultural colouring the world Englishes receive in multilingual and multicultural contexts, especially in genres whose macrostructure, stylistics and specific linguistic realisations are not fixed but subject to negotiation and redefinition.

In the last chapter, **Jolanta Łacka-Badura** investigates English-language academic job postings placed on-line by higher education institutions around the world with a view to establishing whether this genre can be regarded as acultural. The analysis is based on a two-part corpus of 140 vacancy announcements issued by universities and colleges located in Anglophone countries and by institutions operating in non-Anglophone contexts. The author focuses on such features as text statistics, move organization, core vocabulary, and selected markers of formality and neutrality. The obtained results indicate that although the texts in both batches share a number of important characteristics, there are still well marked differences in the content of some of the moves, with non-Anglophone institutions drawing the reader's attention to different assets and promising potential candidates different benefits than their Anglophone counterparts.

The above sketchy outline of the contents of this volume is only a subjective and fragmentary reading of the complex pattern of results on which the contributors to this collection report. Still, while the readers will construct their own interpretations and redefine the importance of the findings relative to their current research interests, preferred methodologies, and academic or professional background, we believe that all the texts included here share an important characteristic: a focus on the place of culture in international scholarly communication in EAL and in particular on its role in the process of occupying and moving between research niches. We hope that this volume may add to our understanding of the practices of international academic community, signal possible tendencies in their evolution, and show some directions for future research in the area of academic discourse.

References

- Ädel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Adnan, Z. (2008). Discourse structure of Indonesian research article introductions in selected hard sciences. In S. Burgess & P. Martín-Martín (Eds.), *English as an additional language in research publication and communication* (pp. 39–63). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ahmad, U. K. (1997). Research article introductions in Malay: Rhetoric in an emerging research community. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 273–303). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aijmer, K., & Stenström, A.-B. (Eds.). (2004). *Discourse patterns in spoken and written corpora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aranha, S. (2009). The development of a genre-based writing course for graduate students in two fields. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds.), *Genre in a changing world* (pp. 465–482). West Lafayette: Parlor and Fort Collins: The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Bazerman, C. (2004). Speech acts, genres, and activity systems: How texts organize activity and people. In C. Bazerman, & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it. An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 309–339). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Belcher, D. D. (2009). How research space is created in a diverse research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 221–234.
- Belcher, D., & Braine, G. (1995). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre. Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2001). Analysing genre: Some conceptual issues. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic writing in context: Implications and applications*. Papers in honour of Tony Dudley-Evans (pp. 79–92). Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English. A study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2009). *Writing scientific research articles: Strategy and steps*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Clyne, M. (1987a). Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 211–247.
- Clyne, M. (1987b). Discourse structures and discourse expectations: Implications for Anglo-German academic communication in English. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 73–83). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Clyne, M. (1994). *Inter-cultural communication at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Čmejrková, S. (1996). Academic writing in Czech and English. In E. Ventola & A. Mauranen (Eds.), *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 137–152). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Čmejrková, S., & Daneš, F. (1997). Academic writing and cultural identity: The case of Czech academic writing. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 41–61). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U., & Kaplan, R. B. (Eds.). (1987). *Reading*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, W. (Eds.). (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Crawford Camiciottoli, B. (2007). *The language of business studies lectures: A corpus-assisted analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Crystal, D. (2003 [1997]). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1807–1825.
- Dewey, M., & Jenkins, J. (2010). English as a lingua franca in the global context: Interconnectedness, variation and change. In M. Saxena & T. Omoniyi (Eds.), *Contending with globalization in World Englishes* (pp. 72–92). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1995). Common-core and specific approaches to the teaching of academic writing. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 293–312). Norwood: Ablex.
- Duszak, A. (1994). Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 291–313.
- ElMalik, A. T., & Nesi, H. (2008). Publishing research in a second language: The case of Sudanese contributors to international medical journals. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 87–96.
- Fløttum, K., Dahl, T., & Kinn, T. (2006). *Academic voices: Across languages and disciplines*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Golebiowski, Z. (1999). Application of Swales' model in the analysis of research papers by Polish authors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 231–247.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London: Continuum.
- Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (Eds.). (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1–20.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1987). Cultural thought patterns revisited. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 9–21). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Kachru, Y. (1987). Cross-cultural texts, discourse strategies and discourse interpretation. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 87–100). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Lorés, R. (2004). On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organisation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 280–302.
- Lorés-Sanz, R. (2009). Different worlds, different audiences: A contrastive analysis of research article abstracts. In E. Suomela-Salmi & F. Dervin (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspectives on academic discourse* (pp. 187–197). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martín-Martín, P. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 25–43.
- Martín-Martín, P., & Burgess, S. (2004). The rhetorical management of academic criticism in research article abstracts. *Text*, 24(2), 171–195.
- Mauranen, A. (1993a). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3–22.
- Mauranen, A. (1993b). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric: A textlinguistic study*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Mauranen, A. (2007). Hybrid voices: English as the lingua franca of academics. In K. Fløttum (Ed.), *Language and discipline perspectives on academic discourse* (pp. 243–259). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Melander, B., Swales, J. M., & Fredrickson, K. M. (1997). Journal abstracts from three academic fields in the United States and Sweden: National or disciplinary proclivities? In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 251–272). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mur Dueñas, P. (2008). Analysing engagement markers cross-culturally: The case of English and Spanish business management research articles. In S. Burgess & P. Martín-Martín (Eds.), *English as an additional language in research publication and communication* (pp. 197–213). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Pérez-Llantada, C. (2010). The ‘dialectics of change’ as a facet of globalisation: Epistemic modality in academic writing. In M. F. Ruiz-Garrido, J. C. Palmer-Silveira, & I. Fortanet-Gómez (Eds.), *English for Professional and Academic Purposes* (pp. 25–41). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21, 1–17.
- Sharifian, F. (2009). English as an International Language: An overview. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an International Language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 1–18). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Shaw, Ph. (2003). Evaluation and promotion across languages. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 343–357.
- Suomela-Salmi, E., & Dervin, F. (Eds.). (2009). *Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspectives on academic discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Swales, J. M. (1981). *Aspects of article introduction*. Birmingham, UK: The University of Aston.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students. A course for nonnative speakers of English*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Thompson, P. (2009). Literature reviews in applied PhD theses: Evidence and problems. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings* (pp. 50–67). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Vassileva, I. (1997). Hedging in English and Bulgarian academic writing. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 203–221). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ventola, E., & Mauranen, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vold, E. T. (2006). Epistemic modality markers in research articles: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 61–87.
- Xu, G-Zh. (1987). Code and transmission in cross-cultural discourse: A study of some samples from Chinese and English. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 66–72). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2004). Research articles in applied linguistics: Structures from a functional perspective. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 264–279.
- Zhu, Y. (2005). *Written communication across cultures: A sociocognitive perspective on business genres*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.