

BOOK REVIEW



PUBLISHING RESEARCH IN ENGLISH: A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Margaret Cargill and Sally Burgess (Eds). PUBLISHING RESEARCH IN ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE: PRACTICES, PATHWAYS AND POTENTIALS (2017), Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press. 278 pp., ISBN: 978-1-925261-51-6 (PBK), 978-1-925261-52-3 (Free Ebook).

260

Various issues related to the dominant position of English as the language of scientific communication have inspired an impressive body of work in the past decades. Numerous studies address the needs of multilingual researchers from a variety of perspectives, while others seek to assist and train them for efficient publishing strategies (e.g. Cargill & O'Connor, 2009; Swales & Feak, 2012). On the other hand, a growing number of translators, editors, publication coaches and “authors’ editors” or “academic literacy brokers” are working to help second language (L2) and novice writers to publish their work. At the same time, academic supervisors often assume the role of editors for their postgraduate students in order to help them navigate through the process of creation of an academic text. Linguistic support may take many forms: for some it is a research question, for others, a profession, or part of their job, as in the case of academic supervisors. All these facets of research publication have been explored and discussed in a large number of studies, but it is not common to have all these different approaches and diverse perspectives under one cover. *Publishing Research in English as an Additional Language* fills this gap by bringing together voices from different spheres of research publication and different academic disciplines.

This book is a successful attempt to establish a dialogue between theory and practice of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). It also contains valuable chapters exploring the adaptation of English as an Additional Language (EAL) practices to local needs and its repercussions in non-English-medium communities. The volume is a result of an encounter between two groups which can be conditionally divided into theorists and practitioners. The division is only conditional because many of the contributors perform both roles. They are participants of PRISEAL (Publishing and Presenting Research Internationally: Issues for Speakers of English as an Additional Language) and MET (Mediterranean Editors and Translators) joint conference held in Coimbra in 2015.

The book contains twelve chapters, a foreword, an introduction, and an afterword. The foreword by Curry and Lillis is an accurate description of many of the current issues in EAL, from the “pressure to publish” mantra to pedagogical approaches, support programmes and the policies of supporting (or supervision) of multilingual writers. The afterword by L. Anthony offers reflections and future directions in English for Research and Publication Purposes (ERPP).

The book covers three dimensions of ERPP as described by the editors in the introduction: multilingual authors (including their cultures, institutional, personal and professional goals, etc.), publishable texts (exploring such aspects as pedagogy, brokering and editing), and journal practices (addressing the issues of standardisation, standards and access). By bringing together professionals from these three broad fields, the book sets the bases for exploring the relationship between these clusters.

This relationship is addressed explicitly in the first chapter of the book. Sally Burgess undertakes an analysis of a small group of Spanish researchers’ life-history interviews regarding current academic assessment policies in Spain. The chapter explores the attitudes and feelings of humanities scholars with regard to institutional requirements on publishing and offers important insights on the post-Bologna Accord academe through several aspects of research publication, such as the lack of equity for different areas, the difference of standards, the relevance of requirements, working methods, conflict of interests, multiple authorship, the attitude towards literacy brokers, etc. The study shows that none of the interviewed scholars, however resentful of “the system”, is prepared to challenge the policies, opting instead for adapting and “learning how to work the system” (p. 28). “Working the system” is often tackled in research writing courses and trainings through teaching the generic and discourse conventions and drawing the attention of novice researchers to the publication requirements of their target journals. Many of the contributions to this volume adopt an explicit pedagogic focus to tackle this issue.

Thus, in Chapter 2, Kate Cadman analyses the pedagogical dimension of ERPP raising such issues as the attitude of a first language EAP instructor towards the dominant role of English, the criteria for selecting the content and materials, focus on content versus focus on language, etc. in a multicultural research writing

classroom. Cadman separates the personae of the instructor as a person with certain beliefs from the instructor as an unbiased evaluator and knowledge facilitator who shares her knowledge of the discipline regardless of whether she agrees with them or not. A helpful tool for outlining the generic and discipline-specific requirements and introducing rigour in social sciences is her Research Matrix designed to help novice and L2 researchers to design and produce a rigorous study.

It is not always the case that novice multilingual authors are able to take specialised research writing courses. Sometimes academic supervisors assume the role of informal research writing instructors, editors or even translators. In Chapter 3 Susan M. DiGiacomo describes a case study of a novice L2 researcher whose doctoral thesis she co-supervised, thus assuming a triple role of thesis adviser, translator and editor. Di Giacomo's experience with this L2 researcher is described from the perspective of the editor witnessing the evolution of a novice author whose command of academic English becomes more and more robust thus decreasing the need for intervention on behalf of the supervisor. The author emphasises the "need for start-to-finish involvement in the thesis writing process by an academic adviser from the student's own discipline or a related discipline who is also a language professional, rather than the use of end-stage translation or 'proofreading' services" (p. 68).

Oliver Shaw and Sabrina Voss make an interesting contribution in Chapter 4. They address the publishing dimension by analysing the differences between comments on Research Articles (RAs) made by an in-house versus freelance editor. The authors unveil a range of important differences in style and content of the comments to RAs submitted for publication: despite the fact that both are editors, the in-house editor makes much more extensive use of the margin comments thus deferring the responsibility to the author, while the freelance editor intervenes in the original text more frequently, thereby assuming the responsibility and relieving the author from extra work, at the same time sparing a number of iterations. Both DiGiacomo's and Shaw and Voss's chapters note that the distinction between study design and language is not always clear – which can make it difficult to determine whether it is the responsibility of the author or the editor to address certain issues.

A useful tool for separating these two aspects of publishable texts is suggested in Chapter 5 by John Linnegar who applies self-directed learning to teach the CCC model (Correspondence, Consistency, Correctness) for editing texts. The chapter reports the results of a study conducted in the frames of an editing course taught to English as a foreign/second language learners. The model turns out quite successful for instructing to-be editors to work consistently and systematically through any given text, as well as an effective tool for (self-)editing. It also offers a wide range of pedagogic possibilities, particularly for self-directed and blended learning settings.

In Chapter 6, Ana Bocanegra-Valle provides an engaging discussion of credibility and trustworthiness criteria for open access journals in the humanities. Open Access journals have emerged relatively recently, and it is often difficult to establish their trustworthiness through the Impact Factor, but there exist robust and valid criteria for assessing and increasing their credibility. The chapter can be a helpful guide for editors and publishers seeking to raise the ranking of their journals and attract relevant submissions. It is also a useful resource for academics supporting the Open Access movement and looking for trustworthy journals to publish their work.

Next, Pedro Martín and Isabel K. León Pérez (Chapter 7) address publishable texts by conducting a genre analysis of RAs on immunology and allergy published in different journals to show that even within the same subdiscipline the rhetorical structure and promotional strategies employed in RAs may differ depending on the expertise of the intended readership, journal scope and the prevalent rhetorical practices of the discourse community. The chapter offers important pedagogical implications.

Another pedagogically-oriented contribution is Chapter 8 by Margaret Cargill, Patrick O'Connor, Riska Raffiudin, Nampiah Sukarno, Berry Juliandi and Iman Rusmana, who present the outcomes of a training intervention organised for scientists from Indonesia. The authors emphasise the importance of systematised ERPP trainings for multilingual novice researchers reporting measurable outcomes in the form of published RAs.

Research supervision seems necessary in many contexts, and it may manifest itself in a variety of styles and formats across national and academic cultures. A case in point is chapter 9. Yongyan Li explores the research supervisor's rhetorical actions in the context of a major Chinese hospital and the "neighboring activity systems" (p. 189) with which it interacts. The findings of this study point to the importance of cultural and contextual aspects of research supervision.

Karen Bennett adopts a culture-based approach to academic plagiarism and explores it from a geopolitical perspective. In Chapter 10 the author argues that attitudes towards plagiarism vary across cultures: in *Gemeinschaft* cultures knowledge is perceived as belonging to society and not to the individuals who create it. Thus certain academic behaviours of multilingual researchers can be explained and addressed through the cultural dimension.

Another culture-based study is Chapter 11, in which Thuc Anh Xuan and Kate Cadman study ERPP instruction in Vietnam. These authors show that Western pedagogical methods and attitudes, such as transformational teaching and enhancing student autonomy, may have different implications across cultures and argue that imposing new methods from the start may not be the most efficient way. Rather, it might be wiser to adapt the new approaches rendering them "glocal" instead of "global" and thus helping both teachers and students to find their own, perhaps not very orthodox, ways of enhancing student autonomy and critical thinking.

The volume concludes with a hilarious piece by John M. Swales who, somewhat light-heartedly, raises the issue of flouting the conventions in academic discourse. Examples cited by Swales include a non-existent author of a published research article, double-edged acknowledgment, highly creative use of endnotes, presenting academic texts as a narrative, an allegory or a stylised story, etc. Swales explicitly calls for “experimentation in both style and substance” (p. 251) in academic discourse, providing an excellent example of experimentation in academic discourse without loosening the rigour and trustworthiness of the study.

The book is an excellent resource for EAP/ESP/EAL practitioners and researchers, editors, publishers, literacy brokers, academic writing coaches, and applied linguists. It offers insights into the current developments and is likely to help generate ideas for future work. Interestingly enough, the digital edition is freely available for download from the publishers’ website – yet another considerable asset of this valuable resource.

[Review submitted 23 Sep 2018]
 [Revised version received 19 Nov 2018]
 [Accepted for publication 22 Nov 2018]

Reviewed by **DIANA BALASANYAN**
 Yerevan Haybusak University
 Armenia
 dianabalasanyan@gmail.com

264

References

- Cargill, M., & O’Connor, P. (2009). *Writing scientific research articles: Strategy and steps*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.