

**Elena Sheldon.** *Knowledge construction in academia: A challenge for multilingual scholars* [Intercultural Studies and Foreign Language Learning, 19]. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2018. 243 pp. €62.30 £ 42.00 US\$ 63.95 ISBN 978-1-78874-266-5 <https://doi.org/10.3726/b13213>

**Reviewed by Pedro Martín** (University of La Laguna)

This book comprehensibly explores the impact of English, as the main international language of research publication, on the production of academic knowledge worldwide and the implications for users of English as an additional language.

Drawing on the frameworks of genre analysis (Swales, 2004), appraisal theory (Martin & White, 2005), and interview-based textography, the author analyses the Introduction and Discussion/Conclusion sections of research articles (RAs) in English and Spanish in the disciplines of applied linguistics and education, produced by three groups of writers: English L1, Spanish L1 and English L2.

In line with the findings of previous intercultural research, the author's results confirm the influence of the first language on the preference for specific academic practices and the importance of understanding rhetorical variation across cultures as a way of adapting efficiently to the conventions expected by the (national and) international academic community in order to get acceptance from peer review gatekeepers. A main contribution to this area of research is the interesting finding which shows that in contemporary academic discourse there is a growing tendency to use interdiscursive hybridity features in English L2 which seem to be accepted by international gatekeepers, since the RAs in Sheldon's corpus were finally published in international indexed journals. This indicates that the current tendency points to greater flexibility and tolerance for discourse patterns which do not adhere completely to the standard Anglophone rhetorical practices.

The volume is divided into eight chapters, including an extended section of updated references, appendices with the analyses of sample texts and an index with the most relevant terms referred to in the main sections of the book.

In Chapter 1, the author starts by contextualizing the present situation in which multilingual scholars are under an increasing pressure to publish in indexed English-language journals if they pursue academic promotion and international recognition. She then continues posing a series of research questions regarding this issue, i.e. how multilingual scholars' practices accommodate global demands in academia, the extent to which English as L2 is influenced by L1 national writing culture, and the degree of acceptance on the part of literacy brokers of discourse

features which do not adhere to Anglophone rhetorical conventions. From a critical perspective, the author also depicts the unfair and contradictory policy of national research evaluation bodies that give more value to publications in high-impact journals in English and, at the same time, do not offer the necessary professional training and economic support to incentivize publications in this language.

In Chapter 2, the author reviews the two schools of genre analysis more suitable to the study and teaching of academic genres, i.e. ESP and SFL. She presents the most relevant models for the move analysis of the Introduction and the Discussion/Conclusion sections of a RA drawn from previous research on English academic texts and intercultural studies. Additionally, the author discusses the concept of genre and how this is shaped by the particular configuration of the various discourse communities across sub-cultures and disciplines.

Chapter 3 deals with the main approaches to evaluative stance in academic discourse. These are discussed from three perspectives: aspects of modality (hedges, boosters and epistemic modalities), self-representation (first person pronouns) and appraisal theory (engagement resources). This dimension of evaluative stance is conceived by the author as complementary to move analysis as it allows the exploration of the interpersonal relationships between writers and readers in RAs across languages.

Chapter 4 focuses on the comparative move analysis of the Introduction section of the texts selected. Perhaps, at this point, it could have been useful to have included a prior methodology chapter describing the procedure followed for the compilation of the corpus, the background of the writers or the criteria for the identification of moves. Although this information is succinctly provided in a subsection of the Introduction chapter and in embedded subsections in this and subsequent chapters, I feel this should be given more prominence in a stand-alone chapter as a way of orienting readers more easily so as to facilitate replication in further studies. As regards the results obtained, the author's findings reveal not only intercultural variation in the frequency of occurrence of steps in Move 1 but also instances of how L1 rhetorical patterns are transferred into the L2. An important contribution at this level of steps in Move 1 is that the author refines Swales' CARS model by adding eight new subcategories under step 1. A surprising finding, however, at the level of Move 2 (a strategy to justify one's research), is that English L2 writers use this move less frequently than their Spanish L1 counterparts, despite the fact that the former group is more familiarized with the Anglophone rhetorical conventions for which it is an obligatory move in Introductions. It might be the case that the overall results would be different had the author extended the number of texts (18) examined; therefore, I recommend the interpretation of these outcomes with caution until they can be substantiated in further research. The analyses of the steps in Move 3 and the sequences of cyclical

patterns of all three moves, furthermore, revealed interesting instances of hybridity in the texts produced by both Spanish L1 and English L2 writers.

Likewise, in Chapter 5, the author conducts a comparative move analysis of the other most rhetorically complex section of RAs, i.e. the Discussion/Conclusion section, revealing how English L2 writers are positioned between the two L1 groups, and offering convincing explanations for the variation encountered both in terms of move structure and recurrence of cyclical patterns.

Chapter 6 adds a new dimension to this study by examining the texts from a semantic perspective which looks into the interpersonal aspect of research writing, drawing on the engagement system of appraisal theory. The analysis of three sample texts, each representative of each group of writers, yielded a variety of evaluative choices which the author appropriately interprets in terms of the wider (international) or smaller (national) audience the writers are addressing.

Chapter 7 offers a third complementary approach to this study based on a series of interviews with 14 applied linguistics scholars from various Spanish higher education institutions with the aim of gaining knowledge of their discourse practices, mainly their perceptions of the most troublesome aspects of RA writing in English. The analysis to the responses corroborates the situation portrayed in previous studies (e.g. Burgess, Gea-Valor, Moreno & Rey-Rocha, 2014; Martín, Rey-Rocha, Burgess & Moreno, 2014) that writing in English represents an additional burden to non-English background scholars mainly in terms of time and effort invested, although most of them see no other alternative if they seek to obtain recognition. At this point, the author very aptly reflects on the negative consequences caused by linguistic disadvantage and calls for specific English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) training programmes and in-house language brokering assistance in their institutions to facilitate publication in English.

In the final chapter, the author critically highlights further the challenges facing multilingual scholars when publishing in English, especially in developing countries with scarce resources, such as access to the internet, in which national government policies persist in giving more credits to indexed journals in English. These policies are often instigated without providing sufficient funding for the implementation of specialized courses in ERPP both for students in higher education and teaching/research staff, all of which creates unfair inequalities around the globe. In the same vein, the author urges indexed journals to collaborate by providing these disadvantaged researchers with advice and editing support. She also discusses alternative measures that can be implemented to diminish the dominance of English, such as critical-pragmatic approaches to the teaching of ERPP alongside assistance for national journals to upgrade their status so that researchers feel that publishing in their national languages is a viable option.

As a whole, the book is of great interest as it brings to the fore the present situation of multilingual scholars who are increasingly accommodating their national rhetorical practices to English academic discourse, although, as attested by the author, the emergence and acceptance of hybrid discourse is also challenging the supremacy of Anglophone rhetorical practices in the globalized context of academia. This book is also very valuable for its pedagogical implications, as the author primarily seeks to assist multilingual scholars, particularly in Spanish-speaking countries, in the arduous task involved in the writing of a RA in English as an additional language. I recommend this book to ERPP teachers, literacy brokers and researchers, and I encourage them to extend this comparative study to other languages and to other under-researched disciplines more closely related to the Humanities in which there still seems to be more resistance to the hegemony of English as the global language of academic output.

## References

- Burgess, S., Gea-Valor, M. L., Moreno, A. I., & Rey-Rocha, J. (2014). Affordances and constraints on research publication: A comparative study of the language choices of Spanish historians and psychologists. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14, 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2014.01.001>
- Martin, J., & White, P. (2005). *Appraisal in English: The language of evaluation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511910>
- Martín, P., Rey-Rocha, J., Burgess, S., & Moreno, A. I. (2014). Publishing research in English-language journals: Attitudes, strategies and difficulties of multilingual scholars of medicine. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 16, 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2014.08.001>
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827>

## Address for correspondence

Pedro Martín  
University of La Laguna  
Spain  
[pamartin@ull.edu.es](mailto:pamartin@ull.edu.es)