Global perspectives on linguacultural variation in academic publishing

Diane Belcher & Hae Sung Yang
Georgia State University

This primarily interview-based study explores the perspectives of published applied linguists around the world on what has facilitated their success in reaching multiple readerships. The focus, more specifically, is on scholars in non-English-dominant settings, a number of whom have made a commitment to both inter- and intranational academic publication, and their perceptions of intercultural rhetoric issues salient in various linguacultural contexts. The findings indicated that such scholars were divided in their views on whether or not there are considerable differences in the rhetorical expectations of international Anglophone and more region-specific, or intranational, journal audiences. What this study's participants shared was an appreciation of the complexities of authorial cross-contextual negotiation of multiple research worlds, only some of which are Anglophone.

Keywords: bilingual publishing, dual publication agendas, intercultural rhetoric, linguacultural variation

1. Introduction

Much attention has been given to the challenges that scholars who are plurilingual English-as-an-additional-language (EAL) writers face, especially when based in non-English-dominant settings and attempting to join global, overwhelmingly Anglophone, disciplinary conversations. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that scholars eager to join such conversations have little to no interest in also publishing in contexts other than those dominated by English, in other words, that they do not wish to have multiple, often bilingual, publication agendas. The reasons for publishing internationally, often code for in English (Lillis & Curry, 2010), may seem self-evident – for visibility in high-profile venues, in turn leading to graduate degrees, competitive employment, tenure and promotion, and financial bonuses (Lee & Lee, 2013). The reasons for maintaining more

https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.19009.bel
Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes 1:1 (2020), pp. 28–50. issn 2590-0994 | e-issn 2590-1001

than an "international" publication agenda, however, may be much more varied and less immediately obvious, but such agendas are now gaining more attention (see Kuteeva and Mauranen's special issue of the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* on "Writing for publication in multilingual contexts," 2014). It should be noted, though, that researchers such as Casanave (1998) began calling attention to "the bilingual balancing act" more than 20 years ago. The Japanese academic community, as Casanave pointed out, valued and expected publication in Japanese. Despite the efforts of Casanave and others (e.g., Shi, 2002), it remains the case that far more attention has been given to the *Tyrannosaurus rex* of English (Swales, 1997), that is, the dominance of English in the research world (Flowerdew, 2013), than to publishing in other languages or to striving for both international and more local publication. This study aims to contribute to our limited knowledge of the challenges authors contend with when attempting to address linguaculturally-differing audiences,[1] that is, including but not limited to an ostensibly international Anglophone readership.

2. Prior research

The last several decades have seen a flurry of research interest in the challenges of academic publishing in an increasingly English-only international forum. The overriding assumption has been that "periphery" (from an Anglocentric perspective)[2] EAL scholars are under immense pressure to publish in a context and language that may disadvantage them. Although the multitude of findings in this research can be categorized as focusing on discursive and non-discursive factors affecting publication, this review will focus primarily on discursive issues. What will become clear as we review the relevant research is that many such issues are not unique to those hoping to publish in English.

Discursive factors, both rhetorical and linguistic, can pose a formidable challenge for periphery scholars. As Swales (1990) discovered in his genre analysis of Anglophone research articles (RAs) across the disciplines, the "moves," or rhetorical strategies, of RA introductions, especially identifying and occupying a research gap, tend to be quite predictable and play a crucial role in novelty and significance claims. Such "niche establishment" (Swales, 2004, p. 116), how-

1. We use the term *linguaculture* to refer to the interface between language and culture, or the "cultural dimensions of language" (Risager, 2012).

2. We will continue to use the term *periphery* throughout this article because of the ongoing privilege of the "center" and its peripheralizing effect on those outside the Anglophone "inner circle" (Kachru, 1992).

ever, may be far from universally valued. As Hirano (2009), for example, found, Brazilian scholars publishing in Portuguese can be reluctant to explicitly identify a gap in colleagues' research. Others have pointed out that among world Englishes, rhetorical and stylistic preferences can vary greatly too (Kachru, 1992).

Taking a more bottom-up view of discourse, at the sentence and phrase levels, a number of studies point to EAL scholars feeling disadvantaged by their self-perceived limited command of a prestige variety of English (see Flowerdew, 2013). Flowerdew (2008) refers to EAL scholars as, in effect, "stigmatized" by language use. Hyland (2016), on the other hand, has argued against the "myth of linguistic injustice," noting that academic writing is no one's native language and that the bar for publication is high for all scholars (in response, see Flowerdew, 2019). Recent studies focused on corpora of published EAL research writing suggest increasing acceptance of English as a lingua franca (ELF), or "non-canonical" style (Rozycki & Johnson, 2013), both in terms of lexicogrammar and rhetoric. Farley (2018) found in one applied science, animal husbandry, that "Western style," for example, prestige variety language use and justifying arguments, including niche establishment, was far less important for Indonesian scholars' publication success in Anglophone journals than such matters as "clarity of meaning" and "quality of explanations" (2018, p. 69).

Findings such as Farley's and Rozycki and Johnson's about increasing ELF acceptance would come as no great surprise to theorists of intercultural rhetoric (formerly contrastive rhetoric), who point to the complexity and dynamism of the practices of any discourse community, large or small (Connor, 2011). No longer is it assumed as it once was by early proponents of contrastive rhetoric that rhetorical preferences are so monolithically culturally determined and static as to be empirically identifiable with some certainty (Belcher, 2014), as Hinds (1987) asserted in labeling Japanese rhetoric reader-responsible. That a community's discursive practices vary and evolve may be good news for authors, offering room for stylistic choice and innovation (Tardy, 2016). Yet determining the boundaries of discursive acceptability can also be a high-stakes guessing game that seems too risky to play other than very conservatively (Belcher, 2009; on the power of journal gatekeepers, see Flowerdew, 2019).

Nondiscursive factors – material, financial, and social – challenging "off-network" EAL scholars (Swales, 2004, p. 43) can easily impact discursive issues. Often taken-for-granted material resources, such as Internet (hence online journal) access, are far from available or affordable to all, making joining the ongoing conversation in a field challenging (Canagarajah, 2002). Though there may be considerable financial incentives to publishing in English, there are also financial disincentives, such as the need to maintain a heavy teaching load for a livable income, inevitably affecting time available to do and write up research.

There also may be no discretionary time to invest in establishing the network of fellow scholars that research writers need for intellectual and motivational support (Lillis & Curry, 2010).

Publishing locally and in one's own mother tongue might seem to circumvent many of the challenges just delineated. One would less likely be subject to complaints of rhetorical or linguistic inadequacy, and a potentially supportive local network could be within reach. However, for scholars educated abroad in English, returning home and attempting to publish in their mother tongues for the first time can pose significant discursive and nondiscursive challenges (Casanave, 1998; Shi, 2003). Returning scholars may lack both the professional lexicon and rhetorical strategies (Shi) preferred in their mother tongue and domestic academic cultures, as well as home-country social networks (Casanave). Even for those not educated abroad, there can be significant challenges, especially if lacking well-connected senior scholar mentors (Casanave). Nevertheless, there can be striking advantages to writing in one's mother tongue too. Gentil (Gentil & Séror, 2014) has noted of his own writing that it has taken "increasing ease with English [as an additional language] over time" to make composing in it feel "less cumbersome" (p. 22).

Whether home language publication, however, is encouraged by national language policies and research assessment schemes can vary greatly from place to place. Lee and Lee (2013) observe that in South Korea, a scholar may be rewarded the equivalent of USD $ 423 for publishing in a Korean journal but USD $ 17,000 for publishing in a very high profile "international" science journal. In Scandinavian countries, on the other hand, as McGrath (2014) has noted, the Nordic Language Policy promotes parallel language use, explicitly valuing all languages equally and rewarding the sharing of research results in Nordic languages. What McGrath also found, though, was that in actual practice Swedish faculty may strategically choose English for "knowledge dissemination to transnational academic communities" and Swedish for domestic "practitioner-oriented" outreach (p. 15).

Given the complexities of publishing in either English as an additional language or in a home language context, one might assume that a multi-language publication agenda would be doubly challenging and, for career advancement purposes, even inadvisable. Yet, a number of scholars make such commitments (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010). Among these, Gentil and Séror (2014) stand out for the duration and success of their bilingual publication commitment and willingness to share coping strategies enabling such a commitment. That even scholars in an officially bilingual nation such as Canada, where Gentil and Séror are based, face challenges in sustaining a bilingual publication agenda speaks to the steepness of potential obstacles for others wishing to establish such an agenda. In countries where the distance between English and the home linguaculture may be far greater than that between Canadian French and English, the challenges may be even more daunting. The current study, as briefly noted earlier, explores this topic, namely, what the writing-for-publication challenges, especially from a rhetorical perspective, may be, as seen from the vantage point of successfully published scholars in non-English dominant settings around the globe, many of whom are maintaining dual publication agendas.

More specifically, the perceived gap that the current study attempts to address includes the following: Whereas most English for research publication purposes (ERPP) studies have tended to focus on a specific geopolitical area, e.g., in Asia (Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Lee & Lee, 2013); Europe (Bennett, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010), or Latin America (Englander & Corcoran, 2019), this study, instead, seeks a more global, transcontinental perspective. Many applied linguistics studies on the challenges of academic publishing have focused on EAL speakers, with the assumption that mother tongue speakers of English more easily navigate international publishing, but this study does not assume such ease. Also, in contrast to the major thrust of ERPP, this study's purview is not exclusively on publishing in English. In short, this study includes both EAL and mother tongue English-speaking periphery scholars in Asia and Europe who may seek publication both internationally and intranationally, focusing especially on discursive issues they perceive as salient in such efforts. Again, as we have seen in our review of prior literature, although the majority of research on writing for publication purposes focuses on the challenges of writing to publish in English, there is evidence that publishing in other languages may also prove quite challenging in many respects, including discursively. In this study we explore the discursive challenges of cross-linguacultural research writing.

3. The current study

Reported here is the interview phase of what began as a larger scale survey/interview study of periphery scholars who had successfully navigated international publication. The initial study sought an emic perspective on getting published from successful authors around the world. The participants originally selected were periphery-situated applied linguists, by training likely adept at identifying discursive issues, who had succeeded in publishing either in *English for Specific Purposes: An International Research Journal* (*ESPj*) or *TESOL Quarterly* (*TQ*). Having long made a concerted effort to be internationally inclusive, these journals were seen as prime places to find published periphery scholars. Past editors of *ESPj* and *TQ*, namely, for the former, co-editors Ann Johns and John Swales, and the latter, Suresh Canagarajah, were quite public in their aims to improve the balance of representation in their journals, as evident in their editorials and their own research interest in ERPP (e.g., Canagarajah, 2002; see also Canagarajah's blog, TQ Editor's Ponderings: <http://www.personal.psu.edu/asc16/blogs/TQeditor/> 2007–2010; Swales, 1997, 2004).

For the initial survey phase, the research question was: What helps and hinders publication in international (English-language) journals? In other words, possible linguacultural variation was not initially a foregrounded issue. The survey research question was a pre-data-collection guiding question. In contrast, the interview research question, to be discussed below, emerged as data was collected.

To briefly recap the survey phase of the study (Belcher & Hirvela, 2014), initially, 65 authors based in non-English-dominant countries who had published in either *ESPj* or *TQ* were invited to participate in an online survey. Of those invited, 34 agreed to participate and were sent a survey link, and 19 responded to the survey. In other words, 29% of those initially contacted actually took the survey. With such a limited sample, no statistical analysis was warranted, and the survey results can only be seen as suggestive.

For the survey, there were four multiple-choice questions focused on what hinders or helps publication before and after submission to a journal. For *What hinders publication before submission to a journal?* the most frequent choice by far (89% of respondents) was limited time for research and writing. For the *What hinders publication after submission?* question, conflicting reviewer feedback was seen by all respondents (100%) as a problem, Regarding what helps publication before submission, the most often-chosen answer was familiarity with journal expectations (89%). Post-submission help that respondents saw as most helpful was reviewer feedback on the content of specific sections of the paper. Mindful, again, that these survey results cannot be viewed in terms of statistical significance, there was a recurring theme in the responses regarding gatekeeper (journal/reviewer) expectations that echoed earlier findings (Casanave & Vandrick, 2003) and that we explored further in the interview phase.

Although very few survey respondents added comments to their multiple-choice responses, one such comment was particularly intriguing as it resonated, in its implications, with observations Bennett (2007), Ferguson (2007), Pérez Llantada (2012) and others have made about epistemicide and domain loss. The survey respondent comment was this:

> The main issue may be a cultural difference in the way researchers from different countries consider such specific concepts or elements in research (I mean from an epistemological point of view, i.e. the way part of ESP research is led in France for instance).

Bennett (2007) describes epistemicide as the epistemological loss that occurs as academic publication is increasingly geopolitically and linguistically restricted by the centripetal pull toward the Anglophone center. In reference to domain loss, Ferguson and Pérez Llantada have expressed concern about what happens when less and less research is published in a country's home language/s. In view of our survey respondent's arresting observation, perceived cultural difference became one of the foci in the next stage of the study, the interview phase, which sought to elicit elaboration on the four "hinders/helps" survey questions, especially with respect to journal/reviewer expectations and perceived linguacultural differences in specific contexts. The emergent research question that guided our queries about this latter issue was as follows: To what extent are linguacultural stylistic issues perceived by scholars around the world as salient for their international and local publication agendas? This is the guiding question that we will focus on in this report.

3.1 Participants

For the interviews, although we aimed at persuading 20 survey respondents to participate in follow-up interviews, 10, in fact, accepted our invitation and obtained their universities' approval of our project and contact with faculty. Asking participants for their institutions' approval was a requirement of the researchers' human subjects review board for a multi-institution international study, in addition to participant consent forms, and may have functioned, unfortunately, as an obstacle to participation. Our choice of interviewees was guided by the principle of maximum variation sampling (Glesne, 2006), a sampling method that aims to "cut across some range of variation" in search of "common patterns across great variation" (p. 51). The range we chose was geopolitical variation in author location. The 10 interviewees were almost evenly divided between residents in Europe and Asia, with five based in Europe (Finland, France, Hungary, Spain, and Sweden), four in Asia (two in China, and one each in Japan and Korea), and one from a Eurasian nation (Turkey). Though we sought geographic breadth, our intention was not ethnolinguistic representativeness, but to have a purposeful sample, that is, in Patton's (2002) terms, "information-rich cases … from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research" (p. 46). As successfully published authors spread across the globe, the participants, we hoped, could share their perspectives on context-related issues they faced in their publication efforts. We did not view these participants as representative spokespersons of large geopolitical cultures (Connor, 2011), but rather as professional academics immersed in and willing to speak of their own geographically-dispersed situated communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). Key demographic information about the interviewees appears in Table 1.

Table 1. Interview participants

Work settings	Self-reported mother tongue	Pseudonym
China (Mainland)	Chinese	Mei
China (Taiwan)	Chinese	Li-Hua
Finland	Hungarian	Klara
France	French	Chloé
Hungary	Hungarian	Magda
Japan	English	Brian
Korea	Korean	Kyungmi
Spain	Spanish	Maria
Sweden	Swedish	Greta
Turkey	English	Paul

3.2 Data collection

The approximately 60-minute semi-structured interviews (one per participant, or 10 interviews total) were conducted via Skype by the first author. The interviews were initially, as noted above, aimed at eliciting elaboration on the survey question responses, or essentially: What hinders or helps publication before and after submission to a journal? Another goal, however, was to determine if others besides the survey respondent mentioned earlier held views on linguacultural, or intercultural rhetoric, issues. One of the interview protocol questions of particular relevance to the findings reported here was the following: Do you ever advise publishing in languages other than English, and if you yourself publish in other languages, what are your goals in doing so? Several additional interview questions prompted discussion of stylistic preferences: Would you advise catering to a journal's expectations? Would you advise sometimes resisting journal reviewers' requests for changes in content and style? Responses to these questions became points of departure for participant commentary on perceived linguacultural stylistic difference.

3.3 Data analysis

For the interview data analysis, all the interview transcriptions were read and independently coded by the two authors, using a combination of coding approaches: thematic and constant comparative. The thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) we chose was primarily deductive, that is, guided by the "researcher's analytic interest" (p. 12), captured, in our case, by the interview questions and linguacultural style topic. The constant comparative method (Miles & Huberman, 1994) was more inductive, with open coding allowing for emergent themes (see Blair, 2015, on the advantages of combining top-down and bottom-up coding methods). Our independent coding was then compared, and discrepancies resolved through discussion. What could be identified as discrepancies, however, were most often aspects of the data noticed by one author, and thus brought to the attention of the other, who then confirmed or moderated the observation.

4. Findings

Of the 10 authors interviewed, only two did not publish both internationally and locally, or, put more positively, eight had dual, though not necessarily bilingual, publication agendas, and the two who did not were the only mother tongue English speakers among the interviewees. For those with dual, or local as well as international, publication agendas, their decisions to publish locally were guided, as self-reported, by a number of not-mutually-exclusive factors. These factors included: topic – when seen as particularly relevant for a local audience, for example, national education policy or translation issues; data sources – when data was locally derived, for example, corpora compiled from local texts; audience – when thought especially likely to benefit, for example, local teachers; and finally, language, which could be both an intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, that is, seen as language loyalty and audience access issues.

Reasons for publishing locally but not always (or ever) in the local language included the difficulty of composing academically in a language other than English when all professional reading was in English, the challenge of translating terms learned initially in English, and comfort level with academic writing in English resulting from English-medium professional education. Other reasons mentioned were the research focus, for example, compilation of an English-language corpus, and target audience, for example, research vs. classroom practice-oriented.

The interviewees' perceptions of linguacultural issues salient to international and more local publication, which we will now turn to, present a picture that is extremely nuanced and context-specific, the complexity of which, to do justice to it, will be reported by focusing on the individual participants. Our goal is to present, to the extent we can, the participants' own emic perspectives on their experiences and the micro- and macro-contexts relevant to their pursuits. As Casanave (2009) has observed, poststructuralist and other qualitative research writers have been "stretching" the boundaries of scholarly writing conventions, presenting details that can "help readers see, hear, and fully sense the presence of people and places in the qualitative project" (p. 296). We hope to facilitate our readers' sense of our participants' presence in our study.

Despite striking variation in the participants' views on linguacultural salience presented here, it is, however, possible to make some broad distinctions among their responses. Roughly speaking, these participants can be placed in one of two categories: those who expressed relatively strong views about rhetorical differences between local and international Anglophone research writing, and those who were less assertive about intercultural difference. In each of these groupings, we have organized the participants' responses according to the assertiveness of their views, from more to less assertive about difference.

4.1 From European vantage points: Focus on difference

Those who were more assertive about linguacultural difference were more likely to reside in Europe. Of these, Chloé, an L1 French speaker living in France, was particularly well positioned to express an observation about Anglophone and home linguacultural writing expectations as she was committed to a balanced bilingual publication agenda: "50% French, 50% English." She noted that in her field, she was equally credited for French and English publications, although the same was not true for her "colleagues in economics, management, or … even worse for physics or math." From Chloé's perspective, academic writing in France was quite distinct from Anglophone academic discourse expectations. Of the macrostructure of French academic texts, Chloé observed that "there is no set structure," hence, "you really need to go through … basically the whole article" to find what you are looking for, such as "the part that is devoted to methodology." In Chloé's view, French texts were thus "harder to read" than English academic texts, but French writers were given "much more" stylistic freedom. According to Chloé, whether one wrote in French or English for a French journal, the stylistic expectations would be the same. When Chloé writes in English for a French journal, as she sometimes did because of the focus of the research, e.g., an English corpus, then her English is very different from what she would use in an Anglophone journal: "I don't write the same English." Chloé also felt strongly that there was a marked epistemological difference between French-based and Anglophone academic discourse, which could be seen even in reference use in France. Publishing in France entails use of particular theoretical frameworks, Chloé remarked, noting, by way of example, that: "…the way we use Bourdieu in France is different from the way … Bourdieu is used in some American papers." Thus, from Chloé's vantage point, French journals had quite identifiably French expectations, and French academic discourse, in her own field, appeared to be alive and well, maintaining its independence and égalité (or, sociopolitical equality), though the same could not be said for other fields in which "they no longer publish in French [or domestically], and it's a pity, and you lose a lot ... theory and background, because it's not just the language."

Also with strong feelings about linguacultural difference was Magda, an L1 Hungarian speaker residing in Hungary, who, like Chloé, had a dual publication agenda but not one she described as balanced. Magda usually published locally, in Hungarian, but because "it's expected" and more highly regarded in the "score system," she aimed for international Anglophone journal publication too. Magda, again like Chloé, had a strong sense of the preferred text structure of academic discourse in her mother tongue and saw it as "not structured so strictly as English studies are." Magda perceived English research articles as very direct: "...you would right at the beginning of the article state your point." In Hungarian academic writing, on the other hand, "it might happen that you only get some vague ideas at the beginning ... and then the main points ... would come at the end." Magda viewed the Hungarian approach as more of a leisurely tour, "kind of guiding the readers through your thoughts, how you got to your final thoughts." She saw in Hungarian and English what Hinds (1987) referred to as a reader/writer responsibility distinction. Magda observed that whereas English writing was more "explicit," that "you need [in English] to give all the information that the reader needs to understand the points," Hungarian, in contrast, was "more writer-focused and you would expect the reader to know something." Magda, however, pointed out that this was not the way she herself wrote in Hungarian since "actually my PhD program was in English ... so I was taught the English academic discourse." When Magda composes in Hungarian, she "kind of transfer[s] ... the whole thing [English conventions] to the Hungarian article." Thus, from Magda's perspective, although Hungarian has a distinctive academic style, it also gives her the option of using her own preferred style, that is, "writ[ing] the English way in Hungarian."

The third participant with a strong sense of linguacultural difference was Klara, who, like Magda, was an L1 Hungarian speaker. Unlike Magda, however, Klara resided in Finland, where she perceived academics as mainly interested in publishing in English. Though Klara did publish in English, she also remained eager to publish in Hungarian, as her research was based in Hungary on a topic especially of interest to readers there. Writing in Hungarian, however, after moving to Finland proved challenging: "I really struggled with getting back to the Hungarian style because I lived in Finland ... three languages [Finnish, English, Hungarian], three cultures." For Klara, what characterized Hungarian style was most evident at the sentence and intersentential levels, "I mean, linguistic devices like linking words, especially linking ... verbs, cohesive devices ... [used] much, much, much less." At the whole text level, on the other hand, Klara saw less difference between Hungarian and Anglophone academic discourse: "I would say in the past it was more different. Now ... we adapted ... more to the English style." This stylistic shift in macrostructure was not seen as loss in Klara's eyes: "I wouldn't say it's particularly bad." Not continuing to publish in Hungarian, however, would constitute a major personal and public loss: "You know, expressing yourself in your native tongue is very important… [and] what about the scientific writing in that particular field in that particular language? ... [if] everything is written in English, it will be lost."

The fourth European participant with pronounced views about linguacultural difference between academic discourse in her mother tongue and in English was Maria, an L1 Spanish speaker residing in Spain. Spanish academic prose style was different at three levels, according to Maria: sentence, text structure, and epistemology. At the sentence level, "…academic Spanish uses long sentences, 30, 34 words per sentence." Maria observed, "We are very fond of coordination, complementation." As for text structure, Maria characterized Spanish paragraph organization as quite different from that of English: "We've never been taught about what a topic sentence is and then supporting sentences and then concluding sentence." Instead, Maria remarked, "…academic writing in Spanish relies on ... discourse markers." Epistemologically, Maria saw differences in stance: "…another big difference has to do with levels of criticism; ... for example, when scholars [in Spain] construct a literature review, or a discussion, that is more descriptive than argumentative." In a follow-up email, Maria elaborated on this issue, seeing it as a matter of "the pragmatics of the language": "Unlike English, academic Spanish shows very limited expression of stance." When asked if she published in Spanish herself, Maria responded with "we never do" as there is "no incentive and ... no merit," especially in her field. Maria also pointed out a major shift in other fields: "I tracked some of the journals in the social sciences, in economics, business management, and they're Spanish-based journals which were Spanish medium journals ... and now ... they've shifted to publication in English" for the sake of international databases and "also kind of prestige." Maria was struck by the irony of the simultaneous existence of a government-sponsored institution, the Cervantes Institute, which "fosters the use of Spanish at all levels," and a national research assessment scheme that rewards English publication.

Not all the European interviewees were on the same page on the issue of linguacultural stylistic difference, however. Greta, an L1 Swedish speaker residing in Sweden, appeared to be an outlier. She did have the experience of dual publication, though she noted, as had Maria, that she wrote all of her research articles in English because of the "point system": "You get more credits ... for international journal work published in English than in Swedish, and that is a pity." Her curriculum vitae revealed that she published book chapters and reports more locally, in Swedish. When asked about academic style in Swedish and English, Greta did not identify any linguacultural distinctiveness but instead saw the stylistic differences that exist in academic discourse as having far more to do with disciplinary and research paradigm differences. Greta remarked that within English itself, there was wide variation even among journals within the same discipline, making knowledge of target journals crucial. One telling comment that Greta made, however, suggested that she might not see academic style exclusively in disciplinary, paradigmatic, or journal expectation terms: "I've been lucky to publish with a lot of colleagues who are native speakers [of English]; I have other colleagues that are not so lucky."

4.1.1 *Summary*

What we have reported so far is that four of the five European scholars were fairly assertive about distinctive characteristics of academic discourse associated with their home linguacultures, which they did not necessarily identify themselves as proponents or users of. Although these four scholars readily pinpointed distinctive linguacultural stylistic features, they also commented on rapid changes in what was traditional domestic academic style, increasing acceptance of Anglophone discourse style, and domain loss, with various disciplines shifting away from the home language. The participants residing in Asia (including Eurasian Turkey), as we shall soon see, tended to express still less emphatic and more varied views about local academic style. We should remind readers that all linguacultural views reported here are those of individuals speaking from their own singular vantage points; in other words, speaking **of** rather than **for** their home linguacultures.

4.2 Views from Asia: Less focused on linguacultural difference

The typological distance between Asian languages and English as well as the claims of Hinds (1987) and other early contrastive rhetoric researchers about Eastern/Western rhetorical difference might lead one to expect our participants based in Asia to be quick to point out linguacultural stylistic difference. Such was clearly not the case, however.

Mixed views of linguacultural difference were strikingly evident in the perspective of Li-Hua, an L1 Chinese speaker based in Taiwan. Li-Hua was committed to publishing in international and domestic journals, though not, for the latter, in Chinese. Publishing in Chinese, she felt, was a challenge for Western-educated scholars like herself, as "all the theories, the lessons learned were in English." From Li-Hua's perspective, there was a distinctive Chinese academic style, though she did not see all Chinese academic writing as uniform. With respect to text structure, she noted that "some … authors actually follow the traditional Chinese style … but other authors … just follow the traditional … North American style, so you have research purpose or research problem; it's just like in a different language [i.e., in Chinese]." Li-Hua felt these co-existing academic styles in Chinese could be attributed to educational background: "…most of the papers …[for journals in Taiwan] that are written in Chinese are written by probably practitioners …[who] do not have that kind of …research training … so they follow the traditional Chinese writing style, trying to share their experience." Despite her association of traditional style use with limited research training, Li-Hua was a staunch defender of the right to use such a style in both Chinese and English. She felt so strongly about this right that she attempted to adopt a traditional Chinese style for an article in an international Anglophone journal. To her, use of this style appeared to mean gradually leading readers to the point of her paper, a strategy that, she realized, might initially "confuse" Western readers. She was less than pleased with the outcome of her attempt to exercise rhetorical freedom: "…in the article I try to write in a way that I advocated… but I think … it's my kind of struggle because … [the editor] still suggested … I make that kind of … clear statement of what follows in my discussion." Li-Hua fully understood the editor's perspective: "I do understand … for the readership, they anticipate a very clear specific statement delineating what's going on in that paper," and she was well aware that her "very culturally specific way" did not meet those expectations. Ultimately, Li-Hua decided to accept editorial guidance: "so … finally … I made a compromise, but only in that piece." Li-Hua's pointed "but" addendum, "but only in that piece," suggests her determination to continue to advocate for tolerance of stylistic diversity in English-language academic publications.

Conscious too of stylistic difference, but not, from her perspective, linguacultural difference, was Mei, an L1 Chinese speaker residing in mainland China. Mei was as committed as Li-Hua to publishing in both international English-language journals and Chinese journals, though in Mei's case, in Chinese for the latter. Mei did see, like Li-Hua, Chinese academic discourse as stylistically distinct, but to Mei this was strictly a pragmatic issue. In her context, Mei observed, despite the high rewards for publishing internationally in English, publishing in Chinese journals, in Chinese, was still a much sought-after accomplishment and could be more competitive than publishing internationally in English. As Mei remarked, because of the need for professional recognition, "…a lot of teachers want to get published [in China], and [hence] limited pages [in Chinese journals]." The space constraints, Mei pointed out, had an impact on style: "…the literature review is usually shorter because … the page limit, is even more strict [than in international journals] … [and] it's usually combined with the introduction." Mei noted that in her Chinese articles, she still indicated a research gap, but it "is not that obvious." When writing in English, Mei felt she had no choice but to have very explicit niche establishment because "in an English article it's really a must," and "if you don't address your gap very clearly," Anglophone journal gatekeepers "will pose the question to you, so I better clear out … the problem before I submit." In Chinese, in contrast, since the literature review is so brief, "you can simply write about the review and … why your research is necessary, just a few sentences…." Thus, from Mei's vantage point, what might look like a linguacultural stylistic difference was driven by efforts to accommodate as many scholars as possible in any single journal issue. Despite Mei's confidence in her understanding of local and international journal preferences, she still felt challenged when attempting international publication: "I think the biggest challenge for a nonnative speaker is still writing … you have a lot of ideas but probably you cannot … [be] clear in your article, so people may get confused." Mei did not, though, view international journals as encroaching on her personal style but, instead, as providing opportunities for feedback: "… [it can] get you on the right track, so … you know how you are doing, and you can get a lot of help…."

Also not focused on linguacultural difference were the two mother tongue speakers of English in this study, Paul and Brian, residents of Turkey and Japan, respectively. Neither of them published locally but both had substantial experience assisting local scholars with their research writing in English, thus ample exposure to the scholars' unedited L2 style. Neither felt strongly that there was what might be called local, i.e., Turkish or Japanese, academic discourse style, at least, not as a linguacultural issue. Paul "guess[ed]" there "might be" a Turkish style, and if so, it was marked by what he perceived as excessive elaboration and redundancy: "…they tend to … put in too much detail and explain everything too much, and keep repeating words too much." At the same time, however, Paul described his own challenges with Anglophone academic style, citing recent journal feedback indicating his writing was "too promotional," feedback he credited with helping him realize "the need to be neutral and not make too many claims." Paul appeared to be implying that Turkish writers' apparent style markers, like his own overstated research claims, could be a proficiency issue.

Like Paul, Brian identified what he saw as problematic stylistic issues in local, in this case, Japanese, scholarly writing in English, but, like others in this study, he saw such issues mainly in terms of educational background. For the medical and engineering faculty he assisted, Brian noted, "They tend to be conscious of what might be called the Japanese style, and they don't write that way." The same was not true for nursing faculty, Brian felt, with their more limited graduate training and study abroad experience. Brian viewed nurses' scholarly writing as "sometimes … indirect, or there's a lot of repetition": "They seem to go back to the same point periodically. I'd advise them just 'you need to move through,' you know." Acknowledging that he advised Japanese writers "to be more kind of linear," Brian, at the same time, rejected the early contrastive rhetoric claim that there is "a Japanese 'Ki Shoo Ten Ketsu' style," that is, a traditional style of Japanese rhetoric marked by "ten," an abrupt topic shift, causing "potential problems for ESL learners" (Hinds, 1983, p. 183). "I don't really buy the idea," Brian remarked of the claim, apparently implying, as did Paul, that the features he saw in local English writing were likely proficiency-related.

Especially noteworthy about the only L1 English speakers in this study is the fact that they did not see their knowledge of Anglophone academic discourse as advantage enough for achieving publication. Both spoke of needing local support. For Paul, his first Turkish collaborator had been one of his writing center clients who proposed they co-author a paper: "…she knew about the journal to go for and … about the *Social Science Citation Index*, which I didn't know about." Paul credited her as a mentor, "I learned a lot about the process of getting published and … sending articles." Brian too saw his publication success as greatly facilitated by local collaboration, as his "biggest problem" in Japan was "language related," since he applied for government grants to support his projects and "you're much better off to do so in Japanese." Brian described his Japanese as "okay," but not at the level needed for grant proposal writing, so his Japanese co-researcher played a critical role in "the language aspect of applying for grants." Both L1 English-speaking EAP-specialist Paul's and Brian's reliance on local collaboration, thus, can be seen as lending support to Hyland's (2016) "myth of linguistic injustice" argument, that is, that linguistic expertise is only one of many factors determining successful publication.

Only one of the study participants based in Asia was particularly insistent that there were no stylistic differences at all between local and international academic discourse: Kyungmi, an L1 Korean speaker residing in Korea, with an American PhD. Kyungmi published both in Korea, in Korean and English, depending on the topic, and in international Anglophone journals, for which she was much more highly rewarded. Publication location and linguistic medium, according to Kyungmi, had no impact on her academic style, nor did it for other Korean scholars: "Most of them are trained in that way; it's more like a genre, so we use the same style, same format." This was not just true for Western-educated academics, Kyungmi noted, "For example … my doctoral students [in Korea], they use the same thing." This sameness resulted, Kyungmi reasoned, from the research reading in English that they all did. Despite this felt sense of stylistic sameness, however, Kyungmi, more than other interviewees, was convinced of Anglocentric bias against her writing, of being "stigmatized" (Flowerdew, 2008): "I feel the language is the issue. It's a problem. Most of the [international journal] reviewers mention about the language." For Kyungmi, this issue was "frustrating": "I usually have my paper proofread twice before I submit the article. They still …gave me the comment about language. Just one sentence: 'Proofread your language thoroughly.' So that really kind of irritates me." Despite her international publication success, Kyungmi was troubled by how "difficult" this persistent problem was. To be clear, Kyungmi's point was not that she still struggled with language but that Anglophone journal gatekeepers were still penalizing her as a lingua franca English user: "I think as far as they know that I'm a nonnative speaker, they just put that sentence [about proofreading]…." Kyungmi felt strongly that "language is still an issue" because the gatekeepers made an issue of it. From her perspective, what Hyland (2016) describes as the "myth of linguistic injustice" is no myth at all.

4.2.1 *Summary*

Thus, of the five Asian/Eurasian (based) study participants, four were ambivalent about linguacultural stylistic difference, in that they saw discourse-level difference (vis-à-vis Anglophone academic style) in the work of local scholars but attributed this discursive distinctiveness to education, proficiency level, or local journal space constraints. Only one of these five participants saw no difference in linguacultural styles, yet this scholar, despite her publication success, also stood out in voicing a strong sense of being disadvantaged by Anglophone gatekeeping reactions to "language" issues in her English as a lingua franca style.

5. Discussion

The interview study reported here has aimed at opening a window on the emic perspectives of international scholars who navigate publication in various intra- and international venues, especially with respect to salient discursive linguacultural issues. Although generalizations from such a qualitative study, with 10 interviewees from one field dispersed around the world, are neither possible nor the goal, the findings do align with those of other studies. What was found, in brief, was that most of the interviewees did comment on stylistic differences between local and international academic discourse while also remarking on stylistic variation and change (toward a globalized norm) in local publication contexts. This finding is in line with more recent observations about complexity and dynamism in intercultural rhetoric (Belcher, 2014; Connor, 2011) and about, more specifically, Anglophone-influenced change in various domestic academic rhetorical styles (Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2012).

As reported in the findings, some participants were more assertive about linguacultural differences than were others. That those who tended to be more assertive resided in Europe could be seen as reflective of awareness of the long research writing traditions in Europe analogous to but historically distinct from those of Anglophone academic discourse, many of which have suffered domain loss in recent decades (Pérez Llantada, 2012). In her survey of Portuguese academics in the humanities, Bennett (2007) found that it was Anglophone academic discourse, not their own, that some viewed in deficit terms. In comparison with Portuguese scholarly writing, these scholars saw English academic discourse as "less elegant," "less refined," and "dogmatic," with "rigid structure," "impoverished vocabulary," and a proclivity for "simplistic" research questions "formulated in such a way as to require a YES/NO type of response" (p. 164).

In Asia, where our participants were less assertive about linguacultural stylistic differences, there may be less interest in maintaining time-honored traditions, especially in areas with many returning Western-educated scholars, as well as eagerness to, in a sense, beat Westerners at their own game. Shi (2003) found that most of the Chinese TESOL-professional returnees (to China) in her study preferred Anglophone conventions in both writing and teaching of academic discourse in Chinese and English. Some of the returnees that Shi (2002) surveyed approximately two decades ago saw themselves as "pioneers" bringing about change in Chinese academic publications by serving as exemplars of Anglophone discourse style (p. 632). Chinese physical scientists are now clearly meeting the challenge of writing for international publication, and are on track to surpass all other nations in citations, having already done so in fields such as engineering and computer science, according to Elsevier's Scopus database (Baker, 2018).

That a number of interviewees, whether based in Asia or Europe, had conflicted thoughts on the provenance of apparent traditional local style was conspicuous. What could be identified as local style was at times, as noted above, attributed to limited research training, lack of international experience, or still-developing research-writing proficiency, a view that mirrors a longstanding conundrum in intercultural rhetoric, that is, whether apparent rhetorical differences are cultural in origin or developmental (Casanave, 2017). Interestingly, however, some who felt especially strongly about rhetorical differences also saw definite advantages to traditional local style, noting such plusses as stylistic freedom, respect for readers' knowledge, as well as unique epistemological stances, echoing some of Bennett's (2007) findings just cited above.

Despite some obvious overlap in the interviewees' views, there is also much that is unique about each one, so much so that one conclusion that could be drawn is that if you ask 10 published scholars around the world about linguacultural and other related writing-for-publication issues, you will hear 10 rather different context-specific responses. The "cultures" that the study participants may be least problematically seen as representatives of (if any) are, as suggested earlier, not large cultures, that is, not large ethnolinguistic, geopolitical entities, but small, situated, plurilingual academic discourse communities continually in flux and unique for each study participant (Connor, 2011).

All of our geographically dispersed participants did, however, share a readily articulated, finely honed sense of audience for their writing. Their own personal experiential contexts, as scholars in particular settings and writers for various audiences, likely influenced their perception of distance (or lack thereof) between local and "international" reader preferences. Their commentary on audience expectations, in other words, can be seen as indexical of experience-based constructions of audience that guide navigation of diverse readerships. How writers conceptualize audience is, as composition theorists Ede and Lunsford (1984) have observed, inevitably complex, given that audience "refers not just to the intended, actual, or eventual readers of a discourse, but to all those whose image, ideas, or actions influence a writer" (p. 168).

Also notable amidst the variation in individual participant responses was a recurring theme pointing to a phenomenon that does not appear to bode well for future stylistic diversity, namely, that a number of research assessment policies privilege international Anglophone publication, hence rewarding mastery of Anglocentric rhetorical strategies. Yet, it would be foolhardy to conclude that the current tidal wave of Anglophone-discourse dominance and stylistic homogenization alluded to by this study's participants is irreversible. In some fields there may be more leeway given for local style in English-medium publications than in others. As Rozycki and Johnson (2013) and Farley (2018) have noted, in fields increasingly dominated by "expanding circle" scholars, e.g., electrical engineering and tropical agriculture, there appears to be noticeable Anglophone journal tolerance of noncanonical language use and, to some extent, rhetorical styles. In other fields, such as the human sciences, publication in English, no matter the rewards, may not be a popular goal (on China, see Flowerdew & Li, 2009). In our own study, research assessment policies' unequal weighting of domestic and international publication have clearly not dissuaded a number of participants from pursuing dual intra/international publication agendas.

5.1 Pedagogical implications

Keeping in mind our sampling limitations, we offer only brief pedagogical suggestions. Our participants exhibited a strong sense of authorial agency, as evidenced by their representation of successful publication as a bilateral process involving not only powerful gatekeepers but writers with their own scholarly authorial goals. What this can mean for those offering support to writers hoping to publish either locally or internationally is that they could benefit from an appreciation of discursive variation not just across linguacultural contexts but also within specific academic discourse communities. Providing writers with the tools to explore commonalities and variation in published work in their own fields, using, for example, DIY corpus building (Charles, 2012), is one way that those who support writers can help empower them to make their own informed stylistic choices. For emerging biliterate authors, Kuteeva and Mauranen (2014) have pointed to the need for multilingual/parallel academic language corpora, and a move more generally toward "more holistic pedagogical intervention" (p.3) from collaborating LSP (language for specific purposes) specialists in English and other languages. Such LSP collaboration could support academic writing development, and ultimately the ability to publish, in more than one language.

6. Conclusion

We ourselves as researchers became aware, as our knowledge of our study participants' complex publication agendas grew, of how our initial ERPP lens, our focus on periphery scholar navigation of Anglophone publication, had limited our original scope of vision when we first launched a survey of successfully published international researchers. The current interview-based study's findings suggest that if there is value in being mindful of possible cross-linguacultural variation, rather than seeing that value in terms of helpfulness to periphery scholars in an English-dominated research world, a broader view is in order. This broader view would include recognition of scholars around the globe inhabiting, contributing to, and advancing multiple, parallel research worlds, where Anglophone academic literacy proficiencies may or may not be useful. ERPP research has contributed much to understanding of how challenging international Anglophone publication can be for periphery scholars, but, given its aims, ERPP has not, understandably, been as adept at increasing appreciation of how much more encompassing such scholars' goals may be and the extent to which publishing "locally" may be as challenging as, if not more challenging than, publishing "internationally." Clearly, the international academic publishing scene is still dominated by English. Yet, as Salager-Meyer (2014) has reminded us, there is also "a world of publishing that does not operate in English or emanate from English-speaking countries" (p.79), a world that contributes, Kuteeva and Mauranen (2014) further observe, to the sustaining of linguistic and rhetorical diversity. Participants in our study have, in effect, added their voices (as have Lillis & Curry, 2010, and others) to a call for a more inclusive conceptualization of the full global scope of international research as more than English-only publication.

References

Baker, S. (2018, July 19). China on the rise. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/07/19/china-may-overtake-us-research-impact-scholars-analysis-finds> (20 February, 2020).

Belcher, D. (2009). How research space is created in a diverse research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(4), 221–234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.08.001

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(4), 59–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.06.003

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (2014, March). What helps and hinders publication in applied linguistics journals. Paper presented at the AAAL Annual Conference. Portland, OR.

Bennett, K. (2007). Epistemicide! The tale of a predatory discourse. *The Translator*, 13, 151–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799236

Blair, E. (2015). A reflexive exploration of two qualitative data coding techniques. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences*, 6, 14–29. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7393/c4f99b5fb8d2d6cd2948c87be0eadb1f023f.pdf> (20 February, 2020).

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5hjn6c

Casanave, C. P. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 175–204. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90012-

Casanave, C. P. (2009). Writing up your research. In J. Heigham & R. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 288–305). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230239517_14

Casanave, C. P. (2017). *Controversies in second language writing* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.8876881

Casanave, C. P., & Vandrick, S. (Eds.), (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410609137

Connor, U. (2011). *Intercultural rhetoric in the writing classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.3488851

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1984). Audience addressed/audience invoked: The role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, 35, 155–171. https://doi.org/10.2307/358093

Englander, K., & Corcoran, J. (2019). *English for research publication purposes: Critical plurilingual pedagogies*. London: Routledge.

Farley, A. F. (2018). NNES RAs: How ELF RAs inform literacy brokers and English for research publication instructors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 33, 69–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.02.002

Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: Questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Iberica*, 13, 7–38.

Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an Additional Language: What can Goffman's "Stigma" tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 77–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.002

Flowerdew, J. (2013). English for research publication purposes. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 301–321). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
Flowerdew, J. (2019). The linguistic disadvantage of scholars who write in English as an additional language: Myth or reality. *Language Teaching*, 52, 249–260. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000041
Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 18, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.09.005
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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.10.005
Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text & Talk*, 3, 183–195. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1983.3.2.183
Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 141–152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Hirano, E. (2009). Research article introductions in English for specific purposes: A comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28, 240–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.02.001
Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 31, 58–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005.1060-3743/
Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. (2nd ed.). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Kirkpatrick, A., & Xu, Z. (2012). *Chinese rhetoric and writing: An introduction for language teachers*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
Kuteeva, M., & Mauranen, A. (2014). Writing for publication in multilingual contexts: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.11.002
Lee, H., & Lee, K. (2013). Publish (in international indexed journals) or perish: Neoliberal ideology in a Korean university. *Language Policy*, 12, 215–230. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-012-9267-2
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. New York, NY: Routledge.
McGrath, L. (2014). Parallel language use in academic and outreach publication: A case study of policy and practice. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 13, 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.10.008
Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Pérez Llantada, C. (2012). *Scientific discourse and the rhetoric of globalization: The impact of culture and language*. London: Bloomsbury.
Risager, K. (2012). Linguaculture. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0709

Rozycki, W., & Johnson, N. (2013). Non-canonical grammar in Best Paper award winners in engineering. *English for Specific Purposes*, 32, 157–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.04.002
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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.11.003
Shi, L. (2002). How Western-trained Chinese TESOL professionals publish in their home environment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 625–634. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588245
Shi, L. (2003). Writing in two cultures: Chinese professors return from the West. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 59, 369–391. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.59.3.369
Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
Swales, J. (1997). English as *Tyrannosaurus rex*. *World Englishes*, 16, 373–382. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00071
Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827
Tardy, C. (2016). *Beyond convention*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.5173647
Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932

Address for correspondence

Diane Belcher
25 Park Place
Atlanta, GA 30302-4099
USA
email: dbelcher1@gsu.edu

Co-author information

Hae Sung Yang
email: dbelcher1@gsu.edu