Editorial

Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry
The Open University, UK | University of Rochester, US

This Special Issue aims to illustrate dynamic approaches to academic writing for publication by offering papers which use the notions of 'text history' and 'text trajectory' to explore academic text production and uptake in a range of linguistic, disciplinary and geographical contexts. In foregrounding *history* and *trajectory*, the Special Issue problematizes the influential tendency in applied linguistics/ English for Academic Purposes towards static orientations to the study of academic writing, whereby texts:[1] (a) tend to be treated as discrete units, fixed in time and place; (b) are often construed as the production of individual authors, with little or no mediation by others; (c) are analysed in terms of production with little attention to uptake; (d) are explored through the lens of single, discrete languages, notably 'English'. The papers in this Special Issue illustrate the significant shift taking place in applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and discourse studies more generally, away from researching language-in-place to researching and conceptualising the projection of language and text across different spatio-temporal contexts (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Lillis and Maybin 2017; Maybin, 2017). The papers emphasize the value of such an approach for generating understandings about the production and circulation of academic knowledge globally.

The term 'text history' and 'text trajectory' capture the growing theoretical and empirical impetus towards the development of dynamic approaches to academic text and knowledge production. Each term signals different dynamic dimensions: *history* signals attention to chronology and *trajectories* signals attention to directionalities of both production and uptake. These terms are often used in conjunction with a cluster of empirically oriented and theoretically loaded notions, such as: *brokers, networks chains, genre suites and sets*, and terms which are used at meso and macro levels, such as *entextualisation, recontextualisation* and *economies of signs*. The importance of focusing on specific histories and trajectories of academic text production and the need to develop a meaningful language of description to articulate practices was signalled in early work in this area

1. Use of caps after colon as specified by current APA conventions varies in this SI taking account of author preference.

https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.00005.edi
Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes 3:1 (2022), pp. 1–5. ISSN 2590-0994 | E-ISSN 2590-1001

(e.g., Canagarajah, 1996; Flowerdew, 2000) and was further developed in work by the editors of this Special Issue, Lillis and Curry, who explicitly introduced a cluster of terms into the study of academic writing for publication (e.g., *literacy brokers*, Lillis & Curry, 2006; *academic research network*s and *network brokers*, e.g. Curry & Lillis, 2010; *economies of signs* e.g., Lillis, 2012). Some of these terms, notably 'brokers', seem to have become, problematically, part of a naturalised discourse in studies of academic writing for publication. A key aim of the Special Issue is to re-locate these terms within their intellectual origins and to hold them up for inspection as part of the ongoing development of a robust and critical language of description for the exploration of academic knowledge production, exchange and circulation.

This Special Issue includes five full-length papers, a perspective piece–a position statement on multilingualism in scientific-academic contexts–and a book review. The five papers are based on empirical studies exploring the histories and trajectories of academic text making, from drafts through to submission to publication outlets and publication. The first paper by Oliver Shaw focuses on the English-medium writing for publication by Spanish biomedical researchers. Focusing on two case studies involving interview and text data, Shaw combines an explicitly textual analytic frame –Swalesian genre–with a text history approach, which he refers to as a 'modified text history and genre approach' to explore textual mediation involving the distinct levels of the language editor and journal reviewers. A key focus is on critically examining authors' differential uptake of specific interventions. Shaw draws on his professional expertise and practice as a language editor as well as his academic research into academic writing for publication to emphasise the value of text history-based research to the professional practice of language editors, as well as to journal reviewers and authors.

In paper 2 Niina Hynninen similarly combines a textual analytic frame with a focus on text production histories to explore evaluation and alignment practices in open peer review practices. Like Shaw, Hynninen is interested in exploring brokers' evaluation practices and the 'evaluating authorities' that are evoked, alongside authors' orientations to such practices which she explores through three 'review histories' in an English-medium open access journal in geosciences. By using data extracted from publicly available open peer review–peer review reports, short comments, author replies, and editor decision letters–Hynninen illustrates how text histories can be explored without necessarily engaging in longitudinal research. Her paper importantly puts the spotlight on a peer review practice that is on the increase and is potentially transforming the relationship between authoring and reviewing.

Paper 3 continues with a key theme to emerge in the SI overall, that is, the nature and consequences of collaboration, focusing in detail on a text his-

tory involving an exiled Syrian scholar supported by two more experienced academics to develop an English-medium co-authored paper. Baraa Khuder and Bojana Petrić critically explore the collaboration through their analysis of specific 'interaction episodes' in the text history. A core concept in Khuder and Petrić's paper is that of 'motion', underlining the processes by which academic texts come into being, as well as indexing the complex impact of differential mobility on scholars' publishing practices. Their paper furthermore foregrounds the role of non-governmental agencies in providing a mechanism whereby scholars experiencing different life trajectories can be brought together to build knowledge making practices.

Whereas the first three papers focus explicitly on English-medium text production and related brokering and authoring, Papers 4 and 5 shift their attention towards multilingual academic text production. Paper 4 by Natalia Smirnova and Theresa Lillis adopts a text history approach to the exploration of citation practices in English and Russian-medium journal articles. Smirnova and Lillis introduce what they refer to as a 'paired text history methodology' to track the production of English and Russian-medium texts by the same author, in acknowledgement of the fact that many scholars globally often work simultaneously on multiple texts in several languages. Using a range of data sources–text, reviews, email communication, interviews–they explore citation practices in three paired text histories in three disciplinary areas–philosophy, sociology and economics. Their paper foregrounds the contested practice of citation and raises questions about 'citeworthiness' as refracted through global evaluation regimes.

The final paper in the Special Issue by Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry similarly foregrounds multilingualism in academic text production, arguing that multi and translingualism are fundamental practices in knowledge production globally. Drawing on a range of qualitative and quantitative data from their longitudinal PAW (Professional Academic Writing) study, they seek to further nuance the notion of text history and text trajectory by foregrounding three dimensions: chronotope, text cluster, and multi/translingual practice. They focus on the practices of twelve scholars from Hungary, Slovakia, Spain and Portugal in the disciplinary areas of psychology and education to explore three key chronotopic dimensions to textual academic knowledge making: *micro time*, specific moments of text production; *meso time* trajectories of texts; and *macro time*, text production practices over scholars' life trajectories. The paper illustrates the value of longitudinal, ethnographically-oriented research to generating insights into academic knowledge making globally.

The **perspective section** of this Special Issue is constituted by a position statement led by Federico Navarro (Chile), co-authored with scholars from a number of geolinguistic contexts–Theresa Lillis (UK), Tiane Donahue (US/

France), Mary Jane Curry (US), Natalia Ávila Reyes (Chile), Magnus Gustafsson (Sweden), Virginia Zavala (Peru), Daniela Lauría (Argentina), Annabelle Lukin (Australia), Carolyn McKinney (South Africa), Haiying Feng (China), and Désirée Motta-Roth (Brazil). The statement challenges assumptions about the presumed legitimacy, value and nature of 'English as a lingua franca' in scholarly exchange and argues for the explicit recognition and adoption of multilingualism/linguistic variety as a powerful resource for knowledge making globally.

The SI closes with a review by Jackie Tuck of two books on a topic that is highly influential in studies seeking to build dynamic approaches to academic writing and knowledge: ethnography. In her review of *Ethnographies of Academic Writing Research: Theory, methods, and interpretation*, Routledge, edited by Ignacio Guillén-Galve and Ana Bocanegra-Valle, 2021 and *Ethnographic Perspectives on Academic Writing*, Oxford Applied Linguistics by Brian Paltridge, Sue Starfield, Christine M. Tardy, 2016, Jackie Tuck reflects on the value of situated accounts of specific academic writing studies, where readers are provided with rich contextualising detail and immersive narrative descriptions of the processes of ethnographic research. Such descriptions enable us to turn the ethnographic gaze towards academic writing research itself and so help to fuel methodological reflexivity and innovation, such as the development of dynamic approaches to writing for publication exemplified in this Special Issue.

We would like to thank the reviewers who gave so generously of their time in critically and creatively supporting the development of the papers in this Special Issue: Sally Burgess, José del Valle, Inmaculada Fortanet Gómez, Guillaume Gentil, Kathrin Kaufhold, Pilar Mur Dueñas, Theron Muller, Carmen Pérez-Llantada, Ingrid Piller, Karen Shashok, Irina Shchemeleva, Lucia Thesen and Karin Tusting. We would also like to thank Sue Starfield for her commitment to this Special Issue and for helping us see it through to completion.

References

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity: A position paper. *Working papers in urban language and literacies*, *70*. Retrieved on 1 February 2022 from www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc

Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). "Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication*, *13*, 435–472. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088396013004001

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2010). Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes*, *29*, 281–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2010.06.002

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(1), 127–150. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588099

Lillis, T. (2012). Economies of signs in writing for academic publication: The case of English Medium "National" Journals. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, *32*(3–4), 695–722.

Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication*, *23*(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088305283754

Lillis, T., & Maybin, J. (2017). Introduction: The dynamics of textual trajectories in professional and workplace practice. *Text & Talk*, *37*(4), 409–414. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2017-0017

Maybin, J. (2017). Textual trajectories: Theoretical roots and institutional consequences, *Text & Talk*, *37*(4), 415–435. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2017-0011

Address for correspondence

Theresa Lillis
Centre for Language and Communication
The Open University
UK

Theresa.Lillis@open.ac.uk

Co-author information

Mary Jane Curry
Margaret Warner Graduate School of Education & Human Development
University of Rochester

mjcurry@warner.rochester.edu