

*Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing*,  
Pilar Mur-Dueñas, Jolanta Šinkūnienė, eds.  
John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia (2018).  
VII + 310 pp., ISBN 9789027201973.

Reviewed by **Mirna Varga**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek  
L. Jägera 9  
31 000 Osijek, Croatia  
E-mail: [mvarga@ffos.hr](mailto:mvarga@ffos.hr)

The preface of the volume *Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing* authored by Ken Hyland opens with the citation of Ware & Mabe's research (2015), reporting that approximately nine million scholars worldwide, the majority of whom are non-native speakers of English, are now attempting to publish their work in English. It is perhaps this striking statistic in the opening sentence that underpins best the need and relevance for the publication of the present volume. As outlined in the preface, it is widely acknowledged that academic publishing in English remains to be an essential component of a vast majority of scholars' international academic careers and that the recognition of their research work outside the national borders is intrinsically tied to the use of academic English and the proficient use of its discursive and rhetorical conventions. It is also known that the specifics of the rhetorical conventions in one's native academic language may depart from those of L1 English, which for many multilingual writers, even those of high English competence, can influence the way they write their academic texts in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Addressing these and other related issues on academic discourse, the current volume with its thirteen up-to-date reports provides significant insights into various discursive and rhetorical features of contemporary intercultural academic writing and marks a relevant contribution to the realm of Intercultural Rhetoric, most notably regarding the use of ELF.

Hyland's preface is followed by the Introduction in which the editors **Pilar Mur-Dueñas** and **Jolanta Šinkūnienė**, the two experienced EAP practitioners and prolific scholars into intercultural academic writing, contextualize the volume by providing a substantial background on intercultural studies into a range of lexico-grammatical characteristics and rhetorical conventions of the central academic research genres in L1 English, L2 English, and various native languages. Readers will also benefit from the summaries of the chapters outlined in this section, which is particularly convenient for the volume of this size.

The volume is well-structured and divided into three thematic sections. Each deals with the specific perspective of intercultural research on the key academic written genres, viz. the research article (RA) and the article abstract. Thus, Part I, entitled "Three-fold intercultural analysis: comparing national, L1 English and L2 English academic texts" contains three chapters, focused on the comparison of writing conventions in Linguistics research articles in L1, L1 English, and L2 English.

In Chapter 1, **Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova** compares the distribution and the rhetorical functions of citations in English-medium and Czech-medium articles written by Czech linguists and English-medium articles authored by Anglophone scholars. The results showed that Anglophone writers use the highest proportion of citations which perform complex rhetorical functions. Addressing a heterogeneous international community, these writers have a greater need to contextualize their study. By contrast, Czech writers use considerably fewer citations to acknowledge previous scholars' work as they publish in a smaller national context in which disciplinary knowledge is considered to be more firmly established. However, when writing in English and addressing a more international readership, Czech writers use more citations, though only in the Introduction while in the remaining RA sections they tend to use significantly fewer citations, retaining thus more locally-oriented rhetorical strategies.

The study by **Jūratė Ruzaitė** and **Rūta Petrauskaitė** illustrates various aspects of internalisation of a national Lithuanian and an English-medium journal, with a particular focus on the macro-structure of RAs. Contrary to the English-medium journal, the Lithuanian journal publishes predominantly RAs and significantly fewer reviews, interviews, etc., which signals less dynamic participation in heterogeneous academic activities. Also, Lithuanian articles do not seem to favour the conventional Anglophone IMRD structure, but rather exhibit a greater structural variation. As the authors note, being oriented to the regionally-based research topics, local writers have a lesser need to situate their studies and underscore their value against the previous research. By contrast, the rhetorical strategies of marketisation, originality, and promotion of one's research are fully exploited in the English-medium articles, which also contributes to the journal's international visibility. The authors suggest that if non-Anglophone scholars wish to

internationalise their work in a global academic research arena, they should adopt not only ELF as a publication language but also an array of broader literacy skills considered to be normative in international academic publishing.

Chapter 3 outlines the third threefold contrastive study conducted by one of the editors of the volume. **Jolanta Šinkūnienė** explores the authorial voice, in particular, the use of 1st Person Sg and Pl personal pronouns, in articles written by Lithuanian scholars in Lithuanian and English and by English native speakers in English. The analysis confirms tendencies reported in previous congruent research, pointing to the greater use of personal pronouns by Anglophone writers. Lithuanian writers abide by the prevailing national writing tradition, in which impersonality is favored over the explicit authorial visibility. Interestingly enough, when publishing their papers in English, Lithuanian linguists are generally more likely to explicitly mark their presence in the text, as reflected in the more frequent use of personal pronouns especially ‘we’. However, they still do not use ‘I’ nearly as frequently as their English peers, which might suggest reluctance of non-Anglophone writers to fully immerse themselves into the ELF writing practices, especially when these largely depart from their native writing conventions.

While the previous chapters focus on research articles, the studies comprising Part II entitled “Two-fold intercultural analysis: comparing L2 and L1 English academic texts/ Anglophone writing conventions” are mainly centered on the explorations of rhetorical and lexico-grammatical features of article abstracts, whose “screening role” in the dissemination of scientific output (Bordet, p. 90) may account for huge research attention that this genre has received.

**Bordet’s study** in Chapter 4 investigates how the use of encapsulating *this* followed by a labelling noun affects textual cohesion and persuasion in English-medium PhD abstracts written by Francophone and Anglophone PhD candidates in two disciplines. The analysis of case studies shows how the competent use of the given rhetorical device adds to argumentation building, increasing thereby a persuasive effect of the abstract and consequently a writer’s credibility as a fully-fledged disciplinary member. The writer suggests that EAP/ESP instructors may pay particular attention to raising non-Anglophone writers’ awareness of this important rhetorical device and how its mastering may contribute to creating textually more coherent and rhetorically more convincing disciplinary texts.

The analysis of theses abstracts and disciplinary writing practices by novice L2 writers in English is also the main topic of **Maryam Mehrjooseresht’s** and **Ummul K. Ahmad’s** research. The authors investigate how L2 writers in Science and Engineering use evaluative language to express their attitudes towards the propositional content. Both groups of writers mostly use evaluative language in the Product section of the abstracts,

which typically foregrounds research findings. Besides, writers (particularly those in Science) frequently employ the markers to boost certainty towards their claims (e.g. *evident, clearly*) and consequently to promote their research and convince disciplinary members of its significance. Given that cautious and rather tentative expression of claims is considered to be a typical feature of Anglophone academic tradition, the authors note that the observed rhetorical choices of novice L2 writers may be a sign of insufficient knowledge of L1 English rhetorical conventions, which may have important implications particularly for postgraduate academic writing programmes in non-Anglophone settings.

Chapter 6 outlines a study on recent trends in the internalization of academic publishing and its impact on the national context of academic writing. Taking a diachronic perspective, **Xinren Chen** explores variations in the construal of a writer's identity in the Introductions of English-medium RAs by Chinese writers. The findings of the rhetorical move analysis clearly show writers' inclinations to reveal their identities as creators of research space (Swales, 1990), particularly concerning the identification of gaps in previous research or knowledge. A higher frequency of those prototypically Anglophone rhetorical features suggests that writers, publishing in the national context, are increasingly more likely to adopt the Anglophone rhetorical conventions. According to the author, this changing trend may be attributed to the growing international status of the national journal and, among others, to the demands placed on authors to publish original and novel research, which in turn requires the use of the specific rhetorical strategies.

Chapter 7 by **Renata Povolná** presents yet another research on abstracts, though those submitted for conference presentations. The author explores intercultural variations in the rhetorical structure and lexico-grammatical features of conference abstracts written by Anglophone and ELF writers of Slavonic background. The findings demonstrate some universalities of the abstract structure in both corpora, which primarily concerns writers' decision to present their research. However, while Anglophone writers generally prefer to use a relatively diversified range of moves, most groups of non-Anglophone writers resort to two central moves, following thereby their L1 writing conventions. The use of first-person pronouns was also more frequently recorded in L1 English than ELF writing, pointing to a tendency of both groups to abide by their writing traditions. In other words, Anglophone writers tend to unveil their identity, while their non-Anglophone counterparts prefer impersonal stance marking.

Finally, in Part III "Intercultural analysis on the move: exploring ELF academic texts", the focus of the volume shifts to the explorations of the current trends in the use of English as a Lingua Franca and its role in the global context of academic publishing.

In Chapter 8, **Rosa Lorés-Sanz** compares the rhetorical structure of research article abstracts written in L1 English, ELF, and L2 English, the latter being translations from

Spanish. Though the findings point to a similar overall structure, a more detailed analysis shows different hybrid structures of non-Anglophone abstracts. Thus, translations from Spanish depart most from the Anglophone writing tradition, showing a lower frequency of certain moves that are commonly associated with L1 English abstracts writing (e.g. Indicating gaps). Unlike the translated abstracts which follow the L1 rhetorical conventions, ELF abstracts are rhetorically much closer to L1 English abstracts, though they also exhibit a relatively idiosyncratic move structure. Generally, the study shows that ELF writers abide by the IMRD structure more than L1 English writers, which may be influenced by their greater awareness as well as concern to follow the Anglophone rhetorical conventions and thus make their research internationally more visible and competitive.

The study by **Jingjing Wang** and **Feng (Kevin) Jiang** explores the intercultural and disciplinary differences in the use of epistemic stance markers (hedges, boosters, and self-mentions) in term papers written by ELF Chinese PhD students and in research articles by L1 English expert writers. The differences concern the use of markers across rhetorical sections, and the preferred choices of lexical devices functioning as hedges, boosters, and self-mentions. For instance, unlike L1 writers, ELF writers tend to use “We” instead of “I” to refer to themselves in single-authored papers. The authors observe that this and other variations in stance marking can be attributed to the insufficient pragmatic competence by ELF novice writers, but also the impact of a wider socio-cultural background on the rhetorical conventions of academic writing. It should be emphasized that this is the only chapter that includes a separate section on the pedagogical implications in which authors offer some teaching suggestions (e.g. building self-corpora of one’s research writing and comparing it with the corpora of expert RAs) on teaching non-native writers become more aware of the distinct features of non-native vs. Anglophone academic writing.

Chapter 10 by **Marina Bondi** and **Carlotta Borelli** compares the use of metadiscursive devices in unpublished ELF research articles and published English-medium articles. ELF writing may be characterized by a tendency to a rather implicit authorial presence (e.g. by avoidance of direct self-mentions) and less explicit stance marking (e.g. by preference towards a selected set of evidentials that do not show a writer’s stance towards the reported material). By contrast, published texts exhibit a more frequent use of stance nouns, epistemic markers, textual deixis, etc., and a generally more explicit authorial voice, as marked by a higher incidence of first-person pronouns. The authors conclude that the latter may be influenced by Anglophone writing conventions but also by a reviewers’ and editors’ work (i.e. literacy brokering) that tends to result in a more prominent use of the metadiscursive devices which emphasize authorial presence and put forward originality of the research.

Aimed at exploring the rhetorical conventions of ELF academic discourse, **Silvia Murillo** sets out to compare the use and functions of reformulation markers in unpublished ELF research articles written by writers of different L1 backgrounds with their use in published RAs written by L1 English writers. Though the analysis showed similar tendencies across both corpora, a closer analysis revealed that ELF writers generally privilege markers that perform a limited set of rhetorical functions as well as phraseologically less complex markers (for example, *i.e.*) used to simplify the argumentation. By contrast, L1 writers tend to use a more diverse range of markers that perform a greater variety of functions. Significant intercultural differences in the overall frequency of the markers used in ELF writing were also reported. The author concludes that these differences may be due to diverse L1 rhetorical writing conventions that contribute to the hybrid nature of ELF writing.

**Enrique Lafuente-Millán** analyzes attitudinal evaluation in unedited RA introductions written in ELF and compares it with its use in the published RA introductions by ENL (English Native Language) writers. It was found that the two groups of writers formulate the introductions and use evaluative strategies considerably differently. ELF writers do not particularly follow the three move-structure as established by Swales' (1990) CARS model, which may be broadly related to the different norms of publication contexts at a local and international level, respectively. Additionally, ELF writers generally express their attitudes less frequently than ENL writers, especially when it comes to underscoring the value of their research and taking an evaluative stance towards previous work. The author points to various interacting factors that should be considered in ELF writing, including cultural values, disciplinary practices, writers' professional expertise, and language proficiency. The author recommends future researchers to tackle the question of whether the traces of non-Anglophone rhetorical practices manifested in ELF writing should represent a decisive factor in accepting or turning down ELF manuscripts submitted for international publishing, which is governed by predominantly Anglophone rhetorical style.

In the final Chapter 13, the second editor of the volume **Pilar Mur-Dueñas** explores the interpersonal nature of RAs written by ELF and ENL writers of various disciplines. The focus of the study is the use of the anticipatory *it pattern* and its typical evaluative functions, viz. attitudinal and epistemic functions. The pattern is more frequently exploited by ELF writers, though in both corpora the attitudinal function prevails over the epistemic one. The analysis also showed that ELF writers tend to use the specific lexemes that are not commonly employed by ENL writers. The author concludes that the creativity expressed by ELF writers in the use of the lexico-grammatical pattern analyzed is not to be taken as a deviant but rather as a legitimate idiosyncratic use of ELF, which contributes to its dynamic nature and thereby merits further explorations.

The volume ends with the afterword written by **Ulla Connor**, who underscores the value of the edition by highlighting its orientation to the two central research genres, viz. research abstract and the article, the abundance of the languages analyzed, as well as a balanced ratio between traditional contrastive analyses and more recent approaches to the study of ELF texts. As the author notes, these and many other insights found in the volume deepen our understanding of the evolving nature of English as a Lingua Franca as a global phenomenon and can, thus, inform a range of EAP teaching contexts worldwide with the latest trends in the specific rhetorical domains of intercultural writing.

To sum up, as foreshadowed in the editors' introduction, the present volume does succeed in being a relevant and valuable reading on multi-faceted aspects of current intercultural written academic discourse, which will undoubtedly enrich the research on Intercultural Rhetoric and ELF and provide useful implications for research-informed academic writing instruction, particularly in non-Anglophone academic settings. Thus, it may be expected that the comprehensive overview of the relevant research in the field, the corpora design and analyses as well as the research outcomes and implications provided by this volume will incite EAP researchers and practitioners alike to further the knowledge base and enrich classroom practice with novel findings and teaching solutions, particularly concerning the mounting importance of ELF in the international academic publication.

## References

- Bordet, Geneviève. 2018. "This dissonance" Bolstering credibility in academic abstracts. *Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing*. Pilar Mur-Dueñas & Jolanta Šinkūnienė, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 83–103. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.18.04bor>.
- Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ware, Mark & Michael Mabe. 2015. *The STM Report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing*. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=scholcom>