

INTRODUCTION

At this early stage of the 21st century globalisation has already become a term of common usage, at least among the members of the information and communication society. However, the confluence of economic, political, cultural, social and ideological dimensions in the notion of globalization makes it a term with contested meanings. Although difficult to define, there are, nevertheless a number of concepts that would appear to be essential for an understanding of what is often regarded as a process, such as those signalled out by Scholte (15-17), who identifies globalisation with five key phenomena: internationalisation, liberalisation, westernisation or modernisation, universalisation and deterritorialisation.

In the academic world, the growing pressure for scientific research to become global and for scientists to become members of international communities of practice can be understood as an effect of universalisation. The communication revolution we have experienced over the last three decades has brought about great changes, creating a multiform system of relationships in which knowledge has supposedly been unified. In this new era of technology, computer-mediated communication has facilitated interaction among scientists working at locations that are remote from one another. The emergence of the World Wide Web has also de-localised knowledge, enabling scholars to access remote sources of information through digital libraries and other information resources. The ultimate outcome of this deterritorialisation is the unification not only of practices, but also of language in today's research world, now sometimes referred to as the global research village.

In our globalised world, publication in refereed international journals has now become a top priority even for those who could build successful careers through national and local publications. Now, international publication is not only the best means of disseminating knowledge, but also of earning a reputation as a successful researcher. In the context of the academic publishing world, international is usually understood as Western and urban. From an ideological perspective, Connell & Wood (184) describe this reality as follows: "the most cited journals are published in the metropole, edited by staff of metropolitan universities, using research paradigms and forms of reporting developed in the metropole."



In this process of westernisation, English has become the dominant language of international scholarly publication, in such a way that not even the other most widely spoken languages —Chinese, Spanish or Hindi— can compete with English in this domain. As a result, non-English-speaking-background scholars seeking to publish their work in international refereed journals will in most cases inevitably be at a disadvantage, in comparison with those who have English as a first language. For the non-English speaking background writer publishing the results of their research in an international journal not only involves a mastery of writing in a foreign language, but also becoming thoroughly familiar with the specific conventions of the academic discourse community which they seek to address (Burgess, Fumero Pérez & Díaz Galán). It is not surprising, therefore, to find in the literature an ever increasing number of studies that investigate the many issues involved in the process of publication of a research article in English (Flowerdew & Peacock).

This volume assembles the work of a variety of outstanding scholars who share a common interest: the role of the English language in the global context. Although varying in foci, the contributions can be divided into two main sections. The first explores the advance of English in countries in which it has traditionally had the status of a foreign language. Eduardo Mendieta, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, in favour of linguistic diversity, give an account of how the spread of English affects such varied areas as commerce, finance, research, education or the media. The other two papers of this section draw our attention to the status of English in Germany and Poland, home countries of their respective authors, Ulrich Ammon and Anna Duszak. In the second section, the papers by Martin Hewings, Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry and Margaret Cargill and Patrick O'Connor, within the common ground of applied linguistics, bring together three different perspectives on publishing academic writing in English.

In the opening paper, Mendieta, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas analyse the forces that are shaping the geopolitics of knowledge. They argue that the increasing dominance of scientific English is reflected in various fields of knowledge. In the area of research, for example, writing in a language other than English or not belonging to one of the core English countries amounts to being invisible. In translation the increasing power of English is reflected in the fact that more and more books are translated from English into languages like German, Spanish, French, Japanese, Dutch, Portuguese, Russian Polish or Finnish, whereas fewer and fewer titles are translated into English from other languages. This reality, as the authors observe, is a clear signal of the symbolic capital of English, which is also enhanced by the leading role of the language in publishing and in the Internet, where “English remains the primary beneficiary and arbitrator of the traffic.” This increasing dominance of English has provoked reactions of anxiety among continental Europeans who fear that the imposition of English and Anglo-American norms may work against cultural vitality and diversity. In the academic world this is reflected in a linguistic bias in favour of English both in the use and production of scholarly writing. The authors bring their article to a conclusion by making a plea for the protection and enhancement of linguistic diversity.



Ammon's paper offers a general view of the status of the English language in Germany today. Following Kachru's representation of the global users of English as forming three concentric circles, Ammon places Germany in the expanding circle (users of English as a foreign language), in contrast with the so called inner circle, represented by countries like United Kingdom, United States or Australia, where English is the first language and the countries of the outer circle such as India, Jamaica or Kenya in which English has been institutionalised as a second language.

Ammon provides an account of the increasing instrumental role English has acquired in the business world, where it has become the official language of many German companies. He then turns his attention to education and notes the introduction at primary school level of English as a general subject together with the creation of "International Study Programs" at university level with English as the medium of instruction. This spread of English has been understood by different sectors of German society as heralding a decline in the status of the German language and has, therefore, raised objections. For the author, the solution to this conflict is the development of a pluricentric world language, "Globalish," which would serve as the international communicative tool for the non-English speaking world.

The last paper of this section examines the effects of globalisation (or "glocalisation") from the perspective of the writing research practices of the Polish academic community. Duszak considers that there are already signs of "reverse globalisation," that is, the weaker recipient culture or language involved in globalisation, here Polish, contrary to what would be expected, reinforces local ideologies and practices.

The author presents Poland as a reflection of its own history and social realities, as a nation striving for stability "between the collective *self* and *the other*," between the defence of the national identity, including, obviously, the language, and the promise of economic prosperity and freedom represented by the West. Similarly, Polish academia either complies with or, alternatively, subverts the dominant (English) discourse and discourse practices. The Anglo-Saxon "colonisation" of the former Polish Teutonic academic tradition, while defended by some as more "user-friendly," accessible and economically profitable, is also criticised by many as a popular, less intellectualised and standardised way of writing. The paper also describes how, paradoxically, the need of scholars worldwide to publish as a means of promotion and fund raising has led Polish researchers to enhance their publishing possibilities locally, with all the advantages and disadvantages that this "reverse globalisation" may have.

Duszak concludes with an overview of the evolution of the English studies in Poland in the last thirty years. As an outcome, she depicts a situation in which "English is more and more often, and quite openly, treated as an instrument for communication and less so as an object of study for its own sake," a picture, we must say, that closely resembles the current situation here in Spain.

Among the growing body of work that deals with the various aspects involved in the writing of a research article we may find descriptions of the discourse practices involved in a wide range of academic genres. Thus, authors not only pay



attention to what may be considered the primary academic genre, the research article, but also to “occluded” (Swales) or non-public domain research genres such as editor-author correspondence (Swales; Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans) or peer reviews (Kourilová; Gosden, “Thank,” “Why”). Adding to this line of research, Hewings, drawing on a corpus of reviews of papers submitted to the journal *English for Specific Purposes*, analyses the reports of peer reviewers to investigate whether meeting the standards of English is a factor for the judgement of the papers and if, accordingly, it hinders non-native English speaking writers from publishing their research.

The author identifies, classifies and discusses the comments on language—either positive or negative—made by the reviewers, arriving at the conclusion that language seems to be one of the criteria by which they judge the articles. He, nevertheless, also makes the case that native-English speaking authors, though generally less often the targets of criticism for their use of language, may also receive negative comments on specific aspects such as punctuation and spelling. At the same time the quality of the language is not the only criterion for the rejection of non-native English speaking authored texts. Other factors, such as an inappropriate organisation and structure or lack of interest for the journal, were frequently mentioned in the negative reviews of these authors’ submissions, suggesting that writers whose first language is not English are not necessarily at a disadvantage in this respect.

Although scholars working in genre analysis have mostly paid attention to the study of completed texts, there are authors like Berkenkotter, Huckin & Ackerman or Ivanic and Simpson, who have studied academic communities of practice from a sociological perspective, establishing the relationship between the nature of these communities and the characteristics of the genres they produce. A smaller but related research tradition (see for example, Bazerman; Berkenkotter & Huckin; Myers, “Paper,” “Pragmatics”) has focused on case studies of individual novice writers exploring their text production strategies and the processes they go through until they gradually gain a mastery of the genres of a particular discourse community. Lillis and Curry take up this line of research with their contribution to the volume, in which they present two case studies of scholarly academic writing production. Through the exploration of the practices employed by the subjects, who represent two different working contexts, Spain and Hungary (again members of the expanding circle), they explore the practices in which scholars engage to achieve successful publication. The main conclusion is that the production of English medium academic texts involves a range of mechanisms and resources. Authors often “do not- and cannot” write in isolation from their colleagues but are part of a larger network in which they benefit from one another’s expertise and experience. This reality offers an alternative model both to students of English and professional academics, which makes them aware of the fact that individual expertise is not the only means of getting their work into print in English-medium journals.

The concern for the non-native English speaking author attempting to produce a manuscript for publication also engages Cargill and O’Connor in a paper that argues for the collaboration between applied linguists and specialists in the specific field. The authors put forward a model to support the design of programs



with the aim of helping novice researchers develop their English writing skills and, as a consequence, enhance their possibilities of becoming members of the international research community. Drawing from the data collected from eight collaborative workshops implemented in Asia and Europe, they argue that the intersection of the different types of expertise involved in the various stages of the publishing process (from content to form) has proved to be highly effective from a pedagogical perspective.

Sally Burgess' interview with John Flowerdew closes the monographic section of this volume. Burgess explores with Flowerdew a number of issues in relation to academic publication in three key contexts: continental Europe, the Middle East and Asia. Drawing on Flowerdew's professional history (as a product of and participant in the discourses of the metropole and as a university lecturer in Oman and Hong Kong) they discuss how the relationships between scholars on the periphery and those at the centre have changed over time and how the very notions of periphery and centre may be defined. With a research profile that spans Critical Discourse Analysis, the teaching of listening skills and lexical signalling in academic discourse, Flowerdew is well-placed to suggest the directions that those of us working with communities of scholarly practice might take as we move further into the twenty-first century.

We cannot conclude this introductory section without expressing our gratitude to the authors of this monograph for their contribution to the volume. We are well aware of the elusiveness of time in our internationalised and globalised academic world, and, therefore, appreciate their having agreed to devote both their time and expertise to the writing for the *RCEI*. It is their generosity that has given us the opportunity to bring together some of the most outstanding figures in relation to the theme of our issue: publishing in English in a global context. Finally, we would like to thank the editorial board of the *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* for providing us with the enriching experience of editing this volume and our dear colleague Sally Burgess for her continuing support.

María del Carmen Fumero
Ana Díaz Galán

WORKS CITED

- BAZERMAN, Charles. *Shaping Written Knowledge*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1988.
- BERKENKOTTER, Carol, Thomas N. HUCKIN & John ACKERMAN. "Conventions, Conversations, and the Writer: Case Study of a Student in a Rhetoric Ph.D. Program." *Research in the Teaching of English* 22.1 (1998): 9-44.
- . *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995.
- BURGESS, Sally, María del Carmen FUMERO PÉREZ & Ana DÍAZ GALÁN. "Mismatches and Missed Opportunities? A Case Study of a Non-English Speaking Background Research Writer." *Volumen homenaje a Angela Downing*. Madrid: Editorial Complutense. Forthcoming.

- CONNELL, R.W. & Julian WOOD. "Globalisation and Scientific Labour: Patterns in a Life-History Study of Intellectual Workers in the Periphery." *Journal of Sociology* 38.2 (2002): 167-190.
- FLOWERDEW, John & Tony DUDLEY-EVANS. "Genre Analysis of Editorial Letters to International Journal Contributors." *Applied Linguistics* 23.4 (2002): 463-489.
- FLOWERDEW, John & Matthew PEACOCK. "Issues in EAP: A Preliminary Perspective." *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes*. Ed. J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 8-24.
- GOSDEN, Hugh. "Thank You for Your Critical Comments and Helpful Suggestions: Compliance and Conflict in Authors' Replies to Referees' Comments in Peer Reviews of Scientific Research Papers." *Ibérica* 3 (2001): 3-17.
- "Why Not Give Us the Full Story? Functions of Referees' Comments in Peer Reviews of Scientific Research Papers." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2.2 (2003): 87-102.
- IVANIC, Roz & John SIMPSON. "Who's Who in Academic Writing." *Critical Language Awareness*. Ed. N. Fairclough. London: Longman, 1992. 141-173.
- KACHRU, Braj. "Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle." *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Ed. Randolph Quirk & H.G. Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985. 11-30.
- KOURILOVÁ, Magda. "Interactive Function of Language in Peer Reviews of Medical Papers Written by NN Users of English." *UNESCO-ALSED LSP Newsletter* 19 (1996): 4-21.
- MYERS, Greg. "In this Paper We Report...": Speech Acts and Scientific Facts." *Journal of Pragmatics* 17 (1992): 295-313.
- "The Pragmatic of Politeness in Scientific Articles." *Applied Linguistics* 10.1 (1989): 1-35.
- SCHOLTE, Jan A. *Globalisation: A Critical Introduction*. London: Palgrave, 2000.
- SWALES, John. "Occluded Genres in the Academy: The Case of Submission Letter." *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues*. Ed. E. Ventola & A. Mauranen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996. 45-58.

