English is now unquestionably the language of international scholarship and an important medium of research communication for non-native English speaking academics around the world. While accurate figures are hard to come by, perhaps one in five of the world's population now speaks English with reasonable competence (Crystal, 2003) and the language is rapidly coming to dominate the dissemination of knowledge. Universities in many countries now require staff to present at international conferences and, more crucially, publish in major, high-impact, peer-reviewed Anglophone journals as a pre-requisite for tenure, promotion and career advancement. As a consequence, EAP practitioners increasingly find themselves called upon to venture into this unfamiliar terrain to improve the writing for publication skills of colleagues from other departments. In this chapter I address this growing area of academic literacy support, focusing on English for Professional Academic Purposes (EPAP): research and instruction with the goal of facilitating academic publication and presentation in English.

Scholarly publication and EAP: mapping the territory

Research shows that academics all over the world are increasingly less likely to publish in their own languages and to find their English language publications cited more often. References to English language publications, for example, have reached 85% in French science journals and English makes up over 95% of all publications in the Science Citation Index. Swales (2004) observes that many leading European and Japanese journals have switched to publishing in English.
and this Anglicization of published research can also be seen in the dramatic increase in papers written by non-native English speakers in leading English language journals (e.g. Wood, 2001). Many prestigious Chinese universities, for example, stipulate that their PhD students must have at least one paper accepted by an international journal before they can graduate, while the Chinese Academy of Sciences supplements the salaries of researchers who have published internationally (Cargill & O’Connor, 2006). With libraries increasingly subscribing to online versions of journals, the impact of English becomes self-perpetuating, since it is in these journals where authors will be most visible on the world stage and receive the most credit.

While the driving forces behind this global spread of English in academic life are complex and often tied to political and commercial interests, one can view these developments in two contrasting ways. It is possible to see the growth of English as establishing a neutral lingua franca, efficiently facilitating the free exchange of knowledge across the globe, or as tool of linguistic hegemony and cultural imperialism (e.g. Pennycook, 1994). It takes on additional importance for scholars, however, who want their work to be widely read and frequently cited. Participation in this global web of scholarship is now an obligation for many academics as publication has become inseparable from the process by which prestige and credibility are assessed. Publication equals ‘productivity’ and is used as a crude measure of worth, with institutions conferring promotion and tenure on the length of personal bibliographies. Additional pressure to publish comes from institutional sources as publication is often a key element in department reviews and Research Assessment Exercises in many countries link government funding directly to individual publication.

The challenges of writing for publication are, however, considerable in today’s competitive climate where it is not unusual for journals in some fields to receive over ten-times more submissions than they can use. Moreover, for writers it not only involves developing the research craft skills and ‘ways of knowing’ of a discipline, but also control of its specialized discourse conventions. A
paper will only find its way to publication if it frames ideas and employs forms of argument which readers are likely to find familiar (Hyland, 2000/2004).

These requirements are daunting to all academics as native English speakers also struggle to produce polished prose (Casanave & Vandrick, 2003) and editors frequently point out that many of the difficulties experienced by NNSs are also shared by NSs (e.g. Gosden, 1992). Swales (2004: 56), in fact, argues that the most important distinction in publishing is not between native (NES) and non-native English speakers (NNES), but

*between experienced or “senior” researcher/scholars and less experienced or “junior” ones – between those who know the academic ropes in their chosen specialisms and those who are learning them.*

There is certainly something to this view, as the growing proportion of papers by L2 authors in refereed English language journals testifies. Native English speakers rarely receive help with academic writing during their university careers and are often less ‘academically bilingual’ than many NNESs and we should not exclude them from EPAP classes. Our writing for publication classes for doctoral students in London, for example, usually contain as many domestic as international students.

This, then, is the territory which EPAP occupies; conducting research and developing materials and activities designed to facilitate the participation of novice scholars in the global research network of English.

**Evidence for need**

Despite the fact that all newcomers feel challenged and intimidated by writing for publication, attention has largely focused on the obstacles faced by Non-Native English speaking researchers in getting into print. This is certainly the view of journal publishers and editors who have viewed the
surge of NNES activity in the publishing arena with some alarm. This extract from an editorial in *Oral Oncology* is typical of this concern:

> An emerging problem facing all journals is the increasing number of submissions from non-English-speaking parts of the world, where the standard of written English may fall below the expectations of a scientific publication. (Scully & Jenkins, 2006)

Research shows that while editors concur that “acceptance or rejection of a manuscript is primarily based on scientific merit” (Gosden, 1992: 129), editors in many disciplines insist on having submissions vetted by native English speakers, often requiring writers to pay copy editors to correct their prose before it is accepted. Referees and editors, in fact, offer a great deal of unsolicited language assistance and suggestions for would-be authors regularly occur in the pages of science journals (e.g. Jaffe, 2003; Tychinin & Kamnev, 2005).

A central cause of difficulty for novice writers, particularly those working outside the metropolitan centres of research, is their isolation from current literature and the demand that they situate their work in a rhetorical tradition. Gosden (1992: 115) summarises the views of his sample of science journal editors in this way:

> The broad term ‘isolation’ covers many causes, for example: not carefully reading ‘Instructions to Authors’; unfamiliarity with the journal and its academic level; not previewing previous literature well and relating to others’ work, possibly due to a lack of literature/library facilities; a lack of awareness of what constitutes publishable research; and unfamiliarity with the broad (and unwritten) ‘rules of the game’.

Many of these disadvantages apply equally to NES outsiders.

Research has also revealed similar concerns among Non-Native English scholars themselves. Over two thirds of the 585 Cantonese L1 academics in Hong Kong who responded to Flowerdew’s (1999) questionnaire, for example, felt they were at a disadvantage compared with NSs, with about
half citing language issues as the main problem. Follow-up interviews with 26 respondents showed that many felt hampered by “less facility of expression” and a “less rich vocabulary”. While it is difficult to say whether these self-perceptions represent actual disadvantage, they may have an impact on writers’ confidence and how they set about drafting and revising academic papers to the rhetorical standards demanded by editors, referees and other gatekeepers.

Research into the writing processes adopted by novice NNES academics also suggest that writing for publication can be a laborious task. St John (1987), for instance, found that her sample of Spanish researchers rarely undertook structural revision and focused instead on precise expression in English through changes in word order and lexis, sometimes via translation from Spanish. Similarly, Li’s (2006) account of a Chinese doctoral student of physics shows how advice from supervisors, a journal editor and reviewers helped guide the student through six drafts and several painstaking resubmissions before her paper was finally accepted for publication. Gosden (1995) also found considerable text revisions by seven Japanese post-graduate students. In response to journal reviewers and colleagues, they made over 320 changes between the first draft and published paper, changes which Gosden sees as a movement towards more mature writing characterised by a greater range of cohesive devices, explicitness, hedging and subordination.

Essentially then, revisions represent a reworking of the rhetorical goals of a paper to more clearly meet the perceived needs of readers. This is shown even more clearly in a later study in which Gosden (2003) points out that the majority of critical feedback from reviewers to NNESs writing for a scientific publication addressed interpersonal features of the presentation rather than technical or ideational material. In a context where editors are overwhelmed with submissions and are often looking for reasons to reject manuscripts, non-standard language may serve as good a reason as any to justify this.
Theoretical understandings: situated learning and social constructionism

The issues faced by newcomers to academic publishing have largely been seen in the theoretical context of the social practices of disciplinary communities, drawing on both a situated learning and social constructionist theories. These perspectives help show how the redrafting process can be seen not just as the transformation of a text, but also the apprenticing of an individual writer into the knowledge constructing practices of a discipline. Gatekeeping genres such as research articles are of particular interest in this context because they can be viewed as sites of disciplinary engagement (Hyland, 2000/2004), where insiders are able to make use of their cultural knowledge to gain advantages over novices. The final product is seen as a social act that can only occur within a particular community and audience. More specifically, by focusing on scholarly writing as a situated practice and by examining the local interactions that occur in negotiating the passage of a paper to publication, it becomes possible to see how participation functions as a mode of learning.

This process of writing and publishing research papers reveals both the regulating mechanisms of a particular discourse community and the dynamism of its practices, at least partly because the norms of the discipline are constantly defined and changed through the participation of newcomers to the discipline. Most centrally for EPAP, however, is the fact that leaning to write for a professional peer audience is the process by which novices are socialised into an academic community: it is the recognised route to insider status.

This perspective draws on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) well-known work on situated learning and the idea that we acquire the skills and practices of our professions mainly by participating in these practices and not just by being taught about them. The metaphor of ‘apprenticeship’ has been used to describe this process, although Lave and Wenger talk of ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ to conceptualise learning as engagement in the sociocultural activities of ‘communities of practice’. In other words we learn by doing; gradually developing an academic identity as we come to write and
think in ways compatible with those of our discipline under the guidance of more senior members, more experienced peers, and the comments of editors and reviewers (Casanave & Vandrick, 2003). When considering writing for publication, this apprenticeship involves a careful negotiation with two principal audiences: the community of scholars who will read the finished paper and hopefully cite it and use it in their own research; and the journal gatekeepers who will judge the paper as ready for publication.

In terms of the larger, community audience, we need to see texts as the outcome of interactions among academics engaged in a web of professional and social associations. The ways writers present their topics, signal their allegiances, and stake their claims represent careful negotiations with, and considerations of, their colleagues so their writing displays a professional competence in discipline-approved practices. In other words, writers must be aware of the distinctive ways of identifying issues, asking questions, addressing a literature, criticizing colleagues, and presenting arguments which readers anticipate in their field (Hyland, 2000/2004 & 2005; Myers, 1990). An important consideration here is the need to balance a personal stance against the demands and expectations of the professional discourse community. Novice writers often believe that they have to strive for an original voice in order to be noticed, but this fails to grasp the essentially social nature of writing for publication. Originality is not the expression of an autonomous self but of writing which is embedded in and built on the existing theories, discourses and topics already legitimated in the community.

Disciplinary socialization, however, is most immediately and locally revealed in the process of negotiating revisions to a paper and incorporating the feedback of editors and reviewers. The process of revising a paper and responding to editorial changes can be a fraught one for novice writers. Not only must they rewrite and polish what may have taken months to craft in order to situate their work more centrally in the concerns of the discipline, but they must also incorporate
others’ views, relinquishing some of their textual ownership (Lee & Norton, 2003). Equally
difficult on this learning path is understanding and responding to the comments of editors and
reviewers (Gosden, 1992; 1995). Rejection or requests for major rewriting are never welcome and
comments may seem overly critical, condescending or dismissive. On the other hand, hedged
criticism and obliqueness can be misunderstood by NNESs and may lead novice authors to
underplay criticisms and fail to make necessary changes (Gosden, 2003).

I have only sketched some of the issues raised by research and theory into NNES publishing, but
the discussion reveals some of the complexities involved as well as helping to establish a
framework for EPAP pedagogy. I turn to some of the teaching implications in the next section.

**Instructional practices**

Clearly the advanced literacy competencies and insider knowledge involved in crafting a paper for
publication and negotiating editorial correspondence presents considerable challenges for many
early-career scholars, whatever their first language. There is however, a large and growing
literature concerning the characteristics of published articles in different disciplines and it would be
remiss of us as EAP practitioners not to make this knowledge explicit to those seeking to publish in
English. Notwithstanding that the practices of publication and associated expectations differ
markedly from one field to another, teaching should, I would argue, focus principally on isolating
key features of texts and making these explicit to writers. This involves both raising awareness of
the ways language is used to most persuasive effect and encouraging reflection on writers’ own
preferred argument practices. In addition, however, I think it is productive to assist novice writers
with the strategies they might employ in the publication process itself, giving particular attention to
the analysis of their target publications and the navigation of the revision process.
i. Targeting a journal

One of the most important findings of research into successful writing is that writers consider their readers, even before they begin to write. For publishing authors a key aspect of this involves writing with a specific journal in mind (revising for another journal if it is subsequently rejected). This means researching target journals to ensure that their paper both addresses the relevant audience and is presented in the appropriate way. While this might be a somewhat tedious part of publishing, there is really no way round this and a few hours of intensive surfing of publishers’ websites getting to know the requirements and kinds of submissions they are looking for can help avoid an editorial rejection before reviewers have even seen the paper. There are a number of useful activities which can help raise an awareness of these strategies among inexperienced writers.

a. Esteem  Among the issues that novices can usefully be encouraged to consider is the hierarchy of esteem which attaches to journals. All publications have a subjective ranking in a discipline from the ‘blue chip’ through the solidly respectable, to the third tier commendable, the locally creditable and beyond. Such discriminations are part of the intellectual stock-in-trade of the successful academic and an understanding of them is important both in terms of a successful publishing outcome and the degree of credit that is likely to accrue to the writer from acceptance.

Students on EPAP courses can draw up a list of the journals in their area and rank them according to their relative prestige into, say four or five categories, such as those suggested in the last paragraph. They can then discuss their decisions with peers from the same discipline or with more experienced disciplinary insiders who are likely to be familiar with the fine gradations that distinguish journals. They might then check these impressions against the journal impact factors in the Science Citation Index (SCI), available online through the Web of Science (http://www.isinet.com/journals/), and perhaps draw up a list of the different criteria they would use to judge the quality of a journal (impact, rejection rates, publishing times, etc). In this way students
can gain a better understanding of the relative risks and rewards of seeking to publish in particular journals and make more accurate assessments of their possible chances of success.

**b. Journal readership and specialism** Successful papers also reveal the writer’s knowledge of the market for the paper in the sense that it is relevant to the audience and timely in its appearance. These two factors may be more important than originality in getting a paper published, and while such decisions clearly involve a knowledge of the field and its current literature, they also relate to the question of finding the right niche for the topic. In other words, the author of a successful paper *knows the journal* to which the paper is submitted. This involves knowing the academic level at which the journal is pitched, knowing the sort of papers it publishes and knowing its intended readership. The author can then respond accordingly and choose a journal which most closely fits the level, subject matter and proposed audience of his or her paper.

EPAP instructors can encourage writers to be clear as to the focus of their target journal in order to improve the chances of successful publication. In turn, of course, this also means that they need to clearly understand the direction of their own work so they are able to position themselves in relation to the literature and to see how it fits the orientation and interests of the readers of the target journal. To accomplish this fit, students can summarize core aspects of their (planned) paper with a series of one-sentence responses to questions such as:

- What is the topic of the paper?
- What theoretical/methodological approach does it use?
- What issues does it address in the prior literature?
- What is novel in the paper?
- Who will it most interest?
This reflection on, and explicit understanding of, one’s own paper makes it easier to then target a range of potential journals for their likely interest in the paper. This can be done as a mini-research activity through library and web searches by looking at back issues to establish the relevance and suitability of the paper for a journal. Students can gain familiarity with the type of papers a journal publishes, the stance or approach it favours, the background knowledge and orientation of its readers, and the composition of its editorial board. As editors often send papers to be refereed by members of the board who may be in the reference list of the submitted paper, additional attention can be given to researching the views and possible responses of this group to the paper.

c. journal format

Publishing requirements, which address formatting, word length, referencing style, submission information and so on, are often publication specific and usually posted on the publisher’s web site. It is worthwhile writers perusing the Instructions to Authors (ITA) and Aims and Scope statements of the journals they wish to target. These documents, particularly the ITA, should guide a writer’s construction of a paper as it is frustrating to have a script returned because it fails to follow the submission guide. To ensure that a script meets these requirements, writers can carry out a web search of journal home pages on their target list and check their papers against the submission guidelines.

ii. Writing a paper

Current theory and research contains a wealth of information on professional academic discourse which can be translated into means of supporting scholars writing in English, either through workshops, personal tutoring, or creation of self-help materials. Unlike earlier intuition-driven practices, this support is based on careful analysis of actual language behaviour, typically employing the techniques of genre and corpus analysis, to make clear how patterns of language work to shape meanings.
I don’t want to imply that our teaching should simply help writers to accommodate themselves blindly to the publication machine. We have a responsibility both to students and to the ethical principles of the discipline to ensure that our students are aware of the consequences of their different language choices. Our goal, it seems to me, should always be to enhance writer empowerment and agency without disadvantaging their acceptance within their communities. This means providing support for individual understanding and expression within institutional expectations and conventions, following the sort of advice which Kubota gives to novice writers:

In my experience, the more the publishing community recognises the credibility of my work, the more I feel empowered to explore alternative ways of expressing ideas. Thus it is advisable for a writer to follow closely the conventions at least in the initial stages of writing for publication in order to gain the cultural capital that will facilitate her or his initiation into the academic community.

(Kubota, 2003: 65)

This kind of support is provided by an encouraging environment in which writers can reflect on, become aware of, and try out the persuasive options their disciplines make available. I will mention here a few key areas where novice research writers might be brought closer to the patterns of their disciplinary discourses.

\textit{a. Reflecting on strategies}

First, assisting participants of an EPAP writing course must involve, as a necessary starting point, some element of rhetorical consciousness-raising and linguistic meta-awareness. I have found it useful to begin EPAP courses with a series of preliminary tasks designed to heighten awareness of writing as a situated disciplinary practice, introducing some basic techniques of genre analysis and encouraging reflection on some of the ways that language is used to communicate research. One way of raising different possibilities to novices is to invite them to share their concerns and introduce them to the practices of established academics found in the ethnographic research literature (e.g. Myers, 1990) or in published first hand accounts (e.g. Casanave & Vandrick, 2003).
They can be asked to respond to ideas such as supervisor mentoring (Lee & Norton, 2003), adapting PhD chapters for publication, the pros and cons of co-authorship, and using good papers as models (Swales & Leubs, 2002).

Another useful task of this kind is suggested by Swales and Feak (2000: 16) who bring some key aspects of academic writing in English to students’ attention then encourage reflection on these:

American academic English, in comparison to other research languages, has been said to:

___ 1. be more explicit about its structure and purposes
___ 2. be less tolerant of asides or digressions
___ 3. use fairly short sentences with less complicated grammar
___ 4. have stricter conventions for sub-sections and their titles
___ 5. be more loaded with citations
___ 6. rely more on recent citations
___ 7. have longer paragraphs in terms of number of words
___ 8. point more explicitly to "gaps" or “weaknesses” in the previous research
___ 9. use more sentence connectors (words like however)
___ 10. place the responsibility for clarity and understanding on the writer rather than the reader

- Reflect upon your own first academic language. Place a checkmark (✓) before those points where academic writing in your L1 and American academic English differ. If you do not think the difference holds for your language, leave it blank.
- Are there other differences that you think ought to be mentioned?
- If you are writing for an American audience how much do you think you need to adapt to an American style? Do you think you need to fully “Americanize” your writing, or can preserve something of your own academic culture in your academic writing?

Contrastive tasks such as this can focus writers’ attention on some recurring organisational patterns and conventions in English which may be familiar to them in their own language, raising issues of effective argument structure, reader awareness, appropriate disciplinary interactions, and cultural
identity. Each of these features has attracted considerable attention in recent research, and an explicit awareness of them can be essential to successful academic writing.

Finally, it is also important for writers to consider issues of purpose and audience in their writing before moving on to look in detail about what these might mean for their rhetorical choices. Novices can have difficulties in recontextualizing themselves as writers in the research community rather than graduate students. Essentially, writing for publication differs from student genres in that it is what Swales (1990) refers to as a norm developing practice, concerned with persuasive reporting through the review process and engagement with the professional world, rather than norm developed which simply displays what the student knows. This is often a difficult transition to make and students are often puzzled why a thesis that meets the requirements of a reputable university fails the criteria of professional journals. Clearly, studies addressed to an expert audience can never just report what was done or what was found, but must textualize work in a way that colleagues recognise as ‘doing biology’ or ‘doing sociology’.

Students might be asked to brainstorm how these requirements for length, generalizable relevance, contextualisation in current debates, and so on can be achieved. Additionally, comparative consciousness-raising tasks can again be helpful in revealing how the purpose and audience of a text can differ, and the following suggestions can be implemented by students working in groups:

- Compare titles, abstracts, sub-headings, etc. from papers in the fields of group members
- Compare a relevant research article with an equivalent popularization of the same topic, focusing in particular on how arguments are framed in relation to audience knowledge and possible response to claims
- Compare a chapter from a thesis with a final published paper looking at audience, cohesion, argument development, level of detail, and so on.
• Outline a methods or introduction section for an article based on the corresponding section from a thesis (preferably the students’ own if possible), discussing what changes have been made to address a different audience and purpose.

b. Focusing on Structure

The schematic structures of research articles in a range of (largely scientific) disciplines have been described, together with their rhetorical moves and steps, and these can be made explicit to students as a framework for creating their own texts. Swales’ (1990) three-part CARS (Creating a Research Space) model of article introductions has been joined by other descriptions for Methods (Peacock, 2007), Results (Brett, 1994), Discussion sections (Lewin et al., 2001) and abstracts (Hyland, 2000/2004). Although descriptions offer conflicting analytic schemes for what are essentially similar texts, some have proved remarkably robust and can be extremely useful in helping novice writers both identify rhetorical units and how these perform communicative functions.

These descriptions suggest a number of pedagogic tasks. Students can, for instance, be presented with a diagrammatic representation of the move structure of a typical article which, as far as possible, corresponds to one in the student’s discipline. Weissberg and Boker’s (1990) Writing up Research, for example, offers some useful diagrams of the experimental research paper format which can be discussed and compared with actual articles in students’ fields, looking for similarities and differences. These diagrammatic representations can then be fleshed out by looking at individual sections, arranged according to what is assumed to be the order of increasing writing difficulty: methods, abstracts, results, introductions, and discussions (e.g. Swales & Leubs, 2002). This helps writers to see the rhetorical unfolding of a paper and how language is related to particular functions. Within particular article sections, discussions can then revolve around text
reconstruction activities, where students put jumbled sentences into their likely original sequence, and matching exercises, where they identify moves and steps and see how these are realized.

Academics intending to write less prosaically patterned social science papers can explore the possible range of options found to recur in presenting key recurring functions. Lewin et al (2001) define these functions as follows (with the corresponding science sections in brackets):

1. Motivating the research (introductions)
2. Describing the collection (methods)
3. Reporting results (results)
4. Evaluating results (discussion)

These communicative purposes can be identified in research papers and then explored for possible sub-functions such as limitations, unexpected results, summarizing results, and recommendations, all of which may be found in Discussion sections. Both Introductions and Discussion sections tend to be especially problematic for novice writers and warrant particular attention by EAP instructors.

By first modeling the different moves suggested in the literature and then asking students to identify the individual steps of moves in sample papers, teachers can raise awareness of conventional patterns of realization. Students can then brainstorm the points they want to include in their paper, consider how these might be expressed and where they would be best included in the paper. Swales and Feak (2004 chapter 8) is a particularly valuable resource in this regard, suggesting a number of tasks for pedagogically exploiting the CARS introduction model.

The insights produced by these kinds of activities, into the links between forms and functions and the possible variations in expressing these functions, are frequently a revelation to writers. They can be particularly useful if the EAP instructor's expertise is used in tandem with that of
experienced disciplinary colleagues. Cargill and O’Connor (2006), for instance, report the success of a ‘collaborating-colleague’ approach designed for groups of novice Chinese researchers working in this way. Questionnaire returns showed that this collaboration was the most valued aspect of the writing for publication course and that students felt they had benefited most from learning about the structure of the article genre and its sections.

c. Analyzing Sentence and discourse features

In addition to an understanding of the rhetorical structure of the research paper, writers need to develop sentence and discourse level strategies for expressing meanings and, again, the research literature directs us to the most productive forms. The fact that most novice writers are already skilled analysts in their fields can be put to good effect here by encouraging them to analyze the features of the genres they wish to write.

Concordance software can be very useful in this regard, revealing frequently used ways of expressing meanings. One such productive pattern, for example, is ‘evaluative that’ (Hyland & Tse, 2005) (as in We believe that or it seems that) which allows writers to mark their main argument, summarize the direction of the research, and highlight their stance as the theme of the sentence. Thus entering the expression it * that into a concordancer will search for the word it followed by that in the near vicinity, producing examples such as these in a corpus of research papers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>it is likely that</th>
<th>it shows that</th>
<th>it is worth noting that</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it seems that</td>
<td>it is claimed that</td>
<td>it is shown that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is clear that</td>
<td>it is true that</td>
<td>it suggests that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When these examples are studied more carefully, they reveal that academic writers use this phrasing extremely frequently to express their evaluation of whether the following statement is
likely to be true or not. Advanced students are likely to benefit from exploring the kinds of predicates used in the construction, the degree of certainty conveyed, and exploring different ways to present the source of their evaluations (Hyland, 2006).

An important feature of much recent research is an attempt to reveal how persuasion is not only accomplished through representing ideas, but also by the construction of an appropriate authorial self (Hyland, 2005). These features include, for example, imperatives, personal pronouns, hedging and boosting, and citation practices. The importance of all these items can be highlighted using corpus searches for common items and then and concordancing these. For instance the frequency of *self mention* (I, we, our, etc.) (Hyland, 2001) can be identified in a relevant corpus and then individual instances analysed in concordance lines to see the particular function they are associated with. Students may decide, for example, whether the form is used to express one of the following functions:

- explaining what was done (*We interviewed ten teachers from schools in ...*).
- structuring the discourse (*First, I will discuss the methodology used....*).
- showing a result (*Our findings show that the ...*)
- making a claim (*I think two factors are significant....*)

In turn, this could lead to a discussion concerning the degree of acceptable personal intrusion and commitment in a given discipline.

*Hedges* represent one of the most frequent rhetorical features of academic writing in all disciplines. These are devices such as *possibly, might* and *likely* which withhold complete commitment to a proposition, allowing information to be presented as an opinion rather than fact. They imply that a claim is based on plausible reasoning rather than certain knowledge and so both indicate the degree of confidence it might be wise to attribute to a claim while allowing writers to open a discursive space for readers to dispute interpretations. The most frequent hedges and their functions can be
identified using a concordance programme and then students asked to speculate on why writers chose to hedge at certain points and whether they chose to express the hedge personally or objectively.

An awareness of hedges can also be approached through the use of text extracts (Hyland, 1996). To discover the effect of hedges on statements students can:

- examine a text and distinguish statements which report facts and those which are unproven;
- identify all hedges in a text, circling the forms used, and account for their use at that point;
- locate and remove all hedges and discuss the effect on the meaning of the text;
- identify hedging forms and compile a scale ranking the amount of certainty they express,
- consider a series of reformulations which vary the levels of certainty of a text and respond in terms of whether they accurately report the original statements;
- determine whether the forms vary cross-culturally by translating them into the L1.

In addition to raising consciousness of forms, students also need to see the importance of hedges as discourse-based strategies and how they relate to the writer’s overall text plan. One way of illustrating the effect of hedges on a text is to examine the same content in different evidential contexts. Thus students can be asked to compare an article with a popularization of the same topic as a text with all hedges removed clearly becomes a different type of text, altogether more certain.

Another key feature of research papers well covered in the literature is that of citation (Hyland, 2000/2004). The inclusion of references to the work of others is obviously central to academic persuasion as it both grounds a text in previous work in a discipline and displays the writer’s status as an insider. It helps align him or her with a particular community or orientation, confirming that this is someone who is knowledgeable about the topics, approaches, and issues which currently interest and inform the field. But because discourse communities see the world in different ways they also
write about it in different ways, with disciplines employing different frequencies and forms. Essentially, we not only find a heavier use of citations in the humanities and social sciences, but also a preference for reporting verbs such as *discuss, suggest, argue, etc* which refer to *discourse activities* and often carry an evaluative element in reporting others’ work. Engineers and scientists, in contrast, tend to use fewer citations and prefer verbs which point to the research itself like *observe, discover, show, analyse*, which remove interpretation and emphasise real world actions.

In terms of pedagogy, students can examine a research paper in their field to study where reference is made to previous work, *why* the author has decided to cite at that point, what material has been cited and what can be safely left uncited. Participants can also look at the forms used, listing the reporting verbs which are used and the evaluative weight they carry, what they suggest about the writer’s attitude to the cited material. Attention can also be drawn to whether citations are mainly integral (cited author is in the citing sentence) or non-integral (cited author is in parenthesis) (Swales, 1990: 148) and why these choices have been made. Several studies have also sought to explain tense choices in citing the work of others and students might wish to examine Swales and Feak’s (2004: 254-5) claim on this issue:

- **Pattern I:** reference to single study – researcher as agent - past tense
- **Pattern II:** reference to areas of inquiry – researcher not as agent - present perfect
- **Pattern III:** reference to state of general knowledge – reference to current knowledge - present

Citation patterns should be followed up by more intensive work on how to organise an effective literature review which builds an argument towards the issues the writer intends to address.

Finally, a major area of academic writing often mentioned by reviewers and analysts as an area of difficulty for novice writers is that of *interactive metadiscourse* (Hyland, 2005; Hyland & Tse, 2004). Sometimes called *textual metadiscourse* or *metatext*, these linguistic devices allow writers to
shape their arguments to the needs and expectations of their target readers, managing the information flow of their text by judicious use of the following features:

- **Frame markers** refer to text boundaries or structure, including items used to sequence, label stages, state goals and indicate topic shifts (*this is in four parts, in sum, we will now*).

- **Transitions**, mainly conjunctions, used to assist comprehension by marking additive, contrastive, and consequential steps in the discourse (*in addition, in contrast, therefore*).

- **Endophoric markers**, make additional material salient to the reader by referring to other parts of the text (*see table two, in the previous section*).

- **Evidentials** indicate the source of information originating outside the current text (citations).

- **Code glosses** signal the restatement of information (*for example, that is, in other words*).

Tasks which can sensitize students to the rhetorical effects of metadiscourse include:

- Comparing two texts on a similar topic written for different audiences (e.g. a textbook and a research paper) and discuss how each audience is addressed by textual choices.

- Locating all transitions in a text, classify them as either addition (*and, furthermore*), comparison (*similarly, on the other hand*) or consequence (*therefore, because*) and see which types and forms are most common. Compare these with another text to draw conclusions about the type of argument or audience expectations.

- Completing a gapped text from which metadiscourse items have been removed and consider the effect of including them.

- Locating and removing all cases of a particular feature and discuss the effect this has on the comprehensibility, impact, and reader-orientation of the text.

- Using a concordancer to locate and identify all code glosses or all frame markers in a corpus of research abstracts or introductions and discuss their use.
iii. Revising and negotiating

A final area of reported difficulty for apprentice scholars is navigating the quality-assurance mechanisms of peer-review and editorial commentary (Gosden, 1992; 1995). While the majority of reviewers take considerable care to frame negative reviews in a helpful, collegial way, many novice writers are so disheartened by criticism that they give up at this point. Learning to accept criticism, understand comments, and negotiate the demands of reviewers requires both open-mindedness and determination, but these are key strategies of publishing success.

It is helpful if writers can see their submission not as a single text but as part of a genre set, the productive and receptive genres which together contribute to a paper’s eventual acceptance. Some of these, such as the ITA, editorial board list, and the paper itself, I have mentioned earlier, but other genres which ensure that a journal paper is not just shaped by the author but is influenced by the professional community through the suggestions of reviewers and editors include:

- referees reports
- editors summary and directions
- covering letter from the writer listing the changes made, noting where these appear in the revised script, and pointing out which suggestions have not been followed and why.

While these genres are ‘occluded’, or hidden from wider view, it is important that students have opportunities to see and understand them.

Frequently NNES writers complain that they can’t understand the point behind reviewers’ comments or the action which the editor is recommending. Criticisms are often hedged, phrased as questions or put in the form of gentle suggestions rather than as required changes (Hyland & Hyland, 2001) and while motivated by politeness, this doesn’t help the writer to see what changes they need to make. Tasks which focus on the expression of commentary and suggestion, such as those mentioned above for hedges for example, can sensitize students to the understatement and
mitigation often found in reviews. Other activities might include students working in pairs to respond to the ‘reviewer’s comments’ on a passage of their work made by the other; interpreting editors’ letters, deciding whether the overall tone is an encouraging ‘revise and resubmit’ or contains the implicit advice to submit elsewhere; and deciding which comments on a draft should be revised and which not, making the case for not making the changes in a covering letter.

Endnote

In this chapter I have outlined aspects of what may be a new and challenging area for EAP practitioners: that of engaging in EPAP and helping professional academics achieve their publication goals. With the growth of English as the language of scholarship and research and the scramble to publish now a career imperative, English for Professional Academic Purposes is fast becoming a central part of EAP’s research and teaching activity. Having sketched out the research evidence for taking this area seriously and the relevant theoretical perspectives which inform our approach to it, I have presented some ways that current genre, corpus and ethnographic research into disciplinary discourses can be translated into classroom support for novice scholars.

I should point out here that this is an area where linguistic research has probably outstripped pedagogic practice. While we have a large and growing understanding of disciplinary discourses and writing practices, we are still far from understanding the specific needs of this group and, indeed, whether the linguistically, socially and disciplinary heterogeneous individuals we lump together in this category actually form a single group at all. We are, in other words, flying by the seat our pants here and both more research into our students’ needs and more understanding of what actually works with different students is required to perfect our practices. What is certain, however, is that this growing and important area is both professionally rewarding and urgently needed, and I look forward to seeing the innovative ways that practitioners will respond to the challenge.
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