Pilar Mur Dueñas and Jolanta Šinkūnienė (Eds.) *Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2018. x + 310 pp. AILA Applied Linguistics Series, Vol. 18. ISBN 978 90 272 0197 3 (hardbound); ISBN 978 90 272 6309 4 (e-Book).

This edited collection of articles offers a range of perspectives on academic writing from the point of view of intercultural rhetoric. The thirteen articles selected for this publication all contrast corpus data on various Englishes and different other languages to glean into rhetorical and structural choices made by academic writers from diverse linguacultures in order to publish their research in English. Following the *Preface* by Ken Hyland and the *Introduction* by the editors, the book is arranged in three sections: "*Three-fold intercultural analysis: Comparing national, L1 English and L2 English academic texts*", "*Two-fold intercultural analysis: Comparing L2 and L1 English academic texts / Anglophone writing conventions*" and "*Intercultural analysis on the move: Exploring ELF academic texts*". The book concludes with the *Afterword: Intercultural rhetoric, English as a lingua franca and research writing* by Ulla Connor.

The three papers in the first section contrast research articles in Linguistics by L1 and L2 English writers with writing by authors in various other L1s. Since citations help us create intertextual connections and engage in a dialogue with readers, **Dontcheva-Navratilova** focuses her analysis on the frequency of citations and their rhetorical functions across the rhetorical moves of research articles (RA). The study confirms that citation practices reflect cultural conventions of linguacultural backgrounds, however L2 English writers tend to adapt to the Anglophone discourse conventions in order to enhance their publication opportunities. Dissecting the internationalisation trends in selected local and international journals, **Ruzaitė & Petrauskaitė** report on the results of a comparison of journal structures, multilingual or monolingual publishing practices, as well as the rhetorical structure of articles. The investigation has lead them to suggest that scholars need to bear in mind both the highly competitive global research arena and the local scientific traditions. Author stance and voice, as reflected in the use of personal pronouns *I* and *we*, inform the contrastive analysis of RAs by L1 and L2 English writers along with Lithuanian authors in Šinkūnienė's paper. The author establishes the features of individual cultural academic identities, but concludes that multilingual scholars adapt their writing styles to the rhetoric conventions of the language in which they produce a text.

The following section analyses persuasion techniques and rhetorical strategies in such academic genres as PhD abstracts, conference abstracts and RA introductions. **Bordet** examines PhD abstracts in English produced by L1 English writers and L1 French writers in terms of *shell nouns* determined by *this*. By comparing data retrieved from abstracts presenting research into various disciplines, she concludes that L2 English writers may require support to handle general language rather than specialist terminology. Focusing on cross-disciplinary variation of evaluative markers in abstracts written by L2 English novice research

writers **Mehrjooseresht & Ahmad** discover that these writers exhibit problems in conveying a precise degree of certainty, because they frequently use a very limited range of epistemic markers. **Chen**'s contribution draws on Swales' (1990, 2004) CARS model for RA introductions to study diachronic changes in Chinese research writing in Applied Linguistics, and discovers that Chinese researchers are steadily moving closer to implementing established English rhetorical conventions when addressing national and international audiences. According to **Povolná**, scholars must use English to gain access to a larger academic audience and become internationally recognized. However, the writer's linguacultural affiliation may still transpire in the writing conventions observed in conference abstracts by L2 English authors.

The final section brings to the forefront the impact of L2 English scholars and their linguacultural backgrounds on shaping English as a lingua franca (ELF) in research settings. Based on her research into academic abstracts produced by either L1 English authors, or L2 English authors, or translated texts, **Lorés-Sanz** claims that in a globalized world of scientific research and science dissemination, the exonormative approach to writing abstracts in English should be complemented with the endonormative one, in order to introduce a new, hybrid rhetorical pattern. **Wang & Jiang** investigate the use of rhetorical devices exploited by Chinese PhD students and L1 English expert writers. The data retrieved from two corpora of articles from four scientific domains suggest that disciplinary epistemologies as well as cultural traditions influence students' expression of stance and authorial identity, thus providing a fresh pedagogical insight that could be used in teaching academic writing to novice L2 English writers. To prove the claim that Anglophone writing standards need to be followed closely in order to publish academic articles in English in acclaimed journals, **Bondi & Borelli** contrast the final versions of unedited papers in ELF with published versions of articles along a number of parameters, such as use and function of *metadiscursive verbs* and *nouns*. Examining a similar corpus of unedited research papers in ELF by authors of various L1 and comparing the data with results from a corpus of articles published by L1 English writers, **Murillo** agrees with Mauranen (2016: 26) that "ELF is, in the main, very much like the rest of English". However, when analysing reformulation markers in both corpora a tendency towards simplification and reduced variation is discovered in the ELF texts, while different linguacultural backgrounds are also reflected in rhetorical patterns imported from writers' L1. With the aim to raise awareness of L2 English writers of the potential challenges they may face when presenting their evaluations in RA introductions, **Lafuente-Millán** investigates cultural and linguistic differences between L1 and L2 English texts at the pragmatic and functional levels. He devises an intricate classification of evaluative acts based on Swales (2004) CARS model, which helps discover that ELF authors tend to promote mainly the research topic, while L1 English authors focus on promoting the value of their own work. The function of anticipatory *it* patterns in expressing interpersonal meanings in RA writing is the focus of **Mur-Dueñas'** paper. Contrasting ELF and L1 English research articles in hard science and social science domains, she reveals that certain anticipatory *it* patterns are much more productive in the ELF RAs and, therefore, suggests a consideration of such uses as innovations and legitimate usages in international scholarly communication in order to enhance intercultural rhetoric.

In sum, this volume presents a comprehensive overview of intercultural variation in academic writing in a globalized and interconnected world, where scholars from different fields routinely use English to share and discuss their findings with an international audience.

Since RAs published in international academic journals serve as the most important platform for dissemination of developments in disciplinary fields among scholars of various L1s, many authors in this volume and in the larger field of applied linguistics (e.g. Connor, 2018; Bennett, 2016; Seidlhofer, 2019) emphasize the need for the academic rhetoric and discursive conventions to integrate insights from ELF research to accommodate intercultural communication of global users in the academia.

References

Bennett, K. (Ed.) (2014). *The semiperiphery of academic writing*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Connor, U. (2018). Afterword: Intercultural rhetoric, English as a lingua franca. In P. Mur-Dueñas, and J. Šinkūnienė, (Eds.) *Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mauranen, A. (2016). ELF corpora: Design, difficulties and triumphs. In M. L. Pitzl& R. Osimk-Teasdale (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Perspectves and prospects: Contributions in Honour of Barbara Seidlhofer* (pp. 19-30). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Seidlhofer, B. (2012). Anglophonecentric attitudes and the globalization of English. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1*(2), 393-407.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research Genres. Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neva Čebron
University of Primorska, Slovenia