DOI 10.36145/DoC2020.01

Preface

Dear Russell,

On the occasion of my visit to your School I left my only presentable brown hat in your anteroom. I wonder whether since then it has had the privilege of enclosing only brains in England which I ungrudgingly regard as better than mine; or whether it has been utilized in some of the juvenile experimentations in physics, technology, dramatic art, or prehistoric symbolism; or whether it naturally lapsed out of the anteroom.

If none of these events, or shall we rather call them hypotheses, holds good or took place, could you be so good as to bring it in a brown paper parcel or by some other concealed mode of transport to London and advise me on a post card where I could reclaim it? I am very sorry that my absentmindedness, which is a characteristic of high intelligence, has exposed you to all the inconvenience incidental to the event.

I do hope to see you some time soon.

Yours sincerely,

B. Malinowski

Dear Malinowski,

My secretary has found a presentable brown hat in my lobby which I presume is yours, indeed the mere sight of it reminds me of you.

I am going to the School of Economics to give a lecture…, and unless my memory is as bad and my intelligence as good as yours, I will leave your hat with the porter at the School of Economics, telling him to give it to you on demand (quated in Kuper, 1983, pp. 23-24).

We begin this preface with letters exchanged in 1930 between Polish anthropologist Bronisław Malinowski and British philosopher Bertrand Russell because they offer an interesting insight into how written discourse may differ depending on the writing tradition authors subscribe to. We can see clearly here that Russell's concise and to-the-point reply is in stark contrast with Malinowski's flowery and digressive diction. Despite the fact that both writers succeed in getting their message across, arguably the most effective, in the context in which they occur, is Russell's.

Effective communication lies at the basis of scholarship as academics need to disseminate their ideas and beliefs through international conferences and publications in order to receive feedback and encouragement for future contributions to the field. Moreover, this is how the content and quality of national and international scholarship constantly evolves and improves. A theme which this publication aims to address; however, is that given that academic knowledge is today mostly constructed and disseminated internationally in English, to what extent might the effectiveness of the communication be affected when scholars are writing in English when it is not their first language.

Decisions about authorial self-portrayal are not independent, but vary depending on the 'rhetorical situation', which involves

"representation of audience, subject matter, and other elements of context" (Cherry, 1988, p. 269). The reader's perspective is a dominant element of the 'rhetorical situation'; it is critical not only in the affect it has on the way writers construct meaning and present their knowledge claims, but also in the perceived assessment of the text as a contribution to the scientific landscape of their shared academic discipline. A text therefore has no life of its own, it is incomplete until it is read and it is the reader who brings 'something' to complete it.

However, the 'something' that a reader brings to an academic text involves a variety of interpretive strategies and approaches. Fundamental to a successful interpretation of a text is the reader's possession of previous specialized knowledge that comes from the shared disciplinary domain; its principles, knowledge sets and discursive practices. This reader-oriented view of academic text production emphasizes the impact of the social context in the process of authorial self-realization and the potential pressure this places on the writer, to reflect and respect the written norms in this community of practice. This leads to a couple of revisions in our long-shaped views on knowledge, language, and communication.

As a result of these revisions, the central question becomes, not how do we know something? But how can we get others to accept our interpretations? Because writers can only guide readers to a particular explanation rather than demonstrate proof, readers always have the option of refuting them. At the heart of academic persuasion, then, is writers' attempts to anticipate possible negative reactions to their claims. To do this they must encode ideas, employ warrants, and frame arguments in ways that their potential audience will find most convincing, and this is accomplished through language. But it is language that demonstrates legitimacy.

Certainly, there are register-level features which characterize a great deal of academic discourse, particularly writing. Students are often encouraged to employ features such as nominalization, impersonalization, and lexical density, foregrounding disciplinary arguments and subject matter to suppress their personal interests and identities. A core of academic competencies might consist of a control of explicitness, intertextuality, objectivity, emotional neutrality, hedging, correct social relations and appropriate genre requirements (e.g., Johns, 1997, pp. 58-64). It is, however, hard to pin these competencies down at the level of rhetorical features as disciplinary practices vary so extensively (Hyland, 2004; Hyland, & Jiang, 2019). Academics only reach some consensus about knowledge through the discourses of their disciplines, so physicists do not write like philosophers nor lawyers talk like linguists. They acquire the specific ways they need to engage with other members of their discipline through participation in its discourses and practices. This means that claims for the significance and originality of research have to be balanced against the convictions and expectations of colleagues, taking into account their likely objections, background knowledge, rhetorical expectations and processing needs (Hyland, 2004).

Persuasion leans heavily on demonstrating credibility by control of research methodologies and the ability to employ community approved argument forms. It involves not only drawing on the theories and the topics of one's field, but establishing a professionally acceptable persona and an appropriate attitude, both to one's readers and one's arguments. Academic discourses, then, are closely bound to the social activities, cognitive styles and epistemological beliefs of particular disciplinary communities. The ways community members understand knowledge, what they

take to be true, and how they believe such truths are arrived at, are all embodied in a community's discourse conventions. This is why writing for publication is just as difficult for Native English Speakers as for researchers who speak another first language. 'Native-speakerhood' refers more accurately to the acquisition of syntactic and phonological knowledge as a result of early childhood socialization and not competence in writing, which requires prolonged formal education. Academic English is noone's first language and we do not learn to write in the same way that we learn to speak, but through years of schooling. For us as academics it is the painful trial and error of participating in a community's valued ways of communicating which makes us proficient and which brings us any success we have.

Persuasion in academic articles, then, just as in other areas of life, involves the use of language to relate personal beliefs to shared experience: you have to make your ideas both comprehensible and convincing to those you address. Academic discourse works to transform laboratory findings or armchair reflections into academic knowledge through a conversation between individuals, and these individuals write and read as members of disciplines. We galvanise support, express collegiality, resolve difficulties, and negotiate disagreement through rhetorical choices which connect our texts with our disciplinary cultures.

Because writing for publication is challenging for both mother tongue and non-mother tongue researchers, framing publication problems as a crude Native vs non-Native polarization would be a considerable oversimplification. As Hyland argues, "writing as an L1 English scholar does not guarantee a successful publishing career any more than working as an isolated, off-network EAL author condemn one to failure. Authorial agency and individual

experience, too often ignored [...], are key dynamics" (2016, p. 66). It seems therefore essential to separate two things here, namely: (1) linguistic proficiency in English, and (2) off-network participation in global scholarship. These two factors are the equally important reasons why many researchers are unable to enter into the Burkean conversation with other academics from international research communities. Many EAL academics are fluent in English but are often unfamiliar with academic varieties of English, and thereby lack access to current scholarship, as a result of which their work sounds like 'old news'.

Today in Central and Eastern European countries, writing in English for research and publication purposes has become a particularly urgent need, and local academic writers now have to face the above challenges. A recent reform of the science and higher education system in Poland (2017-2019) included the decision to consider publications only from indexed databases, which is a first in the history of Polish universities. Consequently, Polish academics and researchers from all academic disciplines, who want to maintain and promote their scientific status must publish in English. This is a critical change in former Eastern bloc countries which previously had significant domestic channels for the publication of their scientific articles. This has sparked hot debates on the future of academic outputs of Polish scholars. Therefore, we feel that in order to respond to this rapid internationalization and 'anglicization' of Central and Eastern European scientific output, in-depth insight is now extremely pressing into how scientists from this part of the world perceive their authorial voice when writing in English and consequently, how they present themselves in their texts.

Despite the fact that the term 'academic writing' is used globally to encompass almost all written output within specific

domain contexts, including academic literacy and scholarly writing, for Eastern and Central European academics the term is not so clear. The art of writing, which came to be called 'composition' in the 19th century in Britain and the United States, has no equivalence in Eastern and Central Europe. For example, in 1874 Harvard University introduced an entrance exam that consisted of a writing component and the composition classes began to develop as a "device for preparing a trained and disciplined workforce" and for assimilating "huge numbers of immigrants into cultural norms, defined in specifically Anglo-Protestant terms" (Berlin, 1996, p. 23).

With the very rare exception of tertiary-level English Philology and some classes on literature, almost no tailored writing classes have been offered to students at any level of education in Eastern and Central Europe. Consequently, these countries have not evolved descriptive, normative standards of rhetoric and students who then go on to pursue activities which involve writing academic texts, have a very vague knowledge of how to organize their written work, or formulate and argue a thesis. In contrast, academic literacy in the Anglo-Saxon world has been practiced in a variety of genres and text types and has standardized principles for acceptance.

In the absence of descriptive, normative rhetorical writing styles, Central and Eastern European academic writers have relied on preconceived assumptions as to what constitutes effective writing for scientific purposes. These assumptions are not bound necessarily by discipline specific conventions but mostly formed on the basis of a *stereotypical vision of scientific writing* established by the intellectual tradition of the respective cultures. This stereotype influences the preferred patterns of scholarly ideation, research tools and methodologies along with academic register and textual structure. In this way, the intellectual legacies of given cultures

have affected how research and study has been diffused to the wider academic community (see Lehman in this volume).

The rhetorical academic legacies which shape Central and Eastern European academics' scholarly writing traditionally reflect the Cartesian (individualistic) model of scientific discourse. Grounded in Cartesian pragmatics, it works on a set of metaphysical and epistemological- methodological assumptions and claims whose main pillars are *cognitive rationality, depersonalization, deductive reasoning, objectivity, anti-rhetorical style, empirical support for claims* and *the priority of the 'knower' over the 'known'* (see e.g. Bazerman, 1984; 1988; Kopytko, 1995; 2001). This view is supported by a Cartesian rationalism which holds that scientific knowledge can be derived a priori from 'innate ideas' through deductive reasoning. In the Cartesian paradigm an agent, i.e., speaker/writer, is capable of individual, rational, context free, abstract and universal acts of cognition.

Modern science, however, rejects the primacy of the Cartesian rational individual as the source of understanding in favour of a sensory empiricism, where the observing scientist records and communicates events in the natural, or social, worlds. This view, of the academic conducting research and then retiring to his or her office to write it up, also has problems however, as it suggests academic discourse simply reports observations that represent an external reality. The problem for scientific views of knowledge is that nature cannot speak to us directly and interpretation of events in the natural or social world always depends on the assumptions which academics bring to the problem (Kuhn, 1970). That is, all reporting occurs within a pragmatic context and in relation to a theory which fits observation and data in meaningful patterns, so there is no secure base from which any theories can be tested. As the celebrated physicist Stephen Hawking once observed, "It makes

no sense to ask if a theory corresponds to reality, because we do not know what reality is independent of a theory" (1993, p. 44) . There is always going to be at least one interpretation for research data and the fact that we can have these competing explanations shifts attention from research, whether in the laboratory or the library, to the ways that academics argue their claims.

Nonetheless, the tendency to subscribe to the Cartesian paradigm can be still found in Polish science and can be illustrated by the choice of research fields by Polish linguists. These include syntax, word formation, onomastics, language theory grounded in structuralism, all of which focus on theoretical aspects of discourse. The lack of focus on pragmatic aspects of discourse analysis was also observed by Duszak who points out that "little recognition is given to the interactive properties of texts, academic texts included" (Duszak, 1997, p. 30). In contrast, Anglo-based research in linguistics concentrates mainly on empirical enquiries, conducting large-scale research in such areas of scientific discourse as L2 writing; academic writing; English for academic purposes; voice and identity in written discourse; discourses of culture, English in the world (see e.g., Hyland, 2009; 2012; Holliday, 2011; 2018) with the aim of pointing to a practical application of their findings. This potential application of research findings traditionally, has no equivalent in Polish research.

The concept of Cartesian paradigm is juxtaposed with the non-Cartesian (contextualized and social) model of scientific discourse, which is more open to pragmatic elements adopted from non-scientific discourses, such as linguistic choices, variability, negotiability, emotions and motivations. It also features a situated agent, whose cognition is "*social*, *context-dependent*, *interactive*, *collective*, *dynamic*, and *embodied*" (Kopytko, 2001, p. 796; see also Varela et al., 1993; Clark, 1997). The non-Cartesian paradigm reaches far beyond the

idealized properties of the Cartesian model and corresponds broadly to the Anglo-Saxon way of doing and writing about science.

Both the Cartesian and non-Cartesian approach to science require a consideration of the following aspects: (1) the purpose in research, (2) suitability of the method and methodology, and (3) the feasibility of the research endeavor. However, in many research cases the adaptation of a single paradigm would not suffice to discuss and disseminate scientific research. For example, the *individual* vs social dichotomy in academic writing cannot be comprehensively analysed within a unified Cartesian methodological framework. Therefore, it is rather a matter of degree than unconditional commitment to one paradigm. Along these lines, Kopytko argues, "A follower of this non-Cartesian view of pragmatics will not feel obliged to endorse the fourteen properties of [Cartesian pragmatics]1. This, however, does not mean that he/she has to completely reject all of them. It does not seem to be a question of 'either - or', but rather one of degree [...]" (2001, p. 791).

In the light of the above, a key purpose of this volume is to obtain deeper insights into the perceptions and strategies adopted by Central and Eastern European academics when writing for publication. It is of interest, therefore, to see how the contributors operationalize the Cartesian and non-Cartesian approaches science in their textual self-representations. In other words, whether they abandon the disjunctive logic of the 'either-or' in favor of

1. *Cartesian pragmatics* is supported by the following 14 tenents: (1) the duality of the mental vs. physical "world", (2) the innateness hypothesis, (3) the modularity of mind, (4) a common cognitive processing mechanism, (5) the representational view of mind, (6) essentialism, (7) the discreteness/categoriality of pragmatic phenomena, (8) cognitive rationality, (9) certain knowledge, (10) universal rules, (11) universal claims, (12) the deductive method, (13) predictiveness, (14) the priority of the 'knower' over the 'known' (Kopytko, 1995; 2001).

the conjunctive ‘both-and’, how these preferences differ across disciplines and most importantly what struggles they face when navigating their texts rhetorically in English.

Ken Hyland & Iga Maria Lehman
Warsaw, April 2020

References

Bazerman, C. (1984). Modern evolution of the experimental report in physics: Spectroscopic articles in Physical Review, 1893–1980. *Social Studies in Science, 14*(2), 163–196.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge. The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Berlin, J. (1996). Writing instruction in school and college English. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *A short history of writing instruction* (p. 23). Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press.

Cherry, R. (1988). Ethos versus Persona: Self-Representation in Written Discourse. *Written Communication,* 5, 251–276.

Clark, A. (1997). *Being there: Putting brain, body and world together again.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Duszak, A. (1997). Cross-cultural academic communication: a discourse-community view. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse* (pp. 11–39). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hawking, S. (1993). *Black Holes and Baby Universes and other essays (p. 44). London: Penguin Random House.*

Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural Communication & Ideology.* London: Sage.

Holliday, A. (**2018).** *Understanding intercultural communication: negotiating a grammar of culture*, (2nd edition). London and New York: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic Discourse: English in A Global Context.* London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary Identities: Individuality and Community in Academic Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 31,* 58-69.

Hyland, K., & Jiang, K. (2019). *Academic Discourse and global publishing: Disciplinary persuasion in changing times.* London: Routledge.

Johns, A.M. (1997). *Text, role and context: developing academic literacies* (pp. 58–64). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kopytko, R. (1995). Against rationalistic pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, 475–491.

Kopytko, R. (2001). From Cartesian towards non-Cartesian pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(6), 783–804.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuper, A. (1983). *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The modern British school* (pp. 23–24). London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Varela, F.J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1993). *The embodied mind.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.