

INTRODUCTION

Birgit Huemer

This book originated from the symposium ‘Academic writing across languages: multilingual and contrastive approaches in higher education’, held at Luxembourg University on 2 and 3 December 2016. The symposium explored how academic writing varies across languages and aimed to enrich concepts for teaching academic writing in multilingual environments in settings of higher education.

Multilingual academic writing is still a young sub-discipline within both academic writing and multilingual studies. Within these two research areas, however, it has been studied from several distinct angles. Most studies in academic writing focus on text analysis, using a functional, genre-based, or corpus linguistic approach. More specifically, contrastive rhetoric looks at the differences between academic writing across languages and academic socializations. Studies in second language acquisition and within tertiary education – such as English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache, or Français sur Objectifs Universitaires (FOU) – help to develop pedagogies for students in order to improve their second or third language skills and to adapt to university norms. Especially today, as English has (been) developed into the dominant language of academia, the repercussions of English as Lingua Franca (ELF) have gained importance within research in higher education. All of these research strands have influenced each other and have developed pedagogies for academic writing.

Although such pedagogies already exist, more recent studies focus on the political implications of language policies at universities and – which is of particular interest for this book – how writers productively deal with their multilingual competences and cultural backgrounds in academic contexts. However, few attempts have been made to research how language professionals can help writers improve their multilingual competences during their learning, researching, and writing activities. This book thus aims to contribute to this pertinent and timely research topic by exploring multilingual teaching approaches, linguistic similarities or differences among writers of various language backgrounds, and writing practices of multilingual speakers.

In the following, this introduction will give a short overview of theories and studies that have influenced the contributions to this book, i. e. contrastive or intercultural rhetoric, cross-linguistic studies, and critical perspectives on language use in higher education.

Contrastive or intercultural rhetoric

Contrastive rhetoric is a term coined by the American linguist Robert Kaplan in 1966 (Kaplan, 1966). As an approach, it is concerned with how linguistic patterns and rhetorical conventions vary across cultures and thus influence language use and second language learning. The field brought attention to intercultural rhetorical differences, especially in writing, and enabled teachers to better assist language learners by comparing writing in students' first (L1) and second languages (L2). It became particularly important for studies in academic and professional writing and, even more so, for students using English as second language (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL).

In its early years, contrastive rhetoric was based first and foremost on text analysis and influenced studies in genre and corpus analysis. In the 1980s and 1990s ethnographic approaches gained more and more influence on linguistic studies, and the concept of language as patterned communication and social interaction (Hymes, 1962) sparked interest in researching writing socialization within contrastive rhetoric.

Following the lead of L1 writing research and pedagogy, in which the 1970s were said to be the decade of the composing process and the 1980s the decade of social construction, empirical research on L2 writing in the 1990s became increasingly concerned with social and cultural processes in cross-cultural undergraduate writing groups and classes, with the initiation and socialization processes that graduate students go through to become literate professionals in their graduate and professional discourse communities [...]. (Connor 2002, p. 497)

Acknowledging the insights yielded by ethnographic approaches to the phenomena under study, Connor suggested changing the term contrastive rhetoric into *intercultural rhetoric*, because it arguably better reflected the focus on cultural differences and the variety of research methods used.

Intercultural rhetoric research is interdisciplinary in its theoretical and methodological orientation. It draws on theories and research methods from second language acquisition, composition and rhetoric, anthropology, translation studies, linguistic discourse analysis, and genre analysis. (Connor 2004, p. 291)

Among other text genres that have been studied, the genres produced in university contexts have become a major research focus. In Anglo-American contexts – but also in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East – academic genres and writing social-

izations have been researched under the label of English for Academic Purpose (EAP) with a view to teaching the specifics of academic writing to novice students (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; Jordan, 1997; Hyland, 2000; Flowerdew, 2002).

In Asian, European and Middle Eastern contexts, the academic writing of students and scientists with an L1 other than English has been extensively compared to the writing of native English-speaking students and scientists. These studies follow, for example, genre-based approaches developed by Swales (1990) or Bhatia (1993), corpus linguistic methods (e. g. Johansson, 1998), text analytic approaches driven by text or discourse analysis (e. g. de Beaugrand & Dressler, 1981; van Dijk, 1985; Bazerman, 1994), or systemic functional linguistic theory (e. g. Halliday, 1985 and others). Ethnographic approaches like Berkenkotter and Huckin's (1993) concept of discourse communities, Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanič's (2000) situated literacies, or Scollon and Scollon's (2000) emphasis on the social situatedness of communication and interaction have influenced a considerable number of these studies.

Outside the Anglo-American contexts, academic language use, development, and teaching have been researched, for example, in German-speaking countries. German as an academic language (Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache) has become a research strand of its own since the 1990's (e. g. Ehlich, 1994, 1999, 2000; Ehlich & Steets, 2003; Graefen, 1997, 1999, 2000; Redder, 2002, Kruse, Jakobs, & Ruhmann, 1999; Gruber et al., 2006; Gruber, Huemer, & Rheindorf, 2009; Pohl, 2007; Steinhoff, 2007). French as an academic language (Français sur objectifs universitaires) has been an object of investigation in French-speaking countries for the last two decades (Pollet, 2001, 2014; Tutin, 2007; Mangiante & Parpette, 2011; Cislacu, Vlad, & Claudel, 2011; Grossmann, 2012; Boch & Frier, 2015; Dezutter, Silva, & Thonard, 2016). For an overview of studies on other European academic languages and writing cultures, see Torrance et al. (2012) and Kruse et al. (2016).

Cross-linguistic studies

Among the many cross-linguistic studies that have been undertaken, only a few can be named here. The studies mentioned in the following analyze the rhetorical structures of different sections of academic texts, for example abstracts, introductions, the method or discussion part of articles, as well as how text sequences are made coherent. Others examine specific aspects of academic texts and how they are realized linguistically, for example in hedging, voice or stance, the use of passive voice, or reporting verbs. The first group of studies investigates how English is used by ESL/EFL users compared to English native-speakers. The second group of studies is concerned with analyzing differences between English and other aca-

demic languages. The third and least-known group compares languages other than English. In the following, some of these studies are listed by language group – Asian, European, and Middle East – and are presented in chronological order.

Hinkel (1997) in his corpus-analytical study finds that speakers of Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Indonesian use rhetorical questions and tags, disclaimers and denials, vagueness and ambiguity, repetition, several types of hedges, ambiguous pronouns, and the passive voice in greater frequencies when they write in English than English native-speakers do. Lee and Chen (2009) analyze function words and other key items in research writing by Chinese learners. Cao and Xiao (2013) explore the textual variations between English abstracts written by native English and native Chinese writers from twelve academic disciplines. Yang (2013) explores linguistic and cultural variations in the use of hedges in English and Chinese scientific discourse. Chen (2013) investigates the overuse or underuse of English phrasal verbs by Chinese, British, and American university students. Leedham (2015) draws conclusions from a corpus-driven study on Chinese students' writing in English, and Gardner derives pedagogical insights from contrastive studies of English and Chinese writers (chapter four in this book).

While Hinds (1983, 1987) claims to find cultural differences between Japanese and English academic writing culture, Kubota (1998) criticizes the West-East dichotomy of cultural representations in the applied linguistics literature of the 1990s as driven by colonial discourse and myths that result from *Othering* when looking at East Asian cultures from a Western perspective.

Many European languages such as Bulgarian, German, Finnish, French, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish have been contrasted with either English or other languages. Tang et al. (2012) in their anthology discuss academic writing issues, including studies of L1 and L2 writers of English, and many other language backgrounds.

Vassileva (2000, 2001) analyzes authorial presence in academic discourse in English, German, French, Russian, and Bulgarian.

Clyne (1987, 1991) examines cultural differences of English and German native speakers in the organization of academic texts. Busch-Lauer (1995) investigates the formal schemata and linguistic devices of German medical abstracts and their English equivalents. Redder (2001) compares the use of modal verbs in German and English academic argumentations. Fandrych and Graefen (2002) analyze text-commenting devices in German and English academic articles, and Thielmann (2009) conducts a contrastive analysis of German and English academic texts (see also chapter five in this book). A research project led by Villa Vigoni compared academic text genres produced by university students in German, Italian, and French university contexts (Dalmas et al., 2009). Heller (2012) contrasts German

and Italian academic discourse, and Venohr (2016) looks at the differences between French and German academic writing.

For Finnish and English, Ventola and Mauranen (1996) analyzes English research articles written by Finnish L1 speakers and compares them to articles written by English native-speakers. They find that Finnish writers used connectors less frequently and with less variation than their English native-speaker colleagues (see also Mauranen, 1993). Luodonpää-Manni (2009) explores the use of metaphors in research articles of French and Finnish writers.

Donahue (2008) compares academic writing at French and American universities. Rowley-Jolivet and Carter-Thomas (2014) study the citation practices of expert French writers of English and possible interference when citing in a foreign language. Their study was undertaken on the basis of 40 draft manuscripts in science, engineering, and computational linguistics and a comparable corpus of articles published by native English. Rentel (2009) analyses the differences of summaries written in the university context in French and German.

Fløttum (2003) investigates pronominal author manifestation in research articles of English, French, and Norwegian writers. In her doctoral thesis, Vold (2008) analyzes epistemic modality in French, Norwegian, and English research articles.

Duszak (1997) examines Polish and English introductions in academic papers, and Golebiowski (1998) compares Polish and English psychology journal articles. Both find numerous stylistic differences between the two languages. Dontcheva-Navratilova (2016) investigates cross-cultural variation in the use of hedges and boosters in academic discourse.

Bennett (2010) analyzes specific discourse features in Portuguese and finds that there are at least two other academic discourses regularly produced in Portugal today that are based upon an entirely different epistemology than the rational empirical paradigm underlying the English model. Hirano (2009) compares the rhetorical organization of research article introductions in Brazilian Portuguese and English in the field of Applied Linguistics, using Swales' CARS model (1990) as an analytical tool.

Moreno (1997, 1998) analyzes genre constraints and the explicit signaling of premise-conclusion sequences in Spanish and English research articles. She finds that writers from both language groups use similar textual strategies with similar frequency for the phenomenon studied. Differences, however, appear on the interpersonal level: Spanish academics seem to hedge their conclusions less frequently than their English-speaking colleagues do. Martin (2003) conducts a genre analysis of English and Spanish research papers abstracts in experimental social sciences. Lee and Casal (2014) investigate cross-linguistic variation of meta-discourse in the results and discussion chapters of Engineering Masters' theses written in English and Spanish.

In the Middle Eastern context, Hatim (1997) contrasts Arabic and English academic discourse. Fakhri (2004) examines Arabic research article introductions and finds that the majority differs substantially from the CARS model suggested by Swales (1990). Furthermore, he compares Arabic introductions in the fields of Humanities and Law (Fakhri, 2009), and concludes that there are disciplinary tendencies as well as patterns borrowed from French academic discourse, yielding a rather complex picture.

Samaie, Khosravianb, and Boghayeric (2014) compare the types and frequencies of hedges employed by Persian and English native speakers when writing English academic article introductions in the field of Literature. They identify many differences, which they suggest scholars should pay attention to when trying to publish in international journals.

Other scholars have studied differences between Arabic and English academic discourse in order to assist students in both academic knowledge-building and acquiring language skills, which are linked (e. g. AlFadda, 2012; Al-Khasawneh & Maher, 2010; Al-Zubaidi, 2012; Mousavi & Kashefian-Naeini, 2011). However, most of these studies are focused on problems or errors rather than specific linguistic characteristics that might differ in Arabic or English academic discourse.

Although the studies mentioned here provide essential groundwork for a better understanding of similarities and differences in academic writing across languages, they focus on some aspects only. Hence, much work remains to be done in order to provide sufficient knowledge of better comparative understanding of academic writing across languages

Critical perspectives on language use in higher education

While some have a pragmatic attitude towards the dominance of English as the *lingua franca* of academia in most disciplines today, others critically call for multilingual policies and teaching approaches at universities. Regardless of the position one takes, the necessity of writing and publishing in English has guided research and teaching approaches since the 1990s, acknowledging the need to help students and scholars succeed in an academic environment in which English is the dominant and most powerful language (Bhatia, 1993; Flowerdew, 1999, 2002; Hyland, 2000, 2003, 2004, 2009; Swales, 1990).

Recently, power relations that derive from the dominance of English in academic settings have increasingly come under scrutiny – perhaps because the consequences of this development have now become obvious. Academic languages other than English are being marginalized, competition has increased, and university language policies are affecting university cultures and academic careers.

University rankings evaluate internationalization and success – to name only a few criteria – by the number of international students enrolled, the number of publications placed in high rated international journals, and research grants awarded. As a result, the number of courses taught in English at universities where English is not the national language keeps growing (Gazzola, 2017). Thus, scholars coming from language and cultural backgrounds other than English are often disadvantaged against scholars socialized in Anglo-American academic discourse communities. Canagarajah (2002a), for example, critically explores how Third World communities and their knowledge are marginalized, while the knowledge of Western communities is legitimated and reproduced. Ammon (2001, 2002), Truchot (2001), and others reflect on the influence that English has on other European academic languages, such as German or French. Lillis and Curry (2006, 2010) look at the pressure to publish in English that scholars in non-English-speaking countries are subject to and examine how literacy brokers such as editors, publishers, reviewers, academic colleagues, and translators influence text production and the publication processes. Haberland and Preisler (2015) as well as Hu (2016) discuss the effects that internationalization has on university language policies.

The aforementioned developments suggested several courses of action for research on multilingualism at universities. Two key studies in Europe that focused on multilingualism in higher education are briefly described here. The project “Cultural identity in academic prose: national versus discipline-specific” (KIAP) compiled a corpus of 150 research articles in total. The corpus consists of research articles in three languages (English, French, and Norwegian). Within each language, sub-corpora of three disciplines (economics, linguistics, and medicine) were created. The aim of this project was to investigate the manifestations of authors’ voices and their interaction with the reader and the discourse community, in order to describe similarities and differences between languages and disciplines. They found both, a number of similarities within disciplines across different languages as well as interesting differences between languages (Fløttum, Dahl, & Kinn, 2006). These findings indicate the importance of raising students’ and teachers’ awareness of language- and discipline-specific characteristics of academic writing.

The project “Language Dynamics and Management of Diversity” (DYLAN) examined how social actors in three different sectors – private companies, political institutions of the European Union, and higher education – deal with multilingualism. The project investigated the following aspects: efficiency and fairness in language choices, emerging language varieties, and the historical dimensions of multilingualism. The results of this project related to higher education are of particular interest to our research topic (Berthoud, Grin, & Lüdi, 2013). Six universities in which multilingual policies and education play an important role are pre-

sented: The Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona with Catalan, Spanish, and English as university languages; the Libera Università di Bolzano with Italian, German, and English; the Universités de Lausanne et de Genève with German, French, and English; the University of Helsinki with Finnish, Swedish, and English; and the Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj, Romania, with Romanian, Hungarian, and German as languages of instruction. The Belgian contribution to this project examines language policies and their effects on school education. The data gathered in order to analyze multilingual policies and interaction stem from document analysis, observation of class interaction, students' informal peer-interaction as well as interviews and questionnaires. The results of this investigation give insights into language policy development and its consequences for higher education. Furthermore, it shows how multilingualism actually comes about in interaction. Both projects, KIAP and DYLAN, have the potential to inform the development of multilingual pedagogies in higher education.

Whereas KIAP and DYLAN analyzed written texts and verbal interactions to draw conclusions, Canagarajah (2002b) follows a theoretical approach. He suggests that students with language backgrounds other than English should foster the discourse about academic writing norms. Despite existing power relations between English and other languages of academic practice, teachers should motivate students to contribute their multiple voices and cultural traditions – being at the same time creative, critical, and reflective – when writing academic texts.

Although Canagarajah acknowledges the contributions that EAP and contrastive rhetoric have made to research into multilingualism and academic writing, he criticizes both approaches for foregrounding the problematics of non-English-speaking language backgrounds. Scholars in EAP, he argues, follow a pragmatic approach: they try to help students manage English academic discourse and writing, without questioning dominant norms and discourses. According to Canagarajah, contrastive rhetoric sees language backgrounds other than English as problematic, because it may cause interference and may therefore hinder successful communication. He further criticizes the Social Process Approach (Bizzell, 1992; Bruffee, 1983) for being too optimistic about students' potential to change existing power relations. However, Canagarajah concludes that the aforementioned approaches are particularly helpful in making existing norms and power relations visible. He calls for multilingual teaching pedagogies that foster critical discussion, challenge existing norms, and empower students to integrate their language backgrounds and academic cultures into established academic discourses.

Like the many different approaches that have influenced researchers in multilingual academic writing, many of which have been briefly summarized here, the contributions in this book view academic writing across languages from different

angles. They have all been collected to present new insights into academic writing across languages and to discuss what still needs to be done to development successful multilingual academic writing pedagogies in university contexts.

Contributions to this book

The book is structured into four parts and concludes with propositions for further research and implications for teaching. The first part is concerned with multilingual and multicultural approaches for teaching academic writing at the university. The second part looks at specific linguistic features in academic papers in contrast. The third part examines multilingual writing practices. Part four, finally, reports on the outcomes of the panel discussion that followed the symposium in 2016 and suggests possibilities for a structural integration of academic writing education into the university.

Donahue starts of the first part by briefly summarizing the research into language across different cultural contexts as it developed over the last 50 years. She observes that so far studies within contrastive rhetoric and discourse analysis have had a tendency to foster discourses of difference. Others, however, she claims, have shown that when we move beyond surface linguistic differences, particular kinds of writing might in fact have more in common than not in shared contexts. In the current context of mobility, Donahue further explains that for writing and language scholars the term *superdiversity* evokes exactly the kinds of rapid fluid change we are seeing in academic contexts today, where student mobility and diversity of student languages cannot but help to affect academic discourse and writing. She thus asks which models and which resources students need in these super diverse contexts and concludes by suggesting three complementary models: *translingualism*, *multicompetence*, and *heteroglossia*. Based on these models she calls for developing pedagogies that foster students' ability to transfer, reuse, and adapt their linguistic and discursive knowledge across contexts and languages. For that aim, she points out, we need to develop a space in which the characteristics of translanguaging, multicompetence, and heteroglossia feel natural. Her conclusion encourages us to reflect on the monolingual or multifaceted models of language we hold in our minds when teaching academic writing.

In chapter two, Kuitunen and Carolan outline a multilingual language and communication program within the discipline of History developed at the University of Jyväskylä Language Centre, Finland. The program is embedded in various BA degrees and uses Finnish, Swedish, and English to induct students into oral and written academic literacy practices. It consists of modules in academic literacy, multilingual communication, and research communication. Kuitunen and Carolan

detail the development and implementation of the program for history students and report on their feedback.

In chapter three, Vold presents cultural differences present in the concept of hedging in academic papers and the repercussions for multilingual authors. She asks which didactic approaches to teaching hedging can be applied in multilingual and multicultural contexts at the university. Considering the disciplinary and cultural background of each writer, she argues, one cannot give a general rule to learners. Furthermore, she explains that discussing the intercultural dimension also opens up a necessary discussion about the individual dimension of academic writing. Instead of teaching norms for academic writing, she suggests raising learners' awareness of different writing styles. She concludes that an awareness model could ultimately improve the conditions for intercultural interactions and exchanges within the research community.

In part two, linguistic features in academic writing in different languages are compared with each other. In chapter four, Gardner describes the British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus and reviews studies that have used it to compare the advanced English academic writing of Chinese and British students. The BAWE corpus contains various assignment types from over 800 students across 300 degree programs. While most of these are written by students with English as their home language, a substantial number are by students with a Chinese home language. The lexico-grammatical differences found in contrastive Chinese-English research using the BAWE corpus can be used to inform vocabulary and grammar teaching in advanced writing courses.

Passive voice is an important linguistic resource in academic writing. It is usually described as having the function of suppressing the agens. In chapter five, Thielmann claims that passive voice actually has more to offer. He explains how passive voice is misleadingly treated as a verb form, thus neglecting the functionality of the components that make up this structure. Thielmann analyzes the components *to be + past participle* in English and *werden + Partizip II* in German, explains their functions in academic texts, and contrasts them to each other. In doing so, he shows that both the English and the German structures are used for thematic organization and for announcing text structure to readers (e. g. in abstracts). His contrastive analysis also clearly points out differences in functionality and therefore ways of knowledge construction between the two languages.

In chapter six Deroey, Huemer and Lejot report on the discourse structure of literature reviews in German, English and French dissertations from the Master in “Learning and Communication in Multilingual and Multicultural Contexts” at the University of Luxembourg. The study forms part of their work to identify content that could be taught in a multilingual academic writing course. The discourse

structure of literature review paragraphs is found to consist of three elements: report, discussion and text organization. While considerable differences exist in the frequency with which these elements occur across the German, English and French samples, the data reveal issues that could be addressed jointly, including creating cohesion in reporting, strengthening the writer's 'voice', and integrating text organizing discourse.

Part three looks at writing practices of multilingual students. In chapter seven, Dengscherz explores how verbal repertoires, language repertoires, and language biographies influence the shape of writing processes in multilingual contexts. She presents preliminary results drawn from two case studies of her ongoing research project PROSIMS. In this project, writing data have been collected in real time via screen videos, and retrospective interviews have been conducted to explore to which extent and in which situations writers use different languages during the writing process. First results indicate that students use individually different strategies during the writing process. Nevertheless, some patterns have emerged: students tend to draw on multilingual repertoires when brainstorming or thinking about contents. However, when they focus on rhetorical tasks, they tend to focus on the target language and only use other languages to compensate or solve wording problems. The study aims to generate a theory of multilingual writing that is meant to support the development of didactic concepts for individual professionalization in multilingual writing.

In chapter eight, Rheindorf gives an overview of and critically discusses research into stance-related strategies – foremost the use and categorization of reporting verbs – in academic writing in EAP and ESL contexts. These studies have shown that expert writers create authority, integrity, and credibility through specific linguistic choices expressing fine shades of epistemic certainty and uncertainty, while L2 student writers rely on a more limited range of linguistic resources for modulating epistemic commitment, leading them to make overly firm or certain assertions. In his own study, Rheindorf argues that this is also the case for postgraduate student writers at Austrian universities who are German native speakers and struggle with appropriate stance-related strategies in English. He concludes by presenting a new framework that allows for more flexible positioning of reporting signals and group activities which can help to increase students' awareness of stance-related resources and their rhetorical effect.

In chapter nine, Giannoutsou argues that a bottom-up investigation into language practices and ideologies can contribute relevant findings to the discussion on language beliefs in academic contexts. Her main objective is to explore ideological aspects of shifting discourse practices with the help of language ethnography. Giannoutsou interviewed 17 scholars at Hamburg University, most of them being

L1 German speakers. Her results revealed that the study's participants feel an unavoidable obligation as well as peer pressure to orient to English. They also feel ashamed of writing in languages other than English. These scholars gave no clear, official reason for subscribing to this monolingual English orientation and mostly viewed multilingual writing as the act of writing in both their mother tongue and English. She highlights the often-neglected role of language ideologies (and of their socio-economic origins) in the formation of professional linguistic orientations.

Part four starts with chapter ten, in which Deroey reports on the outcomes of the panel discussion that followed the symposium in 2016. The scholars taking part in the panel discussed issues regarding policy, knowledge processes, and academic writing in a multilingual higher education context. This chapter outlines approaches to academic writing research and teaching that were suggested as useful and necessary by the panel discussants.

In chapter eleven, Redder links her ideas to the panel discussion and calls for a structural integration of academic writing education into the university. She argues for the establishment of centers for comparative studies into academic language and communication ("Zentrum für die Komparatistik der Wissenschaftskommunikation") at universities to foster multilingual communication and research in academia.

References

AlFadda, H. (2012). Difficulties in academic writing: From the perspective of King Saud University postgraduate students. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 123–130.

Al-Khasawneh, F. M. S., & Maher, S. (2010). Writing for academic purposes: Problems faced by Arab postgraduate students of the College of Business. *UJUM.ESP World*, 9(28), 1–23.

Al-Zubaidi, K. O. (2012). The academic writing of Arab postgraduate students: Discussing the main language issues. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 46–52.

Ammon, U. (Ed.) (2001). *The dominance of English as a language of science. Effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Ammon, U., & McConnell, G. (2002). *English as an academic language in Europe. A survey of its use in teaching*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanič, R. (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.

Bazerman, C. (1994). *Constructing experience*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bennett, K. (2010). Academic discourse in Portugal: A whole different ballgame? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 21–32.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1993). Rethinking genre from a socio-cognitive perspective. *Written Communication*, 10, 475–509.

Berthoud, A.-C., Grin, F., & Lüdi, G. (Eds.) (2013). *Exploring the dynamics of multilingualism. The Dylan project*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. New York: Longman.

Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg Press.

Boch, F., & Frier, C. (2015). *Ecrire dans l'enseignement supérieur. Des apports de la recherche aux outils pédagogiques*. Grenoble: ELLUG.

Bruffee, K. (1983). Writing and reading as collaborative or social acts. In J. N. Hays (Ed.), *The writer's mind*. Urbana: NCTE.

Busch-Lauer, I. A. (2007). Abstracts. In P. Auer, & H. Baßler (Eds.), *Reden und Schreiben in der Wissenschaft* (pp. 99–114). Frankfurt am Main, New York: Campus.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002a). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002b). Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1(1), 29–44.

Cao, Y., & Xiao, R. (2013). A multi-dimensional contrastive study of English abstracts by native and non-native writers. *Corpora*, 8(2), 209–234.

Chen, M. (2013). Overuse or underuse: A corpus study of English phrasal verb use by Chinese, British and American university students. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 18(3), 418–442.

Cisclaru, G., Vlad, M., & Claudel, C. (2011). *L'écrit universitaire en pratique*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Clyne, M. (1991). The sociocultural dimension: The dilemma of the German-speaking scholar. In H. Schröder (Ed.), *Subject-oriented texts. Languages for special purposes and text theory* (pp. 49–67). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Clyne, M. (1987). Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. English and German, *Journal of Pragmatics* 11, 211–247.

Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 493–510.

Connor, U. (2004). Intercultural rhetoric research: beyond texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3, 291–304.

Dalmas, M., Foschi, M. & Neuland, E. (Hrsg.) (2009). Wissenschaftliche Textsorten im Germanistikstudium deutsch-italienisch-französisch kontrastiv. *Trilaterales Forschungsprojekt in der Villa Vigoni 2007–2008, Bd. 2*, (pp. 294–306).

de Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Longman.

Dezutter, O., Silva, H., & Thonard, A. (2016). Scriptur@les, une nouvelle ressource pour repenser la didactique de l'écriture en contexte universitaire à l'ère numérique. *Le français à l'université*, 21(1). Retrieved on October 4, 2018 from <http://www.bulletin.auf.org/index.php?id=2200>

Donahue, C. (2008). *Ecrire à l'université: Analyse comparée, France-Etats-Unis*. Villeneuve-d'Ascq: France Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.

Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2016). Cross-cultural variation in the use of hedges and boosters in academic discourse. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 5(1), 163–185.

Duszak, A. (1994). Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 291–313.

Ehlich, K. & Steets, A. (Hrsg.) (2003). *Wissenschaftlich schreiben – lehren und lernen*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Ehlich, K. (1994). Die Lehre der deutschen Wissenschaftssprache: sprachliche Strukturen, didaktische Desiderate. In H. Kretzenbacher & H. Weinrich (Hrsg.), *Linguistik der Wissenschaftssprache* (pp. 325–352). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Ehlich, K. (1999). *Alltägliche Wissenschaftssprache*. InfoDaF, 26, 3–24.

Ehlich, K. (2000). Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache für das 21. Jahrhundert. In *GFL 1/2000*. Retrieved on October 4, 2018 from <http://www.gfl-journal.de/1-2000/ehlich.html>.

Fakhri, A. (2004). Rhetorical properties of Arabic research article introductions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1119–1138.

Fakhri, A. (2009). Rhetoric variation in Arabic academic discourse: Humanities versus law. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 306–324.

Fandrych, C., & Graefen, G. (2002). Text-commenting devices in German and English academic articles. *Multilingua*, 21, 17–43.

Fløttum, K., Dahl T., & Kinn, T. (2006). *Academic voices: Across languages and disciplines*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fløttum, K. (2003). Personal English, indefinite French and plural Norwegian scientific authors? Pronominal author manifestation in research articles. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 21, 21–55.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 123–146.

Flowerdew, J. (Ed.) (2002). *Academic discourse*. London: Longman.

Gazzola, M. (2017). Why teaching in English may not be such a good idea. In *THE 2017*. Retrieved on October 4, 2018 from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/why-teaching-english-may-not-be-such-good-idea>

Golebiowski, Z. (1998). Rhetoric approaches to scientific writing: An English-Polish contrastive study. *Text*, 18(1), 67–102.

Graefen, G. (1997). *Der Wissenschaftliche Artikel. Textart und Textorganisation*. Frankfurt am Main: PeterLang.

Graefen, G. (1999). Wie formuliert man wissenschaftlich? *Materialien Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 52, 222–239.

Graefen, G. (2000). Wie schwer ist die deutsche Sprache wirklich? *Materialien Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 58, 191–210.

Grossmann, F. (2012). Pourquoi et comment cela change ? Standardisation et variation dans le champ des discours scientifiques. *Pratiques*, 153–154, 141160.

Gruber, H., Huemer, B. & Rheindorf, M. (2009). *Wissenschaftliches Schreiben – ein Praxisbuch für Studierende der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag.

Gruber, H., Muntigl, P., Reisigl, M., Rheindorf, M., Wetschanow, K. & Czinglar, Ch. (2006). *Genre, Habitus und wissenschaftliches Schreiben*. Münster: LIT Verlag.

Haberland, H., & Preisler, B. (2015). The position of Danish, English and other languages at Danish universities in the context of Danish society. In F. X. Vila & V. Bretxa (Eds.), *Language policy in higher education: The case of medium-sized languages* (pp. 15–42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication across cultures. Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Heller, D. (2012). *Wissenschaftskommunikation im Vergleich: Fallstudien zum Sprachenpaar Deutsch-Italienisch*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3(2), 183–195.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor, & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 141–152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hinkel, E. (1997). Indirectness in L1 and L2 academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27(3), 361–386.

Hirano, E. (2009). Research article introductions in English for specific purposes: A comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28, 240–250.

Hu, A. (2016). Internationalisierung und Mehrsprachigkeit: Universitäten als interkulturelle und mehrsprachige Diskursräume. In A. Küppers et al. (Hrsg.), *Bildung in transnationalen Räumen* (pp. 257–268). Wiesbaden: Springer.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London: Continuum.

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin, & W. Sturtevant, *Anthropology and human behaviour* (pp. 13–53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Johansson, S. (1998). On the role of corpora in cross-linguistic research. In S. Johansson, & S. Oksefjell (Eds.), *Corpora and cross-linguistic research: Theory, method, and case studies* (pp. 1–24). Rodopi: Amsterdam.

Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966/1980). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. In C. Kenneth (Ed.), *Readings on English as a second language* (pp. 399–418). Cambridge: Winthrop.

Kruse, O., Jakobs, E.-M. & Ruhmann, G. (Hrsg.) (1999). *Schlüsselkompetenz Schreiben. Konzepte, Methoden, Projekte für Schreibberatung und Schreibdidaktik an der Hochschule*. Neuwied: Luchterhand.

Kruse, O., Chitez, M., Rodriguez, B., & Castelló, M. (Eds.) (2016). *Exploring European writing cultures. Country reports on genres, writing practices and languages used in European higher education*. Winterthur: ZHAW Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften. (Working papers in applied linguistics 10).

Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1–L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 69–100.

Lee, J. J., & Casal, J. E. (2014). Metadiscourse in results and discussion chapters: A cross-linguistic analysis of English and Spanish thesis writers in engineering. *System*, 46, 39–54.

Lee, D., & Chen, X. (2009). Making a bigger deal of smaller words: Function words and other key items in research writing by Chinese learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(4), 281–296.

Leedham, M. (2015). *Chinese Students' Writing in English: Implications from a Corpus-driven study*. London, New York: Routledge.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication*, 23 (1), 3–35.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

Luodonpää-Manni, M. (2009). Étude comparative des métaphores dans les articles de recherche en histoire et en linguistique du finnois et du français. In J.-M. Defays, A. Englebert, M.-C. Pollet, L. Rosier, & F. Thyrrion (Eds.), *Acteurs et contextes des discours universitaires, tome II* (pp. 237–248). Paris: L’Harmattan.

Mangiante, J.-M., & Parpette, C. (2011). *Le français sur objectif universitaire*. Grenoble: PUG.

Martin, M. P. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research papers abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(1), 25–43.

Moreno, A. I. (1997). Genre constraints across languages: Causal metatext in Spanish and English RAs. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(3), 161–179.

Moreno, A. I. (1998). The explicit signaling of premise-conclusion sequences in research articles: A contrastive framework. *Text*, 18, 545–585.

Mousavi, H. S., & Kashefian-Naeini, S. (2011). Academic writing problems of Iranian post-

graduate students at National University of Malaysia (UKM). *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 593–603.

Pohl, T. (2007). *Studien zur Ontogenese wissenschaftlichen Schreibens*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Pollet, M.-C. (2001). *Pour une didactique des discours universitaires: Étudiants et système de communication à l'université*. Louvain-la-Neuve : De Boeck Supérieur.

Pollet, M.-C. (2014). *L'écrit scientifique à l'aune des littéracies universitaires approches théoriques et pratiques*. Namur: Presses universitaires de Namur.

Redder, A. (2001). Modalverben in wissenschaftlicher Argumentation: Deutsch und Englisch im Vergleich. *Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 27, 313–330.

Redder, A. (Hg.) (2002). „Effektiv studieren“. *Texte und Diskurse in der Universität*. In OBST Beiheft 12. Duisburg: Gilles und Francke.

Rentel, N. (2009). Différences interculturelles dans le discours universitaire : une analyse contrastive du type de texte résumé en français et en allemand. In J.-M. Defays, A. Engelbert, M.-C. Pollet, L. Rosier, & F. Thyrion (Eds.), *Acteurs et contextes des discours universitaires, tome II* (pp. 285–299). Paris: L'Harmattan.

Rowley-Jolivet, E., & Carter-Thomas, S. (2014). Citation practices of expert French writers of English: Issues of attribution and stance. In L. Andrzej, & K. Warchał (Eds.), *Occupying Niches: Interculturality, cross-culturality and aculturality in academic research* (pp. 17–34). Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer International Publishing.

Samaie, M.; Khosravianb, F., & Boghayeric, M. (2014). The frequency and types of hedges in research article introductions by Persian and English native authors. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1678–1685.

Scollon, R., Scollon, S. W., & Jones, R. H. (2000). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Steinhoff, T. (2007). *Wissenschaftliche Textkompetenz. Sprachgebrauch und Schreibentwicklung in wissenschaftlichen Texten von Studenten und Experten*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tang, R. (Ed.) (2012). *Academic writing in a second or foreign language: Issues and challenges facing ESL/EFL academic writers in higher education contexts*. London: Bloomsbury.

Thielmann, W. (2009). *Deutsche und englische Wissenschaftssprache im Vergleich*. Heidelberg: Synchron.

Torrance, M., Almargot, D., Castelló, M., Ganier, F., Kruse, O., Mangen, A., Tolchinsky, L., & Van Waes, L. (Eds.) (2012). *Learning to write effectively. Current trends in European research*. (= Studies in Writing). UK: Emerald.

Truchot, C. (2001). The language of science in France: Public debate and language policies. In U. Ammon (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a language of science. Effects on other languages and language communities* (pp. 319–328). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Tutin, A. (2007). Autour du lexique et de la phraséologie des écrits scientifiques. *Rev. franç. de linguistique appliquée*, 2007, XII-2 (5–13).

vanDijk, T.A. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol.1–4). New York: Academic Press.

Vassileva, I. (2000). *Who is the author? A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian academic discourse*. Sankt Augustin: Asgard Verlag.

Vassileva, I. (2001). Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(1), 83–102.

Venohr, E. (2016). Mehrsprachigkeit in grenznahen Unternehmen im Saar-Lor-Lux-Raum. In R. Freudenfeld, U. Gross-Dinter & T. Schickhaus (Hrsg.), „(In) fremde Sprachwelten übersetzen“. *Beiträge zur Wirtschaftskommunikation, Kultur- und Sprachmittlung in DaF und DaZ*, 42, 129–152.

Ventola, E., & Mauranen, A. (1996). *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vold, E. T. (2008). *Modalité épistémique et discours scientifique. Une étude contrastive des modalisateurs épistémiques dans des articles de recherche français, norvégiens et anglais, en linguistique et médecine*. Thèse de doctorat. Bergen: Université de Bergen.

Yang, Y. (2013). Exploring linguistic and cultural variations in the use of hedges in English and Chinese scientific discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 50(1), 23–36.