

Book reviewed:

Fløttum, K. (Ed.) (2007). *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing (vii + 280 pp).

Reviewed by:

Alfredo A. Ferreira
Department of Language and Literacy Education
University of British Columbia
2125 Main Mall, Vancouver, Canada, V6T 1Z4
fredjie@interchange.ubc.ca

Lene Nordrum
Department of Applied Information Technology
Chalmers University of Technology
SE-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden
lene.nordrum@chalmers.se

In recent decades, research on academic discourse has boomed, particularly in relation to English as the lingua franca of scholarship, but also for other languages. The volume *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse* is set firmly in this field, describing academic discourse at various levels of resolution and inter-/intralingual comparison. Three languages are in focus: English, French and Norwegian.

The book emanated from the symposium *Academic Voices in Contrast*, at the University of Bergen in May, 2006, initiated by the Norwegian KIAP project (Norwegian abbreviation for *Cultural Identity in Academic Prose*), whose goal was to shed light on two related questions: 1) whether cultural identities can be identified in academic prose, and 2) if so, to what extent such identities are language- or discipline-specific? The symposium focused on the relation between “‘traditional’ linguistic versus contextual approaches’ and on interlingual and interdisciplinary differences in academic discourse (p. vii). However ‘traditional linguistics’ and ‘contextual approaches’ are interpreted, such questions are clearly at the heart of applied practices, most notably in communication/language interventions in higher education, which constantly need to balance questions of language proficiency, genre fluency and communicative competence.

This multiscale perspective on practice is a recurring motif. As pointed out by Shaw in the introduction, many of the authors in the volume have taught academic writing within the general framework of Language for Specific/Academic Purposes (LSP). This is also the background we bring to the reading of this book. Indeed, it is likely to be advanced scholars and practitioners in LSP that form the largest audience for this work, although the book will also be of direct interest to linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, other social scientists, and scholars in the disciplines studied.

The research represented in the book has a secure foundation in a range of socially-oriented, linguistic approaches to academic discourse, and tends to dialogue with more contextually-oriented sciences up the continuum clause-text-culture. Shaw begins the introductory chapter by proposing that the studies in the volume represent non-competing approaches that collectively illustrate their object – academic discourse – in its different aspects; to do this, he draws on the metaphor, invoked by biologist Stephen Gould, of life as ‘a copiously branching bush... not a ladder of predictable progress’. The dimensions explored in the volume

and reviewed by Shaw are genre, discipline, language, user competence, text medium, and historical focus. The subtitle for the review of these *resources* of scholarship in academic discourse, '[s]ome complications', nicely captures their corresponding nature as problem-posing *objects* for the same scholars. We note that this approach to the review does not, however, accommodate summaries of the twelve other chapters, with the exception of chapter two, in which the KIAP project is presented. This is reasonable considering the symposium was convened by KIAP project scholars, whose work is also cross-referenced in many of the papers collected.

Shaw's review is useful for understanding the aforementioned dimensions of academic discourse; however, the introduction may not prepare some readers as well as it perhaps could have. Readers will encounter the six dimensions richly instantiated, but, in our view, it is not the particular relation of the studies to these dimensions that is likely to 'complicate', in a more fundamental and overwhelmingly good sense, the reading across chapters. A more salient feature is the range of theoretical and philosophical positions reflected in the individual chapters, with papers adopting approaches as varied as enunciation linguistics, educational and functional linguistics, strands of rhetoric, and approaches associated with the historical and contrastive methods of European philology. Predictably, these informing approaches are variably involved and signalled in the respective chapters. In our view, additional orientation to these points of variation among the chapters would have provided readers with a useful perspective on the more central bifurcations in the 'copiously branching bush' that is academic discourse as this is instantiated in the volume.

The opening chapter introduces the key features of academic discourse as the author found it in 2006. The remaining two papers in the opening section, somewhat loosely labelled 'Introduction and General Issues', are less 'general' in their interests than this suggests. Rather, they introduce two programmatic, Nordic-based projects adopting suitably particular frameworks: Swalesean genre and enunciation linguistics in the case of chapter two and Aristotelian rhetoric in chapter three. These and other variations prompt us to address chapters individually, and close with some general comments.

The KIAP project research introduced in chapter two attempts to identify the *cultural identities* in the genre of the research article by exploring academic voices in a double contrastive methodology across three disciplines (economics, linguistics and medicine) and three languages (Norwegian, French and English). In focus in the chapter are the voices of the author (*self*) and of the reader and other persons in the community (*other*). This work is situated within a wider theoretical frame of genre as proposed by Swales and others, with a 'broad interpersonal and polyphonic perspective' informing the more delicate aspects of the analysis. For those readers who find themselves at once intrigued and disoriented by this central part of the methodology, the associated reference suggests a Scandinavian form of enunciation linguistics, which is understood to explore linguistic traces of situated interaction between utterer and interlocutor, notably in the use of interpersonal deictics such as pronouns, modalities, and tenses, often analyzed in conjunction with sociodiscursive constructs such as genre and polyphony. According to the authors, the approach is distinctly linguistic; for example, genre is treated less sociologically than in the new rhetoric approach. Correspondingly, we would add that its linguistics is less attached to a language-based theory of meaning in social context than is systemic functional linguistics (SFL). Analysis of a number of linguistic phenomena was carried out; the specific findings highlighted in the report are for the use of (1) the pronoun 'we', (2) the French pronoun *on* (roughly, 'one'), (3) epistemic modality involving 'may' in English and its

counterparts *pouvoir* in French and *kunne* in Norwegian, and (4) explicit and implicit voices within polyphony.

The findings are presented as both general and specific. A global finding relates to characteristics that may be considered generalizable for the discourse communities examined. Notably, for most of the linguistic features analyzed, the research article writing of disciplinary colleagues has more in common than that of language-community co-members writing in different disciplines; in other words, in characterizing cultural identities linguistically, ‘discipline wins over language’ (p. 15). The reported results for the four features are summarized as follows. For the use of ‘we’, feature (1), the study finds that authors manage degrees of their presence in the work, affiliation with readers, and directness in controlling readers. The use of *on* in papers in French, feature (2), is found to be a notable factor of textual coherence operating across a broad range of semantic features. For (3), the study shows how epistemic modality contributes significantly to the polyphony of the research article, reflecting at once the openness of the author to alternative voices, and the constant semantic pressure exerted by other voices implicitly present. This result is reflected in the wider concern for polyphony (4), the analysis of which shows that degrees of identification of different voices reflect an interactive ‘play’ set up by the author to direct the interpretation of the text. These results appear to show good potential for, among other things, recontextualization in academic writing instruction.

In chapter three, Berge reports on three multidisciplinary Scandinavian studies of non-fiction, ‘subject-oriented’ writing and associated disciplinary text cultures carried out in the 1990s. Collectively, these projects sought to understand the variation and institutionalization of scientific text cultures in everyday Nordic society. It follows that the data used for these studies are science texts in the public domain, such as popular science magazines, government service bulletins, textual practices around birth control, and school and college textbooks. The study is broadly informed by Aristotelian rhetoric of science, which, according to the author, takes as its main object the relation between the goal of ‘unbiased truth’ in science and its mediation by semiotic means in oral and written academic texts. Section two of the chapter attempts to resolve the paradox of studying acts of scientific research as acts of persuasion.

Section three culminates in two key theoretical statements for the study: rhetoric is identified as a semiotically mediated, acculturating force that encodes genre knowledge and offers a principled analytical technique for understanding the relative success of some rhetorical behaviours. According to Berge, these qualities establish rhetoric as a tool for deliberating the ethical dimensions of semiotic acts. From this theoretical base, the three projects set out to analyze the ‘proofs, indices and topics’ of scientific texts (p. 49) and their ethical norms, including the history, acquisition and expression of these norms. Section four presents the methodology associated with the three studies, which Berge characterizes as *textual anthropology*. The approach has several key features. It accounts for the genres, texts, and semiotic modalities that constitute the textual practices of the culture while avoiding the impulse to institutionalize the emergent patterns as disciplinary standards. The approach assumes variation in the permeability of borders between disciplines, in degrees of institutionalization surrounding disciplinary practices, and in the standardization and grammaticalization found in individual texts in relation to the meaning potential in situational contexts.

Berge summarizes the three studies, two of which are Ph.D. theses; these two studies are outlined here. The first, Gjerstad’s analysis of a prominent textbook in criminology, finds that the textbook achieves high status by appeal to its position in the hierarchy of texts in criminology, a position which is buttressed by alignments with the methods of natural science and insistence

on the falsity of non-scientific understandings. Yet, as Gjerstad tries to show, the book persuades by manipulating scientific norms in ways that are ethically questionable and over-simplifying textual roles of participants in criminology discourse. The third study, by Bakken, reports on conflicting paradigms within literary criticism (or literary science, as it is commonly referred to in Scandinavian contexts). Bakken found that, with the emergence of an aesthetic approach as an alternative to the conventional historical one, literary researchers draw on the approach that is most persuasive in the relevant context, enjoying the availability of what Bernstein (1999) would call parallel disciplinary languages. This confirms Bakken's hypothesis, a finding that counters the emphasis ascribed in the KIAP project to cultural convention. Berge concludes the chapter with the recommendation for further critical reflection on the 'scientification' of society, particularly as this process is realized in education. We find in this chapter an imbalance favouring rationale and theory, with too few analytical details from the three focal studies. Nevertheless, the chapter does offer an enticing view on the research programme advanced by Berge and his colleagues. We drew the conclusion, for example, that Bakken's perspective on encounters between disciplinary paradigms and approaches would have been useful in the volume's introduction.

Chapter four, by Bondi, opens the section on disciplinary discourse by examining practices of averral and attribution in the discourse of history. According to Bondi, in the absence of a writer's attribution of a proposition to another author, the responsibility for all propositions in discourse is understood to lie with the writer; the latter case describes averral. The research expands analysis of averral and attribution in history from questions of identifying the source of academic propositions, to those of writer authority, positioning and identity. Specifically, Bondi's purpose is to examine the openings of research articles in history for writers' construction of an authoritative identity through their use of averral and attribution. The study begins with a broad review of the kinds of voices, overt and discrete, that contribute to authorial identities typically involved in history research.

Bondi finds a rich site for observing the writer's use of the resources of voice for identity construction in the intersection between voice and time setting, where the writer's voicing of temporal sequences is analyzed for evaluations of historical entities and events. While different analytical tools are used for the studies of averral and attribution respectively, both parts of the analysis draw on a model of academic voice that maps the status of voices in a matrix formed by the two axes, Discourse, which focuses on entities, and Time. Bondi developed this model from concepts in discourse studies and narratology. The Discourse axis comprises Discourse Participants (i.e., writers, readers and discourse community) and Discourse Actors (i.e., historical characters); the Time axis comprises Time of Discourse (of the writer and reader) and Time of the Story (of historical events). This model highlights the differential access to knowledge of historical events among Actors and Participants in the discourse of history. Using the model, Bondi distinguishes two basic types of openings in history papers. Phenomenic openings, dominated by Discourse Actors and Time of Story, place the discourse in historical time with historical characters. Epistemic openings, dominated by Discourse Participants and Time of Discourse, place the discourse within a contemporary interpretive debate.

Bondi analyzes 280 article openings drawn from ten journals, adopting Swales' CARS model for research article introductions in distinguishing and analyzing the history article openings. These are analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively, using conventional and corpus-based methods, for evaluative and temporal meanings, particularly for the way references to the future are managed in the narrative. Selected results, greatly summarized, are as follows. In

relation to averral, variations in writer identity – as Recounter, as Interpreter, and as Academic Arguer – are observed to emerge in the article openings from modal evaluations associated with degrees of certainty, and from affective evaluations associated with qualities of desirability. As for attribution, Bondi considers variation in the writer's alignment with the other expert voices invited into the text; this process is strongly implicated in constructing the argument and identity of the writer. A question that remains for us concerns the cumulative, synthetic development of evaluation and identity across a text and, for example, the relation between the authorial profile at the start of the text and in its subsequent unfolding. The results of the study may, for some, demand more thinking across the complex framework and unravelling of the somewhat weakly distinguished terms 'voice', 'stance', 'positioning', and 'identity' than is desirable. This will be the cost of an insightful and useful analysis into the construction of history writers' identities in the history papers.

The contributions of chapter five are deeper than might be predicted from the title's catchline, 'Different Strokes for Different Folks'. Hyland's scholarship in academic writing and English for academic purposes (EAP) is widely followed. In this paper, he contributes to 'the emerging field of disciplinary studies' by reporting on studies carried out over ten years into writers' use of interactional resources as acts of persuasion that, furthermore, constitute a central feature of community practices of knowledge construction. The functional overlap associated with the use of interactional resources, especially with textual ones, is typical of the complementarities Hyland finds between broad functional areas in academic discourse (Thompson 2008). The chapter proceeds by asserting that while academic disciplines are highly mutable, they persist as discursively constructed social spaces. Practices of interaction are central to the persistence of disciplines. In turn, the study of these disciplinary practices contributes to their continuity by informing activities such as writing instruction.

Hyland outlines his model for interaction in academic writing using the concepts of stance and engagement. Stance refers to writers' resources for relaying their attitudes and credibility. These include hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mention. Engagement describes resources for drawing readers into the discourse; they are reader pronouns, directives, personal asides, appeals to shared knowledge and questions. The classification represents an advance in delicacy from the model of interactional resources presented in the well-known monograph, *Metadiscourse* (Hyland 2005), where stance is not used as a formal category, interactional resources include the set now within stance as well as the category of engagement, and engagement resources include only two types, versus the five presently identified.

The data comprise a corpus of 240 research articles from ten journals distributed across the humanities, social sciences and sciences. We note in passing that some readers may question Hyland's use of the contentious shorthand of 'soft' and 'hard' to distinguish the disciplines. These data were supplemented by interviews with scholars. Some of the main findings are that the resources of stance were used significantly more frequently in the humanities and social sciences than the natural sciences; hedges were by far the most common kind of stance resource used in all disciplines; and authors in the humanities were far more likely than their counterparts in the natural sciences to use the resources of engagement explicitly for rhetorical effects. Among engagement resources, reader pronouns were the most common, with more than 80% of all occurrences in the corpus found in the humanities and social science writing. Hyland also finds that the writer-reader solidarity inherent in authors' use of 'we' serves the additional purpose for the author of claiming authority by, for example, anticipating reader objections. We note that the engagement resource, in this case, carries some stance-related functionality; this is

an indication of fuzziness in the model, which Hyland considers inevitable in any description or typology (2006).

The research reported in chapter six by Salager-Meyer and colleagues contrasts critical voices in English- and French-language book reviews appearing in well-ranked medical journals. The corpus consists of 50 book reviews (BRs) in each language. These were examined for: the language and form of authorship of the book reviewed (e.g., whether authored or edited); the ratio of BRs containing critical remarks; the occurrence of epistemic modality in conjunction with the critical comment; references to the reviewer him/herself as an indicator of his/her critical voice; the degree of subjectivization and objectivization of the critical remark, i.e., who the flaw is attributed to; and any other notable features of the critical remarks that may be associated with the language of the BR.

The first set of results is curious as it reads like a description of the corpus as this might have appeared in the 'corpus and methods' section. The French and English corpora are very similar in nature of authorship, with an equal ratio of 58% of reviewed books being edited volumes, and 42% of books reviewed being authored (with single or multiple authors). While all the English language BRs reviewed books originally written in English, over half of the French BRs reviewed translations from English. Some of the main results reported for the use of critical remarks are as follows. Approximately 75% of the BRs in both languages contain critical comments, an interesting finding that suggests, according to the authors, that conflict is not a necessary feature of the genre. Critical remarks in the French reviews are accompanied by hedging (realized by epistemic modality) in 42% of cases, while for those in English the number is 12%, suggesting a higher tolerance for threats to face in the English BRs. In accordance with this, English-language book reviewers are found to identify themselves more explicitly than their counterparts using French, who tend to use the impersonal pronoun *on* ('one'). These and other results point to significant contrasts in the nature of critical remarks in medical BRs in the two languages.

In their discussion of the reviewer and the reviewed in the corpus, the authors return to the terms introduced in the catchline of the article title, 'the prosecutor and the defendant'. This metaphor is memorable but perhaps somewhat misleading, in our view: it may indicate an overemphasis on relations between the book reviewer and book author as the context for BR authors' choices of interpersonal language. A feature of book reviews inferred from the authors' very useful literature review is that these texts do not present the final judgement, but rather are linked to many other voices, pronouncements and discussions which arise concerning the book. This Bakhtinian argument can be supported from various angles, including from the observation made by the authors that the book review author is in many cases 'a fledgling' [sic]. The two metaphors, of fledgling and prosecutor, do not sit well together to describe the book review author, even if we accept that this writing task is rich in paradox. The metaphor may also be complicit in forcing a simplification of the social context of the review. The authors write: 'BRs reflect, as we said before, the functioning of the social interaction between their communicative participants, the reviewer and the reviewed' (p. 111). We contend, however, that the review, including the mediational work of managing potential face-threatening acts, realizes and reflects the reviewer's relation with the readership of professional scholars at least as much as it does the relation with the book (or chapter) author. This would be a matter to explore further; however, in our view, the framing of the BR as a textual encounter between two individuals undermines this otherwise refined study.

Tønnesson's rhetorical study of Norwegian history discourse, in chapter seven, investigates the way multiple critical revisions of World War II history are realized in a local history of Sandefjord, Norway, written by Finn Olstad. This history is contextualized as part of a trend towards 'de-tabooing' of the topic of relationships between young Norwegian women and German soldiers, a process that may help address related issues in contemporary Norwegian society such as the alienation of children born from those relationships. Three approaches to critical, multi-voiced revision in Olstad's history text are identified in the text.

The first approach to revision Tønnesson identifies is in the use of multiple implied voices which collectively and in tension with each other build up the rhetorical topoi that constitute the historical argument. The researcher draws on Bakhtin's notion of polyphony and on music theory and notation to categorize the voices operating in the text, drawing mainly on analysis of logoi. These are organized as a 'score' for the text sample, with the notation showing five rows: the 'Superius' or 'Supra' being the uppermost, explicit voice of the author operating 'at the surface' (p. 131) of the text, and the 'Tenor', which is placed at on the bottom row as the 'privileged authorial voice' that carries the forward the argument. In between these two are the three implied voices (Voices I – III), which Tønnesson identifies with topoi available in the socio-discursive context of authorship in Norwegian history: Voice I, of the 'neutrally balancing historian'; Voice II, of the 'classical WWII occupation historian'; and Voice III, of the 'revisionist WWII occupation historian' (p. 130). These voices are realized by sentence- and phrase-level text fragments, which are written into their respective lines of the textual score as a way of illustrating and visualizing the polyphonic meanings of the history text. By rhetorical analysis of the topoi realized in the three implied voices, the analyst identifies one that becomes the Tenor, the voice that distinguishes itself as privileging a recognizable authorial position within the history community.

The second approach extends the analysis of logoi-led topoi to ethos-led topoi, which reflect writer stances in relation to the claims made, and pathos-led topoi, which organize variation in ways of positioning readers. These extensions enable the analyst to posit a Model Reader, which is further theorized using Eco's reception-theory model of the *lettore modello*. This stage in the research is supplemented by intensive interviews with four actual readers closely connected to Sandefjord. The main result from this part of the analysis is that four Model Readers are identified in the meaning potential of the text; these also tend to recognizable, normative positions in the local historical discourse. The final part of the analysis involves synthesis of the first two parts, not as a binary, but as an orchestration of the authorial tenor voice and the voices of Model Reader. The latter are reconstructed from their presumed responses to authorial logoi-topoi. This synthesis is presented in transcriptions of ten text scores. These present rows of cooperating and competing topoi of authorial voices, and of the Model Readers which tell the story of individual textual performances. These results are not further distilled or discussed. This will likely leave curious and patient readers unprepared to respond to the author's closing call for 'critical readers to judge' the logical relations between the proposed analytical categories within the text score.

We present chapters eight and nine together since they both treat the conditional *if*-construction. In chapter 8, Carter-Thomas presents an interesting snap-shot of the use of 'if' and *si* in English and French medicine articles within the field of oncology. Grossly summarized, findings reveal that despite general correspondence of meaning, 'if' and '*si*' are used differently in the French and English articles, with variation both in function and in distributions across IMRaD sections. The English articles contained more *if*-clauses with factual functions and

tended to occur in the informative/descriptive part of the research article, i.e. method and result sections, whereas the French articles had a larger proportion of *si* with argumentative functions found in the introduction and discussion sections. Carter-Thomas tentatively attributes some of these differences to stronger authoritative stance in the French articles, suggesting a difference in genre conventions between the French and English discourse communities.

In chapter nine, Rowley-Juliet sheds more light on the use of *if* in English-language medicine discourse, now from the perspective of different genres in medicine: ‘the research article’, ‘conference presentations’, ‘case reports’ and ‘editorials’. The study finds differences in the use of ‘if’ matching the discourse function of the genre. For instance, it is shown that more factual *if*-clauses are used in the research article, while conference presentations make use of the discourse organizing function of *if*-clauses. These tendencies are attributed to different genre foci: there is larger emphasis on describing methods for reproducibility in research articles, while a key concern in conference presentation is organizing and drawing attention to visual material. An interesting observation regarding the latter concern is the *if*-clause as a space-builder in presentation. Rowley-Juliet presents the *if*-clause as a pragmatic alternative to imperatives, which are too crude in talks for face-threatening reasons. There is some potential for cross-referencing to Hyland here, who discusses different reader attitudes to the use of the imperatives in research articles across disciplines in his chapter. Hyland suggests that in the context of the RP, direct imperatives are not necessarily perceived as face-threatening in the hard sciences, but potentially so in the soft sciences (p. 105). Taken together, the discussions by Rowley-Juliet and Hyland suggest that imperatives in spoken and written discourse function quite differently in the same field.

Apart from its pure descriptive value, the research introduced by Carter-Thomas and Rowley Juliet presents empirical observations with good potential for recontextualization in academic writing instruction across disciplines and cultures. Notable in this respect is Carter-Thomas’ observation that English research articles written by French researchers displayed frequencies in between those of English articles written by English speakers and French research articles written by French speakers. This indicates that the dominance of English scientific publications in medicine do not automatically erase cultural conventions related to the native discourse community. Further food for thought is that tense patterns in conditional sequences followed tense use associated with IMRaD sections rather than the typical formal patterns associated with clines of certainty/hypothesis, i.e., 1) present + will; 2) past + would; 3) past perfect + would have, which are taught rather prescriptively in academic writing courses worldwide. A third observation is the discourse organizing function of ‘if’ in presentations for politeness concerns. Such strategies are particularly valuable in communication courses aimed at non-native speakers, in line with the increased focus on the pragmatic competence of learners in EAP/ESP courses, as captured in course goals of ‘communicative competence’.

In chapter ten, Grossman and Wirth combine what Shaw refers to as ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ perspectives through investigations of evidentiality in the form of *expectations*, i.e., signals of whether content is presented as expected or surprising. A note is that the semantic/pragmatic relation between the two pragmatic categories is not self-evident, which the authors duly recognize. The material comprises English and French research papers from three fields: linguistics, economics and medicine. The joint focus of comparing text cultures along the dimensions of language/country of origin, on the one hand, and across disciplines, on the other, is in keeping with the questions posed in the KIAP project.

Using a top-down perspective, Grossman and Wirth establish a number of linguistic units that signal expectation. These signals are drawn partly from previous research (notably Chafe 1986) and partly through ‘empirical exploration’ of the corpus, which is specified as an exploration of the lexical fields *surprise* and *expectation*. In light of the potential heterogeneous readership of this book, we note that some readers might find the presentation of this method somewhat too schematic; in particular, a clearer description of the nature of ‘an exploration of a lexical field’ would make examples more transparent vis-à-vis methodology.

In terms of results, the division into *lexical markers of congruence* (i.e., of readers’ commenting on expected results through more or less fixed phrases/clauses such as ‘consistent with our results’ or ‘this is to be expected’) and *adverbials of congruence* (i.e., comment adjuncts such as ‘of course’ or ‘obviously’) is particularly useful, as it provides insights into the interplay between culture/language convention and discipline. To signal congruence, English research papers tended to have lexical markers, whereas French research papers had adverbials. Interestingly, the field of medicine stood out in both languages, with few adverbial markers, but a number of lexical markers. Moreover, as the lexical markers were composed of more or less fixed phrases, Grossman and Wirth’s study underlines the fruitfulness of research on phraseology, particularly through the concept *lexical bundle* as a way into discipline-specific language, a direction which is currently being advocated in language pedagogy (see e.g., Hyland 2008).

Further, the study adds empirical observation to the notion of disciplinary epistemologies and cultures as academic tribes advanced by Becher and Trowler (2001). Particularly interesting in this respect is the attribution of the wider use of specific lexical markers in medicine to the empirical/experimental nature of the discipline. Specific lexical markers of the type ‘consistent with the data’ are in step with the view of medicine as a hypotheses-verification-results-interpretation of results field, where experimentation functions as the verification step (cf. the exclusive use of the IMRaD section division in this field), as opposed to the less ‘stable’ theoretical and therefore more argumentative disciplines of linguistics and economics. In the latter disciplines, adverbial expectation markers are used for negotiation of the framework, calling for commentary such as ‘of course’, ‘obviously’ for English and *bien sur*, *évidemment* for French.

The authors also include a bottom-up study of English ‘in fact’ and French *en fait*, which sheds light on the ambiguous semantic/pragmatic character of this construction as a marker of both congruence and incongruence to expectation. This study has high descriptive value and adds refreshing depth to the study on the whole. A couple of considerations can be mentioned, however. One issue is that the result of this study opens up the question of what a similar in-depth study of other adverbials might have revealed in terms of varying function. The adverbial ‘of course’, for instance, seems a particularly likely candidate for Janus-headed behaviour. Further, a comment from a contrastive-linguistic background is that the authors’ apparent treatment of ‘in fact’ and *en fait* as language cognates is problematic. For example, discussing advanced French learners’ written English, DeCock (2004) observes that the status of the two as ‘partially deceptive cognates’ causes problems for French learners in that they use ‘in fact’ in different ways than native speakers.

In chapter eleven, Lundquist links a micro-level text linguistic analysis of demonstrative anaphors to the macro-level notion of discourse as presented by Foucault and Luhmann. Demonstrative anaphors are defined as NPs such as ‘this study’ ([‘this’| ‘these’ + N]). Lundquist also considers the French counterpart ([*ce|cet|cette|ces* + N]). Despite limited empirical data, the

study succeeds in pointing to differences in function across disciplines that are then attributed to the realization and maintenance of discourse as social control through the related concepts of *anonymous systems* (Foucault) and *autonomous systems* (Luhmann), respectively (p. 220--223).

Concretely, Lundqvist's first step is to equip the demonstrative pronouns with three text-linguistic characteristics, giving evidence of their value as cohesive devices: 1) they 'point explicitly to an antecedent in the preceding context'; 2) 'they (re)categorise the antecedent and place it under a new viewpoint' (through nouns such as 'idea', 'conception') and 3) 'they single out crucial moments and strong points in the text' (i.e., deciding which aspects are worthy of anaphoric reference, so to speak). The next step is a classification of the demonstrative anaphor into six classes (*classifier anaphors* ('this type'), *mental space anaphors* ('(from) this perspective'), *method anaphors* ('this method'), *reference anaphors* (split into *self-reference* ('(in) this study' and *other-reference* ('these works'), *resumptive anaphors* ('this question' and *specialised anaphors* ('this equation')). Textual context and the head noun inform this categorization. In addition to these six categories, there are two categories specific to the field of medicine, defined as *temporal anaphors* ('this period') and *anaphors with an adjectival head* ('the latter').

When reading through the list of different classes of anaphors, some readers will surely note potential classification problems, which Lundqvist also addresses through the comment that 'we are dealing with a graduation of expression, some of which are very close and overlap' (p. 233). Lundqvist partly remedies this by introducing three general classes: 1) *method/domain specific demonstrative anaphors*; 2) *classifying, resumptive and mental space demonstrative anaphors* and 3) *reference demonstrative anaphors*. However, we find that there is potential for more discussion. It seems plausible, for example, that domain-specific anaphors, can be seen as a subgroup of classifier anaphors. Another point is that since Lundqvist clearly considers the English literature on this subject, a useful reference for classification is Schmid's (2000) comprehensive study of shell nouns, which include many of the 'determiner + N patterns' in this study, albeit in English.

Results include illuminating notes on discipline-specific use of different types of anaphors, and a very useful interpretation of these results in using them as a basis for defining discourse cultures as 'functional subsystems', thus linking up classes and lexical instances of demonstrative anaphors to the level of social control of disciplinary cultures. The link between these levels is provided by SFL-informed concepts. Economics and linguistics are described as interpersonal, interpretive and focused on rhetorical coherence, but differ in terms of field: Economics treats models through equations and estimations, while linguistics considers examples through comparison and description. Medicine stands out as focused on ideational scientific coherence and is concerned with the field of treating surveys mathematically.

Mauranen's work in academic discourse, corpus linguistics and translation studies is widely recognized. In the study reported in chapter twelve, she explores non-native speaker spoken interaction in university discourses (degree programmes, conferences, theses defences or guest lectures) (p. 244) and how 'manifestations of explicitness strategies are explored.' Non-native speakers are referred to as English as a Lingua Franca speakers (ELF speakers), and comparisons between ELF and native speakers are carried out. The non-native material was retrieved from the ELFA corpus compiled at the University of Tampere, and the native-speaker material from the MICASE corpus compiled at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Findings show that non-native speakers use a multitude of adaptive strategies for successful

communication, which Mauranen divides into three general categories: *rephrasing*, *topic negotiation* and *discourse reflexivity*.

In slightly more detail, the first category, rephrasing, includes both *announced strategies* (i.e., introduced with *rephrase markers*) and *unannounced strategies*. Results indicate that unannounced strategies are more common than announced ones for both ELF and native speakers, and that the predominant function of both types is to ensure clarity rather than fixing mistakes. In addition, ELF speakers use markers more often, but tend to use fewer types than native speakers, which is partly explained by the notion of economy: learners often use one expression for one meaning or function, whereas the native speaker has a larger and more fine-tuned repertoire of expressions. What is less expected is the result that the most common expression with ELF speakers was neither the most frequent, nor the most formal type among native speakers, which is taken as an indication that rephrase markers are picked up in spontaneous interaction rather than in classroom settings.

The most common strategy under topic negotiation is a feature typical of spoken language commonly referred to as *left-dislocation*, which entails fronting of an object-like NP for discourse functions such as highlighting or foregrounding. The reason for using topic negotiation rather than left-dislocation is to avoid the implication that constructions typical of spoken language are imperfect in some way (a similar case is made in the discussion of the terms *self-repair* and *rephrase marker* (the latter term opted for by Mauranen). Another way to accomplish this would of course be to discuss the phenomenon in terms of textual meaning as represented in the system of thematic structure, in which case topic negotiation translates to a complement as Marked Theme, where ‘marked’ indicates that an unusual choice of topical Theme has been made, but the negative flavour of ‘dislocation’ is avoided. Results suggest that topic negotiation is a common strategy for ELF and native speakers both. Further, it is used across different L1 backgrounds, which, according to Mauranen, nominates it as a discourse universal (p. 255).

The last category is *discourse reflexivity*, which refers to ‘discourse on discourse’, i.e., speakers’ comment on what they say in one way or another, e.g., using words like ‘ask’, ‘answer’ or ‘question’ to introduce, or frame their utterances. Here too, Mauranen finds that ELF speakers behave similarly to native speakers: discourse reflexivity tends to co-occur with hedging devices, most notably: [‘I would like to’ + e.g., ‘ask’, ‘question’]. This tendency is tentatively explained through the demands/nature of social interaction, which in Mauranen’s study translates to rather formal contexts where it is expected that speakers engage in polite discussions of academic content.

One of the immediate strengths of Mauranen’s paper is her choice of material. Looking at spoken language, Mauranen travels down a research avenue that, as pointed out by Shaw in the introduction, is ripe for systematic exploration. Further, in her focus on English as a lingua franca, another dimension mentioned by Shaw is discussed: the issue of power. In academic settings today international contribution is a crucial prerequisite for success. This entails conference participation and publication on the international arena, effectively: publications and presentations in English, which inevitably leads to power-imbalance among scholars. The social anthropologist Hylland-Eriksen (2005) describes the situation thus: ‘In a certain, obvious sense, the universal usage of English places everybody except the native speakers at a disadvantage’. We sense a comment on this power imbalance in Mauranen’s closing sentence ‘we must expect English to accept new usages along with new user groups,’ (p. 258), which perhaps is an important aspect as any of Mauranen’s paper.

Chapter thirteen, by Swales and Van Bonn, closes the volume. Swales' genre theory, particularly the description of research papers in terms of discourse moves, most notably the *Creating A Research Space* (CARS) model for introductions, is seminal in providing insights into research articles as communicative texts rather than mere documentations of facts. In this paper, Swales and Van Bonn consider the genre of research article abstracts in a comparison of English and French versions of abstracts retrieved from an ESP society in France (the GERAS society). Swales and Van Bonn note that this should ensure that abstract authors have advanced competence in both French and English, and they also assume that the parallel abstracts have the same author. The study focuses on differences between the English and French abstracts.

The study begins with a useful overview of some of the research on abstracts since Swales' note that the research journal abstract was an under-researched genre in 1990. The review prepares the reader for what type of culture- and audience-related variables can impact the rhetorical composition of abstracts, even within a discipline. Zooming in on a few studies of abstracts from the field of applied linguistics, Swales and Van Bonn show that applied linguistics abstracts are 'generally expected to present the research being undertaken and to provide some information about the findings' (p. 265), but also draw attention to Lorés' (2004) finding that some abstracts have a positioning character with little information of findings (cf. so-called *indicative abstracts* (e.g., Swales and Feak 2004)). They also draw attention to Melander, Swales and Fredrickson's (1997) finding that Swedish linguists tend to focus on methods and results, with little negotiation of research space, whereas American linguists typically present a complete summary of their research in the form of a complete IMRaD structure.

In terms of findings, the authors carefully note that the empirical foundation is too limited to draw any but very tentative conclusions. Of the 30 abstract pairs studied, only six abstracts showed differences worthy of analysis (20%), and these six abstracts provide the material for contrastive observations. Very crudely summarized, differences between English and French abstracts are the following: long French sentences were split into two in the English abstract, and nominal structures in the French abstracts were sometimes unpacked to clauses in the English versions. More first person pronouns were used in the English abstracts, whereas the active voice was used more in the French ones.

We would like to note that this last aspect would be interesting to follow-up in contrastive studies. For example, Swales and Van Bonn attribute the greater frequency of active voice to 'a greater propensity for impersonal and reflexive options in the French verb' (p. 271), which is interesting in light of the well-known fact that many verbs allowing so-called ergative alteration ('the sun melts the snow' – 'the snow melts') in English have reflexive counterparts in French (compare, e.g., 'the number increased' vs. *le nombre s'est accru*) (cf. Kemmer 1993; Davidse and Heyvaert 2007). An intriguing question is thus whether the reflexive verbs in French indeed have ergative counterparts in English, and if so, why this option was not chosen (as the authors seem to suggest that the reflexive constructions in French often correspond to passives in English). In our opinion, a potential explanation might be that despite the fact that the French authors are proficient in English, there is a possibility that some English abstracts were drafted on the basis of the French 'original' abstracts, indicating that the relative high frequency of passives can be attributed to translation-like effects.

This last issue is methodological, of course. Regarding methodology, Swales and Van Bonn provide a useful discussion of 'cross-linguistic and cross discursal' comparisons owing largely to the scarcity of research papers in languages other than English ('the discourse community problem' (p.272)). Suggestions for a more robust methodology include

recommendations that comparisons should be made between journals with equal distribution and audience expectations. In most cases, this means that comparisons between journals with limited, national readership ensure better comparability, as the wide-reaching international journals are almost exclusively English. There are additional problems. For example, in some fields abstracts written by native speakers of English are becoming increasingly rare, complicating contrastive observations from the point of view of culture. To partly control for cultural/language effects related to non-native authors, we suggest that contrastive observations between parallel texts are further investigated in abstracts from comparable French and English journals.

This volume shows that academic discourse is not neutral or devoid of the interests of the people who produce and consume it. Whether the tool adopted is rhetoric, genre, corpus or SFL, this general result is similar. It is thus no longer sufficient to demonstrate this, but rather to detail it in ways that facilitate recontextualization of the knowledge in projects such as interdisciplinary collaboration, intradisciplinary reflection on practice, and specialized language education. In our view, the papers presented in the volume vary in the kind and quality of contribution in this regard; accordingly, readers' satisfaction with individual chapters will vary with their purposes and interests. As researchers and instructors of academic discourse in second- and foreign-language contexts, our particular concern is to support learners' disciplinary writing. The work we find most valuable in this relation profiles the target disciplinary discourses in some systematic fashion such that we can support not only recognition literacy (i.e., recognizing, counting, inserting tokens of specialized meaning) but reflection literacy (e.g., Hasan 1996), whereby meaning emerges from the writer's critical awareness of the correspondences between choices of wording and the rhetorical context construed.

The volume as a whole brings together a truly unique variety of voices and intellectual resources that distinguish it from other monographs and volumes on academic discourse. A particularly attractive feature is that among the globally diffused methods represented, academic voices of the Nordic region can be distinguished and appreciated, in the KIAP project and others. This range is made more valuable by the various perspectives offered across studies and approaches on the specific areas of academic discourse, such as author positioning, evaluation, and conditionality. Weaknesses in the volume that deserve mention include those of production, such as in the copy-editing in some chapters and the small font size. The weaknesses in substance to note are the poor transportability and methodological clarity of one or two of the chapters. More intriguing is the limited preparation the reader is given for the range of voices that distinguishes the volume: in this sense, the volume itself presents its contributors and academic discourse studies with the challenge (i.e., data) to understand variation in the field at even more fundamental levels than through dimensions such as genre, discipline, and user competence. For a volume of this size, the suggestion would be for just a little additional reflectiveness on the scope of informing theories. In our view, this gathering of contributions by distinguished scholars in the field presents an exciting intellectual and geographical cross-section of academic discourse scholarship.

References

Becher, T and Trowler, P. (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories. Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Bernstein, B. (1999) Vertical and horizontal discourse: an essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20:157--173.

Davidse, K. and Heyvaert, L. (2007) On the middle voice: An interpersonal analysis of the English middle. *Linguistics*. 45(1): 155--180.

De Cock, S. (2004) Preferred sequences of words in NS and NNS speech. In *Belgian Journal of English Language and Literatures (BELL) New Series* 2: 225--246.

Hasan, R. (1996) Literacy, everyday talk and society. In R. Hasan and G. Williams (Eds.) *Literacy in Society* (pp. 377--424). London: Longmans.

Hyland, K. (2006) *Metadiscourse*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2008) As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation. *English for Specific Purposes* 27:4--21.

Hyland Eriksen, T. (2005) *McDonaldisation or diversity? Notes on the use of English as a foreign language*. Keynote speech to the conference: *Bi- and Multilingual Universities: Challenges and Future prospects*, University of Helsinki 1-3, September 2005. Retrieved on 6 April 2012 from <http://folk.uio.no/geirthe/EFL.html>

Kemmer, S. (1993) *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Melander, B., Swales, J. and Fredrickson, K. M. (1997) Journal abstracts from three academic fields in the United States and Sweden: National or Disciplinary provlicities? In A. Duszak (Ed.) *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 251--272.

Lorés, R. (2004) On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organization. *English for Specific Purposes* 22:280--302.

Schmid, H.J. (2000) *English Abstract Nouns as Conceptual Shells. From Corpus to Cognition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Swales, J. and C. Feak. (2004) *Academic Writing for Graduate Students – Essential Tasks and Skills*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Thompson, G. (2008) Review of Ken Hyland: *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing* (London: Continuum 2005). *Language in Society* 37/1: 138--141.