Ian MacKenzie
Rethinking Reader and Writer Responsibility in Academic English

Abstract: There is a growing perception that English used as a lingua franca does not need to resemble English as a native language, but can include a great deal of lexicogrammatical variation. However, a more fundamental matter is whether research articles written in English need to conform to the dominant linear, deductive, 'Anglo' pattern of text organization, or whether non-native English speakers should be free to transfer rhetorical patterns from their L1s into English, such as, e.g., an inductive, indirect, end-weighted form of argumentation, perhaps with a less-assertive conclusion. Hinds (1987) describes the latter style of writing as "reader-responsible," as opposed to the "writer-responsible" Anglo-American style, arguing that it requires a great deal more inferential work on the part of the reader. Yet from a relevance theory perspective it appears unlikely that a culture would choose to impose unnecessary additional processing effort on readers. The perception of difficulty is an etic perspective: analysts from "writer-responsible" cultures imagine the processing effort that would be necessary in their culture to make sense of "reader-responsible" texts. Indirect, inductive rhetorical styles do not cause problems for readers accustomed to them. Given that most academic writing in English is for an international audience, non-native English-speaking researchers – and indeed native English speakers too – should be free to adopt a range of styles, or some sort of heterogeneous hybrid, depending on their perceptions of their readers' expectations. A further issue is whether researchers who have reservations about 'Anglo' styles of writing, e.g. in the social sciences or literary and cultural theory, should encourage non-native English speakers to imitate the noun-heavy, nominalized, passivized, syntactically-complex style dominant in these fields.

Keywords: academic English, English as a lingua franca, contrastive rhetoric, reader responsibility, writer responsibility

Ian MacKenzie, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland, E-mail: ian.mackenzie@unige.ch

1 English as the academic lingua franca

In the past few decades, English has become the language of choice, or more often necessity, in academic research and publishing for an international audience. There is an increasing awareness among non-native English speakers (NNESs), and an increasing acceptance among native English speakers (NESs), that when used as a lingua franca, English is no longer related to any given native (or indeed nativized) speech community or 'target culture' in which particular ways of speaking and writing are appropriate. Corpus evidence (e.g. VOICE and ELFA) shows that spoken English as a lingua franca (ELF) contains a huge amount of linguistic variation and non-standard forms, although formal written communication tends to resemble the 'linguistic capital' of standard, 'educated' English as a native language (ENL) to a much greater extent. There is, however, a more important matter than the acceptability (or otherwise) of non-standard constructions, phraseology and lexis, and that is the acceptability of 'non-Anglo' argumentative or rhetorical structures. To what extent can or should academic English encompass *rhetorical* flexibility and variation as well as lexicogrammatical variation? Can and should researchers expect their readers to accommodate to patterns of text organization that are uncommon in native English? How far do 'Anglo' discourse norms constrict alternative styles of thinking, and impose near-homogeneous practices?

Clyne (1994: 29) asserted that inner circle[1] English speakers must "learn about and accept the communication patterns of others. Pragmatic and discourse patterns are so closely linked to people's cultural values and personality that requiring learners to change them as part of the acquisition and use of a lingua franca is an infringement of human rights unless an unusually high level of biculturality can be achieved."[2] Consequently, as Kirkpatrick and Xu (2012: 5) put it, "We need to create an environment in which the ideas of others can flow

---

[1] Kachru (1985: 12) described the countries in which English is used (by native speakers) as a primary language as the inner circle, with countries (mostly former British colonies in Africa and Asia) in which English has an official second-language role in a multilingual setting making up the outer circle. The rest of the world (or most of it), in which English is learnt and used as a foreign (or additional) language, for communication with speakers from all three circles, is the expanding circle.

[2] On the other hand, as pointed out by a helpful anonymous reviewer of this paper, changing people's discourse patterns, as part of the acquisition and use of academic discourse, is what teachers of academic writing (for both NESs and NNESs) are *trying to do*, because *academic* discourse patterns come naturally to no one.

through to the Anglo-American world."[3] Quite apart from the 'human rights' aspect, I will argue, from a relevance theory perspective, that the common claim that so-called 'reader-responsible' forms of writing are inherently more difficult to understand than supposedly 'writer-responsible' forms is dubious, and based on an etic or outsiders' view. Therefore academic writing using English as a lingua franca for a global audience – and hence the gatekeeping practices of academic journals (article selection, reviewing and copy-editing) – should open up to non-'Anglo' styles of argumentation.

I will not discuss the *fairness* of the dominance of English (or related issues of inequality, marginalization, and domain loss for other languages) but rather treat it as a *fait accompli*.[4] For example, it is estimated that English is now used for over 90% of global scientific communication, including books and articles (the prestigious research journals in most fields having switched to English-only publication), as well as research institute websites, private sector R&D, international patents, statistical and data archives, grant applications, job advertisements, job interviews, conferences, visiting lectures, and a lot of graduate-level teaching (Montgomery 2013: 3, 168).[5] Even though written language, which allows for more careful formulation and revision and re-reading, shows less variety than speech, Montgomery (98) states that there is "a significant flexibility in what is now acceptable as written scientific English," without this leading to any "serious problems of meaning." Ammon (2000: 111) insisted that non-native English-speaking scientists should have the right to their "linguistic peculiarities" when writing for the international community; this now seems increasingly

---

3 Strangely, Kirkpatrick and Xu follow this assertive sentence with a much more tentative and hedged one: "We need to debate the proposition that ideas and research which do not conform to Anglo-American rhetorical principles might be presented and published in varieties of English."

4 For the politics, ethics, constraints, etc. of academic publishing in English, see Swales (1997); Ammon (2000); Ammon (2001); Gazzola and Grin (2007); Lillis and Curry (2010); Ferguson et al. (2011); Jenkins (2013). See Canagarajah (2002) on the iniquities and absurdities of academic journal publishing requirements for periphery scholars working, e.g., in war zones without regular electricity, batteries, computers, photocopiers, adequate paper, typewriter ribbons, recent books and journals, a reliable postal service, or even a sample issue of the journal or its style sheet, etc. This ineluctably leads to the marginalization and disenfranchisement of 'periphery' or 'local' scholars.

5 Montgomery points out that publishing internationally in English does not necessarily preclude also publishing nationally: authors can potentially write in their L1s and be translated into English, or indeed write in English and be translated into the L1, although there are of course prohibitive questions of cost and complex copyright issues.

to be the case.[6] However this flexibility is largely confined to surface lexico-grammatical features, and not underlying rhetorical structures.

The variation to be found in English used as a lingua franca can be explained in different ways. It may result from the fact that ELF users are simply uninterested in native lexicogrammatical norms (Seidlhofer 2001, 2011). Alternatively, it may be a consequence of what Mauranen (2012) calls the shaky entrenchment or fuzzy processing, or – from another perspective – the imperfect learning to be expected in a second language (L2). Either way, the leitmotif of the proponents of ELF is that it is *different* from native English, but not *deficient*. ELF users occasionally use approximate forms of the native language – words, phrases and constructions that do not quite match ENL target forms, but are close enough to enable comprehension and communication.

Inherently 'difficult' and incongruous elements of English grammar – those which appear afunctional or idiosyncratic from the perspective of speakers of most other languages – are often reconceptualized and simplified, including the use of prepositions, determiners, articles, plurals, countable and uncountable nouns, and progressive and perfect aspectual forms.[7] ELF speakers also vary ENL phraseology, using either approximate grammar (such as different articles and prepositions) or semantic or lexical approximations, and also occasionally vary morphology to use words which resemble but don't quite match ENL versions. As Mauranen (2012: 144) puts it, ELF speakers often get sequences "slightly wrong," but importantly, they "also get them approximately right."

Other usages of individual ELF speakers are clearly the result of cross-linguistic interaction with (or interference or transfer from) particular L1s. This is to be expected from bi- or multilingual speakers, and is increasingly being endorsed by applied linguists who write about the privilege of the nonnative speaker (Kramsch 1997), and recommend plurilingualism,[8] polylingualism (Jørgensen 2008), translanguaging (García 2009), metrolingualism (Otsuji and

---

6 Jenkins (2005: 153), taking the line that ELF is different from but not inferior to ENL, reproaches Ammon for describing his ELF variants as "peculiarities" and stating that NNESs are linguistically "disadvantaged." Despite the flexibility that Montgomery sees, Jenkins (2013) still finds "native English ideology" dominating international higher education.

7 This also happens in most of the indigenized or nativized New Englishes or World Englishes of Africa, Asia and the Caribbean (see MacKenzie 2014, Ch. 4).

8 The European Council for Cultural Co-operation's *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (2001: 4) uses "multilingualism" to refer to societies, or simply to "the knowledge of a number of languages," and "plurilingualism" to refer to "a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact." However this distinction is not universally shared, and besides, the word "plurilingual" is virtually unpronounceable for many Asian speakers of English.

Pennycook 2010), and codemeshing and translingual practice (Canagarajah 2013).[9]

2 Contrastive rhetoric

The standard forms of text organization of 'Anglo-Saxon' academic writing are obviously not universal. This can easily be ascertained by reading in other languages, as well as by reading research on contrastive or intercultural rhetoric. While other ways of structuring arguments, paragraphs and research papers might violate the expectations of NESs, and strike them as further examples of "linguistic peculiarities" at the textual level, NESs are only one constituent of international academia.

Contrastive rhetoric, often described as beginning with Kaplan (1966), analyzes patterns of paragraph and text organization in different languages and cultures, and in the writing of ESL/EFL learners. The aim is often to show how these rhetorical patterns differ from established English ones, and thus appear to the NES reader to be 'out of sync' and lacking organization and cohesion if transferred to English expository prose. Kaplan famously illustrated rhetorical styles – as revealed by the compositions of international ESL students in American universities – with a series of squiggles or doodles. According to Kaplan (1972 [1966]: 249), English expository essays follow a linear development: ideally, "the flow of ideas occurs in a straight line from the opening sentence to the last sentence," probably with the main argument stated in the first paragraph.[10] Writers of Romance languages and Russian, on the contrary, use digressions and introduce extraneous material and parenthetical amplifications of subordinate elements, while Chinese and Korean writing is indirect – Kaplan says of one paper written by a Korean student that it "arrives where it should have started" – with paragraphs that may be said (borrowing from Yeats'

---

9 Most of this work concerns spoken language, but Canagarajah (2013) explicitly includes academic writing in his discussion of codemeshing and translingual practice. He focuses more on authorial *voice* (a metaphor when used in connection to writing) than on argument structure.

10 However linearity may be in the eye of the beholder. Canagarajah (2002) very reasonably describes as "circular" the "structure of anticipating the conclusion at the beginning, and then reaching the same point in the conclusion" (122), "with the reader brought back to the starting point at the end of the paper" (147). Meanwhile Hinds (1983: 187) quotes an unpublished paper in which Peggy Cheng describes English writing as a series of concentric circles emanating from a base theme; the more important the idea, the closer it is to the centre, while the outermost circle is a peroration, enclosing the rest of the article.

poem "The Second Coming") to be "turning and turning in a widening gyre" around the subject, showing it from a variety of tangents, but never directly (253). In short, Kaplan describes the writing of outer and expanding circle users as "employing a rhetoric and a sequence of thought which violate the expectations of the native reader" (247). His article is about what "the English reader expects to be an integral part of any formal communication." But Kaplan was referring to the native English reader (specifically the ESL composition teacher), whereas today (to a far greater extent than in 1966), the readership of academic work in English is global.

Although Kaplan (1966) put forward a Whorfian notion of culture-specific thought patterns related to given languages, he later (1987: 10) argued that "all of the[se] various rhetorical modes ... are possible in every language" and that "any native speaker of any particular language has at his disposal literally hundreds of different mechanisms to signify the same meaning." Yet notwithstanding this plurality of constructional and rhetorical patterns, the fact remains that "each language has certain clear preferences, so that while all forms are possible, all forms do not appear with equal frequency or in parallel distribution" (10).

While Kaplan based his analysis on transfer features in ESL compositions, many other researchers have analysed the rhetorical patterns and discourse structures of L1s. Clyne (1980) discusses German writers' traditional preference for digressions (*Exkurse*) which introduce 'extraneous,' 'parenthetical' or 'subordinate' material to linear argumentation.[11] Mauranen (1993) analyses work by Finnish academics and finds that they tend to prefer end-weight strategies: providing background materials (hypotheses, facts, other research) and an interpretive framework before making a claim (probably under the influence of the German academic tradition), and presenting claims as a conclusion rather than as a point of departure, necessitating inferential work by the reader *en route*. Writers tend not to make explicit transitions between sections, or to provide signposts or coherence markers which, it is felt, could be rather patronising or overly condescending to the reader.

Finnish academic writing thus shares with some Asian rhetorical forms what Hinds (1990: 98) calls "delayed introduction of purpose." Hinds describes the "quasi-inductive" organization of Chinese, Korean, Japanese and Thai newspaper editorials, which sometimes place the thesis statement in final position, after a lot of contextual detail has been presented. Kachru (1995: 28) suggests that Indian and Chinese writers often give a great deal of background information without ever

---

11 Clyne gives the notable example of Fritz Schütze's (1975) two-volume *Sprache soziologisch gesehen*, which is over 1,000 pages long, and includes some sentences that are over a page long, as well as myriad digressions, and digressions from digressions, even in the conclusion.

relating it directly to the topic under discussion as a politeness strategy, with the indirectness allowing readers to reach their own conclusions. Canagarajah (2002: 149) asserts that 'local' or 'periphery' scholars in Sri Lanka treat the reader as being intelligent enough to understand an evolving argument without heavy-handed guidance from the author. They provide sufficient data to allow readers to make the necessary inferences, and to make up their minds as to the acceptability of the argument without being led by the nose.[12] Montgomery (2000: 268) states that in scientific articles too, Chinese authors use an indirect form of organization and postpone the main argument until the latter half of the paper, although Kirkpatrick and Xu (2012) argue that while Chinese writing has always shown a preference for inductive reasoning (which gives an impression of indirectness and obliqueness), deductive reasoning and mixed methods of argument have always existed alongside it too.

Many linguists have analysed an inductive 4-part structure used in expository prose in Chinese, Japanese and Korean. Originating in Classical Chinese poetry, this structure – called *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* in Chinese, *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu* in Japanese, and *ki-sung-chon-kyul* in Korean – is notable for a sudden topic shift in its third part, which introduces an unexpected element, with a connection but not a direct association to the major theme, into an otherwise normal progression of ideas. The fourth part, the conclusion, need not be decisive, but can indicate a doubt or ask a question. Hinds (1983) gives examples of Japanese newspaper editorials using this structure being translated sentence by sentence for the English version of the paper, and Scollon and Scollon (1997) show how this structure is used in both Chinese and English-language newspapers in Hong Kong, so it cannot be dependent on anything inherent to the linguistic or cognitive structures of a given language.

Hinds (1987) describes this form of writing as "reader-responsible": it is the reader who has to make an effort and use inductive logic to provide the transitions and logical links between the sentences and paragraphs, unlike in "writer-responsible" cultures (such as the US and the UK) in which readers expect writers to use coherence devices and textual transitions to render explicit the connections between arguments.[13]

---

12 This might also be explained in terms of protecting the reader's autonomy and "negative face" – "the basic claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" – while 'Anglo'-style writers are promoting their own "positive face" – "positive self-image and the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 61).

13 McCagg (1996) analyses the newspaper article that serves as an example in Hinds (1987) and disputes the claim that Japanese writing is more difficult to follow for a Japanese reader, but more on the grounds of shared cultural knowledge and experience, and shared conceptual metaphors, than on argument structure as such. Kubota (1999: 15) denies that "Japanese written

The work of Kaplan, Hinds and others provoked an equal and opposite body of work decrying the reductionist, essentialist and deterministic notion of discrete, static, homogeneous cultures and discourse patterns.[14] Moreover, many theorists have criticized the stereotyping and 'othering' of the ESL learner, and the implicit assumption of the superiority of English writers and writing, usually described in terms of virtues such as linearity, logic, directness, clarity, coherence, deductive reasoning, individualism, critical thinking and audience awareness (see e.g. Zamel 1997; Pennycook 1998; Atkinson 1999; Kubota 1999).[15] Kubota and Lehner (2004) call for a "critical cultural rhetoric" that celebrates multiculturalism and "transculturation."[16] Contrastive rhetoric, not unlike orthodox EFL/ESL theory, is clearly a deficit model rather than a celebration of ESL (or ELF) writers' multilingual resources. In response to these criticisms, rhetorical analysts (e.g. Connor 2004, 2008; Li 2008) now tend to use the term "intercultural rhetoric," and to insist that they treat learners and writers as multilingual and multicultural agents, and cultures as dynamic systems.[17]

Yet although some writers do indeed achieve what Clyne called "an unusually high level of biculturality," in general, different cultures, languages, and genres *do* have preferred compositional forms, and the majority of readers have expectations about the ordering of ideas, and understand and recall information

discourse is characterized by culturally specific features such as *reader responsibility*, *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu*, and *delayed introduction of purpose*," but Hinds' (1983: 183) does not suggest that *all* Japanese discourse displays these features but merely argues that *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu* is "an expository writing style for Japanese compositions which is consistently evaluated highly," and is used in at least one well-known popular newspaper column.

14 The fundamental essentialism of such accounts of monolithic, culture-bound rhetorical and discourse patterns parallels the essentialist work in intercultural communication theory of the same decades: the descriptions and classifications of national cultures in the work of Hofstede (1980, 1991), Hall (1959, 1976), etc. Such classifications have since been widely opposed by postmodern accounts of diversity, hybridity, interculturality, liminality, pluralism, reflexivity, transculturation, and so on.

15 Even so, Canagarajah (2002: 31) informs us that Atkinson, in marginal notes to the typescript, objected to the book's "sweeping statements, belated evidence for important claims, lack of rigor in documenting sources, and looseness of organization"!

16 However Kubota (2002) also states that Japanese schoolchildren are now trained in "logical thinking," considered to be necessary in international communication, and in an 'Anglo' style of organizing paragraphs and arguments. As Cameron (2002: 70) points out, this is clear evidence of the existence of dominant and subaltern cultures: "Finns do not run workshops for British businesses on the virtues of talking less; Japanese are not invited to instruct Americans in speaking indirectly."

17 There is, however, still an underlying ESL/EFL attitude rather than an ELF one: e.g. Li (2008: 12) writes "I still struggle with English articles and prepositions and need a native speaker to proofread an article like this."

more readily when it is presented in a manner that meets these expectations.[18] Eggington (1987) describes how many Korean academics educated in the US have internalized the rhetorical patterns of written English (most notably a linear style), which they transfer into Korean when they write in their L1. This presents an impediment to effective communication for readers unfamiliar with Anglo patterns who naturally prefer more traditional structures. Eggington presents experimental evidence showing that Koreans have more difficulty recalling information after a period of time when it is presented in a linear style: using a non-Korean rhetorical pattern "inhibits information recall and the optimal transfer of vital knowledge, as well as the optimal development of the nation" (167).

3 Effort and effect

However, the claim that Koreans find it much easier to process and memorize information presented in the traditional Korean rhetorical fashion has a significant implication, which is that the notion that "reader-responsible" rhetorical strategies impose additional interpretive effort is an outsiders' view. Pragmatic theories of language – notably relevance theory, which shows that all verbal communication is, in part, inferential – include an economic component which states that interpretive effort should be matched by adequate cognitive effects. Consequently we must assume that communicators in supposedly "reader-responsible" cultures are not imposing excessive and unnecessary processing costs on their receivers, who are expected to understand an author's intended meanings, expressed according to the culture's chosen rhetorical forms, by following the path of least effort and expending a minimum of processing effort. This is particularly the case if we accept Sperber and Wilson's (1995: 260) cognitive and communicative principles of relevance, such that "Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximisation of relevance," and that "Every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance."

According to relevance theory, what is optimally relevant (and meaningful, and readily interpretable) depends on the mutual cognitive environment of the communication partners. Thus to describe the non-linear, inductive, 4-part structure of some Japanese or Korean expository prose – and in particular its third part (*ten* or *chon*) – as incoherent, and requiring readers to interpret more

---

18 If this were not the case, the gatekeeping practices of Anglo academic journals would not be as they are.

and generally work harder than readers of linear, deductive English texts, is to reveal an etic perspective. Difficulty lies in the eye of the beholder. Analysts from so-called "writer-responsible" cultures imagine the processing cost or effort, or the amount of inference, that would be necessary to make sense of a supposedly "reader-responsible" text in *their own* cognitive environment, and attribute this effort to readers in "reader-responsible" cultures, with their wholly different cognitive environment.[19]

The fact that perceptions of inherent linguistic difficulty (of either comprehension or production) usually emanate from outsiders is demonstrated by the drift of many languages from a synthetic to an analytic structure. Languages that are used predominantly for esoteric or intra-group communication are in general semantically and grammatically complex. Furthermore, as Wray and Grace (2007: 554) put it, "much of what needs to be said can be said elliptically and formulaically, with huge reliance on shared knowledge, pragmatics and common practice." Such languages are, almost by definition, acquired in infancy, and so tend to abound in phonological complexities and morphological irregularities that are not easily learned by adult outsiders. Esotericity is probably the natural default setting for human language, as for most of the 100,000 or so years that humans have used language, it was in small, dense, stable social networks (mainly of hunter-gatherers) in which everyone knew everyone else, and there was little contact with other language varieties.

However post-adolescent and adult learners have limited abilities of L2 perception and production. They prefer regularity, explicitness and transparency to irregularity and opacity. Linguistic outsiders find things like non-compositional formulaic expressions and idioms impenetrable, and inflections and grammatical agreement hard to learn. Hence "Languages used exoterically will tend to develop and maintain linguistic features that are logical, transparent, phonologically and morphologically simple, and (as a result) learnable by adult incomers" (Wray 2008: 56).

Peter Trudgill suggests that any high-contact language variety that is widely learned by adolescents and adults is likely to replace synthetic structures with analytic ones, to show a reduction in redundancy, and to increase in regularity. Fully analytic constructions have a transparent, one-to-one mapping of meaning units and forms. They use independent words to express different concepts, often with a fixed word order, rather than inflections (conjugations and

---

19 I am indebted to the thoughts of Ernst-August Gutt on this matter, as well as those of Robin Setton and Ronnie Sim. See Gutt, in reply to a question of mine on the Relevance Theory List (November 2013). <http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/robyn/relevance/relevance_archives_new/0890.html> (accessed 29 March 2014).

declensions), derivations, and modifications of roots. For example, *I will survive* is more analytic than the Italian *sopravviverò*; *more simple* is more analytic than *simpler*; and *eye-doctor* is more analytic than *optometrist* or *ophthalmologist*.

Given that exoteric or inter-group communication and language contact have multiplied in recent centuries, *most* major contemporary languages bear the mark of post-adolescent second-variety acquisition. The histories of many Indo-European and Semitic languages reveal extensive syntactic regularization, the simplification of verbal morphology, and an increase in lexical and morphological transparency, resulting in analyzable, compositional and productive structures (Trudgill 1989: 231–32). Compare French with Latin, or Modern English with its Old, Middle or Early Modern varieties. But rule-based systematicity is a historically recent phenomenon, deriving from both literacy and language contact, with the result that "the dominant standard modern languages in the world today are likely to be seriously atypical of how languages have been for nearly all of human history" (Trudgill 2011: 169).[20]

This is not to say that English does not still present multiple difficulties to L2 learners that go wholly unperceived by NESs. For example it has 'too many' words, i.e. a larger vocabulary than most languages, including many near-synonyms, because of the Norse and Norman invasions of Anglo-Saxon England. It has a large vowel system, and consonants that are difficult for speakers of many other languages (including /θ/, /ð/, /z/, /ʒ/ and /dʒ/), as well as fairly arbitrary and unpredictable word stress, and complex intonation patterns. It also has unpredictable orthography and pronunciation, although few native-speaking adults recall the difficulties they had learning to read and write a language in which, e.g. ‹ough› can be pronounced nine different ways, as in *though*, *through*, *thought*, *thorough*, *trough*, *tough*, *bough*, *hiccough* and *lough*. While causing problems for NNESs, complicated linguistic features such as these generally go unremarked by NESs. As Roger Lass (1997: 52) puts it (in relation to the Cypriot syllabary, used for certain varieties of Greek between the sixth and third centuries BC, which had no way of indicating most of the language's vowels or stops), "Surely if this were seriously 'dysfunctional,' it would not have survived so long. Humans seem perpetually willing to accept second best or worse, and have an impressive ability to muddle through." The difficulty or dysfunctionality is only perceived by outsiders. The same applies to sheltered NESs and inductive, non-linear arguments. (This is the end of my *zhuan*/*ten*/*chon*.)

---

20 This is not to say that *all* lingua francas become analytic. Latin was somewhat simplified over the centuries, but no amount of non-native speakers are going to turn a particularly agglutinative or fusional language (e.g. Turkish or Russian) into an analytic one.

4 Writerly freedom and audience expectations

Canagarajah (2002: 148) rather surprisingly suggests that "center scholars (especially those coming from more urban, multicultural, pluralistic communities, in both academic and cultural terms) have to assume a heterogeneous audience for whom all aspects of the text have to be made explicit."[21] But this is surely not the case: 'center' scholars using 'Anglo' rhetoric are catering for readers who have been socialized into a fairly homogeneous academic culture, with a detailed knowledge of disciplinary concepts and terminology, and familiarity with the culture's dominant, explicit ways of writing. On the other hand, many of these readers, those whose L1 is not English – i.e. researchers from virtually all the non-Anglophone countries of the OECD, let alone marginalized periphery scholars – will also be accustomed to rhetorical modes in which not all aspects of the text have to be made explicit.

This is not so much of an issue in the natural sciences. Although they largely derive from twentieth century Anglophone (British and North American) and western European scientists, the fundamental forms of scientific research papers – the IMRD (or IMRAD) structure (standing for Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) for reporting laboratory work in many disciplines,[22] and other normalized verbal and visual forms for reporting fieldwork, theoretical investigations, methodological innovations, mathematical modeling, etc. – are now broadly international. They have well-established organizational norms, styles of argument, uses of evidence, and so on, although there are comparatively minor differences across countries. For example, there is a broad East Asian style involving more indirect ways of expressing doubt and criticism, and a forestalling of disagreement until credibility has been established, or indeed a total avoidance of a dialogical or adversarial stance in relation to the work of other researchers (Montgomery 2013: 186),[23] while Chinese researchers, heirs to a tradition stressing respect for authority and precedent, often include citations of renowned scientists even if they are not immediately relevant to the

---

21 Cf. Edward Hall's (1976) concept of high and low context cultures. In the former – which are homogeneous communities – there is great deal of shared context and listeners do not need to be given much background information; in the latter – heterogeneous communities – speaker and listener cannot be assumed to share a mutual cognitive environment and so explicit background information must be provided.

22 Many researchers in the human sciences would of course contest the plausibility of the IMRAD format's strict separation of data and interpretation.

23 In the West, feminist scholars also propose non-adversarial forms of argumentation; see, e.g. Belcher (1997).

work at hand (108). However all in all, for some domains, Montgomery (60) foresees the emergence of "a global variety of professional English that incorporates or allows for elements from many local discourses – a kind of broad, forgiving world standard."[24]

Even so, there remain differences, such as the one between the deductive, linear, Anglo-American style, and the inductive, end-weighted approach of some Finnish academics mentioned above, a style of writing that Mauranen (1993) suggested would be improved by the addition of explicit textual transitions, connectors, discourse markers, etc.[25] Today, Mauranen (2012: 242) is more circumspect, arguing that "Anglo-American rhetoric is not necessarily the most effective, comprehensible, or 'natural' choice for structuring academic texts even if we use English. It goes without saying that it is not more 'scientific.'"

Rhetorical norms in the humanities and social sciences are less uniform than in the natural sciences, although there are a great many journals (including in applied linguistics) whose positivist reviewers call for empirical data and testable hypotheses, and decry anything that looks essayistic, introspective, etc. (Following Mirowski (1991), some economists like to describe this as "physics envy.") But appropriate text or discourse structure – direct or indirect, deductive or inductive, with immediate or delayed introduction of purpose, etc. – clearly requires an awareness of audience and purpose. For example, Connor (1995) make the very reasonable and pragmatic suggestion that when Finnish scientists are applying, in English, for European Union research grants, they should follow EU norms and expectations, which are to a large extent similar to the rhetorical norms of Anglo-American scientific and promotional discourse. On the contrary, when writing grant applications in Finnish for Finnish agencies, they should follow the expectations of their Finnish readers, and use a less direct style. This is not so much a prescriptive approach to rhetoric as an addressee-centred one, as indeed most teaching of rhetoric has been for the past two and a half millennia.

In recent decades, the number of academics trained in inner circle countries and writing in English has grown dramatically, and 'Anglo' styles of writing are increasingly exercising a hegemony over scientific and academic communication.

---

24 This rather contrasts with Montgomery's (2000: 257) earlier claim that different localized forms of English "to an important degree, make for different sciences," so that rather than a single unified science, we have "different epistemological dialects" (267).

25 Swales (1990: 168) argues that Methods sections of IMRD papers are short on textual coherence, and leave readers to supply inferences and cohesive links themselves – which they are clearly capable of doing. However they are not expected to have to use this ability in the other sections.

As Eggington (1987) suggested, such researchers tend to use Anglo-American conventions in both English and their L1. More and more Asian and European scholars seem to be turning to deductive reasoning, with an explicit statement of purpose and the main idea outlined at the beginning of articles, possibly as a result of training at school, as in Japan. Yet despite this trend, the use of native English styles is clearly not a necessity in a language used as a lingua franca for an international readership. NNES writers should have the option of transferring the rhetorical patterns of their own linguaculture into ELF. Certainly NNESs need to learn to read and understand 'Anglo' rhetorical patterns, or they will not have access to a huge body of scientific and technical writing only available in English. But NESs also need to become competent in reading rhetorical modes and forms of writing other than the dominant one. Ideally all users of academic English should be able to understand both direct and indirect uses of language, and a range of deductive, inductive and quasi-inductive rhetorical styles.

　　Intelligent readers (including monolingual Anglophones) should all be capable of following clues and understanding a developing argument, even one including digressions and tangentially related topics *en route*, especially if it is summarized in a concluding paragraph, even though many reviewers for academic journals continue to complain that such a style entails a lack of perspective, coherence and conviction (see, e.g. Canagarajah 2002, Ch. 4). But given the range of readers of research written in English, an either/or approach – either I use a sign-posted, deductive style, or an inductive style that invites the reader to follow the evolving argument without too much heavy-handed authorial guidance – should perhaps give way to a more hybrid approach. Indeed Mauranen et al. (2010) already see timid signs of hybridization, cross-cultural heterogeneity and diversity in academic English. On the other hand, East Asian researchers, for example, are unlikely to entirely abandon their cultural norms and become as assertive as American researchers overnight. There is almost certainly no Finnish or Chinese Walt Whitman – "I celebrate myself, and sing myself,/And what I assume you shall assume"; "Do I contradict myself?/Very well then I contradict myself,/(I am large, I contain multitudes.)" – or Ralph Waldo Emerson – "To believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men, – that is genius"[26]– and there is unlikely to be any time soon.

26　Whitman (2001 [1855]), "Song of Myself," lines 1–2 and 1324–6; Emerson (1993 [1841]), *Self-Reliance*. In fact, as a reviewer of this paper pointed out, Anglophone *academics* tend not to be as assertive as this, but rather to do a lot of hedging. See, e.g., Hyland (1994), and several subsequent articles.

As Canagarajah likes to put it, we all increasingly need to shuttle between different languages, cultures and communities. NNES researchers writing in English should not abandon their own cultural knowledge, and this knowledge will inevitably mediate their understanding and appropriation of 'Anglo' discourses. Similarly, while NES readers will not wholly abandon their preferred rhetorical strategies, they also need to accommodate to non-linear forms of argumentation.

5 Anglo-Saxon vices

A further question which arises for NNES researchers is what to do if one believes that there is a lot wrong with certain forms of academic writing in English. Although the IMRAD structure and the other formats commonly used by natural scientists seem to enjoy a broad consensus of support, things are less clear-cut in the social sciences and humanities. For example, in his punchily-titled *Learn to Write Badly: How to Succeed in the Social Sciences* (2013: 2), Michael Billig, a sociology professor, states what many non-social scientists have always felt, that some academic social scientists use long words to dress up banalities as profundities. Reading academic articles, Billig says, used to require him to translate the technical terminology into something he could understand, which sometimes turned out to be little more than truisms. This argument has been made before, including by Stanislav Andreski (1971), and Charles Wright Mills (1959), who ridiculed Talcott Parsons' grand style, paraphrasing (or "translating") whole pages of his prose in one or two sentences.

Billig's complaint is that social science terminology (or jargon) largely consists of nouns and noun phrases, sometimes with an almost complete absence of verbs. He suggests that while a noun-based style of writing "is entirely appropriate for the natural sciences" (7), in which it is necessary to avoid personifying the physical world, it is inappropriate for the social sciences, because it reifies the social world, rhetorically turning people into things. (Most social scientists would express this nominally, writing of the dangers of reification.)

Halliday (2006: 68) describes "the device of nominalising" as "an essential resource for constructing scientific discourse." Science needs names for processes and qualities – *refraction*, *reflection*, *attraction*, *repulsion*, *evolution*, *natural selection* – which then become the agents of action (and the subject of theories), rather than physical objects themselves. But they remain virtual phenomena, existing solely "on the semiotic plane" (123); Billig rightly compares

them to Hans Vaihinger's (1925) "fictions" (see Fine 1993). But in the social sciences, all the -*ifications* and -*izations*, created from verbs, eclipse people and their actions, leading to "unpopulated" articles in which the actors are theoretical, abstract, conceptual or machine-like things (usually in passive sentences), rather than actual people – e.g. *market forces*, which *dictate* or *demand* or *forbid*, i.e. perform human actions (Billig, 138).

Corpus data (Biber et al. 1998) show that academic writing contains almost double the ratio of nouns to verbs than fictional writing and conversations. Billig describes a series of books for students explaining "key concepts" in various social sciences (sociology, politics, developmental psychology, anthropology) in which virtually 100% of the entries are nouns and noun phrases, with just a couple of adjectives, and zero verbs.[27] Social scientists also have a fondness for long, multi-word noun strings, such as *matched interlanguage speech intelligibility benefit*, or *early childhood thought disorder misdiagnosis*, which can sometimes usefully be rewritten by moving the last word to the beginning of the string and adding verbs and prepositions.

Billig finds another wide open target: critical discourse analysts (e.g. Fowler et al. 1979; Fairclough 1992) who outline the ideological dangers of nominalization and passivization while using the very grammatical constructions they find problematic, rather than the verbs *to nominalize* and *passivize* (115), and complain about *agent-deletion* (or even *de-agentialization*), which of course doesn't specify who is doing the deleting (121).

The use of passives, long words, and clumpy multi-noun phrases isn't limited to social scientists: as Billig mentions, some literary and cultural theorists insist openly that what they write cannot afford to be easily readable but *needs* to be difficult, full of jargon, allusions, and syntactic complexity. Culler and Lamb (2003: 9) even argue that literary theory may still not be difficult enough. But do we really want to encourage NNES students or researchers to write like this?:

> A course in translation – carrying a distinguished imprimatur as a professional training that could even produce measurable "outcomes" – was often deployed as a patch for "humanities lite" and for literary education that was politically *appauvri* in its amenability to soft diplomacy and its default to models of oneworldedness freighted with the psychopolitical burden of delusional democracy. Here, the psychopolitics of planetary dysphoria were itself definable as a depression of the globe or the thymotic frustration of the world. (Apter 2013: 8)

---

27 As well as verbs, social scientists readily convert adjectives into nouns: *the emic*, *the etic*, *the feminine*, *the imaginary*, *the unhomely*, etc.

Apart from anything else, this passage, with its long sentence and many multi-syllable words, has a Gunning Fog index – a measure of readability, estimating the number of years of formal education needed to understand the text on a first reading – of 27.5. This alone might well ensure "thymotic frustration" in many readers. As might the unnecessary French loan word mixed in with a word from the language of marketing (lite), multiple compounds (oneworldedness, psycho-political, psychopolitics), obscure or infrequent Greek words (dysphoria, thymo-tic), sarcastic scare quotes (is it so terrible that a course in translation might lead to an outcome or an "outcome"?), the multiple value judgements (patch, lite, *appauvri*, delusional), and so on. Compared with writing such as this, which mimics the many poor – or perhaps "foreignized" (Venuti 1995: 20) – English translations of French poststructuralists which imitate or preserve complex, noun-heavy, French sentence structures, neither the lexicogrammatical varia-tions (or 'peculiarities') of ELF, nor the indirect argument structures preferred by many NNESs, seem to be in any way rebarbative.

However, such forms of writing in the social sciences and humanities are generally learned via disciplinary socialization, rather than in writing classes, and indeed Spack (1988) argues that the role of university writing teachers is to initiate students into the academic discourse community rather than a disciplin-ary one. Hence it is up to academics, NES or NNES alike, to decide whether to espouse the dominant styles in their field, or to resist them like Billig. Senior academics have to ask themselves whether *discouraging* junior staff from using these styles would do them a disservice, and damage their professional pro-spects – or save them from themselves, because, as the American philosopher Brand Blanchard (1954: 52–53) argued, "Persistently obscure writers will usually be found to be defective human beings." (If only one *zhuan/ten/chon* is allowed, consider this a German-style *Exkurs*.)

6 Conclusion

Many NNES are now obliged to write in English, the major global language of academic research. But writing for an international audience, they should feel free to transfer rhetorical patterns of text organization favoured in their L1 into English, although the extent to which they actually do so may depend on their perception of their readers' expectations. Thought and discourse patterns are more fundamental than surface 'peculiarities' or lexicogrammatical variation. Consequently, NESs need to become accustomed to articles that do *not* begin by stating their thesis and then systematically develop and support it. They need to

accommodate to papers with delayed introduction of purpose, in which some points may only be implicit, and the ideas only loosely connected, without explicit cohesive devices linking topics from one sentence and paragraph to the next. They need to accept rhetorical styles that give space to a lot of additional background information, and tangential and peripherally related arguments, perhaps all leading to a relatively non-assertive conclusion. Rhetorical strategies such as these do *not* intrinsically impose additional processing effort on readers who are used to them, and given that English is a lingua franca and not just a native language in global academia, NESs ought to get used to them, for reasons of fairness and equality.

References

Ammon, Ulrich. 2000. Towards more fairness in international English: Linguistic rights of non-native speakers? In Robert Phillipson (ed.), *Rights to language: Equity, power, and education*, 111–116. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ammon, Ulrich (ed.). 2001. *The dominance of English as a language of science*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Andreski, Stanislav. 1971. *Social science as sorcery*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Apter, Emily. 2013. *Against world literature: On the politics of untranslatability*. London: Verso.

Atkinson, Dwight. 1999. TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(4). 625–654.

Belcher, Diane. 1997. An argument for nonadversarial argumentation: On the relevance of the feminist critique of academic discourse to L2 writing pedagogy. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6(1). 1–21.

Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad & Randi Reppen. 1998. *Corpus linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, Michael. 2013. *Learn to write badly: How to succeed in the social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blanchard, Brand. 1954. *On philosophical style*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, Deborah. 2002. Globalization and the teaching of 'communication skills.' In David Block & Deborah Cameron (eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*, 67–82. London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2002. *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2013. *Translingual practice. Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge.

Clyne, Michael. 1980. Culture and discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 5(1). 61–66.

Clyne, Michael. 1994. *Inter-cultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connor, Ulla. 2004. Intercultural rhetoric research: Beyond texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3(4). 183–195.

Connor, Ulla. 2008. Mapping multidimensional aspects of research: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric. In Ulla Connor, Ed Nagelhout & William Rozycki (eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*, 299–315. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Connor, Ulla, et al. 1995. *Tekokkaita EU-projektiehdotuksia* [Successful EU grant proposals]. Helsinki: Tekes.

Culler, Jonathan & Kevin Lamb. 2003. Introduction: Dressing up, dressing down. In Culler & Lamb (eds.), *Just being difficult? Academic writing in the public arena*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Eggington, William G. 1987. Written academic discourse in Korea: Implications for effective communication. In Ulla Connor & Robert B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*, 153–167. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings corpus). http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/elfacorpus

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. 1993 [1841]. *Self-reliance, and other essays*. Mineola, NY: Dover.

European Council for Cultural Co-operation. 2001. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ferguson, Gibson, Carmen Pérez-Llantada & Ramón Plo. 2011. English as an international language of scientific publication: A study of attitudes. *World Englishes* 30(1). 41–59.

Fine, Arthur. 1993. Fictionalism. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 19. 1–18.

Fowler, Roger, Bob Hodge, Gunther Kress & Tony Trew. 1979. *Language and control*. London: Routledge.

García, Ofelia. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century. A global perspective*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gazzola, Michele & François Grin. 2007. Assessing efficiency and fairness in multilingual communication: Towards a general analytical framework. In Augusto Carli & Ulrich Ammon (eds.), *Linguistic inequality in scientific communication today. AILA review* 20, 87–105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hall, Edward T. 1959. *The silent language*. New York: Anchor.

Hall, Edward T. 1976. *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2006. *The language of science (the collected works of Michael Halliday volume 5)*. London: Continuum.

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

Hinds, John. 1987. Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In Ulla Connor & Robert B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*, 141–152. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hinds, John. 1990. Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In Ulla Connor & Ann M. Johns (eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*, 87–110. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hofstede, Geert. 1980. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, Geert. 1991. *Cultures and organization: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hyland, Ken. 1994. Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes* 13(3). 239–256.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2005. Teaching pronunciation for English as a lingua franca: A sociopolitical perspective. In Claus Gnutzmann & Frauke Intemann (eds.), *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom*, 145–158. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2013. *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London: Routledge.

Jørgensen, Normann J. 2008. Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3). 161–176.

Kachru, Braj B. 1985. Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*, 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1995. Contrastive rhetoric in World Englishes. *English Today* 11(1). 21–31.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1972 [1966]. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. In Kenneth Croft (ed.), *Readings on English as a second language*, 245–262. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1987. Cultural thought patterns revisited. In Ulla Connor & Robert B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*, 9–21. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kirkpatrick, Andy & Zhichang Xu. 2012. *Chinese rhetoric and writing: An introduction for language teachers*. Fort Collins, CO: Parlor Press. http://wac.colostate.edu/books/kirkpatrick_xu/

Kramsch, Claire. 1997. The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA* 112(3). 359–369.

Kubota, Ryuko. 1999. Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(1). 9–35.

Kubota, Ryuko. 2002. The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In David Block & Deborah Cameron (eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*, 13–28. London: Routledge.

Kubota, Ryuko & Al Lehner. 2004. Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(1). 7–27.

Lass, Roger. 1997. *Historical linguistics and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, Xiaoming. 2008. From contrastive rhetoric to intercultural rhetoric: A search for collective identity. In Ulla Connor, Ed Nagelhout & William Rozycki (eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*, 11–24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lillis, Theresa & Mary Jane Curry. 2010. *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

MacKenzie, Ian. 2014. *English as a lingua franca: Theorizing and teaching English*. London: Routledge.

Mauranen, Anna. 1993. *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Mauranen, Anna. 2012. *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, Anna, Carmen Perez-Llantada & John M. Swales. 2010. Academic Englishes – A standardized knowledge? In Andy Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of World Englishes*, 634–652. London: Routledge.

McCagg, Peter. 1996. If you can lead a horse to water, you don't have to make it drink: Some comments on reader and writer responsibilities. *Multilingua* 15(3). 239–256.

Mills, Charles Wright. 1959. *The sociological imagination*. London: Oxford University Press.

Mirowski, Philip. 1991. *More heat than light: Economics as social physics, physics as nature's economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montgomery, Scott L. 2000. *Science in translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Montgomery, Scott L. 2013. *Does science need a global language?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Otsuji, Emi & Alastair Pennycook. 2010. Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7(3). 240–254.

Pennycook, Alastair. 1998. *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Schütze, Fritz. 1975. *Sprache soziologisch gesehen*. München: Wilhelm Fink.

Scollon, Ron & Suzanne W Scollon. 1997. Point of view and citation: Fourteen Chinese and English versions of the 'same' news story. *Text* 17(1). 83–125.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11(2). 133–158.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spack, Ruth. 1988. Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly* 22(1). 29–51.

Sperber, Dan & Deirdre Wilson. 1986/1995. *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, John M. 1997. English as tyrannosaurus rex. *World Englishes* 16(3). 373–382.

Trudgill, Peter. 1989. Contact and isolation in linguistic change. In L. E. Breivik & E. H. Jahr (eds.), *Language change: Contributions to the study of its causes*, 227–237. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011. *Sociolinguistic typology: Social determinants of language complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vaihinger, Hans. 1925. *The philosophy of 'as if': A system of the theoretical, practical and religious fictions of mankind*. Translated by C. K. Ogden. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.

VOICE (Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English). http://www.univie.ac.at/voice.

Whitman, Walt. 2001 [1855]. *Song of myself*. Mineola, NY: Dover.

Wray, Alison. 2008. *Formulaic language: Pushing the boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wray, Alison & George W. Grace. 2007. The consequences of talking to strangers: Evolutionary corollaries of socio-cultural influences on linguistic form. *Lingua* 117(3). 543–578.

Zamel, Vivian. 1997. Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(2). 341–352.

Bionote

Ian MacKenzie

Ian MacKenzie teaches English and translation in the Faculty of Translation and Interpreting of the University of Geneva. He is the author of *English as a lingua franca: Theorizing and teaching English* (2014), *Paradigms of reading: Relevance theory and deconstruction* (2002), and several English language teaching coursebooks.