INTRODUCTION

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is now a firmly established sub-discipline in Applied Linguistics with research in this area making an important contribution to teaching. Over the last four decades ESP research has seen a number of changes in focus from the early studies in Register Analysis in the 1960's, through work in Rhetorical Analysis in the 1980's, to Genre Analysis, the current dominant paradigm. Each of these approaches had its own methodology. The early work on register used needs analyses as a basis of syllabus design; the New Rhetoricians drew on insights from other disciplines as well as Applied Linguistics. The Genre Analysts examine not only representative texts of a particular disciplinary community, but also the physical situation in which they are produced. Analysis, therefore, has become more ethnographic and genre is conceived as a dynamic phenomenon, subject to change and adaptation by the participants, in accordance with the social purposes that the academic context demands. The notion of discourse community has thus become central to an understanding of how genres are framed.

With the advent and refinement of computer-based corpora it is possible nowadays to relate the quantitative data that emerge form concordance analysis to discourse features of texts. The impact of new technologies has also led to the creation of new genres, such as e-mail, postings on electronic lists or e-logs (see, for example, Nancy Lea Eik-Nes's contribution to this volume), which call for research and pedagogical responses. Two other areas, namely critical approaches to research and discourse (Benesch; Canagarajah), and cultural differences (Ostler; Salager-Meyer, Alcaraz Ariza, and Pabón Berbesí) are having an increasing influence on the development of ESP studies.

We must recall at this point that ESP, as Dudley-Evans and St John note, has traditionally been divided into two main areas: English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP). While EAP is concerned with the language taught in specific disciplines (e.g. biology, psychology, linguistics), EOP refers to English that is not for academic but for professional purposes, that is, the language taught in administration, law, business or medicine. We may thus distinguish between studying the language and discourse of, for example, medi-

cine for academic purposes, which is designed to help medical students while they are undertaking undergraduate or postgraduate study, and the language taught for professional preparation (occupational purposes), which is designed for practising doctors. Nevertheless, Flowerdew and Peacock argue that a distinction between these two branches of ESP in not clear-cut, since a lot of work carried out in higher education is preparation for the professional occupations that students are likely to take up when they graduate and, therefore might be also classified as EOP.

Be that as it may, the fact that English has been well established nowadays as the language of international scientific and technical communication has led, unsurprisingly, to an increasing concern for the teaching of English with the specific aim of helping learners to study and conduct research in that language. Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2) go beyond the idea of preparing students to read and study in English to developing new kinds of literacy, equipping them with the communicative skills to participate in particular academic and cultural contexts "by grounding instruction in an understanding of the cognitive, social and linguistic demands of specific academic disciplines." The educational response to this phenomenon at university and other academic settings has been the rapid expansion of EAP throughout the world. The growing interest in EAP research activity in a variety of situations is reflected in the numerous papers that are frequently presented at international conferences related to EAP (or with special sessions on ESP), and in the increasing number of research articles featured in Applied Linguistics journals, particularly, *English for Specific Purposes* and the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. Much of the research reported in these publications has shown that academics have specific communicative needs which are defined by the social context (education, values, expectations) and rhetorical practices of their particular disciplinary communities.

The increasing pressure to publish internationally that is brought to bear on users of English as an additional language has provided the impetus for research primarily concerned with the academic discourse conventions of English. The objective is to help these scholars to publish and communicate their research in international fora (see, for example, Burgess and Martín-Martín). There have also been pedagogical demands on the EAP community that have grown out of the need for materials at different levels. EAP has expanded its scope from courses aimed at undergraduates to the teaching of English in the academy at all proficiency levels (see Jo Lewkowicz's work on Masters' theses, this volume), including the training of non-English speaking background scholars who teach, carry out research and publish in this additional language.

As laudable as the contributions of EAP researchers and practitioners may be, it should be made clear that that the dominance of English as the international scientific language is not without negative consequences. The imposition of the rhetorical conventions favoured by the English-speaking community has led to the loss of academic registers and genres in some minority languages and has clearly put at a disadvantage those scholars who use English as an additional language; particularly those who work "on the periphery" (see Ray Cooke and Susan Birch-Becaas, this volume).

Following two previous special issues of the *RCEI* journal entitled "English(es) in the Academy" (no. 44) and "Writing in a Global Context" (no. 53), the present issue brings together a collection of papers by major researchers from various international institutions, who were invited to contribute papers on the latest ESP trends, particularly research into writing in academic settings. Most of the authors in this volume argue that there is a general lack of specific guidance to writers as to how to tackle the rhetorical conventions which allow them to meet the expectations of the members of the international scientific community; and all the authors without exception have in common as their prime concern offering assistance to novice writers, and especially non-native speakers of English, with the acquisition of the necessary rhetorical skills to produce successful academic writing in English.

A key stage in publishing a research paper is the peer review process. Christine Feak comprehensively describes this process in the opening article. She terms it a complex genre cluster made up of reviewer reports, submission letters and the author's responses to the reviewers (ARRs). It is this latter type of texts precisely that Feak explores in her paper. She starts by discussing the place of ARRs within the research article (RA) network. Drawing on a corpus of ARRs, in the subfield of Thoracic Surgery, submitted by authors affiliated to various Anglophone and non-Anglophone institutions, Feak analyses the move structure of the available data and proposes a typical ARR model. She finally examines some of the salient linguistic features of the texts, and offers a comparison of ARRs written by researchers from different academic cultures. Apart from the usefulness of Feak's study for authors facing the task of writing an ARR, her work also illustrates the interesting aspect of cultural variation in politeness strategies used in academic settings.

Despite the difficulties that novice writers from English-speaking backgrounds may experience when writing up research in English, it is unquestionable that this represents a more daunting task for non-English speaking background writers. To begin with there are obvious linguistic differences related to linguistic typologies. A case in point are speakers of Chinese languages in Greater China, which has the largest number of learners of English in the world and where English is becoming increasingly relevant at all educational levels. David Li takes up this issue in the next article in this volume. He discusses the main typological and linguistic factors which impact on acquisition for Chinese EAP students. Through the contrastive analysis of the learners' language output, the author focuses on the most salient lexico-grammatical deviations from EAP, which he sees as arising in part from cross-linguistic influences from the learner's mother tongue. This contribution implicitly raises the issue of the need for a greater tolerance of different rhetorical styles in international publications, given the fact that is now used across national boundaries.

The study of the writing practices of postgraduate students, who use English as an additional language, is the focus of attention of the next two contributions. Nancy Lea Eik-Nes looks at how Norwegian engineering students negotiate their identities in their disciplines through the writing of logs. Using Hyland's model of interaction in academic discourse, the author examines the textual signs of sub-

jective interaction in the paper logs and e-logs submitted by doctoral students in an academic writing course and then compares them with Hyland's data obtained in his previous analysis of linguistic markers of interaction in RAs related to the discipline in which these students were engaged, with the ultimate purpose of establishing the degree of interaction in the logs. Her results reveal some typological differences and a higher degree of interaction in the logs, particularly the e-logs, than in the RAs. The author, however, points out the need of a qualitative analysis to better account for the results obtained. In any case, what remains clear is that the practice of "dialogging," as the author puts it, may well represent a means of facilitating student development in academic writing.

Jo Lewkowicz's essay stems from the same concern with assisting students who use English as an additional language, on this occasion, in the demanding task of writing their Masters' theses in English. Her study explores the rhetorical structure of the concluding section of Masters' theses written by Polish Applied Linguistics students and then compares it with the typical rhetorical moves of English theses as described in the literature. The results of her research show a great variability in how conclusions are written, a variability she relates to the specific context in which they were produced. A key element in this context is specific advice on how to write a thesis. The author notes major differences between the advices given in the two languages. In the light of the results obtained, Lewkowicz concludes by questioning the validity of adhering to writing conventions considered as appropriate in English-medium universities in contexts such as the Polish university system.

Within the same contrastive rhetoric tradition, our paper moves on to the analysis of the prevalent rhetorical practices of professional writers from two different cultural environment and disciplinary domains. Due to the increasing pressure to publish scientific articles, unsurprisingly, academics need to use a series of rhetorical strategies which help them promote their research and thus convince their peers of its importance in order to get their papers accepted. Our study looks comparatively at the use of promotional strategies in the introduction section of RAs written in English and Spanish in the two related subdisciplines of Clinical and Health Psychology, and Dermatology. The results reveal that, in general terms, the English texts present a higher degree of rhetorical promotion in both fields, although some degree of cross-disciplinary variation was also found. This indicates that in shaping the rhetorical and promotional features of the genre in question, when discipline and national cultural factors interact, the latter tends to override the influence of disciplinary conventions.

With a very explicit pedagogical concern, the final contribution in this issue also addresses the topic of how academics manage to get their work published. Ray Cooke and Susan Birch-Becaas investigate, in particular, the resources available to non-native English speaking (NNES) graduate students and academics to facilitate their access to the "gate-kept" world of publishing in English. After discussing some of the obstacles that NNES researchers face in order to get their work accepted for publication in English-language journals, the authors turn their attention to the notion of human-computer interaction by discussing the digital materials and procedures used until now as to meet the requirements of NNES scientists,

and end up by describing an innovative web-based writing tool (Type Your Own Script) which, on the basis of the corrected first drafts of Francophone researchers who eventually succeeded in publishing their papers in international journals, illustrates how scientific writing functions by drawing the learner's attention to the linguistic and rhetorical features that typically pose problems. It is worth highlighting here the fact that the writing models to imitate are not longer those of L1 English-speaking authors. An approach such as this, apart from offering unquestionable benefits to French-speaking academics and students, also problematises the Anglophone cultural ethnocentrism which leads to the judging of textual patterns other than those used by English-speakers as, in Ostler's terms, anomalous.

To conclude, we would most sincerely like to thank all the guest-authors for their insightful contributions to this special issue. At the very outset of this new century, it represents a modest step forward in ESP research, a field still firmly grounded in practical education needs.

Pedro Martín Martín
Isabel K. León Pérez

WORKS CITED

Benesch, Sarah. "Rights Analysis: Studying Power Relations in an Academic Setting." *English for Specific Purposes* 18.4 (1999): 313-327.

Burgess, Sally and Pedro Martín-Martín, eds. *English as an Additional Language in Research Publication and Communication*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "Multilingual Writers and the Academic Community: Towards a Critical Relationship." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 1.1 (2002): 29-44.

Dudley-Evans, Tony and Maggie Jo St John. *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Flowerdew, John and Matthew Peacock. "Issues in EAP: A Preliminary Perspective." *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes*. Ed. J. Flowerdew and M. Peacock. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 8-24.

Hyland, Ken and Liz Hamp-Lyons. "EAP: Issues and Directions." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 1.1 (2002): 1-12.

Ostler, Shirley E. "Contrastive Rhetoric: An Expanding Paradigm." *Academic Discourse*. Ed. J. Flowerdew. Harlow: Longman, 2002. 167-181.

Salager-Meyer, Françoise, María Ángeles Alcaraz Ariza and Marielys Pabón Berbesí. "Hidden Influencers and the Scholarly Enterprise: A Cross-linguistic/Cultural Analysis of Acknowledgments in Medical Research Papers." *English for Professional and Academic Purposes*. Ed. M.F. Ruiz-Garrido, J.C. Palmer-Silveira and I. Fortanet-Gómez. Castellón: Universitat Jaume I. [Forthcoming]