
Стаття надійшла до редакції 03.12.2019

Перевірено на плагіат 10.12.2019 р.

унікальність – 94.93%

<https://doi.org/10.17721/StudLing2020.16.40-57>

УДК 811.111: 378.4

НОВІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ У ВИКЛАДАННІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ ДЛЯ АКАДЕМІЧНИХ ЦІЛЕЙ

Ольга Михайлівна Ільченко, olgilch@hotmail.com

доктор філологічних наук, професор

Центр наукових досліджень та викладання іноземних мов

Національної Академії Наук України

Наталія Анатоліївна Крамар, kra_nat@ukr.net

аспірант

Центр наукових досліджень та викладання іноземних мов

Національної Академії Наук України

Навчання англійської мови як іноземної стало сьогодні не лише потужною індустрією, а й плідним напрямком теоретичних досліджень у галузі лінгвістики. У цій статті здійснено критичний огляд нових тенденцій в одній з найбільш актуальних течій у викладанні англійської мови – а саме, англійській мові для академічних цілей (*English for Academic Purposes, EAP*). Розкрито еволюцію розвитку викладання англійської для академічних цілей, окреслено термінологічні проблеми, пов'язані із концептуалізацією цього напрямку у межах англійської мови для спеціальних цілей (*English for Specific Purposes, ESP*). Проаналізовано зміни, які сьогодні відбуваються в академічній англійській мові під впливом інших мов (концепт «симілекту» А. Мауранен), та висвітлено можливості збагачення педагогічної практики у сфері англійської для академічних цілей шляхом залучення перспективи “*English as a Lingua Franca*”, що передбачає вивчення мови з метою ефективної взаємодії у мультилінгвальному середовищі. Розглянуто оновлену (2018) версію дескрипторів Загальноєвропейських Рекомендацій з мовної освіти (CEFR) у їх зв'язку із викладанням англійської для академічних цілей: зокрема, присвячено увагу навичкам медіації, критичному мисленню та інтегративному мисленню, які, на нашу думку, слід активніше задіювати у викладанні наукового письма англійською мовою. Окреслено теоретичне підґрунтя та методологічні принципи викладання англійської мови для наукових публікацій (*English for Research Publication Purposes, ERPP*) як нової підгалузі англійської мови для академічних цілей, що поєднує вивчення жанрової специфіки

англомовної наукової статті із розглядом різноманітних позамовних чинників, що стосуються наукових публікацій.

Ключові слова: англійська мова для академічних цілей, академічне письмо, симілект, критичне мислення, Загальноєвропейські Рекомендації з мовної освіти, англійська мова для наукових публікацій.

ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES: KEEPING UP WITH THE TIMES

Olga M. Ilchenko, olgilch@hotmail.com

D. Sc. in Philology, full professor

*Research and Educational Center of Foreign Languages,
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*

Natalia A. Kramar, kra_nat@ukr.net

PhD student

*Research and Educational Center of Foreign Languages,
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*

English language education, especially in light of the status of English as present-day lingua franca, has become a prolific field of research, and no less prolific area of practical application internationally. Through a critical literature review, the current study addresses one of its most prominent subfields – English for Academic Purposes – with special emphasis on academic writing. We briefly touch upon its evolution and identify the terminological ambiguities involved in EAP conceptualization within the broader framework of ESP (English for Specific Purposes). By examining the changes that academic English is undergoing today due to the overwhelming influence of L2 speakers' varieties (termed "similects" by Anna Mauranen), we elucidate how English as a Lingua Franca movement can benefit and enrich EAP pedagogic practice. We also discuss how EAP fits within the latest CEFR guidelines, paying close attention to mediating skills, critical thinking and integrative thinking skills, which, as we argue, need to be more extensively incorporated into academic writing instruction. We discuss the rationale and the methodological principles of English for Research Publication Purposes as a new offshoot of EAP, which combines genre-based instruction with the exploration of multiple non-linguistic issues, involved in academic publishing, such as interaction with editors and gatekeepers, choosing a suitable journal, navigating the review process. We hope to demonstrate that EAP teaching, and especially academic writing instruction, is in need of major revision to overcome the yawning gap that currently exists between theory and practice.

Key words: *English for Academic Purposes, academic writing, similect, critical thinking, Common European Framework of Reference, English for Research Publication Purposes*

НОВЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ В ПРЕПОДАВАНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА ДЛЯ АКАДЕМИЧЕСКИХ ЦЕЛЕЙ

Ольга Михайловна Ильченко, olgilch@hotmail.com

доктор филологических наук, профессор,
Центр научных исследований и преподавания иностранных языков
Национальной Академии Наук Украины

Наталья Анатольевна Крамар, kra_nat@ukr.net

аспирант,
Центр научных исследований и преподавания иностранных языков
Национальной Академии Наук Украины

Обучение английскому языку как иностранному сегодня стало не только мощной индустрией, но и плодотворным направлением теоретических исследований в области лингвистики. В этой статье представлен критический обзор новых тенденций в одном из самых актуальных течений в преподавании английского языка – а именно, английском языке для академических целей (*English for Academic Purposes, EAP*). Проанализированы изменения, которые сегодня происходят в академическом английском языке под сильным влиянием других языков (концепт «симилекта» А. Мауранен), и освещены возможности обогащения педагогической практики в сфере английского для академических целей путем привлечения перспективы "*English as a Lingua Franca*", предусматривающей изучение языка с целью эффективного взаимодействия в мультиязычной среде. Рассмотрены обновленные (2018) дескрипторы *Общоевропейских Рекомендаций по языковому образованию (CEFR)* в их связи с преподаванием английского для академических целей: в частности, уделено внимание навыкам медиации, критическому мышлению и интегративному мышлению, которые, по нашему мнению, следует активнее задействовать в преподавании академического письма на английском языке. Определены теоретические основы и методологические принципы преподавания английского языка для научных публикаций (*English for Research Publication Purposes, ERPP*) как новой отрасли английского языка для академических целей, сочетающей изучение жанровой специфики англоязычной научной статьи с рассмотрением различных внеязыковых факторов, касающихся научных публикаций.

Ключевые слова: *английский язык для академических целей, академическое письмо, симилект, критическое мышление, Общеευропейские Рекомендации по языковому образованию, английский язык для научных публикаций.*

Introduction

We live in challenging times, with unexpected surprises – or some would rather say possibilities – lurking around the corner. Educators are no exception. Should we change the ways we teach? Or modify the content? What seems to be the latest trend in teaching languages, and academic English specifically? Why should we care?

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is one of the fastest-growing branches of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) today. Over the last three decades, it has become a powerful research-informed movement, driven by the needs of international students studying at Anglophone universities and researchers seeking recognition in the English-dominated academic world [Hyland and Shaw, 2016, p. 1]. The novelty of the study lies in bringing together the latest research on the currently dominant topics in EAP, some of which are rather contentious, and highlighting their pedagogic implications. The object of the study is English for Academic Purposes as an independent field of research and practice in linguistics, while its subject is new trends and developments in teaching English for Academic Purposes today.

The purpose of our narrative review is to analyze the issues and challenges, involved in teaching EAP today, with a particular focus on academic writing. To achieve this, we set out to tackle several timely tasks. We will first pave our way through the maze of EAP-related terms, dealing with underlying conceptual controversies. Synthesizing the latest research in the field, we will examine how the use of ELF (English as a Lingua Franca), comprised of multiple so-called similects, is affecting the standards of academic English and the ways these changes can be addressed in EAP classroom. We will next examine the development of students' mediating skills and critical thinking skills in the light of EAP's relation to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) descriptors, which were updated in 2018. We will also pay particular attention to the emergent field of English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP), where writing instruction is complemented with the exploration of the broader context of international scholarly publishing. This research draws together, synthesizes, and reveals several recurring themes in EAP that strongly resonate with EAP teaching in Ukraine today, in times of educational reform and the trend of overall "westernization" of language education in this country. We have selected recent scholarly sources on the theory and practice of

EAP found in authoritative research electronic databases. For that matter, we have performed core keywords search that helped us identify relevant literature for this study.

Navigating a sea of terms

The rise of English as the international language of economy, technology and science in the post-war era brought about drastic shifts in the field of ELT (English Language Teaching). As the domains of English use became increasingly specialised and diverse, the need arose for language courses that would be focused on the particular professional or academic contexts that learners had to deal with. In response to this need the field of ESP (English for Specific Purposes) was developed, with its major premise being orientation on “the language, skills, and genres appropriate to the specific activities the learners need to carry out in English” [Paltridge and Starfield, 2013, p. 2]. It was thus differentiated from EGP (English for General Purposes), which aims at building the students’ general linguistic competence, regardless of their occupation or discipline. EGP is typically associated with the beginner level of language proficiency and seen as a prerequisite for ESP, which mostly (though not necessarily) targets adult students at the intermediate or advanced levels of language study [Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998, p. 5]. ESP is grounded not merely in linguistic, but also social and cognitive demands of target learners [Hyland and Wong, 2020, p. 2].

According to the well-known classification by T. Dudley and M. St. John [1998, p. 6], the two major branches of ESP are English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP). EAP is further subdivided into English for (Academic) Science and Technology; English for (Academic) Medical Purposes; English for (Academic) Legal Purposes; English for Management, Science and Economics. EOP is represented with English for Professional Purposes (comprised of English for Medical Purposes and English for Business Purposes) and English for Vocational Purposes (comprised of Pre-Vocational English and Vocational English). This classification, however, is far from being exhaustive, as EOP potentially has as many varieties as there are human occupations that involve the use of English for international communication. Thus, a great number of educational resources focus on such subfields as Aviation English, English for Tourism and Hospitality, English for Nursing and even English for Call-Centers. Within EAP more specialised fields have appeared such as English for Research Publication Purposes, or ERPP [Flowerdew, 2015] and English for Thesis and Dissertation Writing [Paltridge and Starfield, 2013, Paltridge and Starfield, 2019]. Besides, the distinction between EAP and EOP is not

definitive, since a large part of the work carried out in higher education context is actually training for professional life and might thus be described as EOP, though its formal label would be EAP [Flowerdew and Peacock, 2001, p. 11]. EAP is sometimes divided into English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP): while EGAP deals with teaching academic English to students in all fields of study, ESAP narrows the focus down to a particular discipline [Flowerdew, 2016, p. 7]. Furthermore, the two can be differentiated with regard to the level: EGAP is mostly provided for undergraduate students, whereas ESAP is suited to the needs of postgraduates [ibid., p. 8].

The term EAP was first used by the British Council in 1975, and by 1997 it was also spread in the US [Flowerdew, 2016, p. 7]. In its early days (the 1970-80s) EAP was primarily associated with English for Science and Technology – the field, which was intensely researched by celebrated scholars such as J. Swales, C. Bazerman, M.A.K. Halliday [Parkinson, 2013, p. 155]. Its focus has largely expanded now, with the increasing number of publications analyzing the discourse of Humanities and Social Sciences (notably, these fields are not represented in the classification by Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998]. However, some researchers, working exclusively with the “hard sciences”, tend to equate EST with EAP [see, for example, Escribano and McMahon, 2009, p. 189].

Whether EAP should be considered a subfield of ESP has also been subject to question. It is sometimes argued that EAP constitutes a separate field of teaching and research in applied linguistics in its own right [see, for example, Hamp-Lyons, 2011, p. 89]. The latest book edited by K. Hyland [together with L. Wong, 2020] bears the title “Specialised English: New Directions in ESP and EAP Research and Practice”, which seems to give support to the aforementioned view, though this issue is not brought up explicitly throughout the book. M. Ruiz-Garrido, J. Palmer-Silveira and I. Fortanet-Gómez promote the term English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EPAP), dismissing the term “specific” altogether as being too broad and vague [Ruiz-Garrido, Palmer-Silveira and Fortanet-Gómez, 2010, p. 1]. Thus, there is much controversy involved in the classification and conceptualisation of EAP.

There is also some ambiguity perceived in the relation of EAP to other innovative pedagogic initiatives, such as EMI (English as a Medium of Instruction) and CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning). However, the three are obviously different in their focus: EAP is concerned solely with teaching language; EMI uses language only as a vehicle for teaching content; CLIL strives to combine both foci (but it is mostly confined to the secondary level of education, in contrast to EAP and EMI)

[Airey, 2016]. At the same time, attempts are often made to integrate EMI with EAP programmes to facilitate learner's autonomy: A. Jiang and L. Zhang [2016] report on the results of one such initiative in China. Even when not located within EMI context directly, EAP undeniably has important implications for EMI, serving to strengthen the language competence students need to comprehend the content as instructed in English.

English as a Lingua Franca and the concept of similects

With speakers of English as a second language (L2 speakers) currently outnumbering its native (L1) speakers worldwide, English has undoubtedly become the first global lingua franca, whose reach has no parallels in history [Mauranen, 2020, p. 10]. This fact has significantly affected the landscape of English language teaching, where the phenomenon of ELF, or English as a Lingua Franca, is now a salient focus of research.

ELF is generally defined as “any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option” [Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7]. This definition does not exclude native speakers, who may use ELF as their additional language (adopting some of its conventions) with the purpose of intercultural communication. A. Mauranen considers ELF in relation to similects – the term she introduced to designate varieties of language (in this case, English) used by the speakers who have a different first language, resulting from parallel cross-linguistic transfer [Mauranen, 2020, p. 10]. They can also be described as particular features of English use that are often shared by people with the same L1. Similects may get local nicknames, such as “Chinglish”, “Finglish”, “Dunglish”, which reflect their hybrid nature. ELF represents a second-order contact language between different similects, being a complex self-organising system [ibid., p. 19]. ELF interactions may involve speakers of different hybrids, which leads to a highly intricate language contact. The multilingual nature of ELF has come to the foreground in its latest conceptualization as “English as a Multilingua Franca”, suggested by J. Jenkins [2018]. The distinction that lies at the core of “English as a Lingua Franca” is not between native and non-native speakers, but between mono- and multilingual speakers, depending on their ability to switch between language varieties at their disposal.

In ELF contexts, speakers may have to accommodate to each other's language varieties for the overarching purpose of achieving communicative efficiency, without much regard for grammatical and phonological correctness. The standard conventions of English language use thus turn out to be challenged. This fact underpins the

innovative and rather controversial pedagogical philosophy advocated by ELF scholars (mainly B. Seidlhofer, A. Mauranen, J. Jenkins). They argue that the linguistic practices of L2 English users should be accepted as appropriate, as long as they are comprehensible to the interlocutors. Therefore, the objective of ELF teaching is to help students to acquire effective communication skills rather than native-like performance [Qiufang, 2012]. It strongly argues against the pervasive use of native speaker norms as a benchmark in English language teaching and assessment – the trend, which has recently received the derogatory label of “native speakerism” [the term was coined by A. Holliday, see discussion in Rose et al., 2010]. Likewise, in her 2011 book, B. Seidlhofer deconstructs the notions of “native speaker (NS)” and “standard English” as idealized and reified concepts that should not be considered as appropriate (nor achievable) target in language learning. Nowadays, it is widely recognized that the ELF perspective is doing a valuable job in promoting realistic objectives in language teaching and rethinking the concept of “error”, which looms large in traditional teaching methods [Swan, 2012]. It has therefore become an integral part of the studies within the realm of TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) [Rose et al., 2010], or, in other recent terms, teaching English to multilingual students [Bitchener, Storch and Wette, 2017]. In 2012 “The Journal of English as a Lingua Franca” was launched, with a large bulk of its articles addressing the pedagogical potential of the ELF movement. It is widely admitted, though, that ELF-aware pedagogies are very slow to be translated into practice, due to the deeply entrenched orientation towards native speaker standards in ELT [Qiufang, 2012].

At this point we would like to clarify the place of ELF among other terms related to English education, which turns out to be a rather complicated question. Non-native speakers can use and learn English either as their second language (ESL) – if they reside in an English-speaking country, or as a foreign language (EFL) – if they reside elsewhere. The term ESL, however, is now being increasingly replaced with EAL (English as an Additional Language), because English may not necessarily be the second language a person acquires (it may be the third, the forth etc.). Regarding the relation between the terms “English as a Foreign Language” and “English as a Lingua Franca”, M. Swan [2012, p. 379] notes that both are “double-sided” because they can refer to teaching and learning activities to and by non-native speakers (EFL) on the one hand, and the use of English by non-native speakers for international communication (ELF), on the other; moreover, they may also be used to designate kinds of language: the English that is taught to and/or learnt by non-native speakers (EFL), and the English that is used by non-native speakers for international

communication (ELF). While the two concepts are often counterposed by ELF scholars, M. Swan believes that “EFL leads to ELF; they are on opposite sides of the same coin.” [ibid., p. 388]. Thus, ELF can be seen either as a separate terrain of English teaching and use or an integral part of EFL. Alongside the well-established term “English as a Lingua Franca”, one can also come across the term “English as an International Language” (EIL) used roughly with the same meaning.

English as a Lingua Franca movement has major implications for the field of EAP, as academic communication today turns out to be largely shaped by non-native speakers. Academic English is thus not a monolithic standardised construct but a mix of culture-specific varieties, with the speakers of different L1 accommodating to each other’s linguistic features for the sake of mutual understanding. English as an Academic Lingua Franca (or English as a Lingua Franca in the Academia, a.k.a. ELFA) has now emerged as a rapidly developing area of research in its own right, with corpus methods being employed to trace the patterns of English as used for intercultural communication in academic setting [Mauranen, Hynninen and Ranta, 2010]. I. Schaller-Schwaner suggests the term “English for Plurilingual Academic Purposes” to capture the overlap between English for Academic Purposes and ELF [2015]. In one of her later works [2018], which is based on a bilingual setting, she regards ELF as a multilingual “edulect” with a large potential as a medium for teaching students other languages.

As noted by Flowerdew [2015, p. 254] the use of ELF is intensely spreading within the spoken and informal written academic varieties, but not in the genre of research article, which is vigilantly guarded by academic publishing gatekeepers, most of whom happen to be native speakers with firm loyalty to Standard English. Therefore, an important question to consider is whether EAP teaching should target the ELF forms, which learners will most likely be using for spoken interactions, or orthodox Standard English, which gives them more chances to succeed in publishing their articles internationally. However, even when EAP instructors stick with the latter option (which is clearly less risky), it seems important that they incorporate the elements of ELF-aware pedagogy to show their students the fluidity of linguistic norms in modern scholarly communication and to increase their ability to successfully communicate with speakers from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Exposure to various English accents, raising students’ awareness of “similects”, discussion of common lexical and grammatical features from ELF corpora (such as Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English) are some of the feasible steps to be implemented in EAP teaching in line with the changing sociolinguistic landscape.

EAP and CEFR

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, or CEFR, is a seven-point scale of descriptors (from pre-A1, A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 to C2) that reflects a person's language ability. It is a benchmark and a standard approved by the Council of Europe and currently being used worldwide, including Ukraine. In the context of EAP, the CEFR serves as an effective tool in the development and assessment of admission tests [Green, 2018, p. 12]. The new, 2018 CEFR expands and deepens the previous 2001 CEFR version. The current CEFR version clearly distinguishes between:

- **communicative language activities and strategies** and
- **communicative language competences** that, in turn, involves:
 - linguistic competences (i.e. general range, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary range, vocabulary, phonology, orthography control),
 - sociolinguistic competences (sociolinguistic appropriateness)
 - pragmatic competences (turn-taking, coherence, spoken fluency etc.)

CEFR also outlines **four modes of communication**:

- reception,
- production,
- interaction,
- mediation [Council of Europe, 2018, p. 30]

Such newly introduced mode of communication as **mediation** should help with communicating when several languages are used, metaphorically speaking, to serve as a “bridge” between languages in order to facilitate communication. Here, the language user acts as a social agent to help construct and convey meaning, with several languages involved in interaction. Hence the importance of a well-developed emotional intelligence and empathy for the viewpoints of others. This term also deals with various social and cultural aspects of cooperative cross-linguistic communication, termed in CEFR Companion Volume as “plurilingual/pluricultural competence” [ibid., p. 28]. CEFR outlines the following **three interconnected types of mediation**:

- mediating a text
- mediating concepts (group work)
- mediating communication (facilitating pluricultural space and communication in delicate situations and disagreements) [ibid, p. 106].

Let's deal with **mediating a text** in more detail, because it is directly related to teaching specialised English, especially academic writing as part of EAP. According to CEFR Companion Volume, mediating a text is about:

- relaying specific information – in speech and in writing;
- explaining data (e.g. in graphs, diagrams, charts etc.) – in speech and in writing
- processing text – in speech and in writing
- translating a written text – in speech and in writing
- note-taking (lectures, seminars, meetings etc.)
- expressing a personal response to creative texts (including literature)
- analysis and criticism of creative texts (including literature) [ibid., p. 107].

As we can see, the activities and abilities listed above are especially relevant for teaching foreign languages – especially English – at tertiary level, when student should be adept at extracting and understanding both explicit and implicit information from a variety of complex academic and scientific texts of various genres to identify the arguments used, to summarize information from several sources – with their critical analysis and to express the student's point of view – in a linear and well-structured manner, with clear links to scientific terms, notions and theories. Accordingly, the recent CEFR Illustrative Descriptor Scales (part of CEFR Companion Volume) state that at levels C1-C2, written reports and essays, alongside being clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured, with systematically developed argument, should set out multiple perspectives on complex academic or professional topics, clearly distinguishing the ideas and opinions of the writer from those in the sources [ibid., p. 77].

Writing argumentative essays is part and parcel of tertiary academic writing training. According to Cambridge IELTS consultants, there are two basic tasks when it comes to writing argumentative essays: OPINION (opinion+discussion) tasks and IDEAS tasks (problem/solution, cause/effect, ideas/evaluate) [Alperne and Swires, 2015]. We argue that for effective argumentation, it is of paramount importance to employ clear argument structure with relevant supporting data and examples, which results from having strong critical thinking skills that enable differentiating between FACTS and OPINIONS, and detecting logical fallacies, pseudo-argumentation and manipulation. T. Boellstorff [2008] is right when he notes the crucial importance of linking data to claims. We agree with the author that this is indeed critical. Let us stress the necessity of bolstering critical thinking and problem solving skills and the

importance of the so-called “integrative thinking”. Unlike conventional thinking, integrative one deals with the ability to consider multidirectional and nonlinear relationships, to see problems as a whole, and to creatively resolve tensions among opposing ideas to generate innovative outcomes [Martin, 2009]. S. Krashen [2011, p. 391] presents strong evidence that, eventually, acquiring the knowledge of academic content is developed through problem solving. We think that problem solving and integrative thinking skills are also needed for employing the so called Rogerian method of argument in teaching EAP in general and academic writing in particular. This method, first suggested by the US scholar C. R. Rogers, is about seeking various ways of finding common ground [Rogers, 1961]. To stress the present-day relevance of this time-tested approach, let us note that the term – which reflects the very idea – of a “discursive essay” has started to be used recently, alongside the well-established “argumentative essay” [see, for example, UCLES, 2018]. In fact, discursive essays have quite a lot in common with argumentative ones. Still, a discursive essay should involve a greater number of possible viewpoints and a plethora of opinions on the issue. Such essays should be a more balanced, well-rounded, multifaceted treatment of an issue in question. For that matter, such an approach as “strategic maneuvering”, first suggested by van Eemeren [2010], might also be useful, in that such maneuvering takes into account a certain set of alternatives and adaptation to audience.

On the other hand, as our teaching experience proves, educators should definitely start with teaching basic argumentation issues to overcome common pitfalls, e.g., lack of cohesion, coherence, proper argument structure, to name a few. We advise using S. Toulmin’s model of argumentation [2003] and M. Harrell’s “argument diagramming” [2016]. Another approach worth implementing is teaching R. Olson’s “formula of science narrative” that is represented by the abbreviation “ABT”, which stands for AND – BUT – THEREFORE storytelling device [Olson, 2015]. It embodies both causal relations and specificity of narration in academic discourse. We suggest that the notion of narrative, and science narrative, for that matter, be also introduced in teaching academic writing. Why is it important? Because here one more thing comes into limelight: the student’s authorial voice that should be heard in the chorus of other authors’ voices. This is important for several reasons. First, it has educational potential of teaching students about the ways to avoid plagiarism and to employ adequate quoting skills. It also emphasizes the importance of summarizing information from sources and its critical evaluation.

Ultimate goal: getting published

Educational and research institutions around the globe are increasingly implementing the policies that urge their faculty to publish in indexed international journals as a necessary requirement for earning tenure or career promotion. Though some scholars are mounting strong opposition to this “Scopus fetish” [to use the term by Polese, 2018], bibliometrics provides the most convenient and cost-efficient way for institutions’ management to measure a person’s academic performance, so this tendency is not likely to be reversed in the foreseeable future. Thus, scholars need to learn to survive under the fiercely competitive conditions of the “publish or perish” mentality ... and keep their sanity, at the same time. The publication imperative turned out to be particularly traumatic for researchers in NIS countries (including Ukraine), who often resort to predatory journals to satisfy the unrealistic requirements they are faced with [ibid.]. This, however, ultimately leads to a decline in academic standards, instead of their rise, and to the destruction of scientific credibility. Though the newly accepted publication requirements may seem extremely hard to match, researchers should take up the challenge with a sense of “fair play” and healthy ambition.

As the vast majority of high-profile journals indexed by Scopus and Web of Science use English as their primary or only medium [Hyland, 2016], the publication pressure has served to reinforce the hegemony of English in the academic setting even more. While the dominance of English in academic publishing may be beneficial for the global dissemination of ideas, it is also fraught with several negative consequences, such as displacement of other languages as means of academic communication, resentment among EAL writers and distortion of scientific knowledge [Leki, Cumming and Silva, 2010]. EAL researchers are often perceived as being disadvantaged in comparison to their Anglophone counterparts, as they have to invest additional time and effort to achieve the level of English needed to access important research findings in their fields, let alone to produce competitive output [Flowerdew, 2015]. K. Hyland, though, denies the reality of such “linguistic injustice”, claiming that “academic writing is nobody’s first language” and native speakers also face numerous obstacles in mastering the conventions of written academic discourse [Hyland, 2016].

The incessantly growing interest to international scientific publishing process has recently given rise to a new branch within EAP – English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP). It is particularly concerned with the genre of research article (RA) and multiple issues, involved in academic publishing, which may go far beyond linguistic proficiency and rhetorical ability. “The Journal of Research for Publication

Purposes” has been established early this year (2020) to provide a venue for discussing both theoretical and pedagogical facets of this rapidly developing field.

While approaches to teaching ERPP display vast heterogeneity, they are mostly grounded in genre theory and seek to equip students with a broad assortment of rhetorical, lexical and grammatical patterns used in RAs, with close attention to their persuasive effect and role in argument construction. In many courses students are encouraged to explore corpora of RAs to better appreciate the language variability in their particular discipline and to choose the patterns that accord with their own sense of self [Hyland, 2016]. In a recent systematic review of 31 articles reporting various pedagogical initiatives in ERPP, Li and Flowerdew [2020] point out that writing tasks lie at the core of ERPP courses, with the students being asked either to make progress on their own RAs or to produce some texts related to this genre (not necessarily relevant to their research). Important features of writing-centered pedagogic programmes are availability of instructor feedback and proofreading support, while some courses also involve peer correction and collaborative proofreading.

Apart from purely linguistic dimensions of academic writing, ERPP necessarily involves multiple social issues involved in scholarly publishing. These include communication with editors and gatekeepers, choosing the journals to submit the article to, navigating the peer review process, collaboration with co-authors etc. [Paltridge and Starfield, 2016]. As argued by Li and Flowerdew [2020, p. 37], ERPP instructors should ideally have “insider knowledge of the publication process”, drawing upon their personal experience as academic authors, editors or reviewers. K. Hyland [2016] stresses the importance of teaching students to evaluate the potential of different research journals in the field to choose the best venue for their output within their reach. In their 2016 book “Getting Published in Academic Journals: Navigating the Publication Process”, B. Paltridge and S. Starfield provide a detailed worksheet that students and instructors can use in the process of journal evaluation. Communication with editors and addressing their concerns is another issue that novice writers need help with as far too many tend to give up upon receiving negative feedback, not aware of the fact that gatekeepers might be open to further negotiation [Polese, 2018]. It is also worth considering the far-reaching influence of digitalization on the scholarly publishing, as evident in emergence of Open Access, the wide use of plagiarism detection software by editors, spread of predatory journals, and the growing role of social media in researcher’s promotion of their works [Paltridge, 2020]. Additionally, ERPP practitioners may choose to adopt a “critical pragmatic approach”, which calls upon students to reflect on the political factors involved in international

publishing, particularly power relations between authors and literacy brokers, consequences of English dominance in the academia to local languages and cultures, standard and non-standard use of English in publishing with regard to ELF [Englander and Corcoran, 2019]. All things considered, instructors need to have extensive writing expertise, combined with personal experience with the publishing process, to design and implement high-quality ERPP courses. It is crucial that educational institutions provide solid support to advanced training of specialists in this area, in view of the high stakes involved in academic publishing today.

Conclusion

Having started as a marginal movement in the second half of the 20th century, EAP has turned into a highly influential enterprise, with the number of its stakeholders and practitioners growing exponentially. However, there are still many unresolved questions regarding its classification, scope, teaching principles and assessment. Thus, it is open to question whether EAP should be regarded as a subfield of ESP or a separate branch of applied linguistics, with both views having strong support. While the major focus of EAP has always been on STEM, the literature is mounting on its applications within Humanities & Social Sciences, where the discourse tends to be more interpretive and the vocabulary much more diversified, presenting new challenges for researchers and practitioners.

The methodological principles and benchmarks that instructors should adopt in teaching EAP are also subject to discussion. Academic English today is largely shaped by L2 speakers and influenced by multiple culture-based varieties – the so-called similects, which, taken together, make up English as a Lingua Franca. In light of this fact, native-speaker targets are often viewed as unrealistic and irrelevant for EAP teaching. While this may be true for spoken genres, as long as academic writing is concerned, strict adherence to Standard English remains critical as scholarly publishing gatekeepers are staunchly native-speaker-centered in their requirements for articles. Nonetheless, it is important to develop students' plurilingual and pluricultural competence – the concepts included in the updated 2018 CEFR descriptors to recognize the value of linguistic diversity in the modern world in line with the ELF perspective.

English language proficiency is by far not the only asset researchers need to gain success in today's competitive academic setting, where publishing one's output in indexed peer-reviewed journals is becoming a question of survival, no less. Thus, a relatively new subfield of EAP – English for Research Publication Purposes – has arisen, where purely linguistic focus is combined with the analysis of multiple

procedural and social issues, pertinent to academic publishing. Evaluating and choosing among numerous journals in the field, communicating with editors, responding to feedback, collaborating with co-authors, boosting one's citation frequency are some of the pressing concerns for novice and sometimes even for seasoned writers. To fully address these concerns, however, ERPP instructors need to be equipped with ample expertise and, ideally, with personal experience with academic publishing as well.

In EAP classroom, more emphasis should be laid on critical thinking skills and, in particular, integrative thinking skills, which imply having a global vision of a problem and ability to resolve tension between opposing viewpoints. Thinking with clarity, employing reasonable arguments, mediating between different opinions, and using storytelling techniques are inalienable components of masterful academic writing.

References:

1. Airey, J. "EAP, EMI or CLIL?" *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, ed. by K. Hyland and P. Show, pp. 71-83. (New York: Routledge, 2016), 760.
2. Alperne, J. and Swires, P. *Get IELTS band 9 in Writing Task 2* (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge IELTS Consultants, 2015), 72.
3. Bitchener, J., Storch, N., and Wette, R. *Teaching Writing for Academic Purposes to Multilingual Students* (New York, Routledge, 2017), 234.
4. Boellstorff, T. "How to Get an Article Accepted at American Anthropologist (or Anywhere)". *American Anthropologist* 110, no. 3 (2008): 281-283, doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1433.2008.00034.x
5. Council of Europe. "CEFR Companion Volume" (2018), <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companionvolume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
6. Dudley-Evans, T. and St. John, M. *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-disciplinary Approach* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998), 317.
7. Englander, K. and Corcoran, J. *English for research publication purposes: Critical plurilingual pedagogies* (New York, Routledge, 2019), 318.
8. Escibano, P. D. and McMahon, J. P. "A Literacy Portfolio for University Students: Academic and Professional Discourse Development within the European Framework of Reference for Languages." *Approaches to Specialised Discourse in Higher Education and Professional Contexts*, ed. by A. C. Fuentes, P. Edwards Rokowski, and M. R. García (Eds.), pp. 182-196. (Newcastle, UK, Cambridge Scholars, 2009), 350.
9. Flowerdew, J. "Some thoughts on English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) and related issues". *Language Teaching* 48, no. 2 (2015): 250-262, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000523>
10. Flowerdew, J. "English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP) Writing: Making the case." *Writing & Pedagogy* 8 (2016): 5-32. doi: 10.1558/wap.v8i1.30051.

11. Flowerdew, J. and Peacock, M. *Research perspectives on English for Academic Purposes* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001), 460.
12. Green, A. “Linking Tests of English for Academic Purposes to the CEFR: The Score User’s Perspective.” *Language Assessment Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (2018): 59-74, doi: 10.1080/15434303.2017.1350685
13. Hamp-Lyons, L. “English for Academic Purposes”. In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. II), ed. by E. Hinkel, pp. 89-106. (New York, Routledge, 2011), 998.
14. Harrell, M. “Creating Argument Diagrams” (Carnegie Mellon University, 2016), http://www.academia.edu/772321/Creating_Argument_Diagrams
15. Hyland, K. *Academic Publishing: Issues and Challenges in the Construction of Knowledge* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016), 239.
16. Hyland, K., and Wong, L. *Specialised English: New Directions in ESP and EAP Research and Practice* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2019), 274.
17. Hyland, K. *Second Language Writing* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2019), 320.
18. Hyland, K. and Shaw, P. *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2016).
19. Jenkins, J. “Not English but English-within-multilingualism”. In *New directions for research in foreign language education*, ed. by S. Coffey and U. Wingate, pp. 65-78 (London, UK, Routledge, 2018), 670.
20. Jiang, A. L. and Zhang, L. J. “ESP/EAP through English-Medium Instruction: Teacher’s Perception and Practices.” In *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching: The Case of China*, ed. by H. Reinders, D. Nunan and B. Zou, pp. 173-197 (London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 332.
21. Krashen, S. “Academic proficiency (language and content) and the role of strategies”. *TESOL Journal* 2, no. 4 (2011), 381–393, doi: 10.5054/tj.2011.274624
22. Leki, I., Cumming, A., and Silva, T. *A Synthesis of Research on Second Language Writing in English* (New York, Routledge, 2010), 259.
23. Li, Y., and Flowerdew, J. “Teaching English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP): A review of language teachers’ pedagogical initiatives”. *English for Specific Purposes* 59 (2020): 29–41, doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2020.03.002
24. Martin, R. *The Opposable Mind*. (Boston, Mass., Harvard Business Press, 2009), 224.
25. Mauranen, A. “Academically Speaking: English as the Lingua Franca”. In K. Hyland and L. Wong (Eds.), *Specialised English: New Directions in ESP and EAP Research and Practice* (pp. 9-21) (Abingdon, Routledge, 2020), 274.
26. Mauranen, A., Hynninen, N., and Ranta, E. “English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project”. *English for Specific Purposes* 29, no. 3 (2010): 183-190. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2009.10.001
27. Mewburn, I., Firth, K., Lehman, S. *How to Fix Your Academic Writing Trouble A practical guide (UK Higher Education Humanities & Social Sciences Study Skills)* (Maidenhead, UK, Open University Press, 2018), 178.

28. Olson, R. Houston, *We Have a Narrative* (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 2015), 256.
29. Paltridge, B. and Starfield, S. *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (Boston, Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 592.
30. Paltridge, B., and Starfield, S. *Getting published in academic journals: Navigating the publication process*. (Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press, 2016), 128.
31. Paltridge, B. R., and Starfield, S. (2019). *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A Handbook for Students and their Supervisors* (New York, Routledge, 2019), 248.
32. Paltridge, B. R. "Writing for Academic Journals in the Digital Era." *RELC* 51, no. 1 (2020): 147-157, doi: 10.1177/0033688219890359
33. Parkinson, J. "English for Science and Technology". In *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*, ed. by B. Paltridge and S. Starfield, pp.155-170 (Boston, Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 529.
34. Polese, A. *The Scopus Diaries and the (Il)Logics of Academic Survival: A Short Guide to Design Your Own Strategy and Survive Bibliometrics, Conferences, and Unreal Expectations in Academia* (Stuttgart, Ibidem-Verlag, 2018), 230.
35. Qiufang, W. "English as a lingua franca: a pedagogical perspective". *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1, no. 2 (2012): 371-376, doi: 10.1515/jelf-2012-0024
36. Rose, H., Syrbe, M., Montakantiwong, A., and Funada, N. *Global TESOL for the 21st Century: Teaching English in a Changing World* (Bristol, UK, Multilingual Matters, 2010), 232.
37. Ruiz-Garrido, M. F., Palmer-Silveira, J. C., and Fortanet-Gómez, I. *English for Professional and Academic Purposes* (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 2010), 237.
38. Seidhofer, B. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca: A Complete Introduction to the Theoretical Nature and Practical Implications of English used as a Lingua Franca*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 244.
39. Schaller-Schwaner, I. "The habitat factor in ELF(A) – English as a Lingua Franca (in Academic settings) – and English for Plurilingual Academic Purposes." *Language Learning In Higher Education* 5, no. 2 (2015), doi: 10.1515/cercles-2015-0016.
40. Schaller-Schwaner, I. "ELF as multilingual "edulect" in a bilingual university." *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 7, no. 1 (2018): 113-129, doi: 10.1515/jelf-2018-0005.
41. Swan, M. "ELF and EFL: are they really different?" *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1, no. 2 (2012): 378-379, doi: 10.1515/jelf-2012-0025.
42. Toulmin, S. *The Uses of Argument*, 2nd edition (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003), 262.
43. van Eemeren, F. H. *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse. Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation*. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, 2010), 308.
44. UCLES. "Prepare for Exam Success: C1 Advanced self-access learning." University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (2018), <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/582660-writing-part-1-the-discursive-essay.pdf>
45. Youlong, L. *Educational Change Amongst English Language College Teachers in China: Transitioning from Teaching for General to Academic Purposes* (New York, Springer, 2020), 149.