Professional Academic Writing by Multilingual Scholars

Interactions With Literacy Brokers in the Production of English-Medium Texts

Theresa Lillis
Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom
Mary Jane Curry
University of Rochester, New York

Scholars around the world are under increasing pressure to publish their research in the medium of English. However, little empirical research has explored how the global premium of English influences the academic text production of scholars working outside of English-speaking countries. This article draws on a longitudinal text-oriented ethnographic study of psychology scholars in Hungary, Slovakia, Spain, and Portugal to follow the trajectories of texts from local research and writing contexts to English-medium publications. Our findings indicate that a significant number of mediators, "literacy brokers," who are involved in the production of such texts, influence the texts in different and important ways. We illustrate in broad terms the nature and extent of literacy brokering in English-medium publications and characterize and exemplify brokers' different orientations. We explore what kind of brokering is evident in the production of a specific group of English-medium publications—articles written and published in English-medium international journals—by focusing on three text histories. We conclude by discussing what a focus on brokering can tell us about practices surrounding academic knowledge production.

Keywords: *scholarly publishing; expanding circle; text ethnography; academic literacy*

In terms of sheer numbers, the dominance of English as the global medium of scholarly publication is well attested. In 2004, 74% of the 52,030 schol-

arly periodicals indexed by *Ulrich's Periodical Directory* were published in English. More than 90% of the social science articles in journals tracked by the Institute for Scientific Information in 2004 were published in English (Web of Science, 2005). Evidence from the small but growing focus on professional academic writing by researchers indicates that there is increasing pressure on scholars to publish in English (Canagarajah, 1996, 2002; Flowerdew, 1999; Gibbs, 1995; Jernudd & Baldauf, 1987; Tardy, 2004) and that English-medium publications are often accorded higher status than publications in other languages. This premium on English publishing influences important areas of scholars' academic lives, such as opportunities for promotion and research grants (Flowerdew, 2000; Yakhontova, 1997). Although scholars continue to produce texts in local national languages (Belcher & Connor, 2001; Canagarajah, 2002; Curry & Lillis, 2004), the pressure to produce in English constitutes a significant dimension to multilingual scholars' lives. This pressure is sustained and refracted through a complex set of interrelationships between local institutional and national geopolitical contexts on one hand and individual scholars' academic interests and material living conditions on the other (Canagarajah, 1996, 2002; Curry & Lillis, 2004). Reaching some understanding about what is involved in successful English-medium academic publication is crucial; it is one of the main aims of our longitudinal study of the English academic writing practices and publishing experiences of 46 scholars in central and southern Europe (Curry & Lillis, 2004).

One key finding to date is that in addition to named authors, successful English-medium academic text production is influenced by a significant number of others—"literacy brokers," such as editors, reviewers, academic peers, and English-speaking friends and colleagues, who mediate text production in a number of ways. Some of this brokering activity is clearly a dimension to monolingual academic text production, although little research has been carried out on the nature and impact of brokering academic writing in any context by scholars who use English, whether as a first or additional language (but see Bazerman, 1988; Myers, 1990). In this article, we seek to contribute to the empirical study of, and understanding about, brokering activity in general and to argue that the substantial amount and range of

brokering in the context of multilingual academic text production needs to be recognized and, furthermore, examined in relation to broader questions of the politics of access and participation in global academic knowledge production.

We begin by outlining the aims, methodology, and theory underpinning our larger research project, followed by the aims and methods used in the specific study reported here on literacy brokering. We summarize the ways in which mediation has been discussed in literacy research and locate our preference for the term *literacy brokering*. We then offer an overview of the different types of brokers identified in text production in the current study and broadly characterize their different orientations toward texts. We next present three "text histories" involving experienced scholars; these are case studies of the production of the most prestigious type of academic texts—international journal articles—from early drafts through to publication. By tracking changes across drafts toward publication, we raise questions about the practices surrounding the academic text production of scholars working outside of Anglophone center contexts (Kachru, 1992; Phillipson, 1992) and the kinds of knowledge that are published.

The Research Aims and Contexts of the Larger Study

Since June 2001, we have been conducting a study of the academic writing and publishing practices of some 46 scholars from central and southern Europe who work in psychology and education. Concerned with how the dominance of English fosters or hinders scholars' access to global publishing forums, we have focused our investigation on their efforts to write for English-medium publications, particularly academic journals because of the prestige attached to such publications (Canagarajah, 1996; Shi, 2002; Swales, 1990). We are seeking to understand the significance of publishing in English for scholars and the obstacles and opportunities they encounter and to examine which texts are successful in being accepted for publication—and why.

The four national sites in the study—Hungary, Slovakia, Spain, and Portugal—form part of what Kachru (2001) has referred to as the "expanding circle" of English language users in which English is used as a foreign language and increasingly as an instrumental language in education, commerce, and other areas. The expanding circle contrasts with the "inner circle," which includes nations such as the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia, as well as with the "outer circle," which represents former colonial sites,

such as India, Singapore, and Nigeria, where English is a second or official language (Kachru, 1992, 2001). Power relations surrounding the use of English have been the focus of considerable attention (Canagarajah, 2002; Pennycook, 1998; Phillipson, 1992) but mainly between the inner and outer circles, which are often characterized as a relation between center and periphery, following world systems economic theory (Wallerstein, 1974, 1991). Such a framing, although clearly important, underplays the heterogeneity within center and peripheral contexts (see Ramanathan, 1999). And of specific relevance to this article, it leaves the—also complex and heterogeneous—expanding circle contexts and their geopolitical location in terms of center-periphery relations invisible.

In taking account both of the notion of three circles (mainly signaling the status of English) and of center-periphery (which emphasizes differing material conditions and dependency relations between periphery and the center), the four national sites in our study are important because they are examples of center contexts that are peripheral in a number of ways (Sousa Santos, 1994, uses the term *semiperipheral*).[1] First, they are peripheral in that they are non-Anglophone center contexts. Second, they are contexts where at the state level, English has historically been granted a relatively low profile with thus limited opportunities for learning English.[2] They thus stand in contrast to many parts of northern Europe, such as Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Scandinavian countries, where English is often the language of instruction in universities and increasingly the language of Ph.D. dissertations (Ammon, 2001; Brock-Utne, 2001; Phillipson, 2003; Truchot, 1994). Third, they include sites where economic conditions are often less favorable than other center contexts (particularly central-eastern Europe), which means that scholars not only earn lower salaries (see Curry & Lillis, 2004) but often have less funding and time for research and travel, less access to well-equipped libraries and laboratories, and less research assistance and other support, including for writing. Following Canagarajah (1996, 2002), we considered that these material circumstances, related to both economic and linguistic resources, would have an impact on scholars' academic writing practices and opportunities for English-medium publication. Our findings thus have implications for issues of equity in the global academic market (Gibbs, 1995, p. 80), notably, the participation of scholars from specific non-Anglophone center contexts in global academic knowledge production.

The study draws on social practice theories of academic literacy and knowledge construction, which view reading, writing, and other aspects of communication as fundamentally social activities (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1992, 1996; Street, 2003). These theories acknowledge that writ-

ing is rooted in specific cultural traditions and ways of constructing knowledge (Bazerman, 1988; Lea & Street, 1998; Prior, 1998), is embedded in relations of power (Canagarajah, 2002; Jones, Turner, & Street, 1999), raises questions of identity (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Bizzell, 1992; Gee, 2001; Ivanič, 1998; Lillis, 2001), and involves complex patterns of access to and participation in a number of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). We have adopted what we call a "text-oriented ethnographic" approach, which involves collecting and analyzing a variety of ethnographic and text data to explore the production of texts in their contexts. Data include semistructured literacy history interviews, group discussions, e-mail discussions, observations, meetings with librarians, and institutional and historical documentary data. Key data sources are drafts of scholars' texts and text-focused discussions abound such texts; to date, we have collected some 520 texts and have conducted 155 interviews with scholars. Given the limited research in this area, a key aim in the study is to develop analytic tools that enable us to track the production of texts across time, including the impact of different participants. Two specific tools developed for this purpose are illustrated in this article: text histories and a text-oriented heuristic.

The nature of this research raises difficult questions about reporting and representation. We are committed to representing scholars' perspectives on scholarly writing practices as well as to exploring empirically their texts and their interactions with center scholars and publishing gatekeepers. At the same time, we recognize that our participants have entrusted us with information that could threaten important professional relationships, so we have worked to maintain anonymity and have imposed certain limits on what we report, including editing text extracts that might identify participants. Some of the difficulties raised by anonymizing written text data are evident in our text history analyses below.[3]

The Present Study: Aims and Methods

Building Text Histories and Tracking the Nature of Literacy Brokering

This article draws on 130 text histories relating to the 30 psychology scholars in the study. Text history is a key unit of data collection and analysis for exploring the trajectories of texts toward publication, including the impact of literacy brokers. The text types included are academic research articles, book chapters, books, conference proceedings, and research reports. More than half of the texts (55%) in the database are journal articles, consti-

Table 1
Data Sources for Text Histories (TH) in Psychology

Minimal Text History (40% of THs in Database)	Medium Text History (25% of THs in Database)	Maximal Text History (35% of THs in Database)
A text (draft or final version) plus one piece of related data (e.g., interview discussion, another draft of the text, communication or feedback from broker)	Two drafts of a text plus more than one piece of related data (e.g., interview discussion, communication or feedback from broker)	Multiple drafts of text plus more than one piece of related data (e.g., interview discussion, communication or feedback from broker)

tuting the largest single category of text (see Table 1). This proportion is not surprising, given the prestige attached to the publication of journal articles in the academic world. We look in more detail at journal articles in the next section.

Each text history involves these key data elements: Interviews with the main author or authors, including discussion of the history of a particular text, such as who was involved; target publication; the collection of as many drafts as available; the collection of correspondence between authors and brokers, including postsubmission broker comments, such as reviews and e-mail correspondence; and e-mail and informal discussions.

The amount and range of data available for each text history varies, as indicated in Table 1, because (a) the texts are at different stages—at the time of writing, some 9% are in progress toward submission—and are therefore incomplete; (b) scholars vary enormously in their practices of keeping drafts and correspondence about specific texts; and (c) scholars vary in the extent to which they report the involvement of others in their text production for a number of reasons, ranging from the relatively straightforward issue of simply not remembering to more complex issues of confidentiality, status, and anonymity. Given the nature of writing activity, we recognize that no text history is ever fully complete, in that frequently, drafts are discarded and written exchanges destroyed (and the significant oral exchange surrounding much text production is largely missing in our data collection; see Gunnarson, 1997). However, we think the range of data collected does enable us to glimpse important moments within texts' trajectories toward publication.

Developing a Text-Oriented Heuristic

Given that a key aim in the present study was to trace the impact of brokers on text production, we developed a heuristic for tracking changes made to

texts that, although informed by a number of textual and rhetorical frameworks (see, e.g., Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; MacDonald, 1994; Swales, 1990; Ventola & Mauranan, 1991), was directly influenced by the work of Knorr-Cetina (1981) and Gosden (1995). They, like us, were concerned with tracking significant changes across drafts of research articles. Knorr-Cetina's important study uses two categories that foreground content: "deletion" (deleting sections of text) and "reshuffling" (reorganizing sections of text). A third, more obviously discourse-marked category is "modality" (strength of claims and attitude toward claims). Gosden extended Knorr-Cetina's two more content-oriented categories to three—deletion, addition, and reshuffling—and added a fourth discourse category, "rhetorical machining," after Swales (1990). Rhetorical machining is made up of three discourse-marked categories: discourse structure (the ways in which links are made across the text through such markers, such as *in addition*), claims (Knorr-Cetina's modality is key here, as in *it can be seen*, etc.), and purpose (closely linked to claims but signaled through such markers as *therefore*). A fifth category mentioned by Gosden but not included in his analysis is "polishing," which concerns sentence-level changes.

Our heuristic was influenced by additional considerations. First, we added several categories of changes that seemed significant following preliminary analyses: argument, positioning, and visuals (see Table 2). Second, we avoided making a straightforward dichotomy between content-knowledge and form-rhetoric (as implied in Gosden's [1995; after Swales, 1990] category rhetorical machining), preferring to consider any change as being of rhetorical significance in any text history. Third, we sought to avoid predetermining the importance of different types of text changes and rather to treat texts holistically and characterize the most salient type of changes. Salience here is a relational notion, related to specific trajectories and publication text histories. Fourth, given our interest in the practices surrounding academic writing for publication, we also wanted to explore the instigators of textual changes and, where possible, how authors responded to or made such changes. A final but important consideration in developing our framework was to use categories that, although robust, would be relatively accessible to participants and other nonlinguists who might analyze sections of the texts. For example, several translators have discussed with us the kinds of changes taking place where parts of drafts were written in the authors' first language; we have also used the categories to discuss our ongoing findings from the project with participants.

Inevitably, the categories in Table 2 overlap or may be subordinate to another category in a specific instance; for instance, cohesion markers may also be additions, and additions may relate specifically to argument and the

Table 2

Text-Oriented Heuristic for Tracking Changes Across Drafts: Example Using Abstract (A) and Introduction (I) Sections From the Second Draft of an Article

	Focus on Text Data			Focus on Interview, E-Mail, Field Note Discussions			
						Rhetorical or Knowledge Significance	
Changes Made to Draft	Draft Number and Section (e.g., A, I, M, R, D, C)	Text Reference or Extract	Suggested or Made by? When?[a]	Response by Author	Named Author Perspective	Researcher Comments
Additions: word, sentence, section added	D2 A	*as well as*, line 6 D2	S	Accepted	See interview	
	D2 I	Figure on X nationally	S	Accepted	GI 16/10/01	
Deletions: word, sentence, section deleted	D2 A	Sections re: methodology cut, lines 5 to 9 D1	S	Accepted		
	D2 I	Line 19 cut, emphasis on intervention cut	S	Accepted		
	D2 I	Lines 28 to 29 cut	S	Accepted		
Reformulation: words, phrase, sentences reworded	D2 I	Lines 9 to 12 D2 reformulated, *mediation* introduced	S	Accepted		
	D2 I	Line 13 *interplay* replaces *interaction*	S	Rejected		Much discussion around this. See interviews
	D2 I	Lines 23 to 25 reformulated	S	Accepted		
Reshuffling: reorganization of sentences, paragraphs, sections						
Argument: claims, evidence, overall argument, what is foregrounded, backgrounded						

Positioning: explicit reference to
  position of paper or research in
  relation to field, discipline, or journal
  (create a research space; Swales, 1990)
Lexical or register: levels of formality,
  discipline, field specific vocabulary
Sentence-level changes or corrections:
  sentence-level syntax, vocabulary,
  grammar, spelling, punctuation
Cohesion markers: ways in which   D2 I   *as well as*, line 6 D2   S
  sentences or sections linked through,
  for example, conjunctions, lexical items
Publishing conventions: specific journal or
  organizational conventions, such as APA
Visuals or representation of text:
  formatting, diagrams, bullets

nature of the claims made, such as the addition or deletion of hedges (e.g., *possibly*) and boosters (e.g., *always*). Cross-referencing changes across categories is part of the process of tracking the nature and overall impact of changes across drafts. We illustrate the use of this framework in the text histories below.

The Mediation of Academic Literacy: The Role of Literacy Brokers

Mediation has been emphasized as a recurring aspect of many literacy practices, encompassing the range of ways in which people are involved in helping others interact with written texts, whether formally or informally, paid or unpaid. This practice occurs within domestic contexts, such as a child acting as a "family interpreter" (Faulstich Orellana, Meza, & Pietsch, 2002, p. 4) or a father writing down the address of a television contest for his son (Baynham & Maybin, 1996), and in public contexts, for example, in official, legal, and religious domains (Wagner, Messick, & Spratt, 1986) and community support networks (Baynham, 1993; Mace, 2002). Instances of mediation take place as an economic transaction or as part of reciprocal exchange networks of family and neighbors. For example, Kalman (1999) emphasizes the selling of literacy in Mexico City by public "scribes" who fill out official forms or write letters for others.

Little research has explicitly focused on mediation in relation to academic text production. Dysthe (2002) uses the notion to characterize advisors of master's students as "mediators of academic text cultures" who help students engage with "disciplinary text cultures and text norms" (p. 494). Mediation of the professional academic writing of scholars has received some attention, although often without explicit reference to the notion of mediation. Ventola and Mauranen (1991), for example, mapped the changes made by native English–speaking language specialists to the texts of Finnish scholars (see also Mauranen, 1997). Looking at text interventions, Burrough-Boenisch (2003) explores hypothetically the activities of those she refers to as "shapers" of texts written by Dutch-speaking scientists. These shapers include language professionals ("correctors" and "author's editors") as well as "members of the author's discourse community" (p. 223), such as journal reviewers and editors. Flowerdew's (2000) case study of Oliver, a scholar newly returned to Hong Kong from doctoral study in the United States, traces Oliver's views on the process of his submission to an "international refereed journal in English" (2000, p. 132) and its publication after extensive interventions by various brokers.

Although much of the above research explores mediation at the level of interaction between individuals, there has also been exploration of the institutional and political nature of mediation. Brandt (2001) examines how institutions such as churches, prisons, and schools interact with economic and social changes to sponsor, that is, foster or constrain, the learning and uses of literacy in the United States across the 20th century. Specifically relevant to our concerns, Canagarajah (1996, 2002) argues that the political material conditions in which scholars write for publication powerfully influence their likelihood of success, pointing to the many ways in which the considerably less favorable working conditions of Third World or periphery scholars influence their publishing.

This review points to three approaches to mediation: ethnographic literacy studies exploring interactions between individuals in specific contexts (e.g., Baynham, 1993; Wagner et al., 1986), research informed by discourse communities (Swales, 1990) and communities of practice (e.g., Flowerdew, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Prior, 1998; Wenger, 1998) exploring how less experienced or new participants gain access to and membership in particular communities, and research emphasizing the political and material dimensions to literacy activity and mediation. In seeking to understand the nature and significance of mediation of scholars' texts, we draw on these strands and use the term *literacy brokers* to signal our interest in observing and theorizing mediation activity. Our approach involves (a) observing the ways in which scholars gain access to brokers and the subsequent impact of brokers on text production and (b) theorizing the relations between brokering and authoring activity in relation to publication. We acknowledge that the mediation of academic texts is not a neutral enterprise but rather involves participants of unequal status and power: In many instances, literacy brokers occupy a powerful position straddling the "boundaries and peripheries" (Wenger, 1998, p. 199) between various communities, influencing opportunities for publication. Access to brokers both constitutes and leads to the securing of a form of capital (Bourdieu, 1998) whereby English-medium publications can be exchanged for immediate economic gain, such as promotion and salary bonuses (see Curry & Lillis, 2004), and for more diffuse social and cultural capital, such as prestige and reputation.

Characterizing the Activity and Orientations of Literacy Brokers

In our 130 psychology text histories, a total of 248 literacy brokers were identified by scholars as being involved in the production of their texts. Bear-

ing in mind that this is a minimum figure—we have only included brokers whose involvement can be traced to specific texts or parts of texts—this figure clearly represents significant activity outside of named authoring in multilingual text production. The range of brokers can be organized under three categories:

Academic professionals. These are academics who work in universities or research institutes. They can be subclassified into three main types, depending on how their professional expertise relates to a particular text: *a general academic*, who is not from the same disciplinary area as the author or authors; *a discipline expert*, who shares the same disciplinary background and interests as the author or authors; or *a subdisciplinary specialist* (Becher, 1994), who is from the same specialist field as the author or authors. Some academic professionals can be further categorized according to their specific role or function in relation to the production of a text postsubmission, for example, a journal reviewer or editor. Given that 73% of all brokers reported fall into the category of academic professionals, exploring the nature of their impact on text construction is important; it is therefore the focus of the following section.

Language professionals. These are brokers whose profession involves focusing on the linguistic medium of communication of interest here, English. This category includes translators, copy editors, and proofreaders. It also includes English-language specialists, such as teachers of English. Twenty-four percent of brokers reported are in this category.

Nonprofessionals. These are brokers whose involvement in the text can be characterized by their personal relationship to the author and their serendipitous knowledge of English. These people may be the author's friends, spouse, or other family; they offer informal support with the production of texts. Three percent of brokers reported are in this category.

The ways in which brokers in these categories influence specific texts vary significantly; we explore some of these ways in the text histories in the following section. On the basis of the larger text-history database, we can broadly characterize the ways in which the categories of brokers orient to texts, as indicated and exemplified in Figure 1. The most significant distinction in orientations is between the academic professionals and the language and nonprofessional groups. Whereas the latter two groups tend to focus on sentence-level revisions and direct translations, the former orients to knowledge content and claims, discipline-specific discourse, and target publication

Figure 1
Brokers Involved in Academic Text Production:
Textual Practices and Orientations

CATEGORY OF BROKER	TEXT EXTRACT	BROKER COMMENT/ ACTION	ORIENTATION
ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL *Example 1:* *General academic*	We could say that the target group participants are more middle-class than the random sample participants.	**Query by broker** Isn't this a bit problematic. What do you mean by middle class?	Knowledge content
Example 2: *Discipline specialist*	We used correlation analysis to examine the relationship between mental rotation ability and intelligence subtests (Table.2. And 3.). The result indicated an interference between verbal abilities and performance time of mental rotations.	**Reformulations made to text by broker** Correlational analysis **was** used to examine the relationship between mental rotation ability and the intelligence subtests (Table 2 and 3). The result indicated a **negative correlation** between verbal abilities and performance time of mental rotations.	Target journal conversations
Example 3: *Subfield specialist*	The evaluation of the X methodology is discussed and recommendations for intervention activities are proposed.	**Section deleted by broker**	Disciplinary conversations
Example 4: LANGUAGE PROFESSIONAL	She enjoyed attending school and her school notes were very good at first grade.	**Corrections to lexical item and preposition made by broker** She enjoyed attending school and her school marks were very good in the first grade.	Specialist discourse
Example 5: NONPROFESSIONAL	Research was undertaken on 5 locations.	**Correction to preposition made by broker.** Research was undertaken in 5 locations.	Sentence level changes/ corrections

interests and conversations (Bazerman, 1988). Our decisions about categorizing textual changes in terms of orientations are made on the basis of textual and contextual information. Thus, for example, although it is relatively straightforward to classify the deletion in Example 3 as an orientation to knowledge, on the basis of additional information about the context of production—the broker and the target publication—we also classify this as an

orientation to target journal interests. We discuss the text history of which this extract is a part in the following section.

The orientations identified with different categories may not be surprising—we might well expect language professionals to orient to sentence-level discourse and academic professionals to orient to content. However, several significant points arise. First, although participants distinguish between types of brokers (friends, academics, translators), they tend to frame all their different interventions as relating to language, whether this is grammatical accuracy or specialist discourse. Consider the comments made by one academic, who described how and why he involves different brokers in different kinds of academic writing:

> If the text is only for [conference] proceedings, I will write the text and don't care about proofreading because it's all dependent on time and I don't have it. But if there is a competition, a selection, in that case I prefer a *native speaker* proofreading to, to the *translator* [non-native speaker]. Because my purpose is to get more the native, "knack", and I know the responsibility for the special talk, special discourse of the discipline is on myself, so sometimes I do not accept the recommendations of the native speaker. If it is for an international journal, then we try to have a *professional* [academic] *native speaker* like S or R. (italics added; G. I., INT, July 3, 2001).[4]

The fact that a large amount of brokering of English-medium publications is carried out by academic professionals and that they orient to content rather than language is thus important, not least because it raises questions about exactly what kind of activity and exchange scholars—both authors and brokers—understand themselves to be engaged in. As Figure 1 and the text histories below illustrate, language is often not the principal focus.

Second, although we have emphasized brokering as a significant activity in English-medium academic text production overall, it is important to note that brokering is not an evenly distributed activity in relation to the category of brokering, target community, or text type. This is signaled by the scholar quoted above who points to the different brokering activity he considers necessary in writing for different target audiences. Here, he touches on an important distinction emphasized by scholars in English-medium article writing, that is, between national versus international English-medium journals. English-medium national journals are produced (and mostly read) in local national contexts (i.e., an English-medium journal published in Slovakia, Hungary, or Portugal), and English-medium international publications are primarily located in Anglophone center contexts, such as the United Kingdom and the United States, with the former often being accorded lower status than the latter.[5] The involvement of different kinds of brokers deemed

necessary by this scholar in writing for different audiences is borne out in patterns across the 130 text histories. Of all brokers documented as being involved in academic article production, 90% are involved in English-medium international journal articles as compared with 10% involved in English-medium national journals. Moreover, 76% of the brokers involved in English-medium international journals are in the professional academic category. Thus, far more brokering activity is going on in texts written for English-medium international publications than for English-medium national journals, and as explored below, a large amount of this brokering is being carried out by academic professionals who orient to issues beyond language.

To explore the impact of professional academic brokers in the production of texts written for English-medium international journals, we next focus on three text histories.

Professional Academic Literacy Brokers and the Construction of Knowledge in English-Medium International Journals: Three Text Histories

The three text histories discussed in this section are drawn from three distinct national contexts. Although all three draw on the discipline of psychology, they are from distinct specialist subfields and have different target communities and journals. The theoretical approaches adopted in their research writings reflect a range of key paradigms, from experimental to social psychology.

It is important to note that the lead writers in each text history were not novices either to the academy or in academic publishing. As can be seen from Table 3, all scholars have considerable experience in academia and success in writing for academic publication (as indicated by their publications in their first languages). In addition, they all work at highly prestigious institutions in their countries. They all work in non-Anglophone contexts where English is not an official part of education, but all have been using English individually for work-related activities (for example, relating to conferences, e-mail exchanges, reading and writing academic papers) for about 10 years.

Text History 1: Presubmission Brokering; Picking the Most Attractive Point

In exploring this text history, we draw on six drafts and two interviews with the lead author, informal discussions with the lead and second author, and one interview with the key professional academic literacy broker.

Table 3
Scholars' Professional Academic Experience and Publication Records

	Lead Author: Qualification, Position, Experience in Academia (in years)	Publication Record: 1. First Language 2. English
Text History 1	Ph.D. Professor 25	1. 21 articles, 1 book chapter 2. 7 articles, 4 book chapters
Text History 2	Ph.D. Associate professor 14	1. 1 book, 3 book chapters, 11 articles 2. 3 book chapters, 3 articles
Text History 3	Ph.D. Associate professor 17	1. 6 articles 2. 4 articles

Authors and Brokers

The authors are two central-eastern European psychologists who have been researching and writing together for 10 years. Four brokers were reported to have been involved in the text production: one language professional (copy editor postsubmission) one nonprofessional (a friend on a presubmission draft) and two Anglophone center academic professionals (one pre- and one postsubmission). The former two brokers made several minor sentence-level changes. The broker most influentially involved was an academic professional presubmission; the impact of this involvement is the main focus here.

The main author, who had "established initial contact with the broker following the fall of Communist dictatorship in the early 1990s" (G. I., INT, April 10, 2005) sought comments from this broker, particularly on the English. Yet the broker clearly contributed to the text's trajectory in more important ways: by identifying an appropriate center target journal and, as is illustrated below, by playing a major part in the shape and content of the final article.

Overview of Salient Changes

Using the text heuristic (see Table 2), significant changes were noted on Draft 2 when the academic professional broker was involved. Changes made here stayed through to submitted and published versions, indicating that the reviewers and editor were in agreement with revisions suggested by this broker. The most salient change relates to the way methodology is positioned

Example 1

Draft 1 Abstract	Draft 2 Abstract (Maintained in Publication)
Presented results outline the procedure that was used for conducting the X methodology and description of the structural, social and cultural context in the X. The evaluation of the X methodology are discussed and recommendations for intervention activities are proposed.	Deleted

within the article overall. The first significant change to the place of methodology in the article is made by the presubmission broker in Draft 2, where the methodology is deleted from the moves in the abstract (Example 1).

Further deletions of references to methodology were carried out by the presubmission broker, and a 400-word section on the evaluation of the methodology was deleted by the postsubmission broker, the editor. This editorial response confirms that the presubmission broker's decision to reduce the centrality of methodology was in line with the target journal's interests. Methodology makes its way to the final published draft but only as a brief description of the research process, not as a significant focus in itself.

Other salient changes made by the presubmission broker in the results section in Draft 2 are illustrated in the changes in subheadings (Example 2). Thematic labeling is used in both drafts, but as can be seen, the broker makes several important changes: reducing the number of subheadings and backgrounding the distinction between the kinds of substances—tobacco, alcohol, illegal substances—which become subsumed under one noun, *substance*. *Substance* is used three times in Draft 2, twice alongside *sexual (risky) behavior*. The effect of these reformulations is to reduce the emphasis on distinct substances and to create one overarching focus, that is, a link between substance use and sexual behavior.

This textual marshalling of distinct elements toward one main focus or argument is sustained through further cuts and reformulations made by the same broker in the results and discussion, two significant examples of which are in Examples 3 and 4.

The effect of these deletions and reformulations is to avoid what might be "dangerous digressions" (after Knorr-Cetina, 1981), dangerous in that Example 3 potentially undermines the importance of the contribution of the article by suggesting that (some) substance use is not as significant as might have been anticipated, and Example 4 raises an issue that is not discussed elsewhere in the article. The latter comment might also be dangerous in that it

Example 2

Draft 1 Results	Draft 2 Results (and maintained in publication)
Subheadings	Subheadings
Structural, Cultural and Social context of X environment:	Structural, Cultural and Social context of X environment:
Sexuality during XXX	1 The context of sexuality
Health consequences	2 The context of psychoactive substance use
Risks:	
Psychoactive substances use	3 Substance use and sexual behavior
Tobacco	
Alcohol	
Illegal substances	

is probably not in keeping with the more socially oriented paradigm of the target journal.

Main Author's Perspective

The main author was extremely appreciative of the support offered by the center academic professional, and both authors delighted at what was their first success in publishing in an English-medium international journal. The main author's attitude toward the involvement of the broker reflected the broker's own account: The broker was actively committed to supporting the writing of scholars in this subfield as a way of supporting the intellectual endeavors of central-eastern European scholars who have historically been isolated from the Western academy.

But what of the changes made to the text, as illustrated here? Commenting on (a) the shift away from methodology as a key focus in the article and (b) the deletion of several "digressions", the author states that the broker "doesn't offer a kaleidoscope—[the broker] picks the most attractive point" (G. I., INT, October 16, 2001). However, given the value of publishing in English-medium international journals, the author for the main part was pleased at the outcome.

Example 3

Draft 1 Results	Draft 2 Results (Maintained in Submitted Version and Published Text)
[the] explosion of the problems with drug abuse in X expected for a long time (by the majority of the X medical experts) has not yet taken place as yet and opinions in its justification differ	Deleted

Example 4

Draft 1 Discussion	Draft 2 Discussion (Maintained in Publication)
It can be characterized by the idea that there is **male sex drive** that requires insistent satisfaction whenever access to opportunity (usually women) is allowed.	It can be characterized by an, at least implicit, **promotion of alcohol**[6] consumption in connection with casual sex practices.

[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

Text History 2: Postsubmission Brokering. From Contrast to Confirmation

In this text history, we are drawing on five drafts, 20 exchanges with reviewers, and two interviews with the lead author.

Authors and Brokers

The article was produced by a close-knit group of central European researchers who have researched and coauthored for some 8 years. The group consisted of three experienced scholars: The most senior scholar has been involved in academic work for some 40 years and is world renowned in her specialist subfield; the most junior in the group, the lead author, has some 14 years experience in academia and some 20 academic publications (see Table 3). The latter scholar was named as lead author is so because she was considered by the team to be the originator of the key ideas. No brokers external to the group were involved before submission of the article. Following submission, the authors received a response from the editor of the Anglophone center journal, who, following reviews, was interested in the paper but proposed the involvement of an additional scholar, a statistician, whose involvement the editor subsequently organized. Here, we focus on the involvement of these professional academic brokers, the editor and the additional scholar, both of whom are Anglophone centre academic professionals.

Overview of Salient Changes

The most salient change from submission to publication is a shift in the main knowledge claim. In the version submitted to the journal for publication, emphasis is on signaling the difference between the findings of the study reported and a key previous study. In the published version, the claim to difference is replaced with claims to confirmation; that is, the study in the paper is reported as confirming the findings of the previous study. This shift is exemplified in text extracts (Example 5).

In the published version, there is a total of 10 overt shifts from signaling difference toward signaling confirmation. Although the extent to which the reported study confirms the previous study is hedged at several points,

> these results also **appear to be** supported in a different linguistic and cultural setting (R & D published version)

and one ambiguous instance of hedging is included,

> **is quite similar** (R & D published version)

such hedging does not alter the overall shift toward confirmation.

It is difficult to pinpoint exactly who made the changes from contrast to confirmation in the text and at what point in the redrafting process. Although the data for this text history is considerable, as indicated above, it is incomplete in that several hard copy versions were no longer available (this illustrates the difficulty surrounding any research seeking to track changes across text trajectories because inevitably some drafts are discarded in the process). However, we can glimpse several key aspects about the process surrounding these changes by drawing on existing data sources, all of which signal the influential roles of the statistician and the journal editor.

In his response to the authors on their first submission, the editor said that a different statistical method was required. The main author said the group would be happy to revisit the statistical method but that neither she nor anybody in her department, including the statisticians, was familiar with the particular method the editor proposed. What is significant about the impact of the additional scholar is that he was involved not only in contributing to the statistical method but in the redrafting process of the whole article. Indeed, such is his status within the authoring process that later correspondence from the editor is directed to him. The changes toward confirmation begin to occur in the drafts when the statistician is involved, indicating that he played a significant part in developing such a shift. It is also clear that the editor favored

Example 5

Submitted Text of Argument (Emphasis on Claiming Contrast or Difference)	Published Text of Argument (Emphasis on Claiming Confirmation)
Another difference from the Z et al study is that in our procedure (I)	The results (see Table 1) **are consistent** with those of Z et al. in that (R, D)
The difference between the strongest factor of Z (author) **and ours** (I)	These results **appear to be supported** in a different linguistic and cultural setting (R, D)
In our case this is accompanied by . . . **while in Z (author)** study (D)	The X also **correlated significantly** with (R, D)
In our case the X factor explanatory value (among other factors) **was greater than in the case of Z et al** (D)	

Note: I = introduction; R = results; D = discussion.
[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

or, indeed, encouraged such a shift, stating in one correspondence that he valued the "confirmatory aspect" of the study.

A further related salient change begins to be made following the additional scholar's involvement. In the submitted version, the national context of the study is mentioned three times, through adjectives and nouns referring to the translation of a research tool. In the subsequent drafts leading to publication, there are a significant number of additional references to the specific national context of the study and moves to position it as a point of comparison with the earlier study. These are exemplified in Example 6.

Whereas there are only three mentions of nationality or national context in the first version submitted for publication, there are 14 in the published version. Moreover, the additional phrases, such as *different linguistic and cultural settings* and *cultural differences*, are clearly intended to constitute a "referential chain" with nationality and the national and the linguistic context of the study (for lexical cohesion and referential chains, see Halliday, 1994, p. 337). This foregrounding of the specific national and linguistic context of the study—and the explicit signaling of this linguistic and national context as "different" (from the earlier study)—is a significant shift in the published version.

As with the shift toward confirmation, it is difficult to establish who made these additions and at which point in the process. However, what is clear is that these additions were made following the involvement of the additional scholar and that the editor throughout took an active part; in correspondence

Example 6

Additions to Submitted Text (and in Published Text)

X (nationality) subjects (A)

  Specifically we wished to assess whether the XXX . . . would obtain in **a different linguistic and cultural setting** (I)

Subjects . . . responding from a **different linguistic and cultural background** (I)

the present study was designed with the intention of replicating P et al's findings—and to determine if the results held across **another culture** (I)

Subjects—responding from a **different linguistic and cultural background . . .** (I)
  a different sample (I)
  a different linguistic version of all measures (I)

Note: A = abstract; I = introduction.
[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

with the lead author and the additional scholar, the editor refers to his "refining" of the text and his hope that they—the lead author and the additional scholar—would not take offense at such considerable intervention.

Main Author's Perspective

The main author appreciated the involvement of both academic professional brokers. She recognized that the editor had made considerable efforts toward publishing this article, saying, "I was happy to have his help," referring to his approach and actions as akin to those of "a friendly grandfather" (K. W., INT, June 22, 2003).

The shift in the overall argument of the article was evident to the main author. She accepted it, acknowledging that it would be easier to publish "if we focus on the similarities rather than the differences". However, she had mixed feelings. In considering the shift from contrast to confirmation, the author foregrounds the position of her national context as a peripheral location for academic production: "Saying something from [central Europe] which is new is not good, not allowed. Of course, it's absolutely their perspective to see [central Europe] as, I don't know, a tribe trying to do something scientific" (K. W., INT, June 22, 2003). She sees this publication, and the compromise it implied in terms of the shift in the main argument, as a necessary first step for a researcher writing out of her national context who is marginal to, in her words, the "mainstream." In practical-epistemological terms, it provides her research group with an authorized citation to use to ref-

erence its work in future publications in English-medium international journals.

Text History 3: Postsubmission Brokering.
Responding to Conflicting Reviews From the Periphery

This history draws on eight drafts; the lead author's correspondence with two journals, the first of which rejected the article; and two interviews and e-mail correspondence with the lead author.

Authors and Brokers

The lead author, T. D., is an associate professor of psychology at a southern European university. As indicated in Table 3, she had previously published four psychology articles in English-medium journals as well as six articles in journals in her country. T. D.'s coauthor for this text history was W. B., an Anglophone center academic professional, whom she sought out for his expertise in an interdisciplinary subject area, as she notes, "In [my country], there is no research in this field" (T. D., INT, February 6, 2004). T. D. spent 6 weeks at W. B.'s laboratory to conduct experiments and write with him. W. B. died unexpectedly after coauthoring two drafts of the article, which T. D. finished and submitted to two English-medium international journals W. B. had chosen. No literacy brokers were involved before submission. Postsubmission brokers were academic professionals: The editor of the first journal was an Anglophone center academic professional; the editor of the second, a non-Anglophone center academic professional (the national and linguistic backgrounds of the five reviewers are not known[7]).

Overview of Salient Changes

The salient changes to the article were made by T. D., in response to reviews from the first journal asking for a stronger rationale, clarification, and streamlining "to focus more directly on supporting [the] main conclusions." One reviewer suggested not discussing "every single data point from this large and complicated experiment individually." T. D. responded by cutting an entire section reporting the analyses of 17 stimuli and, as Example 7 shows, by foregrounding one type of stimulus. Also shown in Example 7 is that she provides a rationale for using this particular stimulus, primarily though adding citations, including one referring to her coauthor W. B.'s previous work.

Example 7

Draft Resubmitted After Reviews (Introduction): Reformulations, Additions

> **X stimulus had been previously used** in different experiments **(three new references)**. The model developed by WB and M (1994) **also used X stimulus**. This motivated, in part, our use of this type of stimuli.

[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

Example 8

Draft Resubmitted After Reviews (Discussion):
   Additions of Extracts From Three New Paragraphs

> Such **a mechanism could be responsible** for the results of the present experiments . . .
> But with [A and B types of stimuli] **there might be an additional effect** . . .
> This **could explain the differences** produced by A and B . . . compared to C and D,
> although further work would be necessary to **confirm this hypothesis**.

[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

T. D. added three short paragraphs in the discussion section that explicitly hypothesize results from using this specific stimulus, extracts of which are in Example 8.

Additionally, to bolster her conclusions, T. D. followed one reviewer's suggestion and added "post-hoc statistical analysis of the reported differences" in results, as Example 9 shows (Example 9).

After resubmission of the article, the reviewers were still dissatisfied; one felt it now only "contains the description of a single experiment with a single interesting finding." Another noted that T. D.'s cover letter had included more discussion of her results than her revision had. In her third round of revisions, T. D. removed much of the post hoc Tukey analysis and reinstated the report of the analysis of 18 experiments. Finally, as Example 10 shows, T. D. strengthened her discussion by including strongly hedged claims from the cover letter she had written earlier (Example 10).

However, two reviewers now felt the evidence did not support T. D.'s claims. One reviewer who had previously recommended acceptance now rejected the article; another reviewer who had opted for rejection now wanted to accept it. The editor rejected the article.

T. D. next decided to submit to the second journal identified by her late coauthor, an English-medium journal that was "not so prestigious [as the first], but it was the most important in Europe" (T. D., INT, February 6, 2004). She jettisoned most of her revisions for the first journal and returned

Example 9

Draft Resubmitted After First Reviews (Results): Addition

Differences among the levels of the [durations of the application of stimuli] **by means of a Tukey test showed significant differences** between [four sets of durations of the application of stimulus C]. The differences between [two other durations of the application of stimulus C] **were not significant**.

[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

Example 10

Draft Submitted After Second Round of Reviews (Discussion): Addition

The **"enhancement effect" may be responsible** for the greater effects found in the A and B conditions. That is, [two sentences of explanation added].

[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

to an early version of the article but made several salient changes. First, she reformulated what had been a claim as a research question (see Example 11).

In the discussion section, T. D. added some explicitly stated hypotheses about this research question (Example 12).

These changes shown in Examples 11 and 12 helped shift the rhetorical framing from one of reporting experimental results to one of hypothesis testing, more consistent with current conventions of natural sciences journals (Bazerman, 1988). The second journal accepted the article with minor revisions, such as putting statistical results in tables, shortening sections, and describing experiments more precisely.

Main Author's Perspective

Although T. D. was pleased to publish the article, she was frustrated with her "really tiring" experience with the first journal. The problems she identified included WB's death, and she said, "To publish in a journal that is not the typical journal for psychologists . . . other customs, other processes for me, it has been different." In addition, "I am not a [specialist in WB's field], I am a psychologist" (T. D., INT, February 6, 2004). To her, the crux of the problem was that "the three reviewers wanted different things, so if I modified the article according to the first [reviewer], for example, it was the opposite of what the second [reviewer] wanted." The second journal's acceptance of the article in nearly its original form reinforced her view that the problem lay in the first

Example 11

Draft Rejected by First Journal (Introduction)	Draft Submitted to Second Journal (Introduction): Reformulation
[The Z process] **takes time** to build up.	We also **attempt to estimate the time course** of the Z process.

[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

Example 12

Draft Submitted to Second Journal (Discussion): Addition
It might be expected that [the Z process] would take time to build up leading to a gradual increase in recognition score with [A-D stimuli] whereas as soon as [A-D stimuli are] established as a separate [process,] **[a particular theory] predicts that the score will increase sharply**. The present experimental results support both hypotheses equally. [Provides a sentence of specific details of experimental results to support both hypotheses.]

[6]Text in bold indicates significant change in draft.

set of reviewers: "Curiously, you can see that these [second journal] reviewers agreed [with] everything" (T. D., INT, May 31, 2004).

Discussion and Conclusion

In this article, we have focused on the phenomenon of literacy brokering in academic text production, which, although a familiar practice to many publishing academics, has been the object of little systematic empirical research. Our goal has been to illuminate this practice, specifically in relation to the experiences of multilingual scholars who live and work in periphery contexts of the non-Anglophone center. A text-ethnographic approach has enabled us to glimpse the extent and nature of literacy brokering in broad terms and to explore in detail the trajectories of three texts as they move from local peripheral research contexts toward publication in the center.

We recognize that on the basis of a small-scale research project involving scholars in one discipline—psychology—we cannot make broad claims about the experiences of scholars across other disciplines and locations. Certainly, more studies on the practices surrounding both monolingual and multilingual scholarly publication are needed. However, we think that the current

study contributes to understandings about the literacy brokering activity surrounding academic knowledge production in several ways.

Although literacy brokering activity varies considerably, we have identified key types of brokers—academic, language, and nonprofessional—and offered broad characterizations of their orientations by focusing on the specific textual changes that resulted from their interventions. Brokers' orientations vary from sentence-level corrections to minor and major shifts in content and knowledge claims (see Figure 1). An important finding is that a large amount of brokering is carried out by academic professionals and that although scholars tend to frame these brokers' interventions in terms of language or discourse, in fact, they tend to orient to content. This raises important questions about the precise nature of the activities both groups of scholars assume they are taking part in (and why).

We have argued that these three types of literacy brokering are not evenly distributed across text production but are stratified according to text type and target publication: Most clearly, the involvement of academic professional brokers is higher in the production of journal articles than in other text types. Such involvement is also significantly greater in English-medium international than in English-medium national journals. The text histories we have presented illustrate in detail the nature and value of such academic professional brokering in this context. Academic professionals here come from the center and broker text production in a number of ways, including making specific changes to the text (Text Histories 1 and 2), suggesting or requiring specific changes be made to texts (Text Histories 2 and 3), and identifying appropriate target journals (Text Histories 1 and 2). The value of these brokers' interventions is clearly not primarily at the level of linguistic medium; rather, they influence opportunities for gaining access to English-medium journal publication as well as significantly contribute to the shaping of textual knowledge. Their textual interventions can be considered along the orientations we identified for this category of brokers: content, disciplinary conversations, and target journal conversations. That such interventions in these text histories were successful is evidenced by the publication of these texts. As indicated in other studies (e.g., Flowerdew, 2001), the brokers involved offered considerable time and energy as well as material resources (see Canagarajah, 1996), such as access to journal issues, other people, and research opportunities, and in this study, at least in Text Histories 1 and 2, were committed to internationalizing journal content. All lead authors expressed appreciation and pleasure at achieving publication.

However, such text-oriented analysis of brokering activity needs to be located within a broader discourse-oriented frame that takes account of two

further dimensions to global text production: the privileging of English center literacy and rhetorical practices and the differential power relations between center-periphery relations regarding knowledge production. These dimensions are signaled at different levels of explicitness by the scholars themselves, who expressed misgivings about the process and/or the changes resulting from brokers' interventions, whether articulating a sense that brokers' interventions may have reduced the complexity of the knowledge they were constructing or feeling the text was being shifted in relation to the perceived marginal position from which the authors made their contributions. Some key rhetorical changes instigated by brokers can be understood as Western Anglo academic literacy practices, where specific notions of textual unity and, conversely, digressions, most evident in Text History 1, are privileged (Golebiowski & Liddicoat, 2002; Mauranen, 1993; Scollon & Scollon, 1981).That such rhetorical practices are dynamic even within center disciplinary contexts (Bazerman, 1988) may also be a dimension to Text History 3, where there appears to be different approaches to the rhetorical treatment and function of experiments from the brokers for two English-medium international journals. The extent to which variation exists between Anglophone and non-Anglophone English-medium center journals (as might be suggested by Text History 3) is an area for further study.

That practices of brokering and text production are affected by unequal power relations is evident, most obviously in the dependence in the text histories on center brokers' support. In Text Histories 1 and 2, the access to knowledge provided by brokers compensated for a shortage of local material resources, namely, access to potential target journals in Text History 1 and access to certain statistical methods in Text History 2. Along the same lines, the lead author in Text History 3 sought out an Anglophone center scholar for expertise in an interdisciplinary field because of the limited expertise in her country. As mentioned earlier, having access to experienced brokers often constitutes a form of cultural capital that is differentially available to scholars in various locations.

Power relations are also more subtly evident in what gets valued as knowledge, as is most suggestively illustrated in Text History 2. Here, the contribution is not suppressed—rejected for publication—but its value shifts from a new contribution to knowledge to a confirmation of existing knowledge through what we may call a process of *exoticization*, whereby difference is not denied or erased "so long as difference is exoticised" (Bernasconi, 2005, p. 241). Exoticization is signaled by the increased salience in the published draft of the local national context but only insomuch as it confirms existing knowledge. The value of its contribution becomes its capacity to demonstrate that findings from the center can be replicated in a "different" context. This

finding raises many issues that we are exploring, but here, it seems important to signal a crucial tension. Flowerdew (2001) noted that one of the criticisms made by center journal editors of peripheral scholars is that they are too "parochial" (p. 134); yet our study, as illustrated in Text History 2, indicates that the value attributed to peripheral work may often be its localness. Periphery scholars may get caught in a double bind here: If they foreground the local, they may be accused of being parochial; if they background the local, they may be denied claims to universal relevance or status because of their peripheral position in global relations of knowledge production. This latter point is articulated by the main author in Text History 2, who clearly echoes Foucault's notion of "enunciative modalities" (as cited in Fairclough, 1992, pp. 43-45): that rights to occupy speaking positions are constrained by geohistorical locations. Our study offers some empirical support for larger sociopolitical claims about knowledge production made by Canagarajah (2002) with reference to Third World scholars and by Csepeli, Örkény, and Scheppele (1996), who queried, with reference to center-peripheral relations within the center,

> We ask our "Eastern" [European] readers: when was the last time you were invited to speak at a conference in the "West" about something other than your country or, perhaps, your region? When were you last considered a writer outside your own region writing about something of general significance even though that was your aim? And we ask our "Western" readers: when did you last turn for "theory" to someone not from your part of the world? (p. 22)

This call to renegotiate the conditions under which global text and knowledges are produced links with Amarou, Canagarajah, Killian, and Robinson (1998) and with Canagarajah (2002, p. 291), who emphasize that knowledge brokering should become a multi- rather than unidirectional process with regard to content and linguistic and rhetorical forms. We recognize that a growing number of researchers and practitioners are developing ways to support multilingual scholars' academic publishing (see, for example, Tardy, 2004). Specific initiatives include direct instruction to help scholars increase their awareness of and control over the conventions of academic journals (Sengupta, Forey, & Hamp-Lyons, 1999), support by periphery journal editors for scholars writing in English as an additional language (Mišak, Marušic, & Marušić, 2005), and scholarly exchanges and mentoring (Flowerdew, 2000). However, we hope that our focus in this article on the different ways in which brokering takes place will signal not only the roles that center scholars can play in supporting periphery scholars but some of the limitations that may result if such brokering remains unidirectional.

Notes

1. The shifting nature of the European Union, where countries from central Europe such as Slovakia and Hungary have only recently become members, raises complex questions about center-periphery relations that we do not discuss here.

2. For the historical position of English in Eastern Europe, see Medgyes and Kaplan (1992) and Petzold and Berns (2000); for Spain, see Morales-Galvez, Arrimadas Gomez, Ramirez Nueda, Lopez Gayarre, and Ocana Villuendas (2000). For current figures on numbers of speakers of English in European Union countries, see European Union Education and Training (http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/lang/).

3. To protect scholars' anonymity, we refer to them by initials and provide minimal identifying details in text extracts and text histories.

4. Repetitions and hesitancies of speech have been cut. Brackets provide contextual information not evident in the talk.

5. The classification of national and international is highly contested. Key factors often referred to are the composition of editorial board, distribution, linguistic medium, and national identities of contributing authors. For further discussion, see Curry and Lillis (2004).

6. We use bold in text extracts to draw the reader's attention to significant changes in drafts.

7. Given the anonymous nature of most journal reviewers, we cannot be certain of their language backgrounds, but it seems to be the case that many reviewers for center-based international English-medium journals are center academics and users of English as a first language. However, variation across disciplines is also likely.

References

Amarou, M., Canagarajah, A. S., Killian, P., & Robinson, T. (1998, March). *Connecting the global community through conduit scholars*. Symposium conducted at the 32nd annual TESOL convention, Seattle, WA.

Ammon, U. (2001). Editor's preface. In U. Ammon (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a language of science* (pp. v-x). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.

Baynham, M. (1993). Code switching and mode switching: Community interpreters and mediators of literacy. In B. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy* (pp. 294-314). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Baynham, M., & Maybin, J. (1996). Literacy practices in English. In J. Maybin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *Using English: From conversation to canon* (pp. 42-63). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Becher, T. (1994). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Milton Keynes, UK: SRHE/Open University Press.

Belcher, D., & Connor, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Reflections on multiliterate lives*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bernasconi, R. (2005). Levy-Bruhl among the phenomenologist: Exoticization and the logic of "the primitive." *Social Identities*, *11*(3), 229-245.

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

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press/Polity.

Brandt, D. (2001). *Literacy in American lives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brock-Utne, B. (2001). The growth of English in academic communication in the Nordic countries. *International Review of Education*, *47*(3-4), 221-233.

Burrough-Boenish, J. (2003). Shapers of published NNS research articles. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(3), 223-243.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). "Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication*, *13*(4), 435-472.

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

Csepeli, G., Örkény, A., & Scheppele, K. L. (1996). Response to our critics (and our supporters). *Replika*, *6*, 21-22.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(4), 663-688.

Dysthe, O. (2002). Professors as mediators of academic text cultures: An interview study with advisors and master's degree students in three disciplines in a Norwegian university. *Written Communication*, *19*(4), 493-544.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Faulstich Orellana, M., Meza, M., & Pietsch, K. (2002). Mexican immigrant networks and home-school connections. *Practicing Anthropology*, *24*(3), 4-8.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(2), 123-145.

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(1), 127-150.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(1), 121-150.

Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice*. New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor and Francis.

Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, *25*, 99-126.

Gibbs, W. W. (1995, August). Lost science in the Third World. *Scientific American*, pp. 76-83.

Golebiowski, Z., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). The interaction of discipline and culture in academic writing. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *25*(2), 59-71.

Gosden, H. (1995). Success in research article writing and revision: A social-constructionist perspective. *English for Specific Purposes*, *14*(1), 37-57.

Gunnarson, B. L. (1997). The writing process from a sociolinguistic viewpoint. *Written Communication*, *24*(2), 139-188.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jernudd, B. H., & Baldauf, R. B. (1987). Planning science communication for human resource development. In B. K. Das (Ed.), *Communicative language teaching* (pp. 144-189). Singapore: RELC.

Jones, C., Turner, J. & Street, B. V. (Eds.). (1999). *Students writing in the university: Cultural and epistemological issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kachru, B. (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. (2001). World Englishes. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics* (pp. 519-524). New York: Elsevier.

Kalman, J. (1999). *Writing on the plaza: Mediated literacy practice among scribes and clients in Mexico City*. Creskill, NJ: Hampton.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1981). *The manufacture of knowledge: An essay on the constructivist and contextual nature of science*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lea, M., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, *23*(2), 157-172.

Lillis, T. M. (2001). *Student writing: Access, regulation, desire*. London: Routledge.

MacDonald, S. P. (1994). *Professional academic writing in the humanities and social sciences*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Mace, J. (2002). *The give and take of writing: Scribes, literacy, and everyday life*. Leicester, UK: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education.

Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric*. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Mauranen, A. (1997). Hedging in language revisers' hands. In R. Markkanen & H. Schroder (Eds.), *Hedging and discourse: Approaches to the analysis of a pragmatic phenomenon in academic texts* (pp. 115-133). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Medgyes, P., & Kaplan, R. B. (1992). Discourse in a foreign language: The example of Hungarian scholars. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *98*, 67-100.

Mišak, A., Marušic, M., & Marušić, A. (2005). Manuscript editing as a way of teaching academic writing: Experience from a small scientific journal. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*, 122-131.

Morales-Galvez, C., Arrimadas Gomez, I., Ramirez Nueda, E., Lopez Gayarre, A., & Ocana Villuendas, L. (2000) *La enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras en Espana* [The teaching of foreign languages in Spain]. Madrid, Spain: Ministerio de Educacación y Deporte, CIDE.

Myers, G. (1990). *Writing biology: Texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Petzold, R., & Berns, M. (2000). Catching up with Europe: Speakers and functions of English in Hungary. *World Englishes*, *19*(1), 113-124.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2003). *English-only Europe? Challenging language policy*. London: Routledge.

Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ramanthan, V. (1999). English is here to stay: A critical look at institutional and educational practices in India. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(2), 211-233.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sengupta, S., Forey, G., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (1999). Supporting effective English communication within the context of teaching and research in a tertiary institute: Developing a genre model for consciousness raising. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*, S7-S22.

Shi, L. (2002). How Western-trained Chinese TESOL professionals publish in their home environment. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(4), 625-634.

Sousa Santos, B. (1994) *Pela mao de Alice: O social e o politico na pos-modernidade* [By the hand of Alice: The social and the political in post modernity]. Porto, Portugal: Edições Afrontamento.

Street, B. V. (2003). What's new in new literacy studies? *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *5*(2), 1-14.

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

Tardy, C. (2004). The role of English in scientific communication: Lingua franca or Tyrannosaurus rex? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *3*, 247-269.

Truchot, C. (1994). The spread of English in Europe. *Journal of European Studies*, *25*, 141-151.

Ventola, E., & Mauranen, A. (1991). Nonnative writing and native revising of scientific articles. In E. Ventola (Ed.), *Functional and systemic linguistics: Approaches and uses* (pp. 457-492). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system: 1. Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world economy in the 16th century*. New York: Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I. (1991). *Geopolitics and geoculture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wagner, D. A., Messick, B. M., & Spratt, J. (1986). Studying literacy in Morocco. In B. B. Schiefflin & P. Gilmore (Eds.), *The acquisition of literacy: Ethnographic perspectives* (pp. 233-260). New York: Ablex.

Web of Science (2005). Thompson Corporation. Accessed April 25, 2005 from http://isi01 .isiknowledge.com/portal.cgi/.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yakhontova, T. (1997). The signs of a new time: Academic writing in ESP curricula of Ukrainian universities. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp.103-112). Berlin, Germany/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Theresa Lillis is a senior lecturer in language and education in the Center for Language and Communications at the Open University, United Kingdom. Her research interests include widening access to higher education and the politics of academic literacy. She is a coeditor of *Language Literacy and Education: A Reader* and *Analyzing Language in Context* (Trentham, 2002) and has published research on academic writing in higher education in *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, and Desire* (Routledge, 2001). She also recently coauthored *A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics* (Edinburgh University Press, 2004).

Mary Jane Curry is an assistant professor of foreign language and teaching English as a second language education at the Margaret Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development at the University of Rochester and is a director of the Warner School's Writing Support Services. She is coauthor of Coffin et al., *Teaching Academic Writing: A Toolkit for Higher Education* (Routledge, 2003). Her articles on access and academic literacy have appeared in *Community College Review*, *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *Literacy and Numeracy Studies*, and with T. Lillis, *TESOL Quarterly*.