A Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis of Scholarly Publications by Polish and Anglophone Authors

Dick Smakman*, Agnieska Duda-Osiewacz**

Abstract

This study compares native English publications with non-native English publications. Specifically, publications have been compared of Anglophone and Polish scholars in the past two decades. Various stylistic and linguistic characteristics and several textual levels are assessed by applying Kaplan's (1966) Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis. Results show that differences exist at the paragraph level and not at the sentence or textual level. Native texts have a higher degree of reciprocity (reader-friendliness) and are more linear. Results reveal that Polish authors write academic English with traces of a Teutonic style but as far as reciprocity is concerned they are moving towards the stylistic features of native English; newer publications by the Polish authors are more reader-friendly than the older ones. Native speakers are not able to reliably recognise native and non-native sentences and often mistake non-native writings for native writing, and in many cases they even label native sentences as non-native. These findings put into perspective the aims applied in teaching academic language.

Keywords: contrastive rhetoric, academic English, Poland

1. Introduction

Traditionally, native speakers of English determine the norm regarding what constitutes correct English (Jenkins, 2000). However, when writing, non-native speakers inevitably apply a written style which incorporates their own cultural habits. Kaplan (1966) noted how rhetorical patterns are unique to each language and culture. He demonstrated that authors may apply their own culture's writing style when writing in English. Authors in the republic of Poland also face this issue. This country has rapidly rediscovered itself in the past few decades and has internationalised its focus whilst trying to maintain its own identity.

* Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, Email: d.smakman@hum.leidenuniv.nl
** Email: adudaosiew@gmail.com

To find out what the current state of affairs in Polish academic writing is, the writings of Polish scientific authors are investigated. To reveal possible recent changes in their English, older and newer scientific publications since the fall of the Iron Curtain are described stylistically, to see whether there are non-native features that seem to be persistent or whether Polish authors are adjusting their style to the native norm in journal articles. The possible errors and items that are unidiomatic have already been ironed out by editors (Precht, 1998). At a deeper stylistic level, however, Polishness may still be present.

1.1 Writing academically in a second language

The general definition of "native" used in this article is "born to the language" and that of "non-native" is "learned [...] through education" (Jenkins, 2003, p. 15). In writing in particular, non-native language users may be able to rid their language of non-native features altogether, and this shows most convincingly in many English academic journal articles by non-native authors.

In recent decades, there has been much interest in second language theory concerning the possibility of reaching the proficiency level of a native author (Birdsong, 1992; Hakuta, Bialystok, & Wiley, 2003). Reaching this level is not an easy task, as it encompasses a wide range of skills, several of which are not taught at school and which the authors therefore need to pick up naturally from the articles they read. Besides learning to use native-like constructions, authors of academic texts must pay attention to the intended audience, the purpose, organization, style, flow, and the intended presentation of the written message (Swales & Feak, 2009). Kaplan (1966) argues that logic in rhetoric is a result of cultural conventions; it is thus not universal, and cannot simply be learned. As a result, L2 writers transfer their L1 stylistic habits as well as their writing abilities into the target language. The transfer of L1 habits and skills into the L2 may cause the text to be perceived as less interesting, as claimed by Duszak (1994). Even editing by native speakers may not solve this issue, as such editing involves correcting grammatical and other errors at the sentence level mainly. A stylistic, pragmatic, organisational or related non-linguistic deviation from the native style is not usually considered erroneous but will simply affect the perceived attractiveness of the text and it will partly determine the chances of publication.

1.2 English in Poland

Until relatively recently, Russian was the dominant foreign language taught in schools and universities in Poland. Interest in learning and using English grew steadily in the 1970s and 1980s, and in 1986 the language was described by the British Council as "the most important Western foreign language in Poland" (Reichelt, 2005, p. 221). Today, English is present nearly everywhere in Polish life.

Since English became recognised as an international language, so Reichelt (2005) reports, the age of initial English-language instruction in Poland has been significantly lowered, but using English poses challenges for many speakers still. The real struggle begins when a sophisticated and well-researched piece of writing is required at the end of a semester at university. Owing to the insufficient attention paid to academic writing in English, and to writing in English for publication at Polish universities (Duszak, 1998; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008), students and researchers often need to improve their writing skills through private tutorials and have their work checked extensively.

1.3 Polish academic publishing in English

Erling's (2004, p. 84) "publish in English or rather perish" principle is true for Polish academics as it is for any academic. Statistics presented by Ball and Tunger (2005) show that in 1975 approximately 65% of articles from Poland were published in Polish, compared to only 10% in 2000. The drawing power of being

recognized in "the supranational community" (Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008, p. 109) of the academic world thus seems to be strong.

Writing in English requires that certain principled choices be made. Since the early 1990s, a rapid move towards self-assurance, national pride as well as internationalisation has been taking place in Poland. Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008) noted a tension between maintaining traditional values and accepting newly emerging ideologies and reported that Poland has recently started to shift away from German and French academic traditions towards more American-orientated traditions, trying nonetheless to remain national in its own way. Such principled choices are likely to affect the chances of international publication.

1.4 The definition of 'style'

Explicit definitions of 'style' exist (e.g., Crystal, 1991, p. 332; Wales, 2001, p. 371, p. 437- 438). However, rather than giving definitions of this phenomenon, authors are usually assuming that readers agree on which definition of style is adhered to or can derive from the article which approach is taken.

In the current paper, 'style' refers to rhetorical structure, which is in accordance with Kaplan's (1966) approach. Kaplan (1966) does use the term 'style' occasionally but does not define it. He discusses how authors with certain cultural backgrounds write their paragraphs and uses terms like "rhetorical structures" and "rhetorical patterns". It is in this line of thought that in the current paper 'style' is used as well; features of academic texts at both the macro and micro-level are considered to constitute 'style'. More specifically, style is determined on the basis of the presence of common textual components (Introduction, Method, Results and Discussion), the structure of Introductions (steps towards contextualising the research), reciprocity (the way authors share their knowledge with readers), linearity (degree and manner of argumentation and elaboration), and the degree to which references are made to existing research.

1.5 Style in Polish academic writing

The main written genre taught in Polish schools is the *rozprawka* ('little treatise'), which might be described as a counterpart to the English expository-argumentative essay (Duszak, 1998, p. 195). It is based not on reporting and describing but on reasoning, explaining, and justifying. The presented arguments are meant to confirm or refute any claims made.

Many researchers (e.g., Clyne, 1987; Connor, 1997) claim that Central and Eastern European countries follow the 'Teutonic' style of writing attributed to the German scholarly tradition. As an example, journalistic articles tend to lack abstracts, and not only do they - in contrast to Anglo-American conventions - "tolerate [...] vagueness, [...] [they] also delay in the articulation of the main purpose of the text" (Čmejrková, 1994, p. 307) and/or focus on content rather than on form (Duszak, 1998; Clyne, 1987). Scientific writing has its own set of features. Duszak (1998, p. 194, p. 197) points out that the scientific register in Polish lacks an emotional element, and refers to the Polish academic register as "intellectualized." In syntax and lexicon, a clear dominance of complex sentences over simple ones is reported, for instance.

1.6 Previous contrastive rhetoric research

Kaplan initiated the study of organizational patterns of native and non-native texts. Kaplan's (1966) intention was to present the manner in which languages reach the end of a paragraph. English, so he claimed, reaches the target in a straight line, while some other languages appear to be more digressive and flexible in the rhythm of their discourse.

It is generally assumed that the writers' native culture exerts an important influence on the way they organize their text when they are not using their native tongue to write a text. The purpose of contrastive rhetoric is to juxtapose texts written by natives and non-natives in a target language. Research has looked at paragraphs but also at the organization of the entire text (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Attention has been paid in contrastive studies to the concept of linearity (Clyne, 1987; Golebiowski, 1998), to reader/writer responsibility (Hinds, 1987), and, for instance, to the knowledge and application of writing conventions within a text or paragraph (Clyne, 1987; Golebiowski, 1998).

Several angles have been taken in Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis so far, and several languages have been researched, for instance Chinese (Taylor and Tingguang, 1991) and German (Clyne, 1987). Clyne (1981) demonstrated that while Romance language paragraphs are said to end clearly, a Russian paragraph simply stops (Clyne, 1981). Polish is considered to follow the latter style.

Traditional Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis soon became subject to criticism. Kubota and Lehner (2004) and Connor, Nagelhout and Rozycki (2008) indicate that traditional contrastive rhetoric tends to generalise about the styles in various languages, presenting them as relatively homogenous and static. Contrastive analysis, so they and Connor (2002) indicate, may implicitly reinforce the image of superiority of the English rhetorical style, presenting it as linear, direct, and logical, which makes languages that deviate from this style non-linear, indirect, and less logical. Scollon (1997), Zamel (1997), and Kubota (1999, 2001) also criticise the lack of cultural sensitivity reflected in traditional analyses. Both Spack (1997) and Zamel (1997) question the definition of culture that seems to be implicit in Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis.

Connor (2002) considers the various criticisms to be an impetus towards improvement of the method. Kubota and Lehner (2004) propose a more critical contrastive analysis so as to enrich the conceptual basis of this type of analysis. Canagarajah (2002), in line with this critical approach, calls for more complex explanations for textual stylistic variation. Connor (2008) argues that for Contrastive Rhetoric to remain viable it needs to describe how culture and education affect a writing situation.

Contrastive Rhetoric has been pursued with a variety of motivations and aims. Matsuda and Atkinson (2008) note that the pedagogical was foremost behind Kaplan's initial (1966) publication. They indicate that people try to combine the pedagogical with the scientific aspect but that this combination poses some tension. The current paper does not deal with the pedagogical ramifications of Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis, which is one of the concerns of, for instance, Kubota and Lehner (2004), nor does it view styles applied by native writers of English as necessarily superior. Instead, this paper tries not to take a position and merely follows a line of research applying straightforward and traditional analyses.

1.7 Research gaps

The past decades have shown an increasing interest in contrastive studies between academic English writing and academic writing in any other language. Discourse patterns have been researched, for example, in English and German (e.g., Clyne, 1981, 1987) and in English and Czech (e.g., Čmejrková, 1994). The focus has primarily been on Introduction sections in articles. So far there has not been enough discussion on textual patterns and on sentence analysis, and Polish authors have not been focussed on extensively either. Duszak's (1994) contrastive study on Introduction sections in discourse written by Anglo-American scholars in English and by Polish scholars in Polish, together with Golebiowski's (1998) investigation into writings by Polish scholars in English and Polish, have to date been the most important ones carried out. The results in these two publications do not always agree with each other. Duszak argues that in Polish scholarly writing *what* is presented is more highly valued than *how* it is presented, whereas Golebiowski makes no such claim and concludes that the differences between Polish and Anglophone authors mainly lie in variation in the tendency to outline goals. Also, scarce attention was paid to the level of English used and the noticeable traces of the author's mother tongue in these publications.

There are reasons to believe that the level of English in Poland has improved since Duszak's and Golebiowski's publications. A generation of researchers is currently active that grew up in the post-Soviet era. This group is likely to be affected by the global influence of English. The current research presents contemporary developments.

2. Research questions and operationalization

The current study contrasts the linguistic and stylistic features of international publications by Anglophone and Polish academics. We want to know whether and in what way Polish academic English is recognisable at different discourse levels and whether in the past two decades Polish authors have shown signs of adjustment to the native norm. This will provide insights into whether non-native stylistic features are likely to be persistent in Polish writing or whether an overall move towards the international Anglophone norm is taking place. To this end, the following research questions will be answered:

a. Does the Polish style of academic writing in English deviate from native academic English at the (a) textual level, (b) section level, or (c) sentence level?
b. If the Polish style deviates from the native style at one or more of these levels, then in what way?
c. Has the Polish style of English academic writing changed in the past two decades?

3. Methodological background

The present section accounts for the methodological choices made while the precise methodology for the research is described in section 4. The aspects of the contrastive analysis that are part of our research methodology will be outlined in the present section, as these explain the methodological choices made. The aspects are: the IMRD Structure, CARS moves, Reciprocity, Linearity, and Referencing. After that, the relevance of year of publication as well of some other factors are discussed.

3.1 IMRD structure

The highest level of analysis is the textual level. The presence of common textual components is determined for such an analysis. The IMRD (Introduction-Method/Materials-Results-Discussion) structure helps the reader to find the required information easily, without the need to read the text linearly (Todorović, 2003). This structure is typical of experimental research papers in particular but it is visible in more theoretical papers as well.

A conventional IMRD structure is used in many international journals (Swales & Feak, 2009). Golebiowski's (1998) research reveals that, when writing in English, Polish writers follow the IMRD schema, with the exception that some statements that should have been included in the Introduction section are found in other parts of the article. By contrast, Duszak (1994, p. 302) observes that the Polish papers she looked at often lacked sectioning. She refers to this phenomenon as an academic "flow of consciousness", since no clear division in the text is visible.

3.2 CARS moves

The Introduction section is usually expected to follow the Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model, which triggers "competition for research space and for readers" (Swales & Feak, 2009, p. 243). Swales (1990) proposes that a CARS structure constitutes the first part of the Introduction section in the IMRD

schema. This structure consists of three 'moves': (1) acknowledge the importance of the research as well as previous research within the field, (2) indicate a gap in previous research, and (3) state the purpose of the research. In Introduction sections written in Polish, the CARS model does not necessarily occur, presumably since the Polish scientific style does not know any such schema. While some researchers are in favour of using the model in contrastive studies, others (Duszak, 1994; Golebiowski, 1998) argue that because of differing conventions of written scientific prose, it is not always appropriate to apply the model in contrasting the use of two different languages.

An example of a CARS move in our research comes from the Introduction section of Sweet's 2009 article from *European Planning Studies*. The CARS moves are clearly outlined, and this example shows how the various moves are sometimes within sentences. First, the author outlines the importance of the research and that of other research on the topic, and simultaneously underlines the gap in research: "Currently studies that analyse the gendered effects of neo-liberal policy implementation in transitioning countries are in short supply [...]. Kalantaridis' (2000) article on the Ukraine contributes to our knowledge base by examining an understudied region and the garment industry" (p. 697). So, the importance of the named research is claimed to lie in the fact that a transition that is obviously taking place has not been studied enough. The author then reiterates more specifically that there is a gap in research so far and combines that with a purpose: "If there were more studies that consider regional, cultural, ethnic and gender-specific diversity and their effect on planning and policy initiatives, new collaboratively created programmes and policies would be able to distribute the costs and benefits of development in a more equitable manner" (p. 698). The author then moves on to explicitly stating the purpose: "This paper, where I use ethnographic data to examine socially constructed gender norms in the context of structural adjustment, contributes to the literature of planning and policy analysis and points to the hidden and complex gender and social cost of neo-liberal development as currently implemented" (p. 698).

Besides the CARS moves, the Introduction contains three features that reveal the relationship of the author with the potential reader audience and the research world; reciprocity, linearity, and referencing. These will be discussed next.

3.3 Reciprocity

Reciprocity refers to the way authors share their knowledge with readers, in regard of the kind of knowledge presented and the way it is done; it also defines a kind of "expected balance in discourse, *communicative homoeostasis*" between what the writer assumes the reader already knows, and what the reader expects from the writer's text (Nystrand, 1986, p. 53). Like spoken communication, writing requires both a 'producer' and a 'receiver' to interact and to exchange information (Nystrand, 1986, p. 39). The application of this 'reciprocity principle' (Nystrand, 1986, p. 48) depends largely on cultural preferences. It presumes the reader's attempts to understand the text and the writer's effort to communicate effectively (Hinds, 1987).

The Anglo-Saxon style differs from the Teutonic style of writing in the way in which the reader and writer are responsible for performing their respective parts of the communication act. Polish academics tend to follow the Teutonic writing style and pay relatively much attention to content, at the expense of form (Golebiowski, 1998). Within this system, the main purpose of the academic paper is to include as much knowledge and theory as possible, and it is the reader's task to attempt to understand the message conveyed. While native English writers outline their aims and goals in early parts of the paper, Polish writers may tend to delay the purpose of the paper or reveal it rather vaguely (Duszak, 1994; Čmejrková, 1994; Golebiowski, 1998). Duszak (1994, p. 302) indicates that the division of responsibility between writer and reader varies between the Introductions written by Anglophone authors in English and by those written by Polish authors in Polish. She refers to the way Polish texts apply a "strategy of avoidance" by being vague and general.

A 2009 article from *European Planning Studies* serves as a good demonstration of an article with a high degree of reciprocity. There is an outline and explanation of the main points and explicit references to the structure of the article, and the readers are reminded of the intentions of the authors: "This article aims to [...]. It draws on [...]. The article opens with an examination of [...]. This is followed by [...]. The conclusions draw out the key findings of the preceding discussion and reflect on [...]." The text, furthermore, is explicit in that readers are constantly updated on the place in the article at large where the reader is. Throughout the article, explicit examples, elaboration, and explanation are given through, for example, "these include" or "for example". Sentence fragments such as "Demand was further stoked by", "These drivers are of course linked in turn to", and "As discussed in more depth below" indicate relationships between text segments. The text has regular occurrences of "However" and "Furthermore" to indicate connections between parts of information and inform the reader as to the place where they are in a larger argument presentation. Although summaries of main points are not made (e.g., through "in other words" or "to summarise"), this text is categorisable as reader-friendly.

3.4 Linearity

Linear writing is characterised by logical argumentation and rational elaboration on the themes chosen. In contrast, digressive writing allows additional and irrelevant information (Golebiowski, 1998). As a result, digressive texts are said to be more asymmetrical, oratorical, and reader-demanding (Duszak, 1997). Clyne (1987) also claims that textual asymmetry is related to the amount of digressiveness in the text.

Linearity is also culture-bound. Golebiowski (1998) claims that "what is considered digressive by the Anglo-American writer may seem linear to the Polish or German speaker" (p. 86). Linearity is claimed to be characteristic of Anglo-Saxon writing styles, and digressiveness of Teutonic styles (Duszak, 1997). The Polish style is said to qualify as digressive, like the German style (Clyne, 1987). Duszak (1994) and Golebiowski (1998) indeed demonstrate that texts written by Poles in English and Polish suffer from a lack of linearity and exhibit an abundance of digression.

Some examples of signs of digressiveness come from a 2003 article from *The Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. The second paragraph of the Introduction describes a community under investigation and ends with a comment (introduced by "even though") which gives a methodological weakness. The third paragraph does not continue discussing the methodology and ends with a side comment starting with "This is, of course, reinforced by", which is not needed to understand the paragraph and which constitutes an open ending. A 2009 article from *The International Journal of Early Years Education* also shows signs of digressiveness, by ending a paragraph with a sentence starting with the words "Notice what a [...]" and not elaborating on the point made or ending with the main topic of the paragraph. Finally, in a paragraph in a 1998 article from *The International Journal of Early Years Education*, the author makes a valid point on the objects of study in the article, then indicates that more relevant examples could be given but that these will not be given. The subsequent sentence starts with "A strong tendency [...] is also noted (although it does not [...])", which signals a digression within a digression - a side comment within a side comment. The final sentence starts with "It seems possible that [...]" and contains information about the topic but not a concluding or summarising comment about the topic the paragraph started with.

3.5 Referencing

Citation is thought to be a means to strengthen an argument when writing academically (Bloch & Chi, 1995; Okamura, 2008). Authors need to cite and learn how to cite and what to cite. Meho and Yang (2007) demonstrate how being referred to by other authors has an effect on academic success.

Referencing is an important part of the Introduction section, and according to Swales and Feak's CARS model it should be employed in both the first and the second move (2009), i.e. acknowledge research and indicate research gaps. In order to contextualize the author's knowledge within the existing literature, referencing credits other experts in the field whose work has been used. The tendency to use external sources as evidence is culture-dependent.

In both the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic conventions of written discourse, contextual knowledge is referenced in the Introduction section. Golebiowski (1998) examined the methods of referencing used in Polish and English by counting the number of references to a single term or a theme. She found that written discourse in English complied with a style employing consistent referencing, whereas in Polish referencing appeared throughout the Introduction section without following any specific pattern. She concludes that "introductions by Polish writers often resemble abbreviated statements of all available knowledge on a topic" (p. 82).

3.6 Sentence level

Native informants' instinctive opinions provide evidence whether non-native sentences still show traces of the native tongue of the author, despite being correct and idiomatic. A sentence may be perceived as non-native because it contains grammatical (word order, punctuation) or structural (sentence length, sentence structure) idiosyncrasies, among others. Taylor and Tingguang (1991) found that non-native sentences and paragraphs (of college students) suffer primarily from a lack of coherence and clarity. When compared with the native style of writing they tend to be shorter (Taylor & Tingguang, 1991) and overloaded (Duszak, 1994), and they include many repetitions (Golebiowski, 1998).

3.7 Year of publication

Polish authors may in the past few years have been influenced by the conventions regarding academic writing and English academic writing in particular. The collapse of the Iron Curtain in the early 1990s may have caused more recent Polish academic publications to resemble Anglo-American publications, both in the style of writing and in the linguistic build-up.

3.8 Other factors

Academic prose is said to use a "very general register" (Biber, 1995, p. 1), and information is presented to readers in a structured format, so that every piece of writing has a regular, predictable pattern of organization. Nevertheless, what may be acceptable in one field may not be in another. The form may be dictated by the requirements of the journal publisher or data repository (Swales & Feak, 2009). These conventions may overrule the effects of nativeness as Polish authors may be successfully adopting these conventions. Also, genre may play a role. The choice to apply a certain stylistic or linguistic characteristic may depend on genre rather than nationality. Samraj's (2008) research, for instance, shows that research discipline is a relevant factor in the use of citations.

To obtain a clear perspective of the results pertaining to the effects of native tongue, we also look at whether journal type, year of publication and discipline affect the language and stylistics of texts. The linguistic and stylistic variables are correlated with these variables. Significant correlations are reported in the methodology below.

4. Methodology

To lay bare the styles of native and non-native authors at the textual and section level, a Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis was done. The sentence level was studied through an evaluation test, which is described in 4.2, the methodology of the Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis is discussed in 4.1.

4.1 The Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis

For the analysis, a small corpus of 32 journal articles in 4 different fields was used. We looked for journals that were not about language or linguistics, as we expected a relatively high degree of author awareness regarding style and language in these articles and thus a lack of representativeness. Journals in the field of the social sciences were selected, as these were assumed to contain the highest degree of prose and argumentative writing. The following four journals were selected as corpus material: *European Planning Studies*, *History of European Ideas*, *The International Journal of Early Years Education*, and *The Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. They were the outcome of an extensive search for journals that would contain articles with the requirements - regarding the nationality of the author, the period of publication, and the genre - needed for the current investigation.

Eight articles in each journal were selected. Three time periods were looked at (see table 1). Article genres were, furthermore, qualified as theoretical or experimental. Finally, it was determined whether the authors were native or not. Deciding factors to determine this were: the name(s) of the author(s), their place of work/study, information in footnotes, and information available on the internet (resumes, mainly). The country of origin of all the authors could thus be determined with a high degree of certainty. Country of origin of the native-speaking authors could not be used as a factor. Previous research (for instance, Precht, 1998) found stylistic differences between the writings of, for instance, Americans and Brits, and both these groups participated in the current research. The resumes of authors showed that oftentimes authors were born in a country where English is the main national language but were educated in another country and/or worked at a university in a country where another variety of English was used (for instance, an Irishman working at a United States university) for a long time. Also, some authors did not live in their country of origin when the article used for the present research was written (e.g., an English researcher writing an article as a guest researcher in the United States). Because authors could be assumed to pick up features from the various cultures and institutes that they visited, type of nativeness (in the current research: English, American, Irish, and Australian) could not be used as a factor.

It was not possible to achieve a perfect balance in the presence of the above characteristics but in the end they were relatively well distributed in the corpus, as shown in table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of characteristics in the corpus of journal articles (N=32)

Feature	Type	Number	
		Native	Non-native
Period	1990-2000	3	4
	2001-2005	3	5
	2006-2010	10	7
Genre	experimental	10	7
	theoretical	6	9

The second author did the coding of the texts, after establishing the exact application of the criteria with the first author by going through several texts together. Below, the procedure of analysing the texts is given, as well as a number of correlating textual features (see 3.8) which should be borne in mind when interpreting the results.

The Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis involved, first of all, examining each article from the point of view of IMRD structure (Introduction-Method/Material-Results-Discussion). The second comparison, which was applied to the Introduction section, determined whether authors were following the Create-A-Research-Space model. For both the IMRD and the CARS analysis, the Introductions needed to be identified. Usually this was possible on the basis of headings. In line with Golebiowski's (1998) predictions, some of the texts examined lacked an Introduction structure (6 articles from *History of European Ideas*; 2 by natives and 4 by non-natives) and thus could not be examined in terms of the Swales (1990) structure. Some publications lacked divisions into sections (10 by native authors and 8 by non-native authors) and presented continuous text, and often also untitled sections. The Method/Material, Results and Discussion sections were usually clearly traceable, which made it clear what the boundaries of the Introduction sections were.

A publication was marked as CARS-oriented when it was possible from the Introduction section to select at least two out of three of the 'moves' of the CARS schema proposed by Swales (1990): acknowledge research, indicate research gap, indicate research/article purpose.

The levels of reciprocity and linearity of Introduction sections were the next point of attention. The former was determined by looking at the presence of information "which is either necessary for the understanding of the article or relevant to the reader's needs and interests, or both" (Golebiowski, 1998, p. 84). This metalanguage organises propositional content and comments on it, and it helps the reader to follow the writer's train of thought. The most important ones are (see Golebiowski, 1998): the extent to which there is a clearly identified outline of the main points to be covered, indications of the author's intentions, the degree of explicitness of the text, metalanguage to guide the reader through the text, summaries of arguments, and indications of relationships between text segments. In our research, a piece of text was tagged as 'reader-friendly' if such tools were presented when necessary, so that the reader was on no occasion confused regarding the author's thoughts. The text was tagged as 'reader-responsible' if it lacked them altogether or if they were exceptional. The tag 'partly reader-friendly' was used if the text contained the necessary metalanguage but not consistently or systematically. 'Partly reader-friendly' meant that there was a combination of writer and reader responsibility, i.e. when it was possible to identify the outline of the main points to be covered but only to some extent. Thus, the structure was made explicit, but not systematically. It should be clear that these three categories were to a degree impressionistic. The places where readers could get lost in the text and the places where the readers were reminded of the structure of the text were first highlighted (with two different colours) and after that, the categorisation was made.

The level of linearity was assessed by the amount of digressiveness. Examples are when the author enters into a scholarly discussion, introduces their own philosophy or ideology, or explains why other issues have been explored (see Golebiowski, 1998, p. 74). Any occurrence of such features caused the text to be marked as less than linear. The extent of linearity versus digressiveness was measured by taking into consideration the concepts of 'textual construction' and 'readability' (Clyne, 1996). A text was marked 'linear' when no digression was present (one topic at a time and digression to other topics was clear and short and there was a clear return to the original topic, so that the main topic remained dominant), and it was marked as 'non-linear' if the digression took up the majority of the text (making it unclear what the main topic was). In cases of minimal digressiveness together with linearity in other parts, the text was marked as 'partly linear'. Again, a degree of researcher interpretation was a factor in performing the categorisation

Additionally, the number of references made throughout the Introduction was taken into account. The categories were '0-5 references', '6-10 references', or 'more than 10 references'. Place where references occurred was not taken into consideration, because no reliable benchmark was available for measuring that factor.

Another factor that may influence results is year of publication. A major part of the current paper is to find out if in the decades after the fall of the Iron Curtain in the early 1990s, writing styles have moved towards the western style or not. Polish authors may in the past few years have been influenced by the international conventions regarding academic writing and English academic writing in particular. This is why year of publication is correlated with textual features, features of the Introduction section, and sentence features. Only significant results are reported.

No correlations were found between journal type or genre and reciprocity, linearity and referencing. The correlation between the kind of journal and the occurrence of the IMRD structure is significant in our corpus (χ^2=10.66, p<0.05). It turns out that the IMRD structure is not employed in some journals and that the structure is most visible in *The Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (75% of the examined articles in this journal follow the pattern) and *The International Journal of Early Years Education* (62.5%). IMRD occurs often within the experimental papers (82.4% of the experimental papers), and the CARS schema occurs in 94.1% of experimental papers and 60% of the theoretical papers. A relationship also exists between the kind of journal and the occurrence of the CARS structure, with a chi-square test revealing a statistically significant relationship: χ^2=18.10, p<0.001. The CARS structure is especially common in *The Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (100% of the examined articles), *The International Journal of Early Years Education* (100%) and in *European Planning Studies* (87.5%) but less so in *History of European Ideas* (25%). In six (3 native and 3 non-native) out of 17 experimental papers the three-move CARS schema is fully employed. In theoretical papers the three-move CARS schema appears in one paper out of 15.

4.2 The Evaluation Test

In order to determine whether native and non-native speech is recognisable as such, even after editing, an evaluation test was done in which native speakers evaluated the nativeness of sentences by both native and non-native authors. The results reveal whether at the sentence level different degrees of nativeness can be spotted. The native speakers of English who acted as informants in the Evaluation Test are in the overview in table 2. The ages of the informant group range from 15 to 76 years old and a little more than three quarters of the participants are in the youngest age group (15-32). The informants represent a wide variety of occupations and different educational backgrounds, and we made sure that none was active in the fields of expertise studied in this investigation. They were not linguists or language experts.

Table 2. The Informants in the Evaluation Test (N=53)

Nationality	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
British	16	9	25
American	10	9	19
Irish	3	4	7
Australian	1	1	2
Total	30	23	53

Speakers from the UK and the US are most numerous in the group, which is in line with the international dominance of the language models from these two areas. There are fewer women than men in the sample.

For the Evaluation Test, 4 native and 4 non-native articles were randomly selected from each of the 4 journals, and 5 consecutive sentences were randomly selected from the Discussion sections of each article, to be used as test sentences. So, 32 articles were used (32 sets of 5 sentences). The mean length of the native sentences was 30.4, whereas the mean length of the non-native sentences was 25.9. The informants

were asked to mark each set of 5 sentences (by one author) as native or non-native and give at least one of the following reasons for their choice: word order, punctuation, sentence length, sentence structure.

In contrast to Golebiowski's (1998) study, sentences were chosen from the Discussion sections of articles. This choice was based on the belief that this part of the article closely represents the author's style of writing. Discussion sections are the parts where the authors need to "introduce and defend their point of view, identify their goals, as well as review, comment upon, and evaluate their own and other contemporary researchers' work" (Golebiowski, 1998, p. 71). So, the author's style is likely to surface in this part, as the Discussion reveals the author's approach to data and research.

4.3 Summary

Table 3 contains an overview of the textual levels and the linguistic as well as stylistic variables that were tested.

Table 3. Variable overview in the Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis

Article level studied	Article sections studied	Variable studied	Value
Text	All sections	IMRD structure	present
			not present
Section	Introduction	CARS	CARS-oriented
			not CARS-oriented
		reciprocity	reader-friendly
			partly reader-friendly
			reader-responsible
		linearity	linear
			partly linear
			non-linear
		referencing	0-5 references
			6-10 reference
			>10 reference
Sentence	Conclusion	native evaluations	native-like
			not native-like

5. Results

Data were collected on three language levels in the journal articles: the textual level (the whole article), the section level (the Introduction section), and the sentence level (Conclusion).

5.1 Text level

Whether the papers contain an IMRD (Introduction-Method/Materials-Results-Discussion) structure was correlated with whether the author is native. Table 4 shows the results. The named relationship shows no statistical significance (χ^2=0.51, p>0.05).

Table 4. IMRD structure in texts by Anglophone and Polish authors

Native tongue of author	IMRD structure	
	Present	Not present

Anglophone	6	10
Polish	8	8

5.2 Section level

The Introduction section was looked at from four angles. First, we looked at the so-called Create-A-Research-Space movements. Furthermore, we looked at the degree of reciprocity and linearity in the texts and the use of references.

The CARS results are in table 5. No statistically significant relationship exists (χ^2=1.64, p>0.05) between the presence of Create-A-Research-Space moves (CARS-oriented or not) and nationality.

Table 5. CARS moves in texts by Anglophone and Polish authors

Native tongue of author	Number of CARS moves	
	0 or 1	2 or 3
Polish	6	10
Anglophone	4	12

A variety of deviations from the schema is noted, in both experimental and theoretical papers, of which the most frequent one is the deletion of one move, namely the second, i.e. "establishing a niche, by indicating a gap in the previous knowledge, or by extending previous knowledge in some way" (Swales & Feak, 2009, p. 244). Repeating one move and reordering of the moves was additionally observed. All in all, the occurrence of the CARS schema is not primarily conditioned by nationality but mainly by genre.

The degree of reciprocity depends on whether an outline of the text structure is clearly visible or given (='reader-friendly') or not (='reader-responsible'). In case of doubt, an intermediate category was applied; 'partly reader-friendly'. The results are in table 6. There is a statistically significant relationship between reader-friendliness and nationality: χ^2=8.99, p<0.05. Native texts are more likely to be reader-friendly.

Table 6. Reader-friendliness in texts by Anglophone and Polish authors

Native tongue of author	Reader-friendly?		
	Yes	Partly	No
Polish	5	5	6
English	12	4	0

A text is marked 'linear' when no digression is present, it is marked as 'non-linear' if the digression takes up the majority of the text, and it is marked as 'partly linear' if a majority of the information is additional. The relevant results are in table 7. A significant relationship exists between native tongue and linearity: χ^2=9.23, p<0.05. Native texts are more likely to be linear.

Table 7. Linearity in texts by Anglophone and Polish authors

Native tongue of author	Linear?		
	Yes	Partly	No
Polish	3	10	3
English	11	0	5

Three degrees of referencing are incorporated. The results are in table 8. No statistically significant correlation between referencing and nationality is found (χ^2=2.00, p>0.05).

Table 8. Reference use by Anglophone and Polish authors

Native tongue of author	Number of references used		
	0-5	6-10	10+
Polish	7	7	2
English	5	7	4

5.3 Sentence level

The nativeness of sentences (after editing) is determined on the basis of evaluations by native speakers. The informants were asked to read each of 32 sets of 5 sentences (1 author per set; 16 sets for each nationality) carefully, and then to mark the set as native or non-native. Table 9 shows how many native and non-native sentence sets are evaluated as native/non-native. The success rate with which the native speakers assessed the author's native tongue ('native English' or 'not native English') is 55.8%, which is remarkably low. No relation seems to exist between nationality (of the author) and the correctness of the native tongue of the author.

Table 9. Assessed nativeness (by 53 Anglophone judges) of 32 sentence sets written by Anglophone and Polish authors

Native tongue of author	Evaluated as native English	Evaluated as non-native English
Polish	43.5%	56.5%
English	61.4%	38.6%

It should be clear that the native speakers are not able to detect the author's native tongue on the basis of these extracts. High numbers of native sentences are categorised as non-native and many non-native sentences are marked as native-looking.

5.4 Effect of year of publication

The relationship between the year of publication and the level of reciprocity turns out to be statistically significant for the Polish authors. A chi-square test reveals (χ^2=11.97, p<0.05) that newer articles written by Polish authors are more reader-friendly. The results are in table 10.

Table 10. Percentages of reader-friendly texts by Polish authors over three time periods

1990-2000	2001-2005	2006-2010
0%	57.1%	72.2%

The reciprocity levels of Polish authors writing in English seem to be moving towards the Anglo-American style at a high pace.

6. Answers to the research questions

Research Question a: Does the Polish style of academic writing in English deviate from native academic English at the (a) textual level, (b) section level, or (c) sentence level?

Differences are visible at the section level only, with Polish authors deviating from native patterns. As for the textual level, the writings of our Polish scholars do not deviate significantly from those of native authors. As for the sentence level, native speakers of English from various countries cannot reliably pick out the non-native sentences when confronted with randomly selected native and non-native stimulus sentences.

Research Question b: If the Polish style deviates from the native style at one or more of these levels, then in what way?

Significant results are visible at the section level. While the Polish authors are equally likely to apply the moves in the Create-A-Research-Space system and use a comparable number of references, non-native Introduction sections are more reader-responsible (i.e. less reader-friendly) and less linear (i.e. more digressive) than their native equivalents.

Research Question c: Has the Polish style of English academic writing changed in the last few decades?

The relationship between year of publication and level of reciprocity is statistically significant: more recent Polish articles are more likely to be reader-friendly than older ones. No significant relationship is encountered between year of publication and the other stylistic and linguistic features.

7. Comparison with the literature

Striving to write like a native speaker is usually considered to entail a command at the sentence level - vocabulary, grammar, and idioms mainly. This is usually the level that receives the most attention at schools where English is taught and this is what editors and authors try to perfect. Our results show that, indeed, the sentence level of non-native speakers of English reaches a level that makes these sentences hard to distinguish from native sentences. It is not clear to what degree the sentence level agreement with native sentences is due to editing, but the fact that even native sentences are often not distinguishable from non-native sentences suggests that nativeness in published academic English is difficult to determine. Both native and non-native speakers seem to abide by the same conventions regarding lexicon and grammar that the field of study prescribes. Our results also suggest that at the textual level the Polish authors follow the conventions in their field of expertise successfully, as at that level their texts cannot be distinguished from those of native speakers. At the textual level, too, more international conventions seem to apply.

7.1 IMRD structure, CARS moves, and referencing

The fact that no statistically significant relationship exists between nationality and the presence of IMRD structures (a textual feature) is in accordance with Golebiowski (1998), who says that Polish authors tend to follow the IMRD pattern. The lack of a significant relationship between nationality and the application of the CARS schema (Introduction section) is not in line with the findings of Taylor and Tingguang (1991), who indicate a relationship between nationality and the employment of the move schema (see Swales, 1990). Referencing, contrary to Golebiowski's findings (1998), has also not pointed towards any statistically significant results. Our results, however, suggest that as far as referencing is concerned a move towards the Anglophone style is taking place, which suggests that changes have been taking place in recent decades.

7.2 Reciprocity

Our results show that the Polish writing habits show clear traces of the Teutonic style. Polish English is significantly more digressive and assigns more responsibility to readers. Digressive writing is more oriented to content than to form (Golebiowski, 1998) and allows additional information. Moreover, when deciding on which information and topics to include, authors applying this style assume that it is the reader's responsibility to understand the background to the research. In other words, readers have to work harder to distinguish core information from additional information, and Polish authors assign relatively much responsibility to readers when it comes to keeping track of the section and paragraph structure.

A similar situation is visible in the comparison of Czech and English writing: Čmejrková (1994) asserts that the Czech style of writing is associated with the Teutonic style of thinking as it presents written knowledge in which it is the reader's responsibility to understand the message conveyed in the academic prose.

The reciprocity findings are in line with Golebiowski's findings (1998) on Polish and English-language publications written by Polish academics and with Clyne's (1987) results. Golebiowski (1998, pp. 83-84) observes that Polish authors tend to give a very general picture of the research, and then gradually come to the final point. Moreover, when deciding on which information and topics to include, they assume that it is the reader's responsibility. Connor (1997) explains that the approach is based on politeness and on "not patronizing the reader", who is expected to be "intelligent" and "knowledgeable" (p. 51). It seems that Polish authors choose not to give up their academic etiquette, while editors do not consider this digressiveness to be less correct or less publishable. Non-native authors increasingly seem to be focussing their actions on "certain standards which are taken for granted as rules of conduct [...] determined not only by what [...] the writer has to say [...] but also by the joint expectation of the conversants that they should understand one another" (Nystrand, 1986, p. 48).

Change is in the air, apparently. Recent Polish articles are more likely to be reader-friendly than older ones. Publications from before the year 2000 are more patterned on the Teutonic style of writing and resemble more closely the traditional Polish style used in academic publications, in which the author tends to give information and textual guidance. This is in line with comments made by Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008) on a possible tendency of Polish authors towards American-oriented traditions.

8. Conclusion

Our findings can contribute to the discussion on what is likely to be the nature of Academic English in a scientific world in which non-native influences are increasingly becoming a reality. Non-native speakers may eventually even have "significant influence on the spread of English" (Jenkins, 2003, p. 42) and could influence the academic stylistic and linguistic range. The question is whether they are willing to adjust their writing style completely and whether they might in fact add a new style rather than conform to the existing one.

8.1 The consciousness of the choice to adjust one's writing style

Duszak (1994) points out that some non-natives may "transmit discourse patterns typical of their own tongue but alien to English", causing not only "lower interest and/or appreciation" but also a possible failure to get published; thus "the academic register could become a barrier to a successful proliferation of scholarly ideas" (p. 291). This lack of adjustment to the international norm may be conscious and not

merely an inability. Although Polish authors may be able and prepared to make their written English correct and idiomatic, it is our assessment that it may well be that at some stylistic level the choice is made not to adjust to a foreign norm. Our results do not reveal whether Polish authors consciously maintain certain Polish features in their English writings but it seems likely that the well-known Polish pride is a contributing factor in stylistic features deviating from those of native English texts.

8.2 Variation in the international norm

Doing Contrastive Rhetoric generates awareness of the rich variation of styles employed by authors with different nationalities and begs the question as to whether there is an actual need for an internationally accepted style. Variation in rhetorical style seems to be both a hindrance and an enrichment. The relevant question seems to be what the degree is to which non-nativeness affects the perceived quality. The Polish-English style of writing deserves more in-depth analysis in order to determine how to improve the way Polish academics write and publish in English, without them losing the sense that publishing in Polish and applying a Polish style when writing in English is valuable.

Jenkins (2003) indicates that many native speakers comfortably speak English with a regional or other accent without striving to meet the linguistic norm. Indeed, even in formal academic writing some variation is accepted amongst native speakers, making papers from the United States stylistically and linguistically different from those written by Englishmen. Should this tolerance to variation perhaps also be extended to non-native speakers and their English? Should this group of authors also be entitled to add their own style to this international language when writing academically?

The choice whether to adapt to native norms to a degree lies with authors themselves. A natural tendency to adjust to those norms is common. However, certain stylistic features in writing reflect the way the author thinks and does research, and the question is whether such features should be eliminated merely to make the text look native. One might conclude that features that do not confuse an international audience, both native and not native, have the right to exist in an international academic writing context. While being willing and able to adjust to the native norms at the sentence level, Polish authors apparently choose to assign some responsibility to readers when it comes to the section level. When it comes to the sentence level, these authors are abiding by the linguistic rules of English without trying to impose a personal style. Their tendency not to willingly adjust to native textual norms caters to the critics of Kaplan's Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis in the sense that the Anglophone stylistic norm may increasingly be considered less dominant, and more room is created for the proliferation of styles arising from other cultures.

8.2 Future research

Future research should focus on factors at play other than nativeness. It should, for instance, try to determine in which ways British and American academic styles are distinct or whether the cultural and academic exchanges between these two cultures is leading to a common Anglophone style. Also, the differences between the styles of authors not necessarily due to native tongue deserve more attention. Experience in the field, writing talent, international experience, and, for instance, exposure to English are different for authors. Kanoksilapatham (2007) argues that reasons for differences may be due to the closeknit-ness of the scientific community, expectations of the community members, and, for instance, national research policy. Such factors may also be at play in Poland and are not the same for every author. The corpus of writings researched was not large enough to iron out such effects or to measure their impact, and so future research should be done on a larger corpus.

Research such as the one presented here can be used to improve academic English classes. Students can be taught to which extent and in which way non-nativeness is likely to stick to their writings, and they

could be urged to form an opinion about the desirability, or acceptability of such features. Those students who have reached the highest possible level of English can choose to go the extra mile and shed the final subtle traces of their native tongue, or simply decide to embrace them.

Dick Smakman is assistant professor at the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics. He teaches English language proficiency and Sociolinguistics. His research focuses on sociolinguistics, phonetics and language learning.

Agnieska Duda-Osiewacz graduated from the department of English Language and Culture of Leiden University. She wrote her MA thesis on the topic as reported in this article.

References

Ball, R., & Tunger, D. (2005). Bibliometrische Analysen - Daten, Fakten und Methoden - Grundwissen Bibliometrie für Wissenschaftler, Wissenschaftsmanager, Forschungseinrichtungen und Hochschulen. *Schriften des Forschungszentrum Jülich, Reihe Bibliothek, 12*. Jülich: Forschungszentrum Jülich.

Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of register variation: A cross-linguistic comparison.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Birdsong, D. (1992). Ultimate Attainment in Second Language Acquisition. *Language, 68*, 706-43.

Bloch, J., & Chi, L. (1995). A comparison of the use of citations in Chinese and English academic discourse. In D. Belcher, & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language*. Norwood: Ablex.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor; Michigan University Press.

Clyne, M. (1981). Culture and discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics, 5*, 61- 66.

Clyne, M. (1987). Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics, 11*, 211-247.

Clyne, M. (1996). *Inter-cultural communication at work. Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Čmejrková, S. (1994). Non-native (academic) writing. In S. Cmejrková, F. Danes, & E. Havlová (Eds.), *Writing vs speaking. Language, text, discourse, communication* (pp. 303-310). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Connor, U. (1997). *Contrastive rhetoric. Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge: CUPQA

Connor, U. (2002). New directions in Contrastive Rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*, 493-510.

Connor, U. (2008). Mapping multidimensional aspects of research. Reaching to intercultural rhetoric. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 1-8). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, W. V. (2008). Introduction. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 1-8). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Crystal, D. (1991). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell

Duszak, A. (1994). Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of Pragmatics, 21*, 291-313.

Duszak, A. (1997). Analyzing digressiveness in Polish academic texts. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 323-341). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Duszak, A. (1998). Academic writing in English and Polish: comparing and subverting genres. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*, 191-213.

Duszak, A., & Lewkowicz, J. (2008). Publishing academic texts in English: a Polish perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 108-120.

Erling, E. J. (2004). English as the language of the European academic community: Questions from the Freie Universität Berlin. In A. Duszak & U. Okulska (Eds.), *Speaking from the margin. Global English from a European Perspective* (pp. 77-90). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.

Golebiowski, Z. (1998). Rhetorical approaches to scientific writing: an English-Polish contrastive study. *Text, 18*, 67-102.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory & practice of writing*. London: Longman.

Hakuta K, Bialystok, E., & Wiley, E. (2003). Critical Evidence: a test of the critical-period hypothesis for second-language acquisition, *Psychological Science, 14*, 31-38.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: a new typology. In U. Connor, & R. Kaplan (Eds), *Writing across languages: analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-153). Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes. A resource book for students*. London/New York: Routledge.

Kalantaridis, C. (2000) *Globalization and entrepreneurial response in post-socialist transformation: A case study from Transcarpathia, Ukraine*, European Planning Studies, 8(3), pp. 285–299.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language learning, 16*, 1-20.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2007). Writing scientific research articles in Thai and English: similarities and differences. *Silpakorn University International Journal, 7*, 172-203.

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

Kubota, R (2001). Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 9-38.

Kubota, R., & Lehner, N. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 7-27.

Matsuda, P., & Atkinson, D. (2008). A conversation on contrastive rhetoric. Dwight Atkinson and Paul Mei Matsuda talk about issues, conceptualizations, and the future of Contrastive Rhetoric. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 277-298). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Meho Li, & Yang, K. (2007). Impact of data sources on citation counts and rankings of LIS faculty: Web of Science versus Scopus and Google Scholar. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 58*, 2105-25.

Nystrand, M. (1986). *The structure of written communication: Studies in reciprocity between writers and readers*. London: Academic Press.

Okamura, A. (2008). Use of citation forms in academic texts by writers in the L1 & L2 context. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 7*, 61-81.

Precht, K. (1998). A cross-cultural comparison of letters of recommendation. *English for Specific Purposes, 17*, 3, 241-265.

Reichelt, M. (2005). English in Poland. *World Englishes, 24*, 217-225.

Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introduction. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 55-67.

Scollon, R. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric, contrastive poetics, or perhaps something else? *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 352-363.

Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 765-774.

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

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2009). *Academic writing for graduate students. Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sweet, E.L. (2009) Ethnographic Understandings of Gender and Economic Transition in Siberia: Implications for Planners and Policy Makers. *European Planning Studies, 17*, 697-713

Taylor, G., & Tingguang, C. (1991). Linguistic, cultural, and subcultural issues in contrastive discourse analysis: Anglo-American and Chinese scientific texts. *Applied Linguistics, 12*, 319-335.

Todorović, L. (2003). The IMRAD layout. *Archive of Oncology, 11*, 203-205.

Wales, K. (2001). *Dictionary of Stylistics* (Second edition). London: Longman.

Zamel, V. (1997) Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 341-343.