# Introducing English for Research Publication Purposes. John Flowerdew and Pejman Habibie, Routledge (2022). 150 pages. ISBN: 978-0-367-33058-3.

Mahsa Alinasab [a, *]

[a] *Urmia University, Iran*

In recent years, English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) has turned into a hot debate among scholars. Flowerdew's (2015) seminal work on the significance of English in scholarly publication prepared the grounds for considering ERPP an independent field. The challenges and intricacies of publication in English-medium high-indexed journals have induced ERPP as a prioritized concern in non-Anglophone communities. This 10-chapter volume (entitled Introducing ERPP) is a timely attempt, yet surprisingly the first, by John Flowerdew and Pejman Habibie on the significance of ERPP in provoking equal opportunities for Anglophone and non-Anglophone scholars to disseminate knowledge. The book adheres to a neat structure with an informative introduction and an insightful conclusion. Other chapters deal with ERPP background (chapter two), the notion of publish or perish (chapter three), English discourses and perspectives (chapter four), theoretical and research grounds of ERPP (chapters five and six), gatekeeping issues (chapter seven), ERPP and digitalization (chapter eight), and ERPP pedagogical directions (chapter nine).

In this review, I would like to discuss the main contributions of this book as well as highlighting its major shortcomings. Firstly and most notably, the authors have made invaluable attempts to clarify the ERPP concept in terms of scope, background, theory, and research. In chapter 2, the authors' arguments based on globalization and neoliberalism are fairly convincing to establish a robust background for ERPP that is mainly marketized. This makes sense as one considers the power of English as the dominant language of knowledge dissemination and, consequently, the spread of *publish or perish* views around the world. The importance of *publish or perish* notion is undeniable in ERPP discussions. However, it can still carry negative and phobic connotations for early researchers and writers, especially in a book that is a leading contribution to ERPP. The authors could also have mentioned positive-looking phraseology to emphasize the determining role of publication in scholars' success. The best example is Gray et al.'s (2018) *publish and flourish* idea, which regards publication as a springboard for scholars' academic improvement, not underestimating respective challenges.

* Corresponding author: Department of English Language & Literature, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran
*Email address:* m.alinasab@urmia.ac.ir

The next chapter embarks upon the research article (RA) genre as the major target of the publication game. As the authors rightly confirm, RA publication in accredited English journals is considered a benchmark for graduation, promotion, and future career, which turns out to be more important when it involves English as an Additional Language (EAL). Although the authors make the point that both Anglophone and EAL scholars go through the publication odyssey, the burden is still felt more by non-Anglophones. EAL scholars encounter numerous challenges in reading and writing research in English, joining wider discourse communities, and even contacting journal editors. For instance, non-Anglophone scholars encounter certain challenges in reading recent research published in English and updating their field knowledge (Flowerdew, 2015). Moreover, the authors rarely discuss the challenges facing EAL novice scholars, which are not linguistically loaded. In other words, most EAL scholars reside in developing countries where supervisor-student relationships are not fully mature. For example, graduate and doctoral students seem frustrated by the lack of support from their supervisors due to many reasons, such as the heavy workload. Even worse, universities and academic institutions deteriorate this into a phobic situation for young scholars through almost no collaboration in funding and rewarding student publication. Given such problems, EAL graduate and postgraduate students, with or without English proficiency, are left with their publicaphobia, which is not considered by Flowerdew and Habibie in Introducing ERPP.

Chapter four paints a two-sided picture of English globalization that strongly establishes ERPP as a concern for non-Anglophone scholars. The first perspective, laissez-faire liberalism, remains outside political orientations and assumes an impartial role for the English language in scientific communication. The opposite view, however, introduces English as a killer language with an imperialistic impetus (Pennycook, 2000). Although the authors do not overtly discuss their position between the two orientations, they provide corroborating evidence on how EAL inequality has affected scholars' publication trajectories. Indeed, Habibie's (2019) notion of the *Lucky Anglophone Scholar Doctrine* paves the way for more consideration of EAL scholars' concerns in the publication journey consisting of discursive and non-discursive issues. Chapters five and six revisit ERPP theory and research directions, which are rather well-known to ERPP practitioners. In chapter five, genre theory, social constructivism, and world systems theory are elaborated as the main theoretical grounds for ERPP. An important contribution of the chapter is its mention of the power-agency relationship in the publication process. Though lightly cited, this part clarifies how novice scholars are victims of their weak power and the position of institutions and supervisors can determine the success or failure of the publication. The authors go on to note that core countries, such as the US and the UK, create the rules of scholarly publication and knowledge dissemination, and (semi)periphery nations simply play the game rules built by the core. It is discomforting that the authors offer no solutions, and even overt objections, to the core-periphery dichotomy in the scholarly world, a point that might frustrate aspiring EAL scholars who come to this volume with the hope of finding at least minimizing, not to say removing, remedies for such inequalities in knowledge sharing.

The starring part of Introducing ERPP is certainly chapter seven which pinpoints the intricacies and complexities of the peer review process in international journals. The bias against EAL writers in journal peer reviews is the main discussion of this chapter. The authors believe that the bias has become a fallacy among young EAL scholars and is not always true. For example, most editors and reviewers comment on the content rather than the language of RAs and how the work contributes to a broader knowledge community. However, I think journal reviews and editor decisions, particularly in high-quality journals, are not without some sort of bias. There are cases in which editors reject the RAs written by EAL writers from developing countries due to political reasons (such as international sanctions against those countries). A clear example concerns my submission to an American journal two years ago when the editor rejected the manuscript due to restrictions set by the US government against some Asian countries, including Iran. Moreover, given the

popularity of English as the major language of scholarly writing and publication, Anglophone writers are invited to review EAL RAs and thus serve a gatekeeping function (Flowerdew, 2015).

Using fresh terminology, the authors provide a vivid image of ERPP-digitalization connections in chapter eight. *Ethnoscape, Epistemoscape, Genrescape*, and *Pedagoscape* are the four new outcomes of digital ERPP. Digitalization has provided the opportunity for scholars to gain international recognition, share unlimited knowledge, practice multimodality in knowledge production and dissemination, and receive online instruction on the publication process. As the authors also point out, digitization brings about shortcomings. For example, authors from the periphery do not have access to high-quality publications, and institutions take no steps for their subscription to journals. Some publishers also do not allow public sharing of their publications, such as most journals published by *Elsevier* and *Sage*. It turns out that digitalization could be a concern in peripheral countries, including Iran, where EAL writers mainly live in. Therefore, the trend of EAL disadvantage seems ever-present in the scholarly world (Li & Flowerdew, 2020).

Chapter nine touches upon the pedagogical aspects of ERPP. Flowerdew and Habibie delicately focus on the discursive dimension of the ERPP pedagogy and how to research this aspect through genre-informed, corpus-based, and pragmatic methodological orientations. The main point is that scholarly writing should not be learned and practiced only through experience and requires formal pedagogical support. Such initiatives must integrate both discursive and non-discursive aspects of ERPP. The latter involves scholars' need to identify target journals and communicate with gatekeepers and editors, which should be considered in addition to the RA rhetorical and linguistic knowledge. The last part of the chapter poses ERPP teacher education as a direction for future research. I feel that this point deserves considerable attention, even a chapter, which can go far beyond a single paragraph. As the authors also note, in many cases, tutors and supervisors are not adequately equipped with scholarly knowledge in order to teach ERPP. The aspect of ERPP incompetence among academic instructors and supervisors should be studied and elaborated on separately. This direction gains significance when it comes to the life-determining role of publication for young scholars at graduate and postgraduate levels who face the fear of publish or perish. In the concluding chapter, the authors provide an account of the current ERPP in universities and what its future might look like.

Despite the above-mentioned caveats, the volume is a welcome attempt in the fledgling ERPP research and practice. Indeed, Flowerdew and Habibie are timely in elaborating ERPP scope, theory, and research in a single volume, all of which are either orally debated or scattered over a large body of EAP/ESP research. It will be of interest to EAP/ESP practitioners to appreciate ERPP as an established independent area of research and practice. In addition, EAP programmers and teachers can use the volume as an inspiration and take proper actions to consider aspiring scholars' writing and publication concerns, and EAL communities may lend themselves easily to such pedagogical reshaping. I highly recommend the book to emerging researchers who are well aware of the importance of ERPP in helping young aspiring scholars catch up with the everyday growing publication world.

## References

Flowerdew, J. (2015). Some thoughts on English for research publication purposes (ERPP) and related issues. *Language Teaching, 48*(2), 250-262.

Gray, T., Madson, L., & Jackson, M. (2018). Publish & Flourish: Helping scholars become better, more prolific writers. *To Improve the Academy, 37*(2), 243-256.

Habibie, P. (2019). To be native or not to be native: That is not the question. In P. Habibie & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Novice writers and scholarly publication: Authors, mentors, gatekeepers* (pp. 35– 52). Palgrave Macmillan.

Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2020). Teaching English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP): A review of language teachers' pedagogical initiatives. *English for Specific Purposes*, *59*, 29- 41.

Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics, ideology: From colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics, and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 107– 119). John Benjamins.