



Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning

Vol. 14, No. 1, February 2024, 81-96

ISSN: 1792-1244

Available online at <http://rpltl.eap.gr>

This article is issued under the [Creative Commons License Deed. Attribution 3.0 Unported \(CC BY 3.0\)](#)

Insights into academic writing in English as lingua franca contexts

Yasemin Bayyurt & Derya Altınmakas

In an era where English is the global lingua franca, academic writing has transformed significantly. This manuscript explores academic writing in English as a lingua franca (ELF) contexts, tracing the journey of English from colonization to lingua franca status and contextualizing it within evolving paradigms of English and language teaching worldwide. We delve into ELF research, where English plays a multifaceted role as a resource for multilingual communication. Our examination encompasses ELF's definitions, diverse users, and English as a multilingual franca. Our focus shifts to academic writing practices within ELF contexts, scrutinizing unique challenges and opportunities arising from linguistic diversity, cultural nuances, and communication strategies. Through a review of existing studies on academic writing in ELF contexts, we offer practical insights for educators, researchers, and students navigating this realm. This manuscript guides readers through the intricate world of academic writing in the globalized domain of English as a lingua franca.

Key words: English as a lingua franca, academic writing, higher education, English for academic purposes

1. Introduction

Today, English has achieved the status of the most widely taught and learned language globally, thanks to centuries of language spread that began in the 16th century. The number of English speakers and learners worldwide has now reached billions. This global phenomenon prompted the emergence of academic fields such as World Englishes (WE) (Kachru, 1992), English as an International Language (EIL) (Matsuda, 2012) in the 1980s, and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Jenkins, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2011) in the late 1990s and 2000s. These developments reflect the growing necessity to examine, standardize, and adapt English language usage in diverse contexts

across the globe. In this paper, our primary focus lies on ELF and writing in English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL; L2) as a specific area of study. During the past two decades, research on L2 writing in ELF contexts is focusing more and more on academic writing in higher education institutions in English medium universities around the world.

In this paper, we summarize and comment on the studies on L2 academic writing practices in higher education institutions published in three journals: the *Journal of English as Lingua Franca (JELF)*, the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes (JEAP)*, and the *Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW)*. First, we provide a theoretical background by defining ELF; then, we give an overview of studies on L2 academic writing practices in higher education institutions; and finally, we discuss how research on academic writing within the ELF paradigm may contribute to our understanding of integration of an ELF perspective in academic writing practices. We can say that research on ELF academic writing is getting more attention among L2 researchers in line with the increasing number of English medium instruction universities, academic publications written by L2 users of English and other domains of written academic English language use. This calls for changing people's attitudes and mindsets towards L2 writers and their writing practices. Hence, we can say that there is still a long way to go before people change their mindsets and prejudices against the inclusion of people's attitudes and opinions in academic writing practices (Bayyurt and Sifakis, 2015; Yılmaz and Römer, 2020).

1.1 Defining ELF

In simpler terms, ELF is defined as “the use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the preferred medium of communication, and often, the only option” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p.7). Jenkins (2015) expanded that definition, coining the term ‘English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF)’, which encompasses the diverse uses and users of English. EMF refers to English not just as a shared means of communication for speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds but also as the language of choice for communication. In fact, most interactions in different domains occur between individuals from diverse linguacultural backgrounds, even in ESL or EFL contexts. While the WE paradigm categorizes countries based on their relationship with English, ELF research shifts its focus, placing other languages at the center and viewing 'English' as a supplementary resource. We will delve further into this distinction in the subsequent section. In the WE paradigm, countries fall into three categories (see Kachru, 1985, 1992): the inner circle (e.g., the USA, the UK, Australia), where English is employed as a first language; the outer circle (e.g., Singapore, India, the Philippines), where it serves as a second or additional language; and the expanding circle (e.g., Japan, Germany, Turkey), where it is considered as a foreign language.

A monolingual viewpoint of English language teaching has dominated research for a period of time in applied linguistics. The immigration waves that started during the late 20th Century and the early 21st Century from Asia, Middle East, Africa and South America as well as Ukraine and other Eastern European contexts towards other European countries, North America, Australia, led to the rise of multilingualism and multiculturalism in the host countries that received migrants. As a result of this, just like other related disciplines of study, that is, sociology, political science and similar, the focus of research in applied linguistics also shifted towards the integration of a multilingual and/or multicultural perspective in second language use both in written and spoken medium of communication. In what follows, we give an overview of the development of the understanding of English as a lingua franca, which we briefly defined earlier in this paper, over

the past two decades. Recently, Jenkins and Lopriore (2021) delineated the emergence of ELF and its recent conceptualization as follows:

[ELF] began following in World Englishes footsteps in just over twenty years later, although research into ELF did not gather pace until the start of the new millennium. [...] Unlike World Englishes, *it cannot be discussed in terms of varieties of English*... Most recently, *ELF researchers have taken the multilingualism of ELF users into far greater consideration* than they had done previously. This in turn has led to a far more *prominent role in the conceptualization of ELF for languages other than English*, with a focus on speakers' use of their multilingual resources rather than 'English only', as they *translanguage* among the languages including English in their entire linguistic repertoires. (p. xvi; our emphasis)

The above quotation summarizes how conceptualization of ELF changed over the period of the last twenty years. As Jenkins and Lopriore (2021) indicate, ELF researchers benefit from the advantages of a multilingual approach in ELF research by giving significance to the linguistic repertoires of the multilingual speakers of English by putting 'English' in brackets and embracing multilingual repertoires of the speakers of other languages. Hence, this perspective takes into consideration 'multilingualism as the norm' and attempts to reduce the impact of monolingual English speakers' influence on the changing linguistic ecology of English language use around the world. This perspective takes other languages in the center and sees 'English' as one of the linguistic resources that multilingual speakers can use in interaction with others, unlike the previous monolingual approaches to English language use where English would be in the center, putting all the other languages in the periphery (Erduyan and Bayyurt, 2022).

1.2 ELF research

In its earlier phases, ELF research primarily focused on spoken language use as researchers were interested in analyzing the great variance observed in the language that speakers from different linguistic backgrounds tended to employ. The communication among people in ELF contexts took place in a very natural way with speakers paying little attention to 'correctness', as preached by standard written and spoken modes of language ideologies (see, e.g., Hynninen and Solin, 2017; Mauranen, 2003, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2004, 2018; Yılmaz, 2021; Yılmaz and Römer, 2021). The difference between the spoken and written modes of communication enabled researchers to gain more insights into written ELF used in academic and non-academic contexts comprehensively (Flowerdew, 2019; Horner, 2018; Marlina and Xu, 2018). These analyses involved critical analysis of different genres of writing ranging from emails to academic research articles, as they constitute the dominant medium of communication in academia (Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2013; Mauranen, 2011, 2012; Mauranen, Pérez-Llantada and Swales, 2010). Since there is a drastic increase in the number of L2 readers and writers of English, it is essential to analyse how they express themselves in a medium of communication which necessitates the writers to conform to rules more than in the case of spoken language use. The range of studies on written academic ELF may involve challenges that L2 writers of English come across when they are asked to conform to a particular standard English language use in their academic assignments, theses, journal papers, books and book chapters. As a policy, many journals expect authors to get native speakers check their papers before finalising and submitting them (e.g., Flowerdew, 2000; Hanauer, Sheridan and Englander, 2019; Mur-Dueñas, 2013). While many scholars welcome the

merits of the flexible use of written ELF to facilitate writing among non-native English language writers in formal and informal modes of communication, some other scholars still have reservations (e.g., Rowley-Jolivet, 2017; Tribble, 2017, 2019).

Jenkins (2015) categorizes ELF research into three distinct phases, referred to as ELF1, ELF2, and ELF3. The ELF1 phase corresponds to the early stages of ELF research. During this period, ELF was primarily viewed as a departure from the World Englishes paradigm. In this phase, researchers (see Jenkins, 2014, 2017; Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey, 2011; Mauranen, Hynninen and Ranta, 2010; Pitzl, 2016; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2011, among others) were mainly focused on investigating postcolonial English language usage and the diverse varieties of English that had emerged. Their goal was to establish and construct a new paradigm that centered around the experiences of English language users in global contexts. This paradigm shift marked the transition from traditional approaches to a more dynamic and inclusive understanding of how English was used as a lingua franca among speakers from various linguistic backgrounds worldwide. The aim was to describe and codify ELF as a variety of English following similar attempts for outer circle varieties (Filipino English, Singlish, and similar) in the WE paradigm. Earlier research on ELF wanted to show that ELF could be separated from other varieties of English with its distinct features of English language use in the expanding circle contexts, with people from different linguacultural backgrounds (see, among others, Modiano, 1999; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2011). During this phase, Jenkins (2000) established a Lingua Franca core for pronunciation, highlighting what would have happened in the absence of these core features causing intelligibility problems in ELF interactions. Based on the VOICE corpus of ELF, Seidlhofer (2004) also attracted attention towards lexico-grammatical features of English language use, including zero marking of the third person singular in the present simple tense, shared by the majority of ELF speakers.

In the second phase of ELF research, ELF2, a variety-oriented perception of ELF was no longer considered as a valid explanation of the dynamic nature of English usage in such contexts. As Jenkins and Lopriore (2021, p. xvi) indicate, it took ELF researchers some time to realize “how contextualized and contingent the phenomenon is, and that, unlike World Englishes, it cannot be discussed in terms of varieties of English”. In the earlier phases of ELF, researchers focused on the differences between ELF and World Englishes, as well as the fluidity of English in face-to-face and online interactions among people with different L1 backgrounds. As Jenkins (2015) indicated, although ELF could no longer be characterized as a distinct linguistic variety, its dynamic use among people with different lingua cultural backgrounds emphasized the variation in the use of the English language in bi-/multi-lingual contexts around the world.

In the third phase of ELF research, ELF3, a re-theorization of ELF was put forth by Jenkins (2015, p. 77), as ELF moving away from the idea of “ELF as a framework to ELF” towards “ELF within a framework of multilingualism”. According to Jenkins (2015, p. 74), English as a multilingua franca “refers to multilingual communicative settings in which English is known to everyone present, and is therefore always potentially ‘in the mix’, regardless of whether or not, and how much, it is actually used”. Hence, the understanding of an ELF context goes beyond the earlier understanding of ELF taking place in expanding circle contexts. In fact, it has expanded its use and scope beyond the expanding circle context, and it is unfair to refer to ELF as interaction taking place only between the people whose mother tongue is not English. Due to migration, study abroad and other reasons (e.g., business, sports), English has become the language of negotiation and/or mediation among different groups of people in the society. Thus, the recent understanding of ELF

as English as Multilingua Franca (Jenkins, 2015, 2017) can be considered as an opportunity to use English as a language that is available to interlocutors in the immediate context and may or may not be chosen as language of communication. In this definition, Jenkins highlights the complexity of ELF and argues that it is an outcome of the linguistic diversity of English language users in ELF contexts. Jenkins (2017, p. 3) updates her conceptualization of ELF as follows:

ELF by definition, involves the use of English among speakers who have different first languages, most of whom are themselves multilingual in that only a small minority of people who use English in intercultural communication are native English speakers, and a still smaller subsection of this minority are monolingual. Thus, ELF is by definition a multilingual phenomenon, and would not exist at all if it were not.

As can be seen in the quotation above, Jenkins highlights that viewing ELF within the framework of multilingualism by linking it to multilingualism research, critical approaches to ELF usage may assist scholars in drawing links between multilingualism research, critical approaches to SLA, and intercultural communication (see, among others, Bayyurt and Yalçın, 2022; Erduyan and Bayyurt, 2022). In light of these ELF definitions, we can say that ELF contexts can be described as contexts where multilingualism is the norm. In recent years, with the rise of English Medium Instruction (EMI) universities as part of the internationalization of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) around the world, any tertiary level education context in either outer or expanding circle contexts (and even in inner circle contexts, such as the US and the UK) are considered as ELF contexts. In such contexts, communication and interaction take place between native and non-native speakers or among non-native speakers altogether. In the next section, we situate ELF in academic contexts, where we see the manifestation of academic writing enacted widely all over the world.

2. Situating the ELF paradigm in academic contexts

In recent years, as discussed earlier in this article, the ELF paradigm has emerged as a dynamic lens through which scholars examine language use in academic writing across diverse higher education settings. This section delves into the nuanced landscape of ELF within academic contexts, exploring its implications, challenges, and transformative potential. Before exploring the influence of the ELF paradigm in various academic settings, we unravel its impact on communication practices, linguistic diversity, and the evolving nature of language use in higher education institutions. Subsequently, we examine the specific ways in which the ELF paradigm is situated within the academic writing practices in these newly emerging, linguistically diverse higher education contexts.

2.1 Exploring academic writing practices in Higher Education Institutions

In the last two decades, to strengthen their positions in international ranking systems, universities have been striving to establish new international collaborations with other universities and relevant business sectors by offering new research and educational programs for academics and students all around the world (Dafouz and Smit, 2020). The number of internationalized HEIs has increased in inner circle and expanding circle countries (Dafouz and Smit, 2020), as a consequence of the Bologna declaration (Murata and Iino, 2018), student/staff exchange programs and mobility, and admission of international students (Baker, 2015). HEIs accommodate “culturally, socially and linguistically heterogeneous student population”, who hold “different identities, understandings and habits of meaning-making to their learning” (Hyland, 2013, p. 54), bringing

along the ‘Englishization’ of education. The terms English as Medium of Instruction (EMI), English as Medium of Education (EME) or English-Medium Education in Multilingual Educational Settings (EMEMUS) refer to the usage of English merely for educational purposes and students’ content learning (Dafouz and Smit, 2016, 2020). In line with the previously mentioned definitions of ELF, the first “E” in EME and EMEMUS entirely reflect the dynamics of ELF usage in academic contexts.

HEIs admitting and recruiting international students and academics respectively constitute a fine example to this, as in these contexts native English speakers (NES), in other words L1 speakers of English (ENL), and non-native English speakers (NNES), in other words L2 speakers of English (EAL), work, interact and study together. Other representative examples are some HEIs in the expanding circle contexts where English tends to be employed along with students’ first languages as medium of instruction in some programs (Dafouz and Smit, 2020) and some other settings in which instructors and students have a similar linguacultural background and use English only for content learning and teaching (Murata and Iino, 2018).

Regarding the socio-linguistic reality of internationalized HEIs, Mauranen (2006) argued that academic discourse communities and academic domains are suitable for ELF research because academic language is *influential*, as it creates its own norms and ‘educated varieties’, *demanding* for its interlocutors, as “high-level” of “intellectual content and real-time speaking” (Mauranen, 2006, p. 148) coexist, innately *international*, and has its own genres. And, in line with this, we contend that the ELF paradigm can particularly inform the academic writing situation at HEIs and academic writing research. ELF communication is actualized by its interlocutors for a purpose and, at HEIs, writing is done for a specific purpose and in English in specific domains, such as teaching/learning, academic research, academic publications, international events (e.g., conferences, seminars, workshops) and so on. In all these higher education contexts, scientific communication entails written modes of communication and English is the language of academic ‘dialogue’ and ‘progress’ in global contexts (Mauranen, 2018). In such contexts, ELF users, both students and scholars, are expected to meet the Standard English norms required in academic writing in their written coursework and publications, respectively. Although deviations from the Standard English norms at lexicon and syntactical levels are now acknowledged and legitimized under the notion of intelligibility in spoken forms, deviations in written form, especially in academic discourse, are still considered mostly unacceptable. Standard English functions within a monolithic framework and structure, as it always sets the benchmark in accordance with NES varieties and deems any form of deviation from these set norms as improper in academic writing. Thus, by definition, Standard English is ideological and creates an unjust powerplay in evaluation of texts produced by NESs and NNESs scholars and students in the academia. In that sense, mostly undergraduate university students and academics from the peripheral contexts are stigmatized.

The ideologically rooted nature of Standard English norms remains insufficient to capture the reality and actual written practices and products of users of English in academia, and gatekeepers, whoever they might be, fail to acknowledge two important points about these abovementioned groups. First of all, cognitively speaking, Englishes that develop both in NES and NNES interactions may “inevitably differ from the community norms of SE” (Hall, 2018, p. 78). Knowledge of Standard English is facilitated only through schooling, learning of grammar and literacy development in NESs, and not all NESs develop a notion of Standard English to the same degree and reach a point where they employ this knowledge effectively (Hyland, 2016), or even find themselves in situations where they have to conform to these norms. The same situation applies for NNESs; in

addition, in most cases they may even come up with more informed explanations on the use of language, as they have learned English with explicit language instruction, unlike NESs who have acquired and proceduralized the language, and their cognitive resources of language processing rely on declarative memory system and controlled recounts of language use. Therefore, it can be concluded that Standard English is “an institutionalized construct, and only really possible when the language is written” (Seidlhofer, 2018, p. 87), hence its strong ties with the teaching process, rather than an authentic and natural linguistic attainment of NESs, which NNESs lack. Therefore, simply associating Standard English norms with NES language use in a general manner and using this in academic discourses as the norm of reference functioning as an “ideological constraint against which deviance and difference are measured” (Pennycook, 2000, p. 118) can no longer provide sufficient lenses to understand and explain the writing practices of NNESs.

Secondly, no one can be ‘native’ to academic writing (Mauranen, 2012), and “there are no L1 writers of English in the sense that everyone has to learn, consciously, how to write” (Kirkpatrick, 2018, p. 145). Particularly at the undergraduate level, both NES and NNES students embark on their programs with very limited or no academic writing experience. For both groups of students, traditional writing methods lose significance upon entering university due to the diverse academic practices in place (see Hyland, 2013). As Breeze (2012, p. 3) argued in *Rethinking academic writing pedagogy for the European University*, being capable of writing very well is not just a beneficial supplementary skill but, instead, it is absolutely necessary for numerous university students. To gain admission to universities, students must submit a statement of purpose letter in English or undergo a locally or internationally acknowledged English proficiency test in order to be accepted in their English-medium programs, meaning that student writing consistently serves as the sole means through which they “both consolidate and demonstrate their understanding of their subjects” (Hyland, 2013, p. 55). Undoubtedly, undergraduate students are the most vulnerable stakeholders of academic discourse communities with their limited academic writing experiences and interactions in contrast to the postgraduate students or professional academics/scholars who have accumulated academic-disciplinary knowledge, writing experience and communicative practice by producing various genres of academic texts in English, be it their native language or second/foreign language. Given the strenuous nature of academic writing, producing texts in different genres might thereby cause a double burden on the shoulders of NNES students.

So far, ELF research in academic settings has prioritized spoken interactions among stakeholders in the discourse communities (Baker, 2015; Björkman, 2018; Mauranen, 2006), and there is scarcity of research on ELF writing. Along with her research team at the Helsinki University of Technology, Anna Mauranen initiated the English as an Academic Lingua Franca (ELFA) corpus in 2003. The ELFA includes spoken language data coming from lectures and graduate events, such as seminars, workshops, conferences, panels and thesis defense meetings recorded in their natural course of action (Mauranen, 2006, 2012). The corpus includes dialogic or polylogic speech events among NNESs and NESs. Most research focusing on the spoken interaction in academic domains used the data available in the ELFA corpus and analyzed syntactic features and phraseological units of ELF, discursal features such as preferences in discourse reflexivity, metadiscourse, and discourse organization, and the strategies ELF users employed for preventing linguistic misunderstandings (see Björkman, 2018 and Mauranen, 2006 for more). The initial priority given to spoken ELF over written ELF in academic settings is justifiable in the sense that “speech undoubtedly lends itself more readily to observing change than writing, which in its published form is heavily monitored and tends to be conservative” (Mauranen, 2006, p. 146) and

writing is a more controlled mode of expression which does not leave much room for flexibility and creativity (Kimura and Canagarajah, 2018). In contrast to the 1970s, where the focus of second language writing research was most vitally on syntactic and rhetorical aspects of texts created by NNES students and how these differed from native speakers' writing, recent years have seen a shift. Contemporary research recognizes NNES writers as integral members of discourse communities with unique practices and stances towards writing, and as language users who can leverage their multicultural and multilingual insights within their own languages (Hyland, 2003). And there are, of course, several studies on undergraduate writing in diverse EFL settings (see Altinmakas and Bayyurt, 2019; Hirose, 2003; Kobayashi and Rinnert, 2012; Leki, 2001; Lu and Ai, 2012; Manchón, 2009, 2011; Morton et al., 2015; Naghdipour, 2021), which, although including representative cases of ELF writing, do not however discuss their findings specifically from an ELF perspective.

In 2011, Mauranen and her colleagues initiated *The Corpus of Written English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings* (WrELFA, 2015) project, which helped to counterbalance the scarcity of ELF research in writing and uncover the characteristics of ELF academic writing. WrELFA consists of written data coming from unpublished and unedited academic texts, that is texts that have not been professionally proofread or checked by a native speaker, such as research articles (SciELF corpus, 759k words, 50% of total), academic research blogs (372k words, 24%) and doctoral examiner reports (402k words, 26%), produced by writers with different L1 backgrounds and from diverse academic disciplines (see <http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa> for more details). The WrELFA project and the studies conducted on the findings derived from its data have undoubtedly contributed to the field to a great extent. However, as Kimura and Canagarajah (2018, p. 303) argued, although corpus data offer valuable and genuine examples ELF academic writing, it falls short in depicting the ongoing process of writing or its intricate aspects as a social practice, and, therefore, "more process-oriented longitudinal approaches" are vital to account, for instance, for successive drafting and revising or the influence of literacy sponsons. We believe further research is needed not only to analyze the textual features of experienced scholars, but also to depict the complexities of academic writing in English experienced by all participants of academic discourse communities.

Bearing this in mind, we have selected three reputable journals (*Journal of English as Lingua Franca*, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, and *Journal of Second Language Writing*) in accordance with the scope of our paper (ELF, academic writing, and writing in a second/foreign language respectively). We reviewed all time published articles up until 2022 in these journals and used ELF and/or ELF paradigm, academic/writing as keywords in our search. We particularly intended to explore what these studies contribute to gaining insights into ELF writing.

2.2 Exploring academic writing practices through the ELF paradigm

Though the scope of the journal specifically focuses on ELF research, we came across a very limited number of studies conducted on ELF writing when we reviewed all issues of the *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*. Yet, some of these studies are promising in the sense that newer approaches are developing in academic writing research using the ELF paradigm.

Using the data in ELFA and WrELFA, Carey (2013) investigated ELF users' high frequency organizing chunks (e.g., 'so to speak', 'in my view', and so forth). No statistically significant difference was

observed between spoken and written corpora in terms of the frequency of the occurrence of these organizing chunks. Comparing the spoken data from ELFA with the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE), Carey discovered that these organizing chunks were used twice as more by ELF users than by ENL speakers. Lorés-Sanz (2016) examined the rhetorical structure of abstracts authored by non-native English-speaking researchers who published in *Social Science Research* during the period from 2011 to 2016 to explore whether ELF users' rhetorical organizations are creating new patterns and reshaping the conventional abstract writing. Lorés-Sanz (2016) concluded that such researchers do not entirely adopt and conform to conventional style of abstract writing; they rather adapt it and create "hybrid ways of articulating moves" (Lorés-Sanz, 2016, p. 77), which portrays a new landscape in academic publishing. These two studies used data coming from scholars, namely experienced writers of English.

Unlike the two publications above, Smirnova and Strinyuk (2020) investigated Russian, fourth-year, management students' usage of hedging devices in their research papers, by comparing the data to the corpus of articles published by non-native professional scholars of the same field, i.e., business and management. They found that professional writers use more hedging than students, and student writers' patterns of use of hedging are in hybrid forms and different from those of professional writers. The results of that study are very significant, as they both illustrate the challenges student writers encounter while using hedging devices in their academic writing and suggest pedagogical implications for EAP courses. Smirnova and Strinyuk (2020) suggested that activities modified based on ELF corpora and materials illustrating how both experts and learners use English could assist students in acquiring the skills to effectively communicate their intended messages in ELF to a global audience, while also addressing "the necessary language and stylistic conventions established in a specific discipline" (Smirnova and Strinyuk, 2020, p. 84).

Different from the studies investigating textual features of academic ELF writers, with a more ethnographic approach, Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2013) explored the views of Icelandic academics from six different academic disciplines on their proficiency levels and use of English in the pursuit of getting published in international journals. Data were collected through a survey administered to 238 university lecturers and semi-structured interviews conducted with ten members of the academic staff. Their findings revealed that Icelandic academics feel confident about their level of general English proficiency whereas they need support for their academic English due to the pressure to publish in international journals. One of the striking findings is that lecturers from Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education seek more assistance and support, as their writing entails more mixed method research designs, qualitative data and discussions, compared to the works of lecturers from Natural Sciences whose research is based on quantitative data and more standardized and structured writing styles. Another interesting result of their study is related to the issue of identity; that is, for some respondents, their "ELF writing feels less genuine" (p. 140), which leads to disparities between their personal identities and professional selves. Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2013) also found that younger scholars had less difficulty in producing texts in English as they have exclusively written mostly all of their papers in English since the beginning of their academic careers. We believe that we need more studies like that of Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2013), which will investigate academic EFL writing practices by employing such ethnographic lenses.

In the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes (JEAP)*, new articles discussing EAP/ESP writing and pedagogies from an ELF perspective have emerged during the last four years. Tribble (2017),

in his article “ELFA vs Genre: A new paradigm war in EAP writing instruction”, very strongly and firmly challenged the criticisms brought on EAP instruction by ELF scholars (particularly Jenkins). He argued that labeling EAP instruction simply as “conformist” to Standard Written English and NES norms and, in turn, regarding pedagogies based on EAP/genre approaches and corpus studies less conformist and more flexible creates a kind of implicit hierarchy among the paradigms. Although agreeing with Jenkins that the power of the idealized native speaker model should be reduced and that NES norms should not be the measures of excellence, Tribble (2017) highlights that the ELF paradigm, which he thinks is based on a NES vs. NNES dichotomy, is insufficient to explain academic writing situations and misleading for the practice of writing. Considering the real needs and demands of university students and early career researchers, he argued that we need to embrace paradigms that align with students’ requirements, instead of “attempting to introduce new paradigms” (Tribble, 2017, p. 40) that seem to lack an understanding of the distinctions between oral and written academic discourse. Similar to Smirnova and Strinyuk (2020), he suggested the use of expert and apprentice texts as exemplars of particular disciplinary-specific genres, so that both students and early career researchers can develop a notion of what counts as acceptable writing in their fields and build experience in writing these texts, regardless of their first languages.

Another research article which brings a fruitful discussion to the field is by McIntosh, Connor and Gökpınar-Shelton (2017). They first explained how paradigms and findings of ELF research and translanguaging bring a more inclusive understanding to the writing situation in international university contexts and argue that scholars and educators should be more open to emerging hybrid forms and linguistic and rhetorical varieties. Although also acknowledging the maintenance of conventional norms of academic writing prevailing in academic discourse communities, they placed emphasis on principles of Intercultural Rhetoric (IR). As they suggested, IR allows educators and students to analyze “rhetorical features of texts in comparable genres across languages and cultures at different stages in the writing process” and can thus yield more productive results in terms of developing “a better sense of where variations occur, which ones constitute lingua franca or translanguaging phenomena, and which of these phenomena can be successfully deployed in particular contexts for specific purposes” (McIntosh et al., 2017, p. 17). We need more similar research on the effectiveness of the paradigms on academic writing practices of students/scholars and on writing pedagogies, along with the ones that are based on morpho-syntactic analysis and corpus data (see Wu, Mauranen and Lei, 2020, also in *JEAP*) to be able to draw a fuller picture.

In addition, studies which discuss student writing practices as a ‘social practice’ from sociolinguistic, ecolinguistic and academic literacies theoretical frameworks are important to understand the dynamics and the complexities of situated writing practices in international universities. Using the ROAD-MAPPING framework which seeks to comprehensively describe and explain EMEMUS settings, Dafouz (2020) published a research article in the *JEAP*, which is one of the first studies exploring practices and processes of undergraduate student academic writing from the perspectives of academic teaching staff in Spain. The case study employed qualitative research data collection and analysis methods; Dafouz (2020) asked via email four open ended questions to 26 lecturers in Business Administration bilingual programs and conducted content analysis to analyze the data. She presented her findings under five themes: practices and processes, academic disciplines, roles of English, language management, agents, internationalization and glocalization, each of which is supported with excerpts from lecturers’ responses and reveals significant insights about EMEMUS. She found that academic writing

situations in EMEMUS contexts were highly influenced by two “diverging factors”: what students bring from their local educational conventions, and “covertly” inherent international forces (Dafouz, 2020, p. 10). Dafouz (2020, p. 10) concluded that “language management policies”, “different disciplinary conventions, different types of agency, and/or issues of internationalisation and glocalisation of HEIs” are some of the factors that need to be taken into account to gain a holistic understanding of student academic writing in any international university context.

In the *Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW)*, there are several research articles and short communication articles exploring writing development/performance/strategies, composing processes of EFL/ESL learners/students, beliefs, practices and professional development of EFL/ESL/EAP teachers, writing instruction in particular EFL/ESL contexts, along with studies investigating L1 influence on organizational patterns and construction of arguments and the effect of L2 competence or feedback on syntactic complexity or writing development of EFL/ESL learners. These studies use EFL/ESL to refer to the context and the participants of the study, i.e., expanding circle or international students in inner circle contexts, situated writing practices and English learning and writing histories of students, with little or none references to idiosyncrasies of ELF contexts or the ELF paradigm. In his short communication, Naghdipour (2021) used ELF interchangeably with EFL. Disciplinary dialogue articles, such as those by Belcher (2014), Hirvela (2017), Kirkpatrick (2017) and Stapleton (2017), discussing how EFL/ESL students’ writing performances or argumentation is shaped by their lingua-cultural backgrounds and previous writing instruction/experiences and how these and IR can guide writing teachers’ approaches to teaching of argumentation open up invaluable space for unfolding the realities of NNES writers, and in a way, of ELF contexts. In *JSLW*, the position of ELF and WE paradigms in academic writing are more explicitly discussed in articles which investigate the challenges faced commonly by NNES scholars publishing high-stakes academic texts in international journals due to their linguistic deviations from standard English forms and monolithic conceptualizations of academic writing held by mainly NES editors, reviewers and copyeditors functioning as gatekeepers and literacy brokers (Flowerdew and Wang, 2016; Hartse and Kubota, 2014; Hyland, 2016). These studies initiated crucial dialogues and significantly contribute to the field by familiarizing the readers about how EFL, WE or translingual paradigms, with a focus on intelligibility and constructive interaction between the scholars and the literacy brokers, alter the approaches to NNES scholars’ texts and maximize the opportunities for publishing internationally.

We believe there is need for more studies striving to understand how the ELF writing situation is experienced by undergraduate students (also see Hiller, 2021 for incorporation of translanguaging in an EAP course as an innovative example). Flowerdew (2015) emphasized that adopting an ELF perspective in academia can bring tolerance towards EAP/ESP practice in native -speaker oriented higher education contexts (see also Mur Dueñas, 2013; Paltridge, 2015). Studies investigating the writing experiences of undergraduate students in ELF contexts can not only enrich the data in the existing written ELF corpora, but it can provide significant insights for instructors and faculty members in their approach to their students’ written texts. Developing an ELF perspective in their evaluations of their students’ written work, in return, would enable these academics to take more informed, confident, flexible and creative approaches to their own research and publications.

3. Future directions in L2 writing research from an ELF perspective

We can conclude that there is a need for further research on the impact of an ELF perspective into academic writing resembling multilingual and multicultural perspectives that are already investigated in relation to L2 writing in diverse academic contexts ranging from K12 to higher education (see Altinmakas and Bayyurt, 2019; Yilmaz, 2021; Yilmaz and Römer, 2020). While there are existing studies that investigate the linguistic aspects of L2 use in academic writing from an ELF or second/foreign language learning perspective, examining metadiscourse features of the EAP practices of language learners or conducting corpus analyses of linguistic aspects in EAP practices of ELF users, there is still a need to explore beyond these aspects of L2 writing. It is essential to examine how translanguaging practices influence both written and spoken English language use in diverse academic contexts worldwide, particularly as EMI universities increase in number, catering to multilingual and multicultural student populations. Projects like WrELFA (2015) and other corpora studies (e.g., Yilmaz, 2021; Yilmaz and Römer, 2020) focusing on EAP and ELF interfaces have significant contributions to our understanding of how English is used in such diverse academic contexts and how the conceptualization of ELF can be positioned in relation to the already well established and constructed areas of study such as EAP or ESP. However, as L2 writing researchers who value the significant contribution of contextual issues in language use of L2 learners and users, we may design research projects on L2 writing from an array of perspectives taking into consideration shifting paradigms of research from essentially monolingual to multilingual contexts, due to factors like migration, study abroad programs in higher education and job opportunities.

In their joint introduction to a journal special issue on the pedagogy of ELF, Bayyurt and Dewey (2020) highlighted the involvement of the concepts of polylinguaging and translanguaging in everyday language use emphasizing how different languages are used concurrently and collectively in everyday interactions. This shows how linguistically and culturally diverse the English-speaking populations are in contexts where English language is used for various purposes including academic writing (Bayyurt and Dewey, 2020). Hence, in academic writing just like in other domains of language use, the differences between languages and their contribution to academic discourse can be seen as multiple resources that students can utilize for successful communication outcomes rather than barriers (Horner et al., 2011). Investigating the contribution of multiple language use in academic writing may in this sense contribute to our understanding of the integration of ELF in academic writing in plurilingual and multilingual contexts.

References

- Altinmakas, D., & Bayyurt, Y. (2019). An exploratory study on factors influencing undergraduate students' academic writing practices in Turkey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 37, 88-103.
- Baker, W. (2015). Culture and complexity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking competences and pedagogy in ELT. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1), 9-30.
- Bayyurt, Y., & Dewey, M. (2020). Locating ELF in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 74(4), 369-376.
- Bayyurt, Y. & Sifakis, N. (2015). ELF-aware in-service teacher education: A transformative perspective. In H. Bowles & A. Cogo (Eds), *International perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca* (pp. 117-135). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Bayyurt, Y., & Yalçın, Ş. (2022). Intercultural citizenship and pre-service teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 11(1), 105-115.
- Belcher, D. (2014). What we need and don't need intercultural rhetoric for: A retrospective and prospective look at an evolving research area. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 59-67.
- Björkman, B. (2018). English as a lingua franca in spoken genres in the international university: Introduction. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(2), 225-228.
- Breeze R. (2012). *Rethinking academic writing pedagogy for the European university*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Carey, R. (2013). On the other side: Formulaic organizing chunks in spoken and written academic ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2), 207-228.
- Dafouz, E. (2020). Undergraduate student academic writing in English-medium higher education: Explorations through the ROAD-MAPPING lens. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 46, 1-12.
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2016). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-Medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(3), 397-415.
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2020). *ROAD-MAPPING English Medium Education in the Internationalised University*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Erduyan, I., & Bayyurt, Y. (2022). Multilingualism with English. In J. I. Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-7). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 127-150.
- Flowerdew, J., & Wang, S. H. (2016). Author's editor revisions to manuscripts published in international journals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 39-52.
- Flowerdew, L. (2019). English as a lingua franca and learner English in disciplinary writing: A corpus perspective. In K. Hyland & L. L. C. Wong (Eds.), *Specialised English: New Directions in ESP and EAP research and practice* (pp. 79-90). New York: Routledge.
- Flowerdew, L. (2015). Adjusting pedagogically to an ELF world: An ESP perspective.' In Y. Bayyurt & S. Akcan (Eds.), *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 13-34). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Hall, C. J. (2018). Cognitive perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 74-84). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hanauer, D. I., Sheridan, C. L., & Englander, K. (2019). Linguistic injustice in the writing of research articles in English as a second language: Data from Taiwanese and Mexican researchers. *Written Communication*, 36(1), 136-154.
- Hartse, J. H., & Kubota, R. (2014). Pluralizing English? Variation in high-stakes academic texts and challenges of copyediting. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 71-82.
- Hiller, K. E. (2021). Introducing translanguaging in an EAP Course at a joint-venture university in China. *RELC Journal*, 52(2), 307-317.
- Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 181-209.
- Hirvela, A. (2017). Argumentation & second language writing: Are we missing the boat? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 69-74.
- Horner, B. (2018). Written Academic English as a lingua franca. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 413-426). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Horner, B., Lu, M.-Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translanguaging approach. *College English*, 73, 303-321.

- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2013). Writing in the university: Education, knowledge and reputation. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 53-70.
- Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 31, 58-69.
- Hynninen, N., & Solin, A. (2018). Language norms in ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 267-278). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ingvarsdóttir, H., & Arnbjörnsdóttir, B. (2013). ELF and academic writing: A perspective from the Expanding Circle. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(1), 123-145.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85.
- Jenkins, J. (2017). Not English but English-within-multilingualism. In S. Coffey & U. Wingate (Eds.), *New directions for research in foreign language education* (pp. 63-78). London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. & Lopriore, L. (2021). Prologue. In Y. Bayyurt (Ed.), *Bloomsbury World Englishes Volume III: Pedagogies* (pp. vi-viii). London: Bloomsbury.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3): 281-315.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 355-365). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kimura, D., & Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice and ELF.' In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 295-308). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2017). How important is argument. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 81-82.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2018). The development of English as a lingua franca in ASEAN. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 138-150). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2012). Understanding L2 writing development from a multicompetence perspective: Dynamic repertoires of knowledge and text construction. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 101-134). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Leki, I. (2001). Hearing voices: L2 students' experiences in L2 writing courses. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 17-27). New York: Routledge.
- Lorés-Sanz, R. (2016). ELF in the making? Simplification and hybridity in abstract writing. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5(1), 53-81.
- Lu, X., & Ai, H. (2015). Syntactic complexity in college-level English writing: Differences among writers with diverse L1 backgrounds. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 29, 16-27.
- Manchón, R. M. (Ed.). (2009). *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching and research*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Manchón, R. M. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Marlina, R., & Xu, Z. (2018). English as a lingua franca. In J. Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-13). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(3), 513-527.
- Mauranen, A. (2006). A rich domain of ELF – the ELFA corpus of academic discourse. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(21), 45-59.
- Mauranen, A. (2011). Learners and users – Who do we want corpus data from? In F. Meunier, S. De Cock, G. Gilquin / M. Paquot (Eds.), *A taste for corpora: In honour of Sylviane Granger* (pp. 155-171). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mauranen, A. (2018). Second language acquisition, World Englishes and English as a lingua franca (ELF). *World Englishes*, 37(1), 106-119.
- Mauranen, A., Hynninen, N., & Ranta, E. (2010). English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(3), 183-190.
- Mauranen, A., Pérez-Llantada, C., & Swales, J. (2010). Academic Englishes: A standardized knowledge? In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 656-674). New York: Routledge.
- McIntosh, K., Connor, U., & Gokpinar-Shelton, E. (2017). What intercultural rhetoric can bring to EAP/ESP writing studies in an English as a lingua franca world. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 29, 12-20.
- Modiano, M. (1999). Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today*, 15, 3-13.
- Morton, J., Storch, N., & Thompson, C., (2015). What our students tell us: Perceptions of three multilingual students on their academic writing in first year. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 1-13.
- Mur Dueñas, P. (2013). Spanish scholars' research article publishing process in English medium journals: English used as a lingua franca. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2), 315-340.
- Murata, K., & Iino, M. (2018). EMI in higher education: an ELF perspective. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 400-412). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Naghdipour, B. (2021). English Writing Pedagogy at the crossroads: The case of Oman. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 1-6.
- Paltridge, B. (2015). Referees' comments on submissions to peer-reviewed journals: When is a suggestion not a suggestion? *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(1), 106-122.
- Pennycook, A. (2000). Disinventing standard English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 4(1), 115-124.
- Pitzl, M-L. (2016). World Englishes and creative idioms in English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*, 35(2), 293-309.
- Rowley-Jolivet, E. (2017). English as a lingua franca in research articles: The SciELF corpus. *ASp, la revue du GERAS*, 71, 145-158.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 133-158.

- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 209-239.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2018). Standard English and the dynamics of ELF variation. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 85-100). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smirnova, E., & Strinyuk, S. (2020). Hedges in Russian EAP writing: A corpus-based study of research papers in management. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 9(1), 81-101.
- Stapleton, P. (2017). Ability to argue: Rooted in nature. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 83-84.
- Tribble, C. (2017). ELFA vs. Genre: A new paradigm war in EAP writing instruction? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 25, 30-44.
- Tribble, C. (2019). Expert, native or lingua franca? Paradigm choices in novice academic writer support.' In H. Habibie & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Novice writers and scholarly publication: Authors, mentors, gatekeepers* (pp. 53-75). Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- WrELFA (2015). The Corpus of Written English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings. Director: Anna Mauranen. Compilation manager: Ray Carey, at <http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa>, accessed 26 November 2021.
- Wu, X., Mauranen, A., & Lei, L. (2020). Syntactic complexity in English as a lingua franca academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 43, 1-13.
- Yilmaz, S. (2021). 'A constructional analysis of written academic English as a Lingua Franca: The case of unedited and edited research writing.' Unpublished PhD Thesis, Georgia State University.
- Yilmaz, S. & Römer, U. (2020). A corpus-based exploration of constructions in written academic English as a Lingua Franca. In U. Römer, V. Cortes, & E. Friginal (Eds.), *Advances in corpus research on academic writing* (pp. 59-88). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yasemin Bayyurt (bayyurty@boun.edu.tr) is a Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Department of Foreign Language Education at Boğaziçi University. Her current research focuses on the pedagogy of ELF; Disciplinary literacies, EMI and CLIL; foreign language teacher education, and academic writing. She has published widely in prominent indexed journals and has (co-)edited various volumes such as *ELF in the Language classroom: Applying Theory to ELT Practice* (Routledge, 2024).

Derya Altinmakas (altinmakasd@mef.edu.tr) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English Language Teaching at MEF University, Istanbul. Her research interests include foreign/second language writing, academic writing, academic literacies, genre pedagogy, English as Lingua Franca (ELF), and teacher education.