Journal of English for Academic Purposes 13 (2014) 5–16

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of English for Academic Purposes

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jeap

Parallel language use in academic and outreach publication: A case study of policy and practice

Lisa McGrath

Department of English, Centre for Academic English, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

Keywords:
Parallel language use
Language policy
Multilingual scholars
Writing for publication
Language choice

A B S T R A C T

Parallel language use has been accepted as the guiding principle for university language policy writers in the Nordic region. However, the extent to which parallel language use reflects the actual publication practices of academics is yet to be established. This study begins to address the gap by investigating the languages used for academic and outreach publication in three departments at a major Swedish university. Questionnaire and database trawl results reveal that English, Swedish and other languages are used for academic and outreach publication, although Swedish dominates in the outreach domain. Furthermore, results derived from semi-structured interviews with 15 informants suggest that language practices are primarily determined by pragmatic forces such as intended audience, publication outlet, topic and genre, rather than by ideological or language-political factors.

1. Introduction

The status of English as an international language of academia is now uncontested (e.g., Ferguson, 2007; Hoffman, 2000; Petersen & Shaw, 2002). Indeed, the push for scholars across disciplines to publish articles in international and primarily English-language, high impact journals has not relented, despite the socio-political and linguistic concerns over domain loss, competence attrition, diglossia, and perceived disadvantages faced by non-native English speakers (e.g., Bennett, 2007; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Ferguson, Pérez-Llantada, & Plo, 2011; Flowerdew, 2008; Giannoni, 2008; Gunnarsson, 2000; Pennycook, 2000; Phillipson, 2009).

The counterpoint to this focus on the transnational nature of English-language academic knowledge dissemination, and subsequent decline in local-language publication outlets, is the local demand for accountability through outreach publication, and academic visibility through the medium of local languages. The implications of these demands have gained less attention, but are no less current in view of recent language-regulatory steps taken by national and supranational bodies. For example, in the Nordic region, the Declaration on a Nordic Language Policy (Nordic Council of Ministers, 2007) establishes *parallel language use* as the principle for language management at the tertiary level (e.g., Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Kuteeva, 2011; Kuteeva & Airey, in press), and has formed the basis of university language policies in the region (Ferguson, 2012). The policy states that knowledge dissemination in local languages is to be promoted, and that universities are to develop and implement strategies which facilitate multilingual practices and enable language choice. The vision is a complex multilingual scenario, in which scholars theoretically function both within transnational English-medium and national local-language academic discourse communities, while at the same time disseminating findings to a lay-oriented audience in local languages.

E-mail address: lisa.mcgrath@english.su.se.

1475-1585/$ – see front matter
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.10.008

However, for a language policy to be viable, it must be "congruent with the observable sociolinguistic reality" (Lindström, 2012: 51). Thus, there is a need for research into academics' "reality" when it comes to the relationship between English and local languages in their publication practices. Uzuner (2008) reviews investigations into scholars' participation in global academic communities, and highlights the need for more case-studies. Much of the canon pertains to China and post-colonial environments (e.g., Flowerdew, 2000; Liu, 2004), central and Eastern European contexts (e.g., Curry & Lillis, 2004; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008), and Southern Europe (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Ferguson et al., 2011). Within the Scandinavian context, Petersen and Shaw (2002) provide a rich analysis, exploring the relations between local and transnational disciplinary communities, and argue that the nature of the discourse community impacts language choice, while Kuteeva and Airey (in press) found disciplinary knowledge-making practices to be influential. Ferguson (2007, p. 17) also views disciplinary factors as a driving force; in disciplines whose objects of study are local-culturally driven such as Law, language practice is described as "academic bilingualism", with English becoming increasingly significant as a language of scholarly enterprise (Berg, Hult, & King, 2001).

A common thread is that academics are assigned an agentive role in determining their publication practices, both in terms of language and genre choice, shaped "by social actions, practices, ideologies and the resources available to those who wish to publish" Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008, p. 108). However, with the exception of Anderson (2013), there appears to be little up-to-date empirical research into the interaction between language policy, language choice and actual publication practices.

Thus, the interplay between language intervention strategies as they are experienced "at the grass-roots level" (Lindström, 2012) and scholars' knowledge dissemination practices needs further research, particularly as much of the current discussion is opinion-based (e.g., Phillipson, 2009; Preisler, 2009). Given that parallel language policy has been described as "a test case for language planning" in tertiary education (Ferguson, 2007, p. 32), the Swedish context constitutes a timely focus. The aim of the present study is to explore to what extent parallel language use is an ideological goal or a professional reality for academics working in three departments in the Humanities faculty at a major Swedish university. While it is generally accepted that the language of academic publication in the natural and exact sciences is English, less is known about the humanities. History, Anthropology and General Linguistics were chosen as these disciplines constitute a relatively broad spread in terms of epistemologies, research methodologies, and target discourse communities. In addition, while History is firmly rooted in the humanities, Anthropology and General Linguistics straddle the disciplinary boundary with the social sciences. More specifically, my research questions are as follows:

1) Which genres and languages have informants used to disseminate findings in the period 2007–2012?
2) What factors drive this practice?
3) To what extent does the policy of parallel language use reflect practice?

The article is organized as follows: I begin by providing a brief introduction to the sociolinguistic landscape in Sweden. Following the methodology section, the results of a genre and language questionnaire and database trawl are presented and discussed in light of interview data. The findings are then placed within the wider debate of university language management, and implications for EAP are discussed.

2. The Swedish scenario: a very brief overview

English has been used as a language of scholarly publication in Sweden since the 1950s (Kuteeva, 2011), and is now clearly dominant in the natural and exact sciences. However, the extent to which English has made inroads into the humanities and social sciences is less clear. For example, a recent study has shown that in 2009, on the graduate level, 94% of theses in the natural sciences were published in English, compared to 65% in the social sciences and 37% in the humanities (Salö, 2010). But this data only provides a partial picture as it does not report publication patterns for professional-level academic and outreach genres.

In terms of language attitudes, Olsson and Sheridan (2012) surveyed 35 academics by questionnaire at a Swedish university to explore their views on how English may affect the viability of Swedish as an academic language across disciplines. Despite the authors' approach being rooted in a tradition which emphasizes the potential "threat" English poses for national languages (see e.g., Phillipson, 2009; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996), their informants were generally positive about the use of English in their professional lives. Kuteeva and McGrath (in press) also report that academic English does not pose a significant challenge for majority of their informants.

Concerns have been raised by some sociolinguists about the potential detrimental effects of English hegemony in academia on the Swedish language (e.g., Gunnarsson, 2000; Teleman & Westman, 1997), although more recent research suggests that concerns over issues such as domain loss (a problematic concept in itself, and subject to different interpretations) may be unwarranted (Ferguson, 2007; Preisler, 2009).

From an ideological perspective, internationalization of the academy has largely been embraced; Sweden is reported as having high levels of international academic involvement (El-Khawas, 2002), with non-nationals representing a significant proportion of the faculty (Marimon, Lietaert, & Grigolo, 2009) and Swedish scholars having high-level English-language skills (Bolton & Kuteeva, 2012; Olsson & Sheridan, 2012). Thus, parallel language policy in Sweden can be viewed as a language-political attempt to navigate the space between the promotion of international academic involvement, and the possible

detrimental consequences of this involvement for the national language. The relationship between parallel language policy and actual publication practices within this sociolinguistic context is explored in the subsequent sections of this study.

3. Methodology

This case-study draws on a data set comprising three components; firstly, the publication practices of 15 scholars across three disciplines were investigated. This number of informants is sufficient to provide an in-depth understanding of the scenario (particularly when combined with other data sources as here) without risk of diluting necessary detail, and is line with other comparable studies (e.g., Li & Flowerdew, 2009; Petersen & Shaw, 2002). Researchers participating in the project were recruited from the departments of General Linguistics (informants L1–5), History (informants H1–5) and Anthropology (informants A1–5) at a major Swedish university. Informed consent was obtained. While it is acknowledged that the informants' sub-disciplines, native languages and academic rank could affect language choice, specific details are not provided in order to preserve their anonymity. Instead, PhD students, post-doctoral researchers and untenured lecturers are referred to as junior academics. It should be noted that PhD students in Sweden are salaried employees and belong to the academic staff. Informants who hold the position of associate professor, professor, or professor emeritus are referred to as senior. All the linguists in the study are senior academics. In Anthropology, informants A1–A4 are senior, and informant A5 is junior. In History, informants H1, H3 and H4 are senior, and informants H2 and H5 are junior. Nine informants have Swedish as a native language, two learned Swedish from an early age, and four have other languages as their native languages, but are proficient in general Swedish.

Data regarding the informants' publication records were gathered from two sources in order to gain a comprehensive overview of the informants' practices in terms of languages and written genres used. Oral genres and teaching materials are beyond the scope of this study. First, the 15 informants were asked to complete a questionnaire pertaining to written academic and outreach genres they had produced from 2007 to 2012, and the language(s) used (see Table 1 for results). Publications were classified as either outreach or academic based on the author's target audience (i.e. written texts targeting a non-academic audience were classed as outreach, whereas texts aimed at a scholarly audience were classed as academic). This data-collection method enabled access to data pertaining to outreach and academic genres which would not be visible in a database, such as blog postings, abstracts written in the local language to accompany English language publications, and abstracts for conferences. This part of the methodology is crucial as the production of these genres constitutes evidence of language use.

In addition to the questionnaire, DiVA (an academic on-line database which lists publications produced by scholars researching at the university) was searched. The publications recorded in the database are organized into two major categories, academic and outreach: texts tagged as "academic", "academic other" or "reviewed" in the database are classed as academic genres. These include journal publications, books, book chapters, written conference papers and academic reports. Multiple book chapters by the same author appearing in one volume are counted as one publication. Conference proceedings publications are included if the entry indicates that the text has been peer-reviewed. Publications tagged "other, popular science, discussion etc." are classed as outreach. University-level course books aimed at students which appear in the database are included in the outreach category. Where it was not clear whether a publication should be categorized as outreach or academic, clarification was sought from the informants where possible. Supplementary information was either provided by informants or obtained from publication lists and CVs posted on professional websites.

In order to validate the results, the database trawl findings (shown in Table 2) were shared with the informants. Thirteen of the fifteen informants gave feedback. Where any discrepancies were identified, numbers were adjusted. Thus, allowing for informants' lapses in memory, incomplete records, the flaws in databases (Anderson, 2013) and the occluded nature of some genres, a relatively accurate picture of the informants' publication practices has been established.

In addition to the questionnaire and database trawl, data were collected via semi-structured interviews in order to explore the motivations behind informants' practices. Inspired by Lindström (2012), question prompts were designed to elicit whether informants have the "capacity, opportunity and desire" (Grin, 2003) to publish in Swedish, English or other languages. Li and Flowerdew (2009) draw attention to the potential unreliability of the co-constructed nature of interview responses; for example, the interpersonal context of an interview can lead to informants providing what they perceive to be socially desirable responses (Harris & Brown, 2010). Nonetheless, this method provides unparalleled insights into the reasons behind choices made by disciplinary insiders; interviews allow for explanation, elaboration and clarification of individual attitudes and opinions, and have been used effectively in a number of studies in the field (e.g. Anderson, 2013; Li & Flowerdew, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Petersen & Shaw, 2002).

Informants were given the choice of speaking English or Swedish during the interviews. All informants chose to use predominantly English. The interviews were recorded and transcribed immediately. Utterances in Swedish were translated by the author.

In the first instance, categories in the interview data were established and grouped according to prefigured codes based on the interview prompts and themes which emerged from a qualitative manifest content analysis of three policy documents: The Declaration on a Nordic Language Policy (2006), the Swedish Language Act (2009), and the case-study institution's language policy (2011). Following Cresswell (2013), emerging codes were also incorporated in subsequent iterations of the interview data analysis.

The analysis of the policy documents proceeded as follows: sections with explicit references to written knowledge dissemination and research were extracted. In addition, sections which have implications for these practices were identified. The content of these extracts was summarized, and three broad criteria for parallel language use were selected. The extracts, summary and criteria were shared with colleagues, who found nothing controversial in my interpretation of the material. The results of the

analysis of the policy documents and a brief discussion are presented in the following section. The official translation is used for the Nordic Language Policy and the Swedish Language Act. The translation of the university policy is unofficial.

4. Analysis of policy documents

Parallel language use is not an empirically established term, and therefore different construals are possible (Harder, 2009). Interpretations include a situation in which more than one language can be used in a given domain (Josephson, 2005), the dual use of the local language and English (Anderson, 2013; Ferguson, 2007; Kuteeva, 2011) or, in a more in-depth discussion by Preisler (2009, p. 13), a "functionally determined" diglossia which constitutes a "complementary" relationship. An underlying principle stated in the Nordic Language Policy is that all languages are considered equal, but do not all play the same role. However, the text becomes somewhat tautological by stating that parallel language use means that languages are used in parallel:

> 1) The parallel use of language refers to the concurrent use of several languages within one or more areas. None of the languages abolishes or replaces the other; they are used in parallel.

The university policy is more wide-ranging. It encompasses a description of students' and lecturers' language skills, the status and role of Swedish and English as academic languages, the risk of competence attrition and domain loss, and acknowledges the special roles of Swedish and English among the "several languages" (see above quote) referred to by the Nordic Language Policy. It states:

> 2) For the university to successfully carry out its mission, Swedish and English should be used in parallel.

Within the sections that deal specifically with a definition of parallel language use, none of the documents make direct reference to academic publication and outreach knowledge dissemination. The Nordic Language Policy suggests the promotion of book publication in the Nordic languages and a reward for "the presentation of scientific results in the Nordic languages essential to society" (p. 94). The university policy is less specific; although there is a stipulation that PhD and MPhil theses written in English are to have Swedish summaries and vice versa, it is acknowledged that:

> 3) The independent status of the individual researcher means that he or she is best suited to determine which language to use in different research contexts.

Indeed, the scholar's place in the international research context is clearly stated in the university policy, as is the recognition that this participation is most likely to be undertaken through the medium of English. Nonetheless, a multilingual dimension is introduced, with the aim of promoting the use of languages other than Swedish or English, if the research context makes this appropriate:

> 4) The university wishes to emphasize the value of publishing and disseminating research results in languages other than English and Swedish, whenever these other languages are of immediate relevance for the content.

Unlike the other policy documents, the university policy also explicitly refers to outreach communication in the context of Swedish language maintenance and development, stating:

> 5) If words and expressions cannot be translated appropriately, communication between different groups, for example, between experts and lay audiences, may be undermined.

A theme running through all three policy documents is the need to maintain the Swedish language. The issue of language maintenance is dealt with here as there are implications for publication practices. Academic terminology and discourse patterns, a preoccupation of the policy developers, are to be used to avoid domain loss and competence attrition. Presumably, a language which is "usable in all areas of society" (Language Act) must by implication be usable in the (national) academic sphere. This notion of *ett komplettspråk*, a 'complete language', is also taken up in more detail in the Nordic Language Policy and the university policy document. For example, the Nordic Language Policy explicitly states that Nordic languages and English should be available as "languages of science" (p. 94).

Thus, the policies do not explicitly make demands on researchers when it comes to language use in publication. They do, however, call for Swedish to be available for use as an academic language. By leaving language selection in the hands of the individual researcher, there is an implication that academics are able to choose their language(s) of publication, and when selecting, should weigh up the need to maintain an international academic presence against the implications of not publishing in Swedish. This agency is also assumed in the Nordic Language Policy, which states that scientific institutions should develop strategies for the "choice of language and parallel language use".

To summarize, the concept of parallel language use is not transparent. Nonetheless, we can ascertain that the policy does not explicitly require researchers to publish in Swedish. In fact, in terms of operating within the international context, it is

recognized that English is often the language of communication. Push-pull factors need to be weighed up by the individual researchers, supported by university-level strategies. Parallel language use does, however, entail researchers some responsibility for ensuring that Swedish language constitutes a 'complete language' through its availability as a medium for academic knowledge communication. It is evident that this availability can only be realized meaningfully and authentically through real-world language use (Harder, 2009), in this case, the production of academic genres. Thus, the following three themes are explored in this article: firstly, the number of academic and outreach genres published in Swedish, English and other languages are documented. I then explore how scholars select language and genre for publication, and finally, I discuss whether scholars view maintaining the Swedish language as relevant to their publication practices.

5. Results

The results section is organized as follows: first, the results of the questionnaire and database trawl are reported. It should be noted that the approach to the study is entirely qualitative; therefore, measures of sample size and the identification of potential outliers are not applicable to the numerical results. The findings are then discussed in light of the comments made by the informants during interviews.

5.1. Results of the genre questionnaire and database trawl

The purpose of this part of the study is to establish whether Swedish, English or other languages are viable languages for writing academic and outreach genres for the informants in the study. Table 1 (below) shows the number of informants who report they have produced the genres listed in the six-year period from 2007 to 2012.

Table 1
Results of the questionnaire. The table shows the number of informants who state they have produced the genres listed in Swedish, English or another language from 2007 to 2012.

Category	No. of informants writing English-language genres			Total	No. of informants writing Swedish-language genres			Total	No. of informants writing in other languages, including translations			Total
	Hist.	Ling.	Anth.		Hist.	Ling.	Anth.		Hist.	Ling.	Anth.	
Academic book/ monograph	1	0	2	**3**	3	0	0	**3**	0	0	0	**0**
Academic book chapter	5	5	3	**13**	4	0	2	**6**	1	1	1	**3**
Journal article	4	5	4	**13**	0	0	2	**2**	1	0	0	**1**
Conference proceedings article	4	5	3	**12**	1	1	2	**4**	0	1	0	**1**
Abstract	4	5	4	**13**	3	3	3	**9**	0	2	0	**2**
Outreach genre	0	1	3	**4**	3	2	3	**8**	0	0	0	**0**
Blog, website contribution	1	3	0	**4**	1	2	0	**3**	0	1	0	**1**

Table 1 reveals diverse practices in terms of genre and language use. Books remain an important genre for the historians taking part in the study, whether the informant produces the entire volume or a contribution in the form of a chapter. Both Swedish and English are viable languages for books, but only one historian produced an entire book in English in the given period, whereas three produced books in Swedish. Book chapters present a more even split, with four of the five informants having produced the genre in Swedish, and all five in English. Conversely, journal articles and published conference proceedings articles are predominantly English-language genres. Outreach genres are only written in Swedish. None of the informants claimed to be active in the domain of digital knowledge dissemination such as blogs or internet forums.

There is a relatively even spread between languages used for the academic genres generated by the anthropologists in the study, with a slight bias toward English. No Swedish-language books have appeared in the six-year period, but two informants have written book chapters and two have written journal articles. This more balanced output in terms of language use is also reflected in the outreach genres; three authors report they have written an outreach genre in English, and three have written in Swedish. One informant's work has been translated into a language other than Swedish or English. Again, none of the informants have contributed to blogs or on-line forums.

Unlike the historians, a minority of linguists in the study have produced an academic genre in Swedish within the time period. Genres produced include book chapters, journal articles and conference proceedings; however, none of the five informants produced a journal article in Swedish, whereas all have written journal articles in English. The linguists are also less visibly active than historians in terms of outreach genres; nonetheless, English and Swedish have been used in this domain by at least one informant. On the other hand, they have been more active than historians in using digital media such as blogs, which have appeared in both English and Swedish. Two linguists have also published academic genres in languages other than in Swedish or in English.

The data in Table 2 derives from the analysis of the publication records retrieved from the database trawl. The purpose of this investigation was to ascertain the representation of languages as a percentage of the total output of individual informants. The table shows the number of academic and outreach publications produced by the informants in Swedish, English and other languages over the six-year period in focus (2007–2012) listed in the database. The academic genre classification comprises peer-reviewed books, book chapters, written conference papers and academic reports and articles. The outreach classification pertains to texts tagged "other, popular science, discussion etc." in the database. For both academic and outreach genres the proportional output in each language is given as a percentage. Thus, in contrast to Table 1, the focus is on comparing language choice in academic versus outreach publication, rather than in individual genres.

Table 2
Results of the database trawl. Publications are shown according to publication type and language. The academic genre classification comprises peer-reviewed books, book chapters, written conference papers, and academic reports and articles. The outreach classification pertains to texts tagged "other, popular science, discussion etc." in the database.

Informant		Academic genres				Outreach genres			
		Swe.	Eng.	Other	Total	Swe.	Eng.	Other	Total
Hist.	H1	10	8	1	19	1	0	0	1
	H2	0	5	0	5	2	0	0	2
	H3	5	2	0	7	5	2	0	7
	H4	2	2	0	4	1	0	0	1
	H5	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0
Ling.	L1	1	21	0	22	9	2	1	12
	L2	0	9	0	9	0	0	0	0
	L3	0	15	2	17	0	2	0	2
	L4	0	13	1	14	5	4	0	9
	L5	0	17	1	18	0	0	0	0
Anth.	A1	3	17	1	21	3	0	0	3
	A2	8	16	3	27	0	1	1	2
	A3	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
	A4	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0
	A5	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0

Table 2 also reveals a mixed practice on the individual and departmental level. Nonetheless, some broad patterns are discernible. In History, two of the informants have produced more in Swedish than English. The two junior informants in the discipline have not produced any academic genres in Swedish. In Anthropology, A3 has only produced academic genres in English, while all the other informants have produced academic genres in both Swedish and English. However, the more prolific writers have produced considerably more in English than in Swedish. In Linguistics, all the informants have produced more academic genres in English than in Swedish in the six-year period, with four of the five having produced no academic genres in Swedish at all. Informants have, however, produced work in languages other than Swedish or English, and one informant in particular has been active in outreach both in Swedish and English.

To conclude, while Tables 1 and 2 suggest that both Swedish and English are possible languages of academic publication in all the disciplines, in Anthropology there is a preference for English, and in Linguistics, this preference is even more marked. Swedish, on the other hand, is undoubtedly the preferred language of outreach publication across disciplines. In the next section, these findings are contextualized by the informants' comments.

5.2. Interpretation of the results in light of the interview data

In this section, the results of the questionnaire and database trawl are reported in light of the interview data. The results are discussed within the context of the broad thematic categories which emerged from the policy analysis. This enables a holistic analysis of the data set, which reveals some disciplinary differences and similarities operating within the context of three principal themes: patterns of language use, language choice, and attitudes toward local-language maintenance.

5.2.1. The language of publication: genre, topic and disciplinary practices

Factors found to be influencing choice of language in academic publishing have been explored in several studies (e.g., Li & Flowerdew, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Petersen & Shaw, 2002). These include evaluations based on bibliometric data, career trajectories and the increasingly transnational character of disciplinary communities, all of which were cited by informants and place an emphasis on English-language publication. Kuteeva and Airey (in press) have found that language choice is determined by disciplinary knowledge-making practices and in an extensive study carried out at a Swedish university, Bolton and Kuteeva (2012) found disciplinary variation in the use of English for publication. The following results provide further support for this finding.

In the case of History, it was found that the two junior informants have not produced any academic genres in Swedish. Of all the three disciplines in the study, this is perhaps the least expected, as History is often referred to in the literature as a

nationally-oriented discipline, with local-language publication outlets, accessed by a locally active discourse community. This was also confirmed by the informants:

> *The discipline of History is traditionally very national or nationalistic. It has been Swedish matters, Swedish topics, and problems from Swedish history that has been dominating our research. (H3)*

Given this traditionally local orientation, for historians, parallel language use as a practice emphasizes the use of English, rather than concerns surrounding the use of Swedish. In fact, informants confirm that English is becoming increasingly important as a language of academic knowledge dissemination within the discipline, resulting in perceived shifts in disciplinary knowledge making and dissemination practices:

> *It certainly is a rising pressure to publish our results in English and prestige journals […] most people are very skeptical, but still there is awareness of this pressure. I would say it will probably change our discipline. (H3)*

One reported change in History is a shift from the monograph as the prestige genre (which two informants identified as the important genre in the discipline) to an increasing emphasis on the journal article (three informants). This has implications for parallel language use, given that in terms of the informants' practice, the journal article is primarily an English-language genre (see Table 1). The questionnaire and data-base trawl data are also supported by comments in the interview data, for example:

> *It seems to me that we are in a process of transformation. When I was young and started, we had to write those big books, monographs. But we also had the possibility to write for journals of course, and to give contributions to conferences […]There are pressures for us to publish in the same way as the natural and social sciences; prestige journals, international English contact. (H3)*

> *Books have been the most important. Articles haven't given you very much merit for your career, but it's changing. It's more article-writing today, and they are more important than previously, especially in the right journals (H1)*

> *I'd say a research article in English in a renowned international journal would be top notch. Secondly, I'd say a monograph in Swedish which despite being academically sound also becomes a best-seller. That would be up there! (H2)*

The historians in the study primarily read and target English-language journals for publication (five of the eight journals given in answer to the questionnaire). One journal mentioned is Swedish monolingual. Of the remaining, *Historisk Tidskrift* (the most mentioned journal) publishes a majority of articles in Swedish, although occasionally articles and review essays are published in another Scandinavian language or in English. In the *Journal of Modern History*, articles can be written in a major European language, but those written in languages other than French or German have to include an English abstract. If accepted, the journal commissions an English translation for publication (information was obtained from the journal websites). Thus, a shift toward writing more journal articles would appear to necessitate a shift toward writing more in English. This practice is accommodated by a local department language policy, described by informant H2:

> *There have been very clear points made from different people at the university that English publications are worth more than Swedish ones. There was a system at my previous department where once you defended your PhD you were granted two months post-doc to write a research article based on your PhD for an English language publication, because that's worth more for the department. (H2)*

It was also suggested that writing in English has implications for the object of study in the discipline. This includes a widening of the research focus, the inclusion of a comparative dimension, and a greater focus on method and theoretical approach:

> *The historical contexts and institutions and people and time and place are in Swedish literature. The theoretical input and comparative aspect, how you make something interesting out of this is lifting it in the international horizon, and that's how I work as I am writing in English. (H2)*

> *If we want to be uppmärksammade (noticed) internationally, then we have to choose broader topics, maybe comparative. (H3)*

> *My sources are Swedish and my case is Swedish […] but my theory and my methods, I try to be […] international, not restricted to a Swedish case. (H5)*

Unlike History, Anthropology is described as "a small discipline with a comparative, international outlook" (A2), with a long tradition of publishing in English. Nonetheless, the discipline has a significant outreach role, not necessarily targeting the general public, but rather national advisory bodies, governmental bodies and practitioners, resulting in a comparatively wide range of possible genres. Despite the disciplinary differences, some of the attitudes pertaining to genre and language choice were echoed by the informants from Anthropology. Like History, monographs are highly valued in the discipline, but an increasing emphasis on journal articles was referred to, which in turn places greater emphasis on English. A3 noted:

> *Of course now there's a whole push for peer-reviewed publications. As a younger scholar, I think it is a smarter strategy to go for articles in journals, rather than going for the book […] now with the way things are evaluated, it's more economical to have more articles, articles in English. We don't have any Swedish journals that would count for anything. (A3)*

As with History, the journals the informants gave as potential publication outlets were predominantly English-language, with the exception of *Socialvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, which is a Swedish-language journal. This journal was described by the informant as being practitioner-oriented rather than strictly scholarly. Some Swedish language journal articles written by the informants were also described as "very accessible for being a scholarly article. It has all the academic forms, but it is still accessible" (A1), and "half-popular; it's not peer-reviewed" (A4). This suggests that the anthropologists are targeting a Swedish-language audience which constitutes an "applied community" (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 42) rather than a national academic community (which is targeted by the historians). Historians also have outlets to an applied community which provides some justification for the use of Swedish. This is exemplified by the following anecdote:

> *For the moment we are engaged in a book about (topic), and this is a typical Swedish product because it is supported by an organization of for Swedish municipalities. The readers are hopefully persons working in the municipalities, politicians etc. so it should be in Swedish. It could also be for academic people, but the character of the book means there is no choice between doing it in Swedish or English. (H1)*

Conversely, Linguistics was described by the informants as an international discipline with no coherent local-language academic discourse community in Scandinavia, and with the exception of one sub-field, no locally-based practitioner audience. In fact, according to one informant, a Swedish-language conference that was organized regularly in Sweden has now folded (L3). Thus, it appears that linguists do not engage with the diversity of discourse communities potentially experienced by the informants in the other disciplines. Accordingly, only one of the linguists has written an academic genre in Swedish between 2007 and 2012 (excluding abstracts), even though the output in English across the informants is prolific. Of the eight journals the informants stated they read and target for publication, only one invites submissions in languages other than English (German, French and Russian are also accepted). Even though the vast majority of academic publication is in English, the linguists acknowledged the possibility of using languages other than English, but with some caveats. For example:

> *Things that I have written in Swedish are more like essays, so an academic or half-academic audience, so it's a kind of half-popular thing. If I do write in Swedish, it would probably be more like that, more popular things, because I have no idea of the audience which would need me to write academic discourse in Swedish. (L3)*

In terms of prestige, the informants within Linguistics do not appear to place the same emphasis on the journal article. Two of the five informants identified the genre as being the most valuable in terms of bibliometrics and career evaluations. Two other informants placed more emphasis on collated articles which appear in special volumes following conferences, or book chapters. Nonetheless, according to the data, these are all predominantly English-language genres.

5.2.2. Agency

In this sub-section, I discuss the level of agency scholars experience in their publication practices. This is significant because, as argued in Section 3, parallel language use entails making language choices. However, only a minority of the informants across disciplines indicated that they have complete autonomy when it comes to selecting the language of publication.

This perceived lack of choice manifests itself in different ways. Least prototypical was the attitude expressed by the two junior historians, who view language use in the academic sphere as dichotomous. A choice is available, but once a language is selected, it remains the language of one's entire academic output. This is illustrated by the following comment, and is reflected in the informants' publication records (H5 has only published academic genres and all are in English. H2 has published all academic genres in English and all outreach genres in Swedish):

> *I made my choice (English). It was very conscious. I had to make a choice because there are so many implications depending on which language you write in in history. My analysis will invariably be affected by what language I choose to present it in […] I had to make a conscious decision and a stand for writing in English. (H2)*

Other reasons for choosing to be a monolingual English writer included a rejection of national boundaries, and perceived benefits for career development. Nonetheless, in both Anthropology and History, informants gave anecdotal evidence that it is possible to develop a career as a Swedish-language scholar. However, this is achieved by transcending the popular/academic divide, either through a best-selling monograph or a place in the media as a public intellectual.

For the three senior historians, language 'choice' is determined by the context surrounding text production; contextual factors include the genre through which the knowledge is to be disseminated and the sub-disciplinary or national-orientation of subject matter:

> *When we are writing for a journal, perhaps invited to write for a journal or a contribution to a book, then that's a reason for using English (H1)*

> *If I take part in a conference and then have the opportunity to publish, then the editors and organizers of the conference have made a decision about language, and it's not going to be Swedish […] I have two topics that I write about. I do (topic 1). Some [publications] are in Swedish, but more of them are in English. But I write about (topic 2) too, and all those are in Swedish, so that's topic based and audience based. (H4)*

This practice of reporting nationally-oriented subject matter in the local language was also taken up by a senior linguist, who nonetheless viewed this as a parochial stance which is somewhat irrational and restrictive:

> *For me, it is relatively seldom the case that it makes sense to write things in Swedish. I can see that for other people it may seem more natural to do so because their topics and their audiences are more specifically Swedish or Scandinavian […], it feels a bit funny to do it in English. But it's strange because if you do the same thing somewhere else, like a language in Indonesia, then it would be very natural to write in English. (L4)*

The targeting of a transnational discourse community was very prominent in the data. Even historians who have a coherent local-language community stated that they belong to an international community, which necessitates a lingua-franca dialog with peers:

> *In order to be able to pursue [certain topics] I have to publish in English, because then you are taking part in a much wider dialogue. (A1)*

> *It's about who you want to have a dialogue with. Not that anyone is reading you, but imagine that! Yes, I didn't have so many dialogues with Swedish researchers when I was writing. It's the ones you refer to. I think that's also one of the reasons that I write in English. (H5)*

Predictably, all the informants viewed Swedish as the language of publication for outreach genres. Some informants commented that the reason they do not write outreach genres in English is that they are less familiar with the channels of dissemination. Nevertheless, a sense of choice was not particularly apparent. This is illustrated by the following comment by a historian:

> *Popular texts for a home audience are in Swedish, but I am not sure that there is the possibility to choose. The language is pre-set, default. (H4)*

Whether writing an academic or outreach genre, the more senior academics across the three disciplines are often invited to write rather than self-activating, and thus conform to whichever language demands editors or conference organizers place on them. Anthropology as a discipline has an additional ethical dimension, in that there is a duty to make research accessible to the communities studied as far as possible. This provided a rationale for publications in Swedish and English, as well as the multilingual practices shown in Tables 1 and 2. Thus, as with History, the object of study also determines language use in Anthropology. Field work carried out in Sweden was generally thought to naturally lead to a Swedish publication, particularly if the genre used for knowledge dissemination is a PhD thesis. But when it comes to methodological or theoretical developments, a switch to English seems natural. This is illustrated by A4's comment:

> *I have a PhD student now. If she writes in English, she needs to makes sure that it's theoretically important […] but still I felt that she should write in Swedish and then re-write certain parts of it as articles in English. (A4)*

The disciplines diverge in that the sources used by historians in the Swedish department tend to be located in Sweden, whereas the anthropologists are more international in their collection of raw material. This is again reflected in the more diverse range of languages used by the anthropologists; one scholar who publishers on the Middle East has been translated to French, another who focuses on the Indian sub-continent publishes in English.

5.2.3. Language development and maintenance

Issues of Swedish language maintenance and development were not particularly prominent in the interview data. One linguist asserted that "Swedish is used in all these functional domains where a language should be used at a university"; however, when the discussion turned to practices at the post-graduate level, the informant advocated the use of English, as post-graduate work involves functioning in the international domain. Indeed, another linguist stated he would actively try to dissuade a PhD student from writing their PhD thesis in Swedish, unless the topic was the Swedish language.

The importance of maintaining Swedish was expressed by three members of the Anthropology department, and several references to a lack of terminology were made across disciplines. The general feeling is exemplified by the following:

> *You sort of know the Swedish equal, but sometimes you don't have terms […] All the major journals are in the US, meaning that your whole vocabulary becomes English, concepts, and it's so difficult to translate. (A3)*

There were some suggestions that English is a more effective academic language, not in terms of the potential for reaching a broad audience, but rather micro- and macro-level features of English-language academic discourse such as vocabulary, terminology, sentence structure, and rhetorical structure:

> *I wrote really short sentences and I had a friend of mine read it for me. He said, why are you writing all these short sentences? Take the opportunity and use the English language with all its possibilities! (H4)*

> *Swedish can sometimes feel a bit conscribed. It feels so ordinary. English has a much larger vocabulary, and you can sometimes think it's more interesting. It sounds better in English, more professional. (A4)*

> *It [English] feels good because I have all the terminology I need. It feels good because of the tradition of academic writing where you have to structure everything with an introduction and conclusion. (L5)*

The division in terms of when Swedish and English are appropriate as mediums of academic and communication was clearest among the comments made by the linguists, which included one mention of diglossia: English for academic publication and Swedish (or other languages) for outreach, administration, informal communication among the wider disciplinary community and day-to-day departmental interaction.

> *The two languages aren't equal in almost any domain here […] Swedish is very important for teaching. It's the colloquial language of the department, so Swedish is very important, but we have a kind of diglossic situation with English as the written language (L5)*

> *If I collect comments from external reviewers who write in English, then I may add something in Swedish or I might just say these things in Swedish, and if I write a more official document, it will be in English. (L3)*

> *There are Swedish conferences yearly, not even there you wrote things in Swedish […]. But I am getting more of these requests to write some short thing to explain research for a general public. That kind of thing I do in Swedish. (L1)*

In summary, for the informants in the study, the language of publication is determined by practical forces such as intended audience, publication outlet, topic, and to a certain extent, genre. While relatively few informants explicitly expressed concern over the viability of Swedish as an academic language, all recognized that findings should be disseminated to practitioner and lay-audiences when time and resources allow, and that this should be and is effected through the medium of Swedish.

6. Discussion and conclusion

The overarching aim of this study has been to explore the 'on the ground' experiences of 15 scholars across three disciplines with a view to developing some understanding of the relationship between parallel language policy and actual publication practices. In this final section, the three research questions set out in Section 1 are answered in turn, and placed within the wider context of university language management. In addition, some implications for EAP are discussed.

The first research question pertains to the language(s) and genres used by the informants in academic and outreach publication. It has been established that both English and Swedish are viable in History, Anthropology, and Linguistics, as genres across all three disciplines have been published in the last seven years. Nonetheless, in terms of quantitative output, considerably more academic genres have appeared in English than Swedish. Thus, it would seem that English has made significant inroads into the humanities and social sciences, but not to the extent seen in natural and exact sciences (see, for example, Sandelin and Sarafoglou (2004)). Conversely, Swedish is clearly the dominant language of outreach and practitioner-oriented publication in those sub-disciplines where the appropriate audience exists. As shown in Table 2, fewer genres in this category have been produced; nonetheless, this domain constitutes a significant opportunity for knowledge dissemination in the local language.

The historians' publication records are particularly noteworthy for EAP practitioners, in that informants suggest an increasing emphasis on the (English-language) research article. To date there has been relatively little research into the English-language disciplinary discourse of History, perhaps due to the perception that historians overwhelmingly write in local languages. However, this may be an outdated assumption, and more investigation into the discursive patterns of this discipline is potentially needed.

The results for the second research question are in line with studies rooted in other language contexts which show that language use in publication is determined by extra-institutional forces (Anderson, 2013; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Petersen & Shaw, 2002). These include the supranational nature of most academic communities, as well as disciplinary (Kuteeva & Airey, in press; Petersen & Shaw, 2002) and sub-disciplinary factors. For example, in the present study, intra-disciplinary variation in language use is dependent on the research topic: scholars whose objects of study are locally-relevant (and who can find appropriate local-language publication outlets) on the whole have published in Swedish. However, there is less evidence to support Duszak and Lewkowicz's (2008) argument that publishing in English constitutes an "ideological choice". In fact, given the pragmatic approach expressed by most informants, and the external constraints listed, publishing an academic text in the local language would seem to constitute more of an ideological stance.

In terms of type of publication, all scholars in the study have produced more academic genres than practitioner-oriented or outreach texts, citing both institutional and extra-institutional pressures which place far greater emphasis and reward on knowledge-dissemination within the academic communities. If publication in Swedish is to be increased, local reward systems could be altered so that outreach publications and publications targeting local academic discourse communities are privileged (Petersen & Shaw, 2002). However, as is recognized in the current policy (see extract 3 in Section 4), the variations in the publication opportunities of the various discourse communities means a uniform approach is perhaps inappropriate.

The third research question pertains to the relationship between actual publication practices and parallel language policy. To date, studies which focus specifically on outreach and academic publication within the context of parallel-language policy in other counties have not appeared; therefore, a comparative discussion here is not possible. Indeed, as has been established, parallel language use as a concept is highly problematic, and a full understanding of what the term implies is yet to be achieved. Nonetheless, some "concurrent use of several languages within one or more areas" (Nordic Language Policy) is evident in the informants' practices. If publication constitutes a discrete "area", only two of the 15

informants are monolingual in their practice. The practice of the other informants suggests a functional distribution between Swedish and other languages. Prototypically (and intuitively), the distribution is English for knowledge dissemination to transnational academic communities and Swedish to outreach, practitioner-oriented, or locally-focused academic audiences. In this case, Preisler's (2009) term "complementary language use", or Ferguson's (2007) description of bilingual practices are more apt. Nonetheless, given that the policy explicitly refrains from pinning down terms such as "area", there is no apparent conflict between policy and practice. This seems eminently sensible, as a move toward requiring academic publication in Swedish would contradict efforts to increase internationalization. However, for the policy to interact with practice in a more reflective way, the sections which assume scholars "choose" to publish in one language over another require revision. As has been shown, language use in written knowledge dissemination appears to be pragmatically determined. Therefore, a policy which invites scholars to write in a language for ideological reasons (i.e. safeguarding the national language) rather than communicative reasons (i.e. communicating with a transnational community of academics) would be wide of the mark. Instead, a shift of resources to facilitate the kinds of publications which have an existing local-language audience may prove more productive.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Maria Kuteeva, Anna Mauranen and the reviewers for their valuable feedback. I would also like to thank David Minugh for assistance with translation, and my informants for agreeing to be part of the study.

References

Anderson, L. (2013). Publishing strategies of young, highly mobile academics: the question of language in the European context. *Language Policy, 12*(3), 273–288.
Bennett, K. (2007). Epistemicide! The tale of a predatory discourse. *The Translator, 13*, 1–19.
Berg, E., Hult, F., & King, K. (2001). Shaping the climate for language shift? English in Sweden's elite domains. *World Englishes, 20*, 305–319.
Bolton, K., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). English as an academic language at a Swedish university: parallel language use and the 'threat' of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(5), 429–447.
Cresswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. California: Sage.
Curry, M., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: negotiating interests, demands and rewards. *TESOL Quaterly, 38*, 663–688.
DiVA. http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/search.jsf.
Duszak, A., & Lewkowicz, J. (2008). Publishing academic texts in English: a Polish perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 108–120.
El-khawas, E. (2002). Developing an academic career in a globalizing world. In J. Enders, & O. Fulton (Eds.), *Higher education in a globalized world* (pp. 241–254). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Iberica, 13*, 7–38.
Ferguson, G. (2012). English in language policy and management. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge University Press.
Ferguson, G., Pérez-Llantada, C., & Plo, R. (2011). English as an international language of scientific publication: a study of attitudes. *World Englishes, 30*(1), 41–59.
Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the non-native English speaking scholar. *TESOL Quaterly, 34*(1), 127–150.
Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an additional language: what can Goffman's "stigma" tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 77–86.
Giannoni, D. (2008). Medical writing at the periphery: the case of Italian journal editorials. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*, 97–107.
Grin, F. (2003). *Language policy evaluation and the European charter for regional or minority languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Gunnarsson, B. (2000). Swedish tomorrow – a product of the linguistic dominance of English? *Central Issues in Language and Society, 7*, 51–69.
Harder, P. (2009). Parallel language use: a case for active social construction. *Angles on the English-Speaking World, 9*, 109–127.
Harris, R., & Brown, G. (2010). Mixing interview and questionnaire methods: practical problems in aligning data. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation, 15*(1), 1–14.
Hoffman, C. (2000). The spread of English and the growth of multilingualism with English in Europe. In J. Cenoz, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Josephson, O. (2005). Parallellspråkighet. *Språkvård, 1*, 3.
Kuteeva, M. (2011). Teaching and learning in English parallel-language and ELF settings: debates, concerns and realities in higher education. *Iberica, 22*, 5–12.
Kuteeva, M., & Airey, J. Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education*. DOI: 10.1007/s10734-013-9660-6, in press.
Kuteeva, M., & McGrath, L. Taming "Tyrannosaurus rex": English use in the research and publication practices of humanities scholars in Sweden. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Communication. Special Issue: English in the Language Ecosystem of Northern Europe*, in press.
Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2009). International Engagement versus local commitment: Hong Kong academics in the humanities and social sciences writing for publication. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*, 279–293.
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
Liu, J. (2004). Co-constructing academic discourse from the periphery: Chinese applied linguists' centripetal participation in scholarly publication. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 14*, 1–22.
Lindström, J. (2012). Different languages, one mission? Outcomes of language policies in a multilingual university context. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 33–54.
Marimon, R., Lietaert, M., & Grigolo, M. (2009). Toward the 'fifth freedom': increasing the mobility of researchers in the European Union. *Higher Education in Europe, 34*(1), 25–37.
Nordic Council of Ministers. (2007). *Deklaration om nordisk språkpolitik 2006*. Köpenhamn: Nordiska Ministerrådet.
Olsson, A., & Sheridan, V. (2012). A case study of Swedish scholars' experience with and perceptions of the use of English in academic publishing. *Written Communication, 29*(1), 33–54.
Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics, ideology: from colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Petersen, M., & Shaw, P. (2002). Language and disciplinary differences in a biliterate context. *World Englishes, 21*(3), 357–374.
Phillipson, R. (2009). English in higher education: panacea or pandemic? *Angles on the English-speaking World, 9*, 29–57.

Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1996). Danish scholars and languages of scientific communication. In B. Bakmand, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Papers in language policy: Papers from the language policy conference, 29 January 1996. ROLIG-paper 56* (pp. 33–42). Poskilde, Denmark: Roskilde University.
Preisler, B. (2009). Complementary languages: the national language and English as working languages in European universities. *Angles on the English-speaking World, 9*, 10–28.
Salö, L. (2010). *Engelska eller svenska? En kartläggning av språksituationen inom högre utbildning och forskning*. Stockholm: Språkrådet.
Sandelin, B., & Sarafoglou, N. (2004). Language and scientific publication statistics. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 28*, 1–10.
Teleman, U., & Westman, M. (1997). Behöver vi en nationell språkpolitik? *Språkvård, 2*, 5–16.
Uzuner, S. (2008). Multilingual scholars' participation in core/global academic communities: a literature review. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 250–263.

Lisa McGrath is a doctoral student at the Centre for Academic English in the Department of English, Stockholm University. Her research interests include specialized disciplinary discourses, EAP and issues surrounding English for research and publication.