þÿResearchers language practices concerning kno
production and dissemination : Discourses of mono- and multilingualism

Hynninen, Niina

Palgrave Macmillan
2020

þÿHynninen , N & Kuteeva , M 2020 , Researchers language practices co
production and dissemination : Discourses of mono- and multilingualism . in M Kuteeva , K
Kaufhold & N Hynninen (eds) , Language Perceptions and Practices in Multilingual
Universities . Palgrave Macmillan , Cham , pp. 323-350 . https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6_13

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/342328
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6_13

Author's accepted manuscript of

Hynninen, Niina & Kuteeva, Maria (2020) Researchers' language practices concerning knowledge production and dissemination: Discourses of mono- and multilingualism. In: Maria Kuteeva, Kathrin Kaufhold & Niina Hynninen (eds) *Language Perceptions and Practices in Multilingual Universities*. pp. 323-350. Palgrave Macmillan.

***

Chapter 13

Researchers' language practices concerning knowledge production and dissemination: Discourses of mono- and multilingualism

Niina Hynninen and Maria Kuteeva

1. Introduction

Academic disciplines and institutional contexts may vary not only in their research practices but also in how mono- or multilingual these practices are. Several previous studies have focused on research publication practices of second language (L2) users of English in different disciplines and geolocations (e.g. Li & Flowerdew, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Anderson, 2013; Gentil & Séror, 2014; McGrath, 2014; Schluer, 2015; Curry & Lillis, 2018). These studies have drawn attention to the increasing use of, and demand for English in academic publishing across disciplines, discussing both the benefits and challenges the situation poses to individual scholars in different contexts, as well as the more general implications of the trend. Much of the focus has also been on the "choices" L2 writers of English make when writing for research publication, although publication patterns can be determined by external factors and pressures leaving individual scholars with little choice as to what language to use (e.g. Salö, 2015). While these choices may have been reduced because of the current status of English as the main academic lingua franca, research shows how scholars, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, negotiate international participation and local research commitments by publishing both in English and in their first language (L1), and sometimes in other academic languages, too (e.g. Li & Flowerdew, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Anderson, 2013). Studies that have examined research writing practices from the perspective of the writing process further illustrate that while English increasingly dominates as the research publication language across various fields, the writing process may not be monolingual (see e.g. Lillis & Curry, 2010; Salö, 2015). It thus seems that scholars' research practices tend to be more multilingual than the statistics on languages used for publication may indicate.

Tensions concerning academic monolingualism versus multilingualism in knowledge production and dissemination have been addressed to a certain extent in previous research. For example, in their extensive research on research writing practices of multilingual scholars, Lillis and Curry (2010, pp. 42-46) identify as many as seven different communities along disciplinary, geolinguistic, and applied vs. theoretical dimensions that these scholars were found to be writing for – in different languages. Based on these findings, scholars' motivations for writing for a particular community ranged from personal and scholarly motivations to external pressures, notably rewards systems that increasingly favour English-medium publications. While English is increasingly required for publishing for international disciplinary communities, language choices are context-dependent. Writing about Spanish geoscientists' language perceptions, Pérez-Llantada (2018) reports that although the scientists described their research communication practices as English-only, multilingual practices were reported to take place, for instance, in field trips with international colleagues.

Much of the research and discussion about languages for knowledge production and dissemination evolves around English versus national (and possibly other) languages viewed as closed systems which are separate from each other (see Holmes, this volume). Some calls for translingual practices in research writing have been made (Canagarajah, 2013), but it seems that while knowledge production may exhibit translingual practices (e.g. Pérez-Llantada, 2018), research publications are usually required to be monolingual. At the same time, in some disciplines, attempts are made to diversify language uses: some journals in language studies (e.g. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *Ibérica*) encourage their authors to provide supplementary abstracts in languages other than the language of publication, and most universities in the Nordic countries require doctoral dissertations to be accompanied by summaries in English or the national language or both (e.g. Salö, 2018). While such practices may be described as supporting parallel monolingualism (see Introduction, this volume), they are clearly meant to diversify the target audiences of research publications, both within and outside academia.

This contribution builds on the premise that academia is an inherently multilingual setting, where various linguistic resources may be used in the research process despite predominantly monolingual publication outcomes. It examines the ways in which researchers from four disciplines and two Nordic countries talk about their language practices, particularly those related to knowledge production and dissemination. The focus is thus not only on the researchers' language practices concerning research writing and publication, but also on those concerning the reading of research literature and the doing of research itself. Our chapter aims to shed light on the mono- and multilingual language practices described by the researchers and on the ways they position themselves (e.g. as research writers or readers of source literature) when talking about these practices (cf. Edley, 2001; Pavlenko, 2007). By focusing in more detail on how the researchers position themselves when talking about their language practices, it will be possible to nuance our understanding of the roles different linguistic resources play for researchers across a range of disciplines. We use the notion of discourses to refer to particular perspectives and understandings as manifested in the ways in which the researchers talk about their language practices (cf. Kuteeva, this volume). Our understanding of the notion suggests that while discourses provide a basis for researchers' shared social understandings and perspectives, they are constructed and reconstructed in specific instances of communication (cf. Edley, 2001). The research questions addressed in this interview-based study are:

1. What kinds of discourses about language practices are constructed in the interview accounts?
2. How do these discourses relate to the ways the researchers position themselves in the interviews?

2. Data and methods

This study contributes to the body of research investigating researcher perspectives on knowledge production and the associated writing processes, with particular focus on what roles different languages seem to play for researchers. In order to shed light on such perspectives, the study draws on research interview data. Below, we briefly describe the context of our study (section 2.1), after which we introduce our data (section 2.2) and the methods of analysis (section 2.3).

2.1. Context of study

The data for this study were collected in three multidiscipinary universities located in two Nordic countries, Finland and Sweden. Both of these countries have national languages that are regional (Finnish and Swedish in Finland, and Swedish in Sweden) and that have limited reach beyond the national borders, or at least beyond the Nordic countries in the case of Swedish. This means that scholars working in the two countries have always had to operate in a language other than the national one(s) in order to take part in international research communities. This is true particularly of disciplines where no research publication outlets have ever existed in the national languages in question (section 3.1; see also Introduction, this volume, on the impact of discipline on language use).

Both countries use bibliometric systems for distributing funding to universities, Finland has its own Publication Forum[i] and Sweden uses the Norwegian Publication Indicator[ii] . Both of these systems recognize publications written in different languages, but one of the main criteria for high ranking in the systems is for the publication to be international, which explains the prevalence of English-language publication outlets (Auranen & Pölönen, 2014; Nygaard & Bellanova, 2018). A certain push towards publishing in English is thus evident in both contexts, even if research publishing and particularly outreach activities in national languages are increasingly encouraged in the Nordic context, often in the interest of trying to ensure that the national language(s) will continue to be used as academic languages (see e.g. Hultgren, Gregersen, & Thøgersen, 2014).

2.2. Study participants and data collection

Our data include 43 research interviews conducted with researchers working in Finland (29) and Sweden (14). The researchers represent four disciplines: anthropology (5), computer science and human computer interaction, or HCI (17), geology (7), and history (14). The data from the computer/HCI scientists and historians are from both countries, whereas the data from anthropologists are from Sweden and the data from geologists from Finland only. The Finnish data, collected by the first author from two universities in 2015–2016 forms part of an ethnographically informed research project entitled Language Regulation in Academia (LaRA)[iii] . The Swedish data were collected from one university by the second author and research associates in 2013–2016. Thus, our study combines data collected for different research projects, but with a joint focus on research writing practices. The interview guides covered similar themes in all 43 interviews and thus ensure comparability across the data. These themes were: languages used for research purposes, the role of English in the field, and experiences and perceptions of research-related writing. The exact questions that were asked in the interviews varied, as is typical of semi-structured interviews that seek to elicit discussion of specific topics and that allow the interviewer and interviewee to pursue any topic of relevance that happens to emerge during the interview. Informed consent was obtained from all study participants.

For this study, our main goal was to consider mono-/multilingual practices among all researchers included in our dataset. For this reason, we have not aimed for equal distribution of the data between the disciplines or countries by artificially balancing the data by leaving out some of the interviews from the analysis. Rather, we have examined all 43 interviews at our disposal as a single dataset (see section 2.3). We are aware that the number of study participants varies across the four disciplines, but to ensure comparability, we have used a minimum criterion of 5 interviewees, each speaking at least one language in addition to their L1, from different career stages. Accordingly, in each of the disciplines, the study participants consist of researchers at different career stages, including professors, senior researchers, postdocs, and doctoral students, which ensures representativeness of the data in this regard. The data were collected from both female (18) and male (25) participants, as well as L1 speakers of the national languages of the two countries (27) and speakers of other languages (16). Out of the four disciplines, computer science / HCI was the most varied in terms of researchers' L1s, which reflects recruitment patterns in the institutional contexts investigated. In total, our study participants had 14 different L1s from the following different language families: Balto-Slavic, Finno-Ugrian, Germanic, Indo-Iranian, Niger-Congo, Romance, Sino-Tibetan and Turkic. Apart from two L1-English speaking computer/HCI scientists, all participants were multilingual scholars with various L1s.

All 43 interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim (see Appendix 1 for transcription conventions). The interviews with the L1-Finnish speakers were conducted in Finnish, which was also the L1 of the interviewer. The remaining interviews were conducted in English. The analysis was done in the original languages of the interviews. Excerpts from the interviews conducted in Finnish have been translated into English by the first author; the Finnish versions are available upon request. The translations seek to retain as much of the original style as possible without compromising readability. Depending on the amount of detail provided by the interviewees, the typical length of an interview varied between 30 minutes and 1.5 hours.

In the data excerpts used in this chapter, we refer to each study participant with a numbered code indicating only the national and disciplinary contexts they work in (e.g. FH1–9, SA1–5). When an excerpt has been translated, this is marked with a “t” at the end of the code, e.g. FH3t (historian working in Finland #3, translated). When referring to the interviewees, we use “they” as the third person singular throughout.

2.3. Data Analysis

Our data analysis proceeded as follows: We first coded the data by identifying passages related to the researchers’ language practices. We selected passages where the interviewee and interviewer talk about the linguistic resources that the interviewee uses in their work, including discussions about the choice of language and the reasons for using a specific language for a particular purpose, as well as any discussion about the benefits or challenges of using a particular language. We then further coded these passages based on whether the language practices were described as mono- or multilingual. In conjunction with this, we considered how the interviewees positioned themselves when talking about language in these specific ways, that is, whether they talked more generally from the position of a researcher representing a particular discipline, or more specifically from the perspective of reading, writing or doing research (see Davies & Harré, 1990; Edley, 2001; Pavlenko, 2007). We thus used "positioning" as an analytic concept that allowed us to consider possible differences in language practices between disciplines (e.g. whether interviewees positioning as historians as opposed to geologists talked differently about their language practices), but also between roles the interviewees take as researchers (e.g. whether different kinds of language practices were associated with doing research as opposed to research-related reading and writing).

To see what discourses were constructed in the accounts, we looked for patterned ways of talking about the different linguistic resources mentioned, as well as those that seemed too self-evident to mention. Our aim was to discern how the interviewees position themselves during the course of the interviews, and how these positionings relate to how they talk about their language practices (e.g. which languages they use for which purposes and why). Our aim has thus been to examine how the researchers' perceptions of, and choices related to their language practices, may be linked to specific positions from which they are talking. Our starting point in the analysis was to treat the data as a bulk of text about researchers' language practices; for instance, we did not systematically seek to compare the disciplines to one other. However, as shown below, disciplinary differences arose in the process of data analysis.

3. Findings: Discourses of mono- and multilingualism

In the following, we examine the ways in which the researchers described their mono/multilingual reading and writing practices, and what discourses of language use these descriptions construct. The three discourses identified in the data are: (a) discourse of disciplinary monolingualism, (b) discourse of dual monolingualism, and (c) discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism. The aim is to consider how the descriptions form a web of interconnected discourses the relevance of which may vary for the researchers depending on the position from which they are talking.

3.1. Disciplinary monolingualism

The discourse of disciplinary monolingualism builds on researchers' descriptions of disciplinary practices that favour a particular language. This discourse is manifested in three main ways: (a) in the way English was described as the only viable option for participation in some of the disciplinary communities; (b) in the way English was reserved for scientific writing in these fields, even if other languages could be used for outreach purposes; and (c) in the way English was described as an easier language for research writing than the researcher's L1.

The discourse manifested in researcher descriptions about research writing, particularly when the researchers positioned themselves as research writers operating in particular fields. A clear disciplinary divide could thus be detected: the discourse was more widely spread in the interview talk of geologists and computer/HCI scientists than among anthropologists and historians. The following extracts illustrate the centrality of English in the two fields where the discourse was the most dominant.

(1)

> In our field [i.e. geology], if something is noteworthy it has to be internationally recognized, and nothing else is internationally recognized than a text written in English <I: yeah> because then there are no readers anymore <I: yes> if it's something else.

(FG3t)

(2)

But all the writing is always done in English because there are international conferences <I: right> um so, there is, not much of @@ a possibility to use <I: yeah yeah> another language.

(FCS10)

Positioning themselves as research writers working in specific fields, in the first extract, a geologist emphasizes how research needs to be written in English for it to have a chance to be recognized in the field (cf. Pérez-Llantada, 2018), and in the second extract, a computer/HCI scientist sees no possibilities of using other languages than English. Both extracts draw attention to the international nature of the disciplines in question ("internationally recognized", "international conferences"), and emphasize how there is no real language choice for publication or other officially recognized research outcomes.

What is noteworthy is that for the geologists and computer/HCI scientists in the contexts investigated, using an L2 for research purposes is not a new situation (cf. Kuteeva, this volume). As one Finnish geologist put it,

(3)

There has never been, a geological research bulletin in Finnish. ((…)) I can't think of any publication channel where I would publish my research in Finnish.

(FG2t)

Similarly, the computer/HCI scientists emphasized how the field of research "lives completely in English" (FCS3t), and as is evident in the following comments from two established scholars in the field, how they have almost exclusively published in English, also in the past:

(4)

> And then all publications are in English, there are no Finnish-language publications so I don't have that kind of a choice so in that sense it remains a bit, because there is no choice then it's in English, mostly.

(FCS6t)

(5)

> I would say that of the hundred plus papers that I have on my website uh a- as things that I've been involved in writing, one of them may be in Swedish and one of them may be Dutch so ninety-nine plus percent [are in English].

(SCS4)

This discourse of disciplinary monolingualism was repeated across the interviews with researchers working in these two fields, and also reached beyond research writing, as suggested in extract (6).

(6)

> Well we are quite an international and multicultural group, um we're basically forced by necessity to all work in the same language [i.e. English] so we don't er manage language (in any other way).

(FCS8)

The extract exemplifies how English could also be construed as the main language used for communication in local research groups, which further constructs the pragmatic necessity associated with using English.

At the same time, this does not mean that research would be conducted monolingually in English, nor that all writing in the two fields would be in English (see sections 3.2 and 3.3; cf. Salö, 2015). The disciplinary monolingualism in these fields comes from the dominance of English for scientific writing and communication, as suggested in the following quote from a geologist: "other than some popularized articles in Finnish, all research publishing is done in English" (FG4t).

A similar kind of genre division for research-based writing manifested in the talk of anthropologists, as exemplified in the extract below.

(7)

> It’s completely my decision whether I write in English or Swedish. I’m driven by certain topics I’m interested in, and in order to be able to pursue them, **I have to publish in English**, because then you are taking part in a much wider dialogue. What happens is that when we write in English, Swedish colleagues would read us in English, so in that sense there is an overlap. **I reach my Swedish colleagues when I write in English**. Also, our students use our books that we write in English. So this is why when I write in Swedish, I normally popularize.

(SA3)

In the extract, the anthropologist describes language choice as autonomous, but at the same time determined by pragmatic necessity. The logic seems to be that because the disciplinary community operates in English, there is no need to use “other” languages except for outreach purposes (cf. McGrath, 2014). While the possibility for using these other languages exists in principle, the account thus suggests a trend towards disciplinary English-language monolingualism.

What is more, in all of the above fields, it seems that the socialization of particularly younger scholars has taken place through English, which is illustrated in comments such as:

(8)

> I mean the, the fact that I write it in English, is pretty natural in the sense that, this is, this is almost the only language I’ve ever written research in. So technically I kind of learned, this sort of technical writing, only in English.

(FCS9)

For a number of these scholars, English had become such a natural part of their working life that they reported it to be easier to use English than their L1 (cf. Nygaard, 2019). In the words of FSC9, an L1-French speaker:

(9)

I: Which one would you say is your strongest language, or is there one?

R: Interesting. If it's about technical writing, I kind of want to say English, because there are things I'm not even sure how to start expressing in French. For, for everything else, obviously French.

(FCS9)

In all, there was variation in the interview accounts in terms of which language(s) the researchers felt were their strongest one(s) for research purposes, but English was chosen by a larger proportion of younger scholars and by a larger proportion of scholars in geology, computer science / HCI and anthropology compared to history where the discourse of disciplinary monolingualism was hardly present at all. Many historians reported an increasing pressure to publish in English, as suggested in the following quote: "you get more merits today if you write in English, previously it was no different, you had no advantage in writing in English" (SH1). At the same time, monolingualism in publication writing was rare among the historians (see section 3.2), and what is more, two history professors in our data reported to be publishing in their L1 only, which would not have been an option in the other fields discussed. In all, it seems that the discourse of disciplinary monolingualism is more widely spread in those fields where original research has always been published in an academic lingua franca, for instance, English, German, French or Latin, rather than a "local" language.

3.2 Dual monolingualism

The discourse of dual monolingualism becomes evident in the participants' talk about research writing in two languages (cf. discussions of parallel language use, Introduction, this volume). In the fields where disciplinary English-language monolingualism was the strongest, researchers reported to be using their L1 mainly for more popularized writing, whereas, in particular, historians reported to be writing research publications in at least two languages (typically English and their L1). The discourse thus relates to two kinds of positionings: positioning as research writer and positioning as "citizen". In both cases, the discourse is manifested in the descriptions of and tensions between: (a) the researcher's pragmatically driven language choices, and (b) their felt responsibilities towards writing in a particular genre or language.

As shown in section 3.1, when positioning as research writers, the accounts by researchers in geology, computer science / HCI and typically also anthropology, constructed the discourse of disciplinary (English-language) monolingualism. However, if we consider the ways these researchers positioned themselves when writing for the wider public, we can see that their writing practices on the whole were not monolingually English. Rather, many of them reported to be using their L1 when writing more popularized texts (e.g. trade magazine articles, textbooks, and press releases); for instance, FCS2t stated that "when we sometimes do science popularisation, we do that in Finnish" (see also extract 7). This suggests that their accounts also constructed the discourse of dual monolingualism, with language choices related to domain-specific writing. More popularized genres were mainly associated with societal relevance of research, which was described, for instance, as being "more and more strongly recognized" (FG2t) and "a responsibility" (FCS6t). Responsibility thus seemed to be more strongly associated with achieving societal impact for research rather than any kind of responsibility towards one's L1.

In contrast, in the interviews with historians, the discourse of dual monolingualism typically related to positioning as research writer. Often, the choice of language for research writing was described in these data as a conscious strategy that related to audience design: "it's about who you want to have a dialogue with" (SH5). Topic and audience were seen as determining factors (cf. Schluer, 2015):

(10)

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.

(SH4)

As suggested in the extract, the pragmatic necessity for a historian may be to write in two languages rather than one (cf. discourse of disciplinary monolingualism in section 3.1). English seemed to be a self-evident choice for nearly all of the historians (apart from two history professors, who only wrote in their L1): "it's at least very wise to publish in English too if you want to continue in the academic world or get a permanent position at some point" (FH2t). At the same time, the kind of dual strategy of writing in English plus L1 was adopted by many of the interviewed historians.

(11)

It's a **combination of kind of pragmatism and** on the other hand ideality **idealism**. Well, pragmatism on the other hand, because you need to choose, or you need to think what the language is that the audience will understand, but then again, idealism too. We've had, there's been, a lot of discussion about whether you should write also in one of the national languages and, quite many or most historians including myself, believe that **we have, could I say even a duty to produce research also to the local audience**, and to shed light on for instance some important stages of Finnish history that are important for our, so that we understand how our society is organized or, why how its central features have come to pass or something like this. **So because of that, also because of that, I like to publish both in a local language and then in English which is now in practice the international language of science**.

(FH9t, the interviewer's minimal feedback has been removed for readability)

Similarly to the historian in extract (10), in extract (11), the interviewee relates the choice of publication language to pragmatic considerations of audience, but also to a felt duty towards the local audience (cf. Nygaard, 2019). In describing their writing practices and positioning as a research writer, the historian construes English as "the international language of science", as a self-evident choice, but describes publishing in a local language as a felt responsibility ("duty to produce") they share with a number of colleagues. Following

McGrath (2014), this suggests that it is more of an ideological choice to use a local language rather than the apparently expected international language English.

Interestingly, similar depictions of the responsibility to produce research in one's L1 were repeated across the data from historians.

(12)

> And and I do sort of **feel the responsibility** to from time to time publish something in Dutch because I think oh yes, I mean we do have a cultural production of our, of our own, whatever that means @@. Erm and it's a language I like, and love and I think needs to sort of be, be kept alive. But, in, **in terms of your individual decisions that's a weird thing to do, @@ because you have your own career to think about and it's not my responsibility to keep Dutch (like), yeah**. So I don't kno-, like it's a very odd thing to sort of try and legislate, for language.
>
> (FH7)

As can be seen in the extract, when positioning as a researcher who needs to make career-related choices, the historian questions the utility of publishing in their L1 and distances themselves from the felt responsibility of publishing research in the L1. At the same time, the researcher clearly "feel[s] the responsibility" of publishing in their L1, and this is what this multilingual scholar continues doing. What the extract suggests is that tensions may arise between language policies and what is beneficial from an individual researcher's perspective, and that these tensions may influence researchers' language choices.

A similar tension is also evident in the following extract from an L1-Finnish speaking historian who was asked about whether they worry about the status of Finnish as a research language:

(13)

> I don't know how much I should worry about it [i.e. publishing in Finnish] and this is partly because the research field where I operate is so international and mainly abroad that it doesn't touch me the same way, but then of course it is extremely important

> that there are also Finnish-language academic publication channels and that Finnish also remains a language of science.
>
> (FH1t)

In the extract, a tension is created between career-related pragmatic choices that for this historian seem to mean writing research publications in English, whereas a protectionist stance towards their L1 manifests itself when the talk becomes more abstract and policy related (see Saarinen & Taalas, 2017, on Nordic language policies for higher education). In particular, when a researcher expressed a preference for writing in their L1, this protectionist stance could also relate to views about the ease and benefits of writing in one's L1: "Using your own language is so much easier and it makes the, your research more accurate I think" (FH8).

In sum, the discourse of dual monolingualism manifested itself in the interviews with historians as the reported possibility to use at least two languages for research publication, and thus, disciplinary bi- or multilingualism. On the one hand, this bi- or multilingualism enables researchers to make pragmatic choices concerning the languages they use for publication (even if in practice choices may be limited, see e.g. Lillis & Curry, 2010). On the other hand, it also obligates researchers to learn to write academically in more than one language, possibly following different writing conventions. Interestingly, it seems that the multilingualism in research writing in history is partly influenced by a felt duty to publish research in one's L1, even if this may not necessarily be rewarding career-wise. The findings thus indicate a tension between pragmatic and protectionist perspectives. At the same time, protectionist perspectives were less visible in the accounts of geologists and computer/HCI scientists (as well as to an extent by anthropologists), who had a tendency to associate language choice with domain specific writing.

3.3 Functional epistemic multilingualism

The discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism builds on researchers' descriptions of doing research and constructing knowledge in or through several languages. It manifested in the data mainly when researchers talked about their language practices from the position of doing their research and reading research literature. The discourse was thus strongly associated with research-related reading (whether primary or secondary sources) and the research process itself (e.g. data collection, notes writing and communication with researchers who share one's L1), but to some extent also with outreach activities. As shown in the previous sections 3.1 and 3.2, when the researchers positioned themselves as research writers operating within their fields, the discourse of disciplinary monolingualism and that of dual monolingualism prevailed.

Although the discourse of dual monolingualism was more typical in relation to talk about outreach (section 3.2), sometimes the discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism was constructed. A case in point is extract (14), where, positioning as citizen, a professor in HCI tells about their research group's practice of writing and translating press releases in several languages and releasing them simultaneously in the different language areas in order to maximize the impact of their work.

(14)

R: This is also part of our societal responsibility that we take a stand and bring our research forward so it's not just about us getting attention

I: Yes. In what languages do you do this?

R: Well now that we get to these language issues, Finland is such a small language area that if we only played within Finland then **our impact would be really restricted**. <I: mhm> So I always say that it has to be international, the focus, and that means in practice that all press releas-, well **all social media is of course in English, but press releases we often translate**. <I: okay> So for instance when we developed a new [technique] it was translated into Korean ((...)) That helped a lot, it instantly spread there. <I: okay> Then

> this [other research] was translated into Spanish and Chinese and <I: okay> and German on top of English and Finnish. We had five languages. <I: okay, yeah> And that helped when they are all sent out together <I: okay> there is often a kind of network effect <I: yeah> that signals strengthen each other. ((...)) **So we get this kind of network effect when we publish it in many languages.**

(FCS6t)

In the extract, the professor describes their research group's practices as international, and portrays first English ("all social media is of course in English"), but then also other languages ("press releases we often translate [into several languages]"), as essential in spreading their research results across national borders. That the researcher describes outreach activities as an international, rather than as a "national", activity in the "local" language(s) of the environment where the research group operates provides a new perspective to language debates in higher education. Often, these debates associate societal impact with organisational nationalism of universities, whereas the account suggests that researchers may also aim for societal impact to be international, which in turn influences their language choices.

As illustrated with extract (14) above, traces of the discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism could be found across the data from different disciplines. However, the discourse was more pronounced in the talk of historians and anthropologists. Positioning as researchers in their respective fields, they described multilingualism as a prerequisite for doing the kind of research they are involved in. In the words of one of the historians: "It's probably always like this for a historian that you have to know terribly many languages, otherwise it just wouldn't work" (FH5t). As illustrated in the short data extracts (15a–c) from responses to a question about which languages they use for research, most of the historians in our data listed several languages:

(15)

(a) Well basically there’s four, like I’m, I’m actively researching in French German English, Dutch not at the moment but I have used it in the past sort of, and I can go, I think in all those languages, into the 18th century. (FH7)

(b) Finnish and English mostly but when reading source texts Latin Irish and sometimes French German Swedish but not that often so I might read some publications in those languages. (FH1t)

(c) Er <sigh> well I wish I would be able to read in more languages but I read daily in English French Swedish Finnish <I: okay> if needed I can read texts from my own field in German Italian Spanish. <I: whew wow> Yeah but it’s not that fluent (with a dictionary). (FH5t)

In extracts (15a–c), the historians seem to treat multilingual practices (particularly, reading historical source texts as well as research literature in several languages) as a normal part of their job as historians. Three things are to be noted here. First, depending on the historical era they are studying, historians may need to be able to decipher source texts written in old(er) forms of a language, which creates a challenge of its own for language learning (see 15a). Second, the languages needed for reading source texts, those needed for reading publications, and those needed for writing for publication may be different (see 15b). Third, the need for several languages as expressed in all three extracts, as well as the wish expressed by FH5 to be able to read in even more languages (see 15c), suggest that multilingualism is a pragmatic necessity in the field. This last point is further accentuated in the following extract, where the historian describes a situation where the linguistic repertoire (Blommaert, 2010) of master’s students may restrict their choice of a thesis topic.

(16)

We often think that it is unfair to us small ones [i.e. speakers of less widely spoken languages] that we are forced to invest so much on this English and other languages, but at the same time it is also a tremendous advantage compared to when suddenly master’s thesis writers are in a situation that they can’t choose this topic or that topic because they would have to know Russian or they would have to know German or they would have to know this or that language and then they only know for instance English pretty well.

(FH3t)

From the position of someone doing research on history, the interviewee describes multilingualism as an asset ("tremendous advantage"), but also suggests that the multilingualism of historians is a prerequisite for certain research to be conducted in the first place. From this perspective, we can speculate that the discipline is likely to remain multilingual, even if the reported research writing practices of the historians were not as multilingual as their practices of doing research. Similar conclusions may be drawn in relation to anthropology, as illustrated in the following extract from an interview with an anthropologist.

(17)

I: So, you use Arabic in your fieldwork and you read academic French?

R: Yes, and sometimes German with a bit of pain, an interesting text, like right now I have something in Spanish which I can, if it isn't too much, at least I am able to get the ideas to tell someone that they should look at this or not.

I: You haven't said Swedish!

R: Oh yes, I do I do, I teach in Swedish, I write in Swedish, I quite often also think in Swedish.

(SA1)

The anthropologist reported to be publishing in Swedish and English, and in the course of the interaction above, four other languages are mentioned as being part of the researcher's repertoire. Similarly to extract (15b), the researcher uses these different languages for different purposes. Notably, the number of languages the researcher uses for research purposes (=6) is larger than the number of languages they use for research and outreach publishing (=2).

What is notable is that the multilingualism of the research process may not be visible in research publications (cf. Piller, 2016). Some of the researchers in our data described how their written products are required to be monolingual, even if the research process and the data used have been multilingual. For instance, one historian described a book writing process where, for editorial reasons (i.e. the length of the book), the original extracts in French and Dutch had to be left out from the final English-language publication, and only the English translations remained. The historian lamented the loss of the multilingual elements in the book as follows:

(18)

> [When translating the examples] I sort of saw where the nuances were were disappearing where you sort of think, oh. And it doesn't matter for an international audience I think because they really don't care, but to me it's (sort of) <I: yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah> and I know that, there's a couple of reviews coming up now and I'm fairly sure someone will (bitch about it) like someone will (complain) about (there) not being the French and Dutch originals, and they will be right, but, yeah, I would agree with the reviewer @@.

(FH7)

In the extract, the historian builds a contrast between the multilingual process of doing their research and the monolingually English output of their book. The historian expresses a preference for including multilingual elements in their text and speculates that reviewers may share this preference. The historian can thus be seen to contest monolingual publication practices, although at the same time, they also question the relevance of multilingual elements to an international audience. What is clear is that the multilingualism of the research process is hidden in the monolingual research output expected by the publisher. As suggested by Canagarajah (2018), it thus seems that different scales of consideration are in operation at different stages of the writing process, with the finished products subjected to norms and conventions at higher scales.

Importantly, other kinds of writing, such as fieldwork notes, were reported to include various languages, as illustrated in extract (19).

(19)

> The data was in Albanian, but it’s not very good Albanian so it’s a mixture of German Albanian and English, my field notes are sometimes in Swedish, they were for that article, and this is what anthropologists do, they have their field notes it depends you sort of mix it depending on what you are writing your field notes about at that moment.
>
> (SA4)

In the extract above, the anthropologist describes their multilingual practices, and how they sometimes mix different languages when writing field notes. This mixing of languages suggests that the boundaries between languages may become blurred, which resonates with Canagarajah’s (2013) notion of translingual practices. The comment also raises the question of the kind of language expected of different kinds of texts (cf. Hynninen & Kuteeva, 2017; Solin & Hynninen, 2018).

Some of the historians reported to be writing research publications in up to four different languages, which means that the discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism could also be relevant when researchers talked about their research writing practices. However, for most of the historians and anthropologists who reported to be using several languages for their research, the discourse tended to shift to that of dual monolingualism, or even disciplinary monolingualism, when they talked from the position of a research writer. As one highly multilingual historian put it: “I can only write in Finnish and English” (FH3t), which suggests that research writing requires a different kind of language competence from reading source materials.

In all, it can be concluded that when positioning themselves as “doers” of research, the discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism was key in the way particularly historians and anthropologists talked about their language practices, whereas when positioning themselves as research writers, with a few exceptions, the same researchers tended to construct a discourse of disciplinary monolingualism or that of dual monolingualism. Interestingly, the discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism was sometimes also constructed in talk about outreach activities, where multilingual practices were described as a means to increase the impact of research.

4. Discussion and conclusion

The ways the researchers in our data described their mono/multilingual language practices were found to construct three discourses: (a) disciplinary monolingualism, (b) dual monolingualism, and (c) functional epistemic multilingualism. The findings show that the researchers' positionings, that is, whether they talked from the position of research writer, reader, citizen or someone doing research, influenced how they talked about their language practices and what those practices were described to be like. The first two discourses were the most evident when researchers talked from the position of research writer, whereas the third one was constructed when the researchers positioned as "doers" of research and readers of research-related texts. Clear disciplinary differences were detected, with the discourse of disciplinary monolingualism being the strongest in the talk of computer scientists and geologists, and particularly historians and anthropologists constructing different discourses depending on the positions from which they were talking.

That different discourses were associated with different positionings is important to note in relation to discussions about the dominance of English in today's academia, and particularly in research writing for publication (see e.g. Canagarajah, 2002; Curry & Lillis, 2015; Hyland, 2016). Much focus has been given to how English has come to dominate research publishing across fields, albeit to different degrees. However, as the findings of this study suggest, multilingualism seems to be typical of everyday research practices even if research writing may be done in one or two languages only. In fields such as history and anthropology, multilingualism may be a pragmatic necessity, but multilingual practices have also been reported in more monolingually English fields (see Salö, 2015; also in our data computer/HCI scientists reported they might conduct e.g. user experiments in a local language). It is a pity that the multilingualism of everyday research practices is hidden behind a more monolingual writing scene (excluding perhaps the list of references where publications written in other languages may be seen), but it is also an important reminder that exploring which languages are used for research publication does not provide a full picture of researchers' language practices. Importantly, extract (14) further illustrates how multilingualism may be utilized in outreach activities that in language policy debates are often only considered in relation to the "local" language(s).

The analysis shows that English plays a key role in the language practices of our study participants. The interesting thing is how it is perceived and used in relation to other languages. The clearest trend was the almost taken-for-granted employment of English for research writing across the fields. Differences were detected in the researchers' experiences and perceptions of the need for "other" languages, and for which purposes these "other" languages would be used.

In the historians' accounts, multilingualism was constructed as a pragmatic necessity for knowledge production in the field, and most of the historians also wrote research publications in at least two languages, typically in English and in their L1. The historians generally took pride in their multilingual research practices, and sometimes expressed a wish for being able to operate in even more languages. The findings may be considered in relation to Schluer's (2015) triangle of factors influencing language use in publications. Schluer (2015) lists (a) target audience, (b) the object of research, and (c) the researcher's language competence as the three most important factors influencing German linguists' choice of publication language. She suggests that tensions may arise for individual researchers if, for instance, they wish to reach an international audience through the medium of English but feel their English-language competence is not adequate for the purpose. Certainly, language competence also came up in this study as a factor either enabling or restricting participation in certain research communities. What was interesting in the case of the historians was that competence in a given language (or lack thereof) was reported to sometimes influence the choice of research topic and not only the language of publication (see extract 16). A narrowing of the range of languages learned by researchers may thus lead to a narrowing of historical topics studied. At the same time, this kind of narrowing was not evident in the interviewed historians' talk, as they, for example, reported to employ various means to decipher texts written in the languages they were not sufficiently competent to read on their own. For research-related reading (doing work in the archives, or reading research literature), the object of research seemed to be the main determiner of which languages the researchers reported to be needing and using. For writing, language competence issues seemed to narrow the choices for most of the historians to two (English and their L1), but similarly to Schluer (2015), the accounts constructed a pragmatic stance towards choosing the language to be used based on the target audience and research topic. While English tended to be seen as a career-related pragmatic necessity, the choice of writing in one's L1 seemed to be at least partly based on language protectionist views, as discussed below.

The geologists' and computer/HCI scientists' accounts constructed an understanding of English as a mostly unquestioned pragmatic necessity, and other languages, particularly the researcher's L1, as facilitating communication with those who share the L1, including some of the researchers' colleagues, their study participants and the wider public. The accounts suggest that knowledge production in these two fields to some extent involved other languages than English (see also Kuteeva & McGrath, 2014; Salö, 2015), but that reading and writing for research purposes was almost exclusively done in English, because no option was seen to exist. For instance, the main local languages in the contexts investigated, Finnish and Swedish, have had a very limited use throughout the history of research writing in the fields (see Salö & Hanell, 2014, for Swedish in computer science; compare Pérez-Llantada, 2018, for Spanish in geosciences). Using an L2 for research writing is thus not new for either the geologists or computer/HCI scientists working in these contexts. This reality is not necessarily linked to the global spread of English. Whereas computer science / HCI is a very new discipline, with origins in the English-speaking world, geology is one of the oldest academic disciplines which has relied on the use of academic lingua francas – Latin, French, German and English – for several centuries now (cf. Kuteeva, this volume). It is noteworthy that besides the disciplinary English-language monolingualism described in the accounts, many researchers in these two fields (e.g. FCS2, FSC10, FG1, FG6, among others; see also extract 14) also reported to engage in research dissemination for the wider public in other languages (e.g. when writing popularized texts or press releases reporting their research findings). This practice suggests that connections between academic knowledge and societal needs are sustained regardless of the disciplinary English-language monolingualism (see Harbord, 2018).

The anthropologists largely shared the geologists' and computer/HCI scientists' understanding of the pragmatic necessity of English and reported to be doing most of their research writing in English. This can also be explained by the discipline's connection to the English-speaking world (e.g. SA5 has described anthropology as "so Anglo"), as opposed to the local discipline of ethnology. Similarly to the historians, the anthropologists' knowledge production was multilingual, often by necessity (see extracts 17 and 19). The findings thus suggest that pragmatism may be related to both monolingualism and multilingualism.

Across the data, except in the accounts by historians, monolingualism in English (used as a lingua franca) was often described to be a pragmatic necessity, the only viable option, for sharing research findings across borders (i.e. discourse of disciplinary monolingualism). The kind of dual strategy of using English and one's L1 for research publishing, as described particularly in many historians' accounts, similarly reflected pragmatic concerns of reaching relevant audiences for one's research (i.e. discourse of dual monolingualism). At the same time, multilingualism was described as a pragmatic necessity for knowledge production, especially in the fields where the object of research called for multilingual language practices, that is, history and anthropology (i.e. discourse of functional epistemic multilingualism). This suggests that the object of research is key in determining how multilingual the research process is likely to be, and that in those fields where the object of research requires the researcher to operate in several languages, the likelihood of also writing research publications in more than one language increases, and vice versa.

When the researchers talked about their language choices related to research publication, some tensions could be detected between what could be termed career-related pragmatism and protectionism towards the researcher's L1. As noted above, even when there was a choice, English as the current lingua franca of science was often described as a self-evident language for research publication. When the researchers (especially historians and anthropologists) talked about publishing in their L1, many reported a felt duty for publishing in that language. This pressure seemed to be associated with language political debates about upholding (or developing) the researchers' L1s as languages of science (see e.g. Hultgren et al., 2014), also when the researcher's L1 was not the one used in the environment where they worked. While researchers described this aim as relevant to their context, the aim could also be in conflict with their career-related pragmatic choices, and they did not necessarily see it as an individual researcher's responsibility. In all, our findings suggest field-specific trends in the researchers' language practices. English plays a special role across the four fields investigated, but the object of research seems to be key in determining how English is positioned in relation to “other” languages.

5. 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.

Auranen, O., & Pölönen, J. (2014). Julkaisufoorumi-luokitus ja kansallinen julkaiseminen. [Publication forum classification and publishing nationally]. In R. Muhonen, & H.-M. Puuska (Eds.), *Tutkimuksen kansallinen tehtävä* [The national responsibility of research] (pp. 153-175). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2018). Materialising ‘competence’: Perspectives from international STEM scholars. *The Modern Language Journal 102*(2), 268-291.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (Eds.) (2018). *Global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, *20*(1), 43-63.

Edley, N. (2001). Analysing masculinity: Interpretative repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide to analysis* (pp. 189-228). London: Sage.

Gentil, G., & Séror, J. (2014). Canada has two official languages - or does it? Case studies of Canadian scholars' language choices and practices in disseminating knowledge. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *13*(1), 17-30.

Harbord, J. (2018). Language policy and the disengagement of the international academic elite. In J. M. Curry, & T. Lillis (Eds.), *Global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies* (pp. 88-102). Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Hultgren, A. K., Gregersen, F., & Thøgersen, J. (Eds.). (2014). *English in Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *31*, 58-69.

Hynninen, N., & Kuteeva, M. (2017). "Good" and "acceptable" English in L2 research writing: Ideals and realities in history and computer science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *30*, 53-65.

Kuteeva, M., & McGrath, L. (2014). Taming Tyrannosaurus rex: English use in the research and publication practices of humanities scholars in Sweden. *Multilingua - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, *33*(3), 367-389.

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*(4), 279-293.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). Academic writing in a global context. The politics and practices of publishing in English. London: Routledge.

McGrath, L. (2014). Parallel language use in academic and outreach publication: A case study of policy and practice. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *13*(1), 5-15.

Nygaard, L. P. (2019). The institutional context of 'linguistic injustice': Norwegian social scientists and situated multilingualism. *Publications*, *7*(10), 1-13

Nygaard, L. P., & Bellanova, R. (2018). Lost in quantification: Scholars and the politics of bibliometrics. In M. J. Curry, & T. Lillis (Eds.), *Global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies* (pp. 23-36). Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(2), 163-188.

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2018). Bringing into focus multilingual realities: Faculty perceptions of academic languages on campus. *Lingua*, *212*, 30-43.

Piller, I. (2016). Monolingual ways of seeing multilingualism. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *11*(1), 25-33.

Saarinen, T., & Taalas, P. (2017). Nordic language policies for higher education and their multi-layered motivations. *Higher Education*, *73*(4), 597-612.

Salö, L. (2015). The linguistic sense of placement: Habitus and the entextualization of translingual practices in Swedish academia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *19*(4), 511-534.

Salö, L. (2018). Universities, their responsibilities, and the matter of language. On supplementary-language summaries in internationalizing academia. *Language and Education*, *32*(6), 548−562.

Salö, L., & Hanell, L. (2014). Performance of unprecedented genres: Interdiscursivity in the writing practices of a Swedish researcher. *Language & Communication*, *37*(1), 12-28.

Schluer, J. (2015). English as a lingua franca in linguistics? A case study of German linguists' language use in publications. In R. P. Alastrué, & C. Pérez-Llantada (Eds.), *English as a scientific and research language* (pp. 233-260). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Solin, A., & Hynninen, N. (2018). Regulating the language of research writing: Disciplinary and institutional mechanisms. *Language and Education*, *32*(6), 494−510.

Appendix 1: Transcription conventions

Speaker codes:

I	Interviewer
R	Researcher

Transcription symbols:

te-	Unfinished utterances
(text)	Uncertain transcription
<I: text>	Minimal feedback when marked within another speaker's turn
@@	Laughter
<text>	Sighs, coughs etc. marked within angle brackets
((…))	Text omitted from transcription
[text]	Text added for clarity by the writers of this chapter

Note: Capitals and punctuation have been added to the excerpts to facilitate reading.

Acknowledgements

For Hynninen's part, this work was financially supported by funding received from the Kone Foundation (LaRA project, grant number 088787). For Kuteeva's part, the work was supported by Stockholm University's funds for collaboration with the University of Helsinki and SU Sabbatical 2018/19 (SU FV-5.1.2-4375-17). Our warmest thanks to our study participants, who by sharing their time and perceptions made this work possible! We also express our thanks to Lisa McGrath and Ezra Alexander for conducting some of the interviews in the Swedish context. Some of the interview data from Sweden was collected and used by Lisa McGrath as part of the research leading towards her PhD.

[i] See http://www.julkaisufoorumi.fi/en/publication-forum.
[ii] See https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside.
[iii] The LaRA project, funded by the Kone Foundation, is based at the University of Helsinki and directed by Dr. Anna Solin. The website of the project is at http://www.helsinki.fi/project/lara.