

Original citation:

Liddicoat, Anthony John. (2016) Multilingualism research in Anglophone contexts as a discursive construction of multilingual practice. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11 (1). pp. 9-24.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/85597>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* on 18 November 2016, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/17447143.2015.1086361>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

Multilingualism research in Anglophone contexts as a discursive construction of multilingual practice

Anthony J. Liddicoat

Research Centre for Languages and Cultures, University of South Australia, Adelaide Australia

Contact address:

Anthony J. Liddicoat

Research Centre for Languages and Cultures

University of South Australia

GPO Box 2471

Adelaide SA 5001

Australia

Email: Tony.Liddicoat@unisa.edu.au

Abstract

This article investigates the presence of multilingualism as an academic practice within the field of research in multilingualism by examining the citation practices of research publishing in key English-language journals in the field. It investigates how researchers make use of material published in other languages as a component of their research writing and thus of their conceptualisation of the field of research to determine to what extent multilingualism itself is actually present in multilingual research communicated in English. This article argues that, although some research published in languages other than English may be cited in multilingualism research, multilingualism as a visible research practice is largely absent from the study of multilingualism. This means that research into multilingualism largely constructs multilingualism as a subject to be studied from a perspective that lies outside the phenomenon of multilingualism itself and normalises monolingualism as the standard form of academic practice within the English-speaking world. It can therefore be argued that multilingualism research is a site in which a monolingual habitus predominates and that this represents an epistemological dilemma for the field.

Keywords; multilingualism, monolingualism, research practice, citation practices

Introduction

The predominance of English in academic publishing is a well-established phenomenon that applies across disciplines, although this tendency is much stronger in the hard sciences than in the social sciences (Ammon, 2001; Carli & Calarescu, 2003; Ehlich, 2012; Gablot, 1981;

Hamel, 2007, 2013a; Sano, 2002a). Many studies have critiqued the increasing monolingualism of international academic publication and have traced the rise of English and the decline of other languages in a range of academic fields (Baldauf & Jernudd, 1983, 1985; Ehlich, 2001; Hamel, 2007, 2013b; Sano, 2002b). Most studies have tended to document publication practices – that is the proportions of academic literatures produced in various languages, however, there has been comparatively less research on the use of literatures published in various language in developing academic writing (Baldauf & Jernudd, 1986; Garfield & Welljams-Dorof, 1990; 1992 are exceptions). Thus, the focus has been on how research is produced in academic contexts not on how research has been used by researchers in producing their own work.

The relative use of a particular language in a particular field reflects the role of language as a symbolic marker of the relative power relations within that field and of the status of the linguistic communities involved (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara, & Trumper-Hecht, 2006). In academic contexts, therefore, the prevalence of a language is both the production and the consumption of research can be understood as indexing the value given to research produced in that language and to the relative power of the community of scholars using that language in a particular disciplinary context. Examining the ways that research is used in a field is a way of understanding how ideas that are created and communicated in one language and within and for one academic tradition are disseminated and used in other academic traditions (Liddicoat & Zarate, 2009). An examination of citations in research articles can give an understanding of the extent to which researchers in a particular field read research produced in a particular language and thus whether they participate in a multilingual network of research practice or whether their ideas emerge largely or even solely from within a single linguistic and academic tradition (Baldauf & Jernudd, 1986). In this way, it is possible to understand the citation practices of academics as a discursive process of engagement with the diverse languages of knowledge production and also a representation of the value attributed in a field, or by researchers in a field, to knowledge production in various languages. The practices of using knowledge in research can be seen as a form of conceptual linguistic landscape – a symbolic construction of the public space of research writing – that shows the way that knowledge created in different languages is valued.

If one considers the use of material produced in a range of languages as a discursive practice of valuing linguistic and academic diversity in knowledge production, then an examination of the research writing practices of researchers publishing in the field of multilingualism is of

particular interest. In the study of multilingualism, multilingualism can be both an object of study and a form of engagement with knowledge. The discourses of researchers in multilingualism typically seek to give value to linguistic and cultural diversity and to the advantages that lie in being able to access multiple epistemologies through multiple languages. *Ipsa facto*, one would expect the research writing practices of scholars in multilingualism are discursively consistent with such a view – that is, the practice of research writing in multilingualism would be multilingual. This paper seeks to examine the reality of this by examining the citation practices of research writers writing in English in journals specifically devoted to research on multilingualism.

Data

The data for this study is drawn from a small number of international journals published in English with an explicitly multilingual focus. These journals are: *International Journal of Multilingual Research*, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* and *Multilingua*. In reporting the results of this study, the various journals will not be named but reported as Journal 1¹, Journal 2, etc. because the aim is not to discover the practices associated with specific journals, which are likely to vary from issue to issue, but rather to understand how these journals collectively represent an overview of the practice of multilingualism in the reporting of research about multilingualism. The aim therefore is to construct a conceptual linguistic landscape of the linguistic practices of citation in the field rather than to critique specific journals.

This paper examined the volumes of these journal published in 2013. This selection of journals for this year contained not only regular publications of articles submitted on diverse topics by diverse authors, but also a number of special issues. Such special issues are of particular interest as they may focus on specific multilingual contexts or on the use of specific languages, and the presence of special issues could thus have an impact on citation practices. In calculating citation practices, this study considered all research articles published in the year and also the introductions to special issues, which regularly set the theoretical and contextual shape for the issue. Books reviews, editorials and other contributions were not included as they typically had fewer, sometimes no citations and so represent a different form of citation practice from research writing more strictly defined. The database for this study is summarised in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1: Database of publications in multilingual journals (2013) here]

In determining the citation practices of authors, the titles in each reference list were counted and each was attached to a language. This follows the procedure adopted by Baldauf and Jernudd (1986) in their study of psychology publications. In some cases, the language of publication was not immediately clear from the reference list and in these cases, the language of publication was verified by checking the work cited, either in the original journal or in a database. Works translated into English from other languages were counted as works in English, but were also coded as translations. Translations can be considered as mediating texts through which knowledge created and communicated in one language is made available to an audience that does not speak the original language. For this reason, translations need to be treated separately as they do ultimately represent a multilingual contribution to the creation of knowledge and also the ways that translations are treated in citational practices can also be seen as an acknowledgement of multilingual practice in research writing.

The linguistic landscape of citation practices

The overall findings on the citational practices of the four journals is presented in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2: Citation practices in selected journals (2013) about here]

Table 2 shows that, overall across the journals, English language publications constitute the vast majority (92.9 percent) of all references used in research articles with a multilingual focus. Other languages constitute only 7.1 percent of all references. The relative proportions of English and other languages across the journals vary considerable, but the contribution of other languages remains consistently a minority one ranging from 0.6 percent in Journal 3 to 10.4 percent in Journal 2. This shows that overall research in multilingualism is dominated by research communicated in English, with comparatively little research communicated in other languages being used to construct and communicate knowledge of multilingualism.

In some articles in reference lists, titles of articles were given only in English, even when the article was published in another languages (*translated titles only*), with a designation after the title that indicated the original language of publication, e.g. [In Greek]. This was not a common practice and appears to be a practice of individual authors rather than a policy of journals. The use of English translations of titles only renders the presence of multilingual sources less visible in articles' reference lists.

The presence of translated works slightly increases the contribution of knowledge from outside the English-language academic tradition, but the presence of translations is quite limited in the

corpus of articles published in these journals in 2013. The translations were of works of just three authors: Bourdieu, Bakhtin and Vološinov, and drew from just two languages: French and Russian. Given the small number of translations used, little can be made of the inclusion of these authors and languages, except to note that the act of translation itself can be considered a consecration of the work of particular scholars and their induction into a new academic tradition. It is therefore likely that translations may largely be drawn from the work of a relatively small pool of authors working within in academic traditions that have, or have had in the past, particular prestige within English-speaking academia.

It is notable that in references for translations in these articles translations may not be acknowledged to be translations. For example, Vološinov (1973) may be cited in one of two ways:

1. Vološinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik, Trans.). New York: Seminar Press.
2. Vološinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Seminar Press

In version 1, the creation of the text outside the English-speaking tradition is acknowledged by the attribution of the work to the translators, although the original language of the text is not made visible. Thus, the text is acknowledged to be in another language, but the contribution of the original linguistic tradition to scholarship is less evident, unless the original language of the text is known to a reader. In version 2, the omission of the names of the translators obscures the fact of the creation of the text in another language and treats it as a production of the English academic tradition. This is a version of Venuti's (2006) invisibility of the translator, but it constitutes more than simply a lack of acknowledgement to the creative contribution of translators to texts, it represents a rendering invisible of the fact of translation itself. Thus, the contribution of other traditions to scholarship is made less visible and in research on multilingualism, the contribution of scholars from outside the English-speaking is de-emphasised as part of the epistemological practice of the discipline.

There is an additional complexity in considering the contribution to research published in languages other than English that can be determined from the ways that publications are used in the articles themselves. For a researcher, texts can either contribute to theory, the construction of the academic discipline and the development of an argument about data or they

can be used as data themselves when the texts provide evidence or illustration for the arguments being made. When this distinction is taken into account (see Table 2) the overall contribution of texts in languages other than English is somewhat reduced as a proportion of the references are used as data (5.6 percent of citations rather than 7.4 percent) – they are the objects of study themselves – rather than being part of the analytic and theory building processes of academic work.

The languages used in references in the journals is shown in Table 3. This Table shows that 22 languages in addition to English were present in work on multilingualism published these journals in 2013.

*[Insert Table 3: Languages used in selected journals in addition to English (2013)
about here]*

The distribution of use of these languages varies considerably, with some languages contributing only a one reference (Dutch, Estonian and Kriol) or two (Danish, Malay, Welsh) across the whole publication period, with only a small number of languages reaching 25 references or more (that is 0.5 percent of the total references): French, German, Japanese and Spanish. Most of the languages that appear are European languages, reflecting an historical dominance of European academic traditions in scholarship (Durand, 2001), although some of these languages do not have established positions in that tradition, for example, Basque, Galician, Welsh. The three most commonly used languages, French, German and Spanish are the languages of well established and historically strong academic traditions (Ammon, 1998; Ehlich, 2005; Hamel, 2005; Walter, 1996). When the division between languages that contribute to theory and analysis and those that constitute texts for analysis, the number of languages involved decreases and no texts in Arabic, Mauritian Creole, Kriol or Thai were used other than as data for analysis. Table 3 shows that the languages appearing in the journals are not consistent across the journals – only Chinese and Spanish occur in every journal – and this reveals something about the nature of publications in some of the journals, as will be discussed below.

Citation practices across journals

Table 2 and Table 3 showed that there was considerable variation in the presence of multilingualism in different journals. This section will consider the structure of each journal

and examine how individual issues of each journal shape the ways that multilingualism is made present in research on multilingualism. Table 4 and Table 5 show the results for Journal 1.

[Insert Table 4: Citation practices in Journal 1 (2013) about here]

Table 4 reveals considerable variation in the multilingualism present in each issue of varies significantly and that most of the multilingualism present is represented by Issue 2, which was a special issue with a European regional focus. This would suggest that multilingualism in the citational practices of researchers publishing in Journal 1 is less significant than the overall result presented in Table 4, especially when those publications used only for data are excluded from Issue 3. The particular European focus of Issue 2 is also shown in the languages used as shown in Table 5.

[Insert Table 5: Languages used in Journal 1 in addition to English (2013) about here]

Table 5 shows that the two most commonly used languages, French and German, are almost entirely limited to Issue 2 and reflect the citation practices of (mainly central) European scholars dealing with a European context. In fact, this single issue contributes the bulk of German citations in the data but, although there is considerable use of French, this is not as marked a contribution to the total number fo citations of French texts. Issue 3 contains the only publication to use Arabic and the texts are all used as data, as are four of the Spanish texts.

The results for Journal 2 are shown in Table 6 and Table 7. These two tables also reflect variation in the use of multilingual resources in the articles, but with a much small contribution of any one journal to the overall pattern of multilingualism.

[Insert Table 6: Citation practices in Journal 2 (2013) about here]

Table 6 shows that in Journal 2, levels of multilingual practices are relatively high, although in two issues (3 and 7), there is relatively little use of material published in languages other than English.

[Insert Table 7: Languages used in Journal 2 in addition to English (2013) about here]

Table 7 shows a considerable range of languages, although some (Malay and Mauritian Creole) are used only to provide data and do not contribute otherwise to the scholarship of multilingualism. Again there is little regularity in the choice of languages across issues, although French is used in all issues, the number of texts used varies considerably across issues.

The citation practices in Journal 3 were the least multilingual of all the journals surveyed and the results are presented in Table 8.

[Insert Table 8: Citation practices and languages in Journal 3 (2013) about here]

Journal 3 was characterised by the smallest use of material produced in languages other than English but also by the greatest use of translation, although translations were not commonly used in the whole corpus. Issue 2 was the only entirely monolingual issue in the corpus.

The results for Journal 4 are presented in Table 9. In terms of overall patterns of citation as shown in Table 10, no one issue significantly influenced the citation practices, although there was variation in the number of references in languages other than English, with some issues having very few such references.

[Insert Table 9: Citation practices in Journal 4 (2013) about here]

[Insert Table 10: Languages used in Journal 4 in addition to English (2013) about here]

Table 10 shows the impact on a single issue, Issue 2, on the distribution of languages used – in this case Issue 2 was a special issue focusing on Japanese and this issue accounts for the majority of Japanese references found in the corpus.

This survey of the individual journals show that citational practices in terms of multilingualism are highly variable not only between journals but between issues of the same journal and that in many issues the use of material published in languages other than English is very small. In addition, the incidence of references in any particular language is also relatively small in any journal issue, although the nature of the issue can have an impact on either the prevalence of multilingual practices or in the choice of languages being used. This suggests that the focus of study in monolingualism research can influence the citational practices of researchers. Moreover, because the overall number of references is small, single papers (and thus the

language practices of individual authors) contribute much to the overall patterns of multilingualism in research on multilingualism.

Focus of study and multilingual practices

This section will examine the relationship between the multilingual context being researched and the multilingual practices being adopted by researchers. This information is presented in Table 11.

[Insert Table 11: Multilingual citations compared with area of study about here]

Table 11 reveals that researchers publishing on multilingual topics investigate a considerable range of multilingual situations. Many papers investigated issues of multilingualism that were not situated in a specific region or context – that is they discussed issues that were features of multilingualism or theoretical constructs that were not anchored in any polity or region. Of the 20 articles of this nature, the majority were characterised by monolingual English citational practices. In the remaining five papers, French predominated as the other language of scholarship, with marginal use of Japanese and German. This indicates that in general discussion of multilingualism, monolingual practices predominate and where additional languages are used, the choice of languages is quite restricted and reflects the historically dominant academic traditions. This set of practices constructs the area of multilingualism research, in general terms, as a basically monolingual discipline in terms of the knowledge base it draws on and its theoretical and discursive influences.

The two most studied multilingual contexts in the 2013 corpus were Australia and the United States, both predominantly English-speaking countries. Studies in these contexts tend to be monolingual in the use of English in their research practices. Only two out of 13 papers about Australia cited material produced in another language, each citing only a single reference. Moreover, the reference in Kriol, an Australian indigenous creole, is used as data for analysis. This means of the 13 articles only one drew on information communicated in a language other than English to shape its ideas and approach, and this used a single article in German. In the case of the United States, only one of 11 articles did not draw entirely on English language sources, in this case the article used a single reference in Spanish. A similar pattern emerges in research in other predominantly English-speaking countries: for the United Kingdom, of four articles only one had a reference drawn from another language and this was a single reference in Danish and the single paper on New Zealand had a single reference in German. This reveals

that the language practices of researchers in English-speaking research contexts reflect a predominantly monolingual to research, as few researchers draw on material published in other languages and when they do they do so in a very minimal way. In this way, research on multilingualism in English-speaking contexts is based almost solely on material created in and communicated through English, although in some of the articles translated work was also used. The use of translation indicates that it is only when research becomes available in English does it enter into the work of research in multilingualism researching in English-speaking contexts, giving the impression that research communicated in other languages is of marginal relevance for researching the multilingual world.

Table 11 also reveals that when research undertaken about particular multilingual contexts draws upon more languages than English, it mostly uses only two languages. In this case, the usual language pattern is English and the official language of the place being researched: French research is used in studies of France, Chinese in the study of China, Japanese in the study of Japan, etc. This pattern reflects the dominance of official languages in research communication in academic contexts and a willingness of researchers to draw on local academic literature in studying such contexts. This parallelism between languages of the research site and languages of research input would appear to reflect a natural association in that people who research a particular context are likely to speak the languages involved in that context and so have the capacity to access research in these languages. However, it also creates a representation of the value of research in particular languages as being of relevance primarily (or in most cases only) in research contexts in which that language plays a role. That is, research in most languages is represented as having little transversal role in the study of multilingualism and that research that is not communicated in English is only locally relevant. The number of references used in papers where the language of the study context and the language of academic communication is not the same is very small, except for the use of research published in French or German. In addition, there are a number of research contexts about which no research published in a local language is used, although these consist of single studies in a range of countries: Israel, Italy, Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Taiwan, Trinidad and Vietnam.

Finally, Table 11 shows the use of languages that have been historically submerged in academic contexts being used in research, such as the use of research published in Catalan, Galician or Basque in research on multilingualism in Spain or research published in Welsh for research in about Wales. While this pattern of language use reflects the construction of research in local

languages as being relevant only to contexts in which that language is used, it appears also to reflect a political position that seeks to give value to research communicated in previously marginalised languages and to assert the normalisation of the use of these languages in valued domains, such as academic research.

The close association between dominant languages of research sites and practices of drawing on research in languages other than English constructs a representation in publishing practices that research in English is of universal relevance and that the use of this research is adequate in the practice of research in multilingualism while the use of research in other languages is of local rather than of general relevance.

Monolingual vs multilingual publication practices

This discussion above has made the argument that English language monolingualism is a normal research practice in work in multilingualism. This can be seen in a more precise way in Table 12.

[Insert Table 12: Multilingualism in citation practices about here]

Table 12 examines the number of articles that adopt monolingual and multilingual citation practices. The table shows that the proportion of monolingual articles varies from journal to journal with Journal 3 representing the more monolingual pole and Journal 4 the more multilingual pole. Altogether only about one half of all articles in these journals use sources published in language other than English. The majority of research that uses languages other than English uses research in two languages. Comparatively little research draws on research published in more than two languages. In the corpus of articles reviewed, the use of research published in multiple languages typically involves the combination of English, a major national language of the research site and a minority language of the research site (for example, English + Spanish + Catalan), although the combination of the more dominant languages of academic communication (English, French and German) is also found.

[Insert Table 13: Number of citations from languages other than English per article about here]

Table 13 shows the number of citations from languages other than English for each article published. This table shows that some individual articles contribute significantly to the use of sources from different languages, with a small number of making substantial use of articles

published in languages other than English, with many articles citing only using one such citation. Taking into consideration that many of the articles using other languages may use only a single reference in another language, the figure of just over 50 percent seen in Table 12 above somewhat overstates the multilingualism of research practice.

Conclusion

This study has shown that in the citational practices in research in multilingualism studies published in English vary from monolingual to multilingual and that different papers may have different approaches to using multilingual sources in their research. Nonetheless, in publication in English and the use of English varies from about 90 percent of sources to 100 percent across issues of the journals. Other languages play a minor role as sources for ideas or in shaping thinking about research in the field. In this way, languages other than English, and their associated epistemologies, are made almost invisible in the research practice of the field and are represented as making only a peripheral contribution to the field and to its theoretical bases. It creates therefore an absence of knowledges and of academic traditions from outside English-speaking academic practice and in so doing represents them as not having a contribution to make when understanding the field (Santos, 2007).

The reasons for this are inevitably complex. The fact that the journals selected as for study are English-language journals is likely to contribute to the dominance of English language sources being used as it is axiomatic that researcher who write in English have the capacity to read in English. However, this do not in itself explain why researchers in multilingualism do not read in languages other than English or draw on ideas produced in such languages. The capacity to write in English does not inherently mean a lack of capacity in other languages,² nor does it mean that those who write in English are even more capable in English than in other languages. One must also consider that publication in English is becoming an increasingly dominant publication practice and is demanded in academic institutions as a consequence of perceptions of prestige and audience relating to English language publication (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Gingras, 1984). This could have an impact by reducing the corpus of research that could be drawn on, especially in languages without a strong academic tradition. There are also practical limitations on researchers that limit their ability to access research that is available in other languages. One such limitation is researchers' knowledge of those languages in which relevant academic research is produced. Given the historical reality that most research is in fact produced in a relatively small number of languages (e.g. French, German, Spanish) (Walter,

1996), this especially affects researchers who work in languages that do not have established research traditions in the field or are not used as languages of academic communication. Also, there are institutional practicalities, such as access to publications in languages other than English that result from both institutional policies in terms of journal subscriptions and difficulties of accessing hardcopies. There is also the effort required in working with material in a language other than one's own, a demand, which van Parijs (2007) points out is born unequally by native speakers of English and those who must produce research in English as an additional language. There is also a differential reward for the efforts required: for English speakers writing in English, the use of sources in other languages is seen as contributing little in contexts where the prestige and sufficiency of English language sources is defended by dominant ideologies and discourses of knowledge production and communication. These institutional realities reflect the hegemony of English in academic communication, which in turn has a very real influence of the allocation of resources for research and the ways in which institutions value particular languages and cultures.

Although there may be practical issues that shape how researchers make use of material published in languages other than English, it is nonetheless the case that citational practices in studies of multilingualism reflect a situation in which English has largely become normalised as the sole language of academic work. In this way, research in the field recreates the dominant discourses about languages in academic communication, discourse which as Guardiano et al. (2007) note are essentially a posteriori legitimisations of the current hegemonic position of English as the language of academic communication. The ideologies of the role of English as thus elements of and constitute the power of the hegemonic relationship between English and other languages within academic communication (cf. Gramsci 1975). Guardiano et al. (2007) argue that there is an existing belief in academic fields that the use of English democratises the spread of academic knowledge and so publication in English opens research to a universal community. They also point out, however, that the reliance of such research means that 'Anglophone scholars who do not know any national language other than English do not have access to the great deal of scientific traditions developed in the past within national scientific communities' (33) (see also Carli and Calarescu 2003). That is, the see monolingualism in English as limiting access to past knowledge created before the hegemonic domination of English as a language of academic communication. To this must be added also, that they do not have access to knowledge still being created in the present in such communities unless work is translated into English, which applies only to the work of a very small academic elite,

or unless people working in such communities also publish their ideas in English. In the context of research in multilingualism, there is however another possible dynamic at work – some researchers with capabilities in other languages that they may use in some aspects of their work (e.g. data collection) may not use these languages in their research writing or draw on theories and findings developed in languages that they do speak. That is, knowledge created in languages other than English has been rendered largely invisible as contributing to academic work, except as a low-level tool. This constructs a one-way flow not only of communication from English to other languages but also of utility both of which contribute a loss of ‘cultural identity and voice’ (Shi-xu 2009, 30) within the academy.

It was argued above that the use of languages in developing research ideas often reflects dominant languages in the multilingualism being studied. Studies of multilingualism in English-speaking countries tend to be English only, while research in other languages tends to be used only in research about those languages (although French is an exception, although still not frequently used for reporting research conducted outside French-language research contexts). Thus, there is a discursive construction through citational practices that research in English is relevant to all contexts of multilingualism research and may be sufficient, while research reported in other languages is of only local relevance to researchers working within particular countries or with particular groups of people. English language research is thus constructed through research practices having a universal character, while other academic traditions are positioned as “particularistic, local, contextual and situation” (Santos, Arriscado Nunes, & Meneses, 2007: xlvii). There is thus a construction of certain epistemologies of multilingualism as being less relevant or as hierarchically inferior or less important for academic work than others.

Given that researchers in multilingualism would overtly express the value of linguistic diversity and the epistemological advantages of multilingualism for individuals and societies, the research practices of the field do not appear to reflect such a view being applied in thinking about academic work as a fundamental feature of the field. The overwhelming dominance of English-language research sources in reporting studies of multilingualism indicates that in this field multilingualism may be more an object of study than a practice of research. The research practice itself is characterised to a greater or lesser degree by a monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994), which sees monolingualism in English as being the normal situation in which research in monolingualism is done and in which the enacted multilingualism of researchers in their research writings is a marked case. The monolingualism that exists within the research field is

not only a linguistic phenomenon, but can also be understood as the development of a monoculture of knowledge (Santos et al., 2007, see also Shi-xu, 2009) in which the academic products of one academic tradition become the sole source of knowledge that shapes the field.

The use of preponderant reliance on English language research in the study of multilingual reflects – realities of publication, realities of access and realities of language capability, but also (re)produces linguistic inequalities within the academic field and normalises monolingualism in scholarly work. Such inequalities are not specific to the field of multilingualism research, but are characteristic of contemporary knowledge production and communication, even in other fields which could be expected to critique structures and practices of linguistic imperialism as Shi-xu (2009) notes in discussing Critical Discourse Analysis. Language-oriented scholarship is “not less, but, with accelerated globalisation, rather more under the sway of the West-centred hegemony” (Shi-xu, 2009: 31), a hegemony that is enacted largely through a single language of the west. The citation practices of multilingualism research thus reflect prevailing discourses about the role of English and the dominance monolingualism in academic work more widely. Thus, research in multilingualism is affected by the same monolingualising tendencies that affect research practices and the international communication of research and participates in the monolingualised reality that it seeks to critique. However, if researchers who are invested in multilingualism as a research area do not model multilingualism as a part of their academic practice, who will?

Notes

- ¹ Note that the order Journal 1, Journal 2, etc. is not intended to correspond to the order in which journals are presented in the list above.
- ² In attempting to develop a formula to determine whether a researcher publishing in English was a native speaker or not, Swales (1985) used citations in languages other than English as an indicator of non-native English-speaker status, although he did acknowledge this to be an uncertain criterion. Nonetheless it does reveal a discursive construction of the English native-speaker as being less likely to have multilingual abilities than non-native speakers and of research in languages other than English as being somewhat unexpected in the writing of native speakers.

References

- Ammon, U. 1998. *Ist Deutsch noch internationale Wissenschaftssprache? Englisch auch für die Lehre an den deutschsprachigen Hochschulen*. Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Ammon, U. (Ed.). 2001. *The dominance of English as a language of science. Effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baldauf, R. B., & B. Jernudd. 1983. Language use patterns in the fisheries periodical literature. *Scientometrics* 5(4): 245-255.
- Baldauf, R. B., & B. Jernudd. 1985. Language of publication as a variable in scientific communication. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 6(1): 97-108.
- Baldauf, R. B., & B. Jernudd. 1986. Aspects of language use in cross-cultural psychology. *Australian Journal of Psychology* 32(3): 381-392.
- Ben-Rafael, E., E. Shohamy, M. H. Amara, & N. Trumper-Hecht. 2006. Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 3(1):7-30.
- Carli, A., & E. Calarescu. 2003. Le lingue della comunicazione scientifica: La produzione e la diffusione del sapere specialista in Italia. In *Ecologia linguistica*, ed. A. Valentini, P. Molinelli, P. Cuzzolin & G. Bernini: 27-74. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Curry, M. J., & T. Lillis 2004. Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly* 38: 663-688.
- Durand, C. 2001. *La mise en place des monopoles de savoir*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Ehlich, K. 2001. Wissenschaftssprachkomparatistik. In *Mehrsprachige Wissenschaft - europäische Perspektiven: Eine Konferenz im Europäischen Jahr der Sprachen*, ed. K. Ehlich: 1-10. Munich: Universität München.
- Ehlich, K. 2005. Deutsch als Medium wissenschaftlichen Arbeitens. In *Englisch oder Deutsch in internationalen Studiengängen*, ed. M. Motz: 41-51. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

- Ehlich, K. 2012. Was heißt Wissenschaftssprachkomparatistik? In *Linguistik und Sprachdidaktik im universitären DaF-Unterricht*, ed. A. M. Birk & C. Buffagni: 147-164. Münster: Waxmann.
- Gablot, G. 1981. L'anglais: Language scientifique internationale. In *Le français chassé des sciences: Débats et perspectives*, ed. N. Chambrun & A.-M. Reinhardt: 27-49. Paris: CIREEL.
- Garfield, E., & A. Welljams-Dorof 1990. Language use in international research: A citation analysis. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 5(11): 10-24.
- Garfield, E., & A. Welljams-Dorof, 1992. The microbiology literature: Languages of publication and their relative citation impact *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 100: 33-37.
- Gingras, Y. 1984. La valeur d'une langue dans un champs scientifique. *Revue Sociographique* 25(2): 285-296.
- Gogolin, I. 1994. *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Munster & New York: Waxman.
- Gramsci, A. 1975. *Quaderni del carcere*. Turin: Instituto Gramsci.
- Guardiano, C., M. E. Favilla, & E. Calarescu. 2007. Stereotypes about English as the language of science. *AILA Review* 20: 28-52.
- Hamel, R. E. 2005. El español en el campo de las ciencias: propuestas para una politica del lenguaje *Congresso Internacional obre linguas Neolatinas en la Comunicación Especializada*, pp. 87-112. Mexico City: AIF, Collegio de México, Unión Latina.
- Hamel, R. E. 2007. The dominance of English in the international scientific publication literature. *AILA Review* 20: 53-71.
- Hamel, R. E. 2013a. L'anglais, langue unique pour les sciences? Le rôle des modèles plurilingues dans la recherche, la communication scientifique et l'enseignement supérieur. *Synergies Europe* 8: 53-66.

- Hamel, R. E. 2013b. El campo de las ciencias y la educación superior entre el monopolio del inglés y el plurilingüismo: elementos para una política del lenguaje en América Latina. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada* 52(2): 321-384.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & G. Zarate. 2009. La didactique des langues face à la circulation internationale des idées. *Le Français dans le Monde: Recherches et Applications* 46: 9-13.
- Sano, H. 2002a. The world's lingua franca of science *English Today*, 4: 45-49.
- Sano, H. 2002b. データベースからみた論文使用言語の動向 [Trends language use in research articles viewed from a database] In 第39回情報科学技術研究集会予稿集 [Proceedings of the 39th Information Science and Technology Workshop]: 107-110. Tokyo: Japan Science and Technology Agency.
- Santos, B. da S. 2007. Conhecimento e transformação social: Para uma ecologia dos saberes. *Somanlu: Revista de Estudos Amazônicos* 7(1): 175-189.
- Santos, B. da S., J. Arriscado Nunes & M. P. Meneses,. 2007. Introduction: Opening up the canon of knowledge and recognition of difference. In *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies*, ed. B. da S. Santos: xix-lxii. London: Verso.
- Shi-xu. 2009. Reconstructing Eastern paradigms of discourse studies. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 4, no.1: 29-48.
- Swales, J. 1985. English language papers and authors' first language: Preliminary explorations. *Scientometrics* 8(1-2): 91-101.
- van Parijs, P. 2007. Tackling the Anglophones' free ride: Fair linguistic cooperation with a global lingua franca. *AILA Review* 20: 72-86.
- Venuti, L. 2006. *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.
- Vološinov, V. N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. (Trans. L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik). New York: Seminar Press.
- Walter, H. 1996. L'Évolution des langues de la communication scientifique. In *Le français et les langues scientifiques de demain*: 27-39. Quebec: Service des communications du Conseil de la langue française.

Tables

Journal	Issues per year	Total articles	Total references cited
Journal 1	4	26	1049
Journal 2	7	41	1765
Journal 3	3	14	699
Journal 4	6	32	1831
Total	20	113	5344

Table 1: Database of publications in multilingual journals (2013)

	Journal 1	Journal 2	Journal 3	Journal 4	Total
Total references	1049	1765	699	1831	5344
References in English	950	1581	695	1738	4964
Works in other languages	99	184	4	93	380
Translated titles only	2	12	0	0	14
% contribution of other languages	7.9	10.4	0.6	5.1	7.1
Translated works	1	3	8	2	14
Translations not acknowledged	0	3	2	1	6
Total material taken from other traditions (translation + original language)	100	187	14	95	396
% contribution from other traditions	9.5	11.8	2.1	5.2	7.4

Other languages not used as data/exemplification	84	137	4	76	301
% contribution to 'theory'	8.0	7.8	0.6	4.2	5.6

Table 2: Citation practices in selected journals (2013)

Language	Journal 1	Journal 2	Journal 3	Journal 4	Total
Arabic	8				8
Basque		2		1	3
Catalan	2	11		1	14
Chinese	1	20	2	1	24
Czech	8				8
Danish				2	2
Dutch	1				1
Estonian				1	1
Finnish				10	10
French	29	90		18	137
Galician		19			19
German	34			16	50
Greek	3				3
Irish		6			6
Italian	2				2
Japanese		6		27	33

Kriol				1	1
Malay		2			2
Mauritian creole		7			7
Spanish	8	14	2	11	35
Thai		5			5
Welsh		2			2

Table 3: Languages used in selected journals in addition to English (2013)

	Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4
Total references	363	199	216	271
References in English	357	124	199	270
Works in other languages	6	75	17	1
% contribution of other languages	1.7	37.7	7.9	0.4
Translated works	1	0	0	0
Total material taken from other traditions (translation + original language)	7	75	17	1
% contribution from other traditions	1.9	37.7	7.9	0.4
Other languages not used as data/exemplification	5	73	5	1
% contribution to 'theory'	1.4	36.7	2.3	0.4

Table 4: Citation practices in Journal 1 (2013)

	Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4
Arabic			8	

Catalan	2			
Chinese			1	
Czech		8		
Dutch	1			
French		30		
German		34		1
Greek	3			
Italian		2		
Spanish			8	
Swedish		4		

Table 5: Languages used in Journal 1 in addition to English (2013)

	Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4	Issue 5	Issue 6	Issue 7
Total references	252	229	208	287	178	272	339
References in English	224	193	191	243	162	238	330
Works in other languages	28	36	17	44	16	34	9
% contribution of other languages	11.1	15.7	8.2	15.3	9.0	12.5	2.6
Translated works	2	0	4	0	0	1	5
Total material taken from other traditions	30	36	21	44	16	35	14

% contribution from other traditions	11.9	15.7	10.1	15.3	9.0	12.9	4.1
Other languages not used as data/exemplification	24	30	3	43	12	23	2
% contribution to 'theory'	9.5	13.1	1.4	15.0	6.7	8.5	0.6

Table 6: Citation practices in Journal 2 (2013)

	Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4	Issue 5	Issue 6	Issue 7
Basque		2					
Catalan						11	
Chinese						20	
French	24	3	6	38	16	1	2
Galician		19					
Irish				6			
Japanese	2		4				
Malay	2						
Mauritian Creole		7				5	
Spanish		12				2	
Thai							5
Welsh							2

Table 7: Languages used in Journal 2 in addition to English (2013)

	Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3
Total references	291	217	191
References in English	288	217	190
Works in other languages	3	0	1
% contribution of other languages	1.0	0	0.5
Translated works	8	2	2
Total material taken from other traditions (translation + original language)	8	2	2
% contribution from other traditions	3.8	0.9	1.6
Other languages not used as data/exemplification	11	2	3
% contribution to 'theory'	3.8	0.9	1.6
Languages used	Spanish 1 Chinese 2		Spanish 1

Table 8: Citation practices and languages in Journal 3 (2013)

	Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4	Issue 5	Issue 6
Total references	225	334	424	218	391	239
References in English	213	308	416	204	366	231
Works in other languages	12	26	8	14	25	8
% contribution of other languages	5.3	7.8	1.9	6.4	6.4	3.4

Translated works	0	0	0	1	1	0
Total material taken from other traditions	12	26	8	15	26	8
% contribution from other traditions	5.3%	7.8	1.9	6.9	6.7	3.4
Other languages not used as data/exemplification	9	24	7	11	20	3
% contribution to 'theory'	4.0	7.2	1.7	5.1	5.1	1.3

Table 9: Citation practices in Journal 4 (2013)

	Issue 1	Issue 2	Issue 3	Issue 4	Issue 5	Issue 6
Basque						1
Catalan						1
Chinese			1			
Danish				2		
Estonian					1	
Finnish					10	
French	1	1		6	9	1
German	1		7	6	1	
Greek					2	
Japanese	2	25				
Kriol					1	
Spanish	8					3

Table 10: Languages used in Journal 4 in addition to English (2013)

Region	No of articles	No using English+	Languages used
Nonspecific	20	6	French=24; Japanese=2; German=1
Australia	13	2	German=1; Kriol=1
USA	11	1	Spanish=1
Japan	8	8	Japanese=27; French=1
Spain	6	6	Spanish=25; Galician=19; Catalan=5; Basque=3; French=1
UK	4	1	Danish=1
Cyprus	3	3	Greek=5, Dutch=1
Switzerland	3	3	French=25; German=19; Italian=2; Swedish=1
China	2	2	Chinese=22
Canada	2	2	French=6; German =1
Hong Kong	2	1	Chinese=1
India	2	1	French=15
Malaysia	2	1	Malay=2
Mauritius	1	1	Creole=7; French=6
Baltic	1	1	German=11; Swedish=3
Cameroon	1	1	French=16
Czech Rep.	1	1	Czech=8
Estonia	1	1	Estonian=1
Finland	1	1	Finnish=6

France	1	1	French=21
Germany	1	1	German=2
Guernsey	1	1	French=2
Ireland	1	1	Irish=6
Arab region	1	1	Arabic=8
Mexico	1	1	Spanish=8
N. Zealand	1	1	German=1
Nigeria	1	1	German=5
S. Africa	1	1	French=1
Thailand	1	1	Thai=5
Wales	1	1	Welsh=2

Table 11: Multilingual citations compared with area of study

	Total articles	English only	English + 1 language	English + 2-4 languages	Proportion of English only
Journal 1	26	13	9	4	50.0%
Journal 2	41	24	13	4	58.54%
Journal 3	14	11	3	0	78.6%
Journal 4	31	10	15	6	32.26%
Total	112	58	40	14	51.79%

Table 12: Multilingualism in citation practices

Number of references	Journal 1	Journal 2	Journal 3	Journal 4	Total
----------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------

0	13	25	11	8	57
1	3	3	3	9	19
2-4	3	4	0	8	15
5-10	4	3	0	5	12
10+	3	8	0	2	13
Total	26	43	14	32	115

Table 13: Number of citations from languages other than English per article

Shi-xu. (2009). Reconstructing Eastern paradigms of discourse studies. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 4(1), 29-48.