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Question of how research articles in different languages are related to each other in the process of knowledge production has received little research attention. This paper draws on and illustrates a text history methodology to explore citation practices of three experienced Russian scholars in economics, sociology, and philosophy. The empirical focus is on the analyses of three paired text histories: one text history of a Russian medium RA production is compared with the text history of an English medium RA production in each discipline. By analyzing the data related to the changes made to citation use in each paired text history, the paper throws light on a) citation practices in two languages of production and the implications for the ways in which knowledge is circulated globally; b) the methodological importance of text history to explore citation practices as a complex phenomenon of what counts as citeworthy.

At the micro level, the changes made to citations signal that brokers decide what counts as citeworthy and author’s acceptance or denial of citation requests secures/denies publication opportunities. At the macro level, consequences of citation brokering are significant for knowledge production in the local/global context as the divide between English medium center scholarship and Russian medium center scholarship is increasing further.
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1. **Introduction**

Research into writing for publication indicates that academic texts are produced by researchers in non-transparent and complex ways. Studies have focused on the importance of various aspects of such complexity: working in different languages of production (Arvay, Tanko, 2004), different stages of production (Ju Chuan Huang, 2010), across disciplines (Salas, 2015), novice vs experienced (Li, 2006), involvement of ‘others’ in text production (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Lillis & Curry, 2006). While research has been carried out into academic text production complexities, questions of how research articles (RA) in different languages are related to each other in the process of knowledge production have received far little research attention. That is how academic text produced by the same author in different languages are intertwined, draw on each other linguistically, epistemologically, rhetorically as they write they write their texts for publishing in academic journals and why it is so. With the increasing number of English medium publications globally and the hegemony of English in research output measurements worldwide, the relation of the linguistic media of publishing and the production of knowledge by scholars in from different localities remain to be underexplored.

Recent studies suggest that the way to explore how different languages are related to each other in the process of knowledge production is to explore micro and macro levels in knowledge production. Lillis and Curry (2010; 2019) usefully illustrate that by engaging with the larger ‘context’ of RA text production, in particular, exploring values and beliefs of writers, literacy brokers’ and gate keepers’ orientations surrounding academic publishing we can explore both micro and macro levels of power relations in knowledge production. In other words, paying attention to the dynamic, lived experiences of actors in the process of text production as well as paying attention to textual realizations (entextualization, recontextualization, see Lillis & Curry, 2015) of RAs we can explore the hidden, underlying aspects in knowledge production.

While the notion of context is elusive and raises questions, what is considered as context and how to achieve methodological consistency which can bridge the text/context divide (Lillis, 2008), contextual detail in academic text production has been explored via different yet insightful methodologies. For example, Burrough-Boenisch (2003) explores how brokers impacted production of a Dutch paper written by a non-native speaker of English and traces changes made to the text. Lillis and Curry (2006) continue problematizing the impact of brokers on academic text production in the context of the English medium publication drive and the existing evaluation regimes in 5 European countries. Pérez-Llantada, Plo, and Ferguson (2011) focus on publishing experiences of Spanish scholars and their accounts of the challenges they face in disseminating their research in English medium journals. Ron Martinez and Graf (2016) show how literacy brokering happens around thesis production via research supervision in Brazilian context.

While these approaches have their merit, text history approach seems to be most methodologically significant in its ability to empirically reconstruct the process of writing for publication, with its dynamic and contested nature (Maybin & Lillis, 2015; Hynninen, 2020). Key is its ability to explore the relationship/impact of literacy brokers on text production and reveal how they impact knowledge making, how text production is rooted in power relations and ideologies surrounding knowledge production (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Lillis & Curry, 2015).

In the study reported in this paper I examine how RAs written by the same author and on the same research issue are related to each other when they are published in Russian and English. To do this, I developed an additional analytical lens, ‘paired THs analysis’, to empirically focus on a particular aspect of text production, citation practices, as while they are core to academic text production what gets cited is not neutral and surrounded by the existing ideologies and power relations in complex knowledge production (Hewings, Lillis, Vladimirou, 2010).

I argue that citation use in academic texts is not a neutral enterprise but rather involves mediation where participants hold unequal status and power. Literacy brokers occupy a powerful position and significantly influence opportunities for publication via negotiating citation use in academic texts. In current knowledge evaluation regimes, where published RAs have become a form of capital, linked to academic promotion and salary as well as prestige and reputation (Lillis & Curry, 2010), citation use is at the heart of power play in academic publishing globally, the politics of access and participation in global academic knowledge production.

1. **Theoretical framework of the study** 
   1. **Knowledge production and citation use**

The complexity of knowledge production has been explored from a variety of perspectives: sociology of knowledge (Latour & Woolgar, 1979), sociohistorical study of knowledge production in academic journals (Bazerman, 1988), bibliometric studies of knowledge dissemination (Kirchik, Gingras, Larivière, 2012), sociolinguistic research into writing for publication experiences of scholars (Lillis & Curry 2010, Canagarajah, 2002). The studies indicate that knowledge production is rooted in local histories of meaning making, culture, and disciplinary fields.

At the same time, increasingly evaluation regimes are becoming a key focus of research attention in knowledge production since academies experience significant transformations as a result of shifting evaluation regimes which have become core to knowledge production worldwide (Bennet, 2007; Lillis, 2017; Feng, Beckett, Huang, 2013). RA has become a highly visible ‘core’ product or ‘exchange coin’ (Lillis & Curry, 2010) in knowledge economies. Indexing is rooted in US based index systems of university rankings and English medium publishing. The dominance of English in research output measurement and assessment in universities across the world have resulted in significant shifts in what knowledge is *worth* publishing. Understanding what knowledge is considered worth publishing is in part related to what is considered *citeworthy* sincecitations are core to evaluation regimes*.* In other words, what knowledge is (not)allowed/controlled should be explored via power lens.

Traditionally, citations are used in academic text production as a rhetorical/intertextual means to support claims by referring to earlier studies/research, to join disciplinary conversations, to indicate which theoretical/empirical camp (research tradition) a research paper belongs to. References to other authors create a context for the writer’s text and establish links with the existing literature (Hyland & Jiang, 2019). Presenting a discoursal self is central in the writing process (Ivanic, 1998). Bazerman (1988) extensively studied how citations work as innovation of the early 20th century using Physical Review as his source material. In his socio-historical account he concludes that during the whole 19th century, references remained firmly attributed to authors - as opposed to identifiable and precisely dated texts. After 1910 the number of (dated) references per article increased rapidly, and the modern citation became a specific layer of communication in and among scientific texts. Citations became a part of "a socially legitimated, critical, socially interactive, and cumulative communal process centered on publication in socially recognized forums, screened by gatekeepers ---, and being accepted into a codified literature".

Lillis, Hewings, & Vladimirou (2010) argue that majority of citation studies are overwhelmingly textual where analysis of citations as part of the internal micro-features of the text, which are then analysed in relation to larger textual or rhetorical frames. Citations represent an academic literacy practice because citation is a way of meaning making and is influenced by the existing ideologies in knowledge production (Lillis, Hewings, Vladimirou, 2010). Practices are rooted in specific cultural traditions and ways of constructing knowledge (Bazerman, 1988; Lea & Street, 1998; Prior, 1998), are embedded in relations of power (Canagarajah, 2002; Jones, Turner, Street, 1999), linked with identity (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Ivanic, 1998; Lillis, 2001), and shaped by complex patterns of access to and participation in a number of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998).

That is why even when contextually sensitive approaches are used, ‘context’ mostly means revealing individual perspectives, experts’ views, or disciplinary differences (see for example, Becher & Trowler 2001; Fløttum et al. 2006; Harwood; Hyland 1999; 2000; Thompson & Tribble 2001). Quantification of citations and their text level rhetorical features brings important insights into citation use in academic texts (citation types, distribution in published RAs, across disciplines) and represent ‘accepted’ knowledge and citation ‘norm’. Yet how norms are played out, changed, and maintained in academia remains unclear. Citation use in RAs, similarly to all uses of language, is shaped by social ideologies and relations of power and contributes to shaping social forces that will operate in the future (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Citation practices have consequences for the social identity of the writer both during the writing and afterwards (Ivanic, 1998).

Who/where/why gets cited varies across geopolitical locations/spaces is highly consequential (Lillis, Hewings, Vladimirou, 2010). The high status of English and Anglophone centre gatekeeping practices create a tension between the politics of knowledge building and knowledge measuring. Introduction of the impact factor and the increasingly wide use of citations as statistical measure of scholarly output globally results in cyclical dynamics of power relations (Foucault, 1970). It signals that citation use should be explored in a larger social context of their production.

In my study of citation practices explore how citation ‘norm’ is reproduced/resisted/negotiated by experienced authors who work in two languages. *What gets cited* is not neutral and is significantly shaped by the politics of knowledge production and measuring research output mechanisms at individual, institutional, national, international levels. The value of such an approach lies in generating understandings about the circulation of academic knowledge globally with the micro focus on social practices in which writers/brokers as editors engage in and the macro focus on the existing power relations in knowledge production. I use text history data to research both citations used in published texts (language-in-place) and reconstruct knowledge production across different spaces and temporalities (Lillis and Curry, 2010).

These are the key theoretical and methodological premises I draw on in developing a methodological approach to study writing for publication practices with a particular focus on citation as social practice by multilingual scholarly writers in a particular geopolitical, geolinguistic and institutional/disciplinary context of Russia.

* 1. **‘Paired’ THs analysis of citation practices**

While there is a body of research in the field of writing for publication into how citations function rhetorically in RAs, citations practices in scholarly writing often remain invisible (Lillis & Curry, 2010). In my study, the complexity of exploring citation practices at micro and macro levels in two languages requires methodological attention to the non-linear, dynamic, and mediated nature of research articles production across spatio-temporal contexts (Lillis & Curry, 2010). The text histories methodological approach in the study of academic writing has been well established (Lillis, 2001; Lillis & Curry, 2010). For each TH, I track changes made to citation use across drafts to capture the chronology of involvement of others. In particular, the type of change, who introduced a change, the participant’s decision about each change (see Appendix A).

While analyzing the RAs by participants, I came to realize that RAs produced by the same author focus on the same research issue or significantly overlap. Each article in a pair is aimed at different communities and published in, respectively, a Russian and an English-medium journal. To explore production of RAs related to each other across time and space, I developed a specific analytical focus, a paired analytical lens to text histories, which comes from the need to explore citation use when knowledge travels from one place to another in time. By adopting the paired THs lens, I explore citation practices in two languages as ‘part of a narrowly intertwined set of ‘academic’ practices spilling over (and connecting) several different chronotopes (Horner, Blommaert, 2017) as instances of textualization-as-practice and practices of re-entextualization. ‘Re-entextualization involves the capability to turn a text into several others, across the boundaries of genres, languages, audiences, and functions, re-centring them each time towards specific goals in ways that maintain the intertextual links between the different texts’ (Horner, Blommaert 2017, Silverstein and Urban, 1996). Practices developed over time and are rooted in time.

Each paired THs is a ‘telling case’ (e.g., Mitchell, 1984, but see Andrews, 2017 for a critical account of ‘telling’ cases and typical/atypical cases), that is a deep, detailed description and analysis of a large data set from two text histories with one most experienced participant. Each individual scholar is an individual ‘case’ (see Yin, 2009 for a post-positivist case study tradition) and findings are specific to those scholars, specific disciplines and institution. In line with ethnographically oriented research tradition, I see epistemological value in exploring single ‘cases’ to capture and illuminate key aspects of a particular phenomenon which might otherwise go unnoticed (Casanave, 2003; Mitchell, 1984).

I see citations are such instances, links between different texts which are made in line with the dominant norms and at the same time are subject to alternative traditions and change (‘reinvention’ of academic literacies, Bartholomae, 1985; Lillis, 2001). By drawing on cases I show how citation practices manifest themselves in the given context and aim to establish theoretically connections between invisible citation practices and their consequences for knowledge production/circulation globally. Dynamic analysis of citation changes in RA drafts over time is important because they reflect the social context in which the texts are produced and received and provides instances how scholars engage into citation practices and knowledge-making locally and globally. I draw on the notions of uptake and orientations (Lillis & Curry, 2010) to understand academic brokering in text production in order to capture the complexity of citation practices.

By employing the paired TH lens, I seek to capture the dynamic nature of knowledge production and circulation at the micro level of citation practices and the macro level of relations of power in academic knowledge production, to explore the often non-transparent impact of brokers on RAs uptake, participation and/or exclusion of experienced scholars working in Russian and English in/from knowledge production.

1. **Methodology of this study**

**Larger study context**

The paper draws on a larger study exploring the writing for publication practices of 16 Russian scholars working in one Russian leading university and in three disciplines - economics, sociology, philosophy (XXX). The location of data collection allows selecting scholars who are actively involved in knowledge production and multilingual writing practices in Russian academia and supported by the university they work for. In line with ethnographic orientations (Lillis, 2008), the study draws on context-rich data set (interviews, texts, documents) to explore scholars’ publication practices. The selected participants are academics and have published in Russian and English. The focus on economics and sociology (soft applied sciences) and philosophy (pure soft science, Becher & Trowler, 2001) aims to explore knowledge making practices (Prior, 1998, Larson, 2018) with regard to disciplinary fields and languages of publication within a particular geolinguistic place.

*Figure 1. Data set of a larger study*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of participants** | 16 scholars from one academic research-intensive institution |
| **National context** | Russia |
| **Disciplinary focus** | Economics, Sociology, Philosophy |
| **Data sources** | Published RAs written by the participants (32 RAs: 16 Russian and 16 English medium RAs)  Literacy history interviews (16 recorded sessions, 1 h. 30 min. each)  Talk around text interviews (16 recorded sessions, 1 h. 30 min. each)  Ongoing email discussion between participants and researcher (257)  Copies of email correspondence with editors, reviewers, etc. (348)  Documentary data from the national site (institutional, national policy documents) |

**Participants**

The dataset for this paper includes: six selected THs from the three disciplines produced by Olga, Ivan, and Nikolai (see Case 1, Case 2, Case 3). I focus on text history data from most experienced scholars since they know the dominant norms and at the same time have developed their own ways of engaging with norms (to a greater degree than less experienced writers)(Figure 2).

*Figure 2. ﻿Scholars’ academic experience and publication records.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participants** | **﻿Lead Author:**  **highest academic qualification and place of degree, position,**  **experience in academia (in years)** | **﻿Publication profile:**  **1. Russian**  **2. English**  **3. Other languages** | **Disciplinary field** |
| **﻿**  **Olga** | ﻿Doctor of sciences  Russia  Professor, 28 | ﻿1) 51 articles, books, chapters  2) 4 articles, 4 book chapters | Economics |
| **﻿**  **Ivan** | Ph.D.  USA  Professor, 27 | 1) 11 articles  2) 27 articles, 2 book chapters | Sociology |
| **﻿**  **Nikolai** | Candidate of sciences  Russia  Associate professor, 24 | 1) 41 articles  2) 3 articles | Philosophy |

**Empirical research questions**

This paper seeks to explore two questions, one empirical and one methodological:

*What changes were made to citation use in published RAs in two languages, by whom, why, and with what consequences (what counts as citeworthy) for knowledge making globally?*

*How can paired analysis of text histories be used as a methodological tool to explore citation use and what light does it shed on the nature of the production of research articles?*

**Data analysis**

I first trace changed made to citations in RAs drafts from each paired set of THs from each participant to explore who made these changes, when, what was changed and why (Appendix A). Next, I draw on the whole TH data set in each pair to learn more about why changes happened, the role of literacy brokers in the process, and writers’ views on the changes being made. By doing discourse analysis I aim to explore micro (citations as language at hand) and macro (knowledge production) levels of power play in the scholarly citation practices.

**Results**

**Case 1. Olga, economics**

In this paired text histories, I draw on 11 drafts, two interviews with the lead author, the lead author’s correspondence with her coauthors, and ﻿email correspondence with two journals which accepted both articles for publication (Figure 3).

*Figure 3. ﻿Two paired text history data set in economics*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **﻿Russian RA** | **﻿English RA** |
| **Topic overlap** | IT investments in Russia | IT investments in emerging economies |
| **Target journal** | Leading Russian medium academic journal in economics | Leading Anglophone center English medium academic conference proceedings in economics |
| **﻿RA drafts** | ﻿6 | ﻿5 |
| **Reviews** | 2 | 2 |
| **﻿Email discussions with coauthors** | - | 43 |
| **Email correspondence (with editors, reviewers, etc.)** | 44 | 3 |
| **﻿Interviews** | 2 (3 hours, total time) | |

**Author and brokers in text trajectories towards publication**

The paired text trajectories started with the same text, originally produced in Russian. Olga and her master’s student wrote the Russian medium paper and submitted it to a local ‘leading’ (Olga, interview) journal in economics and management. Four brokers were reported to have been involved in the text production during post submission stage: two journal reviewers, editorial assistant, language professional. Citation use was most significantly influenced by one of the reviewers and the language professional also impacted citation use.

The English medium RA was initially coauthored by Olga and the same student and later two more coauthors from the Anglophone center joined as coauthors. Olga initiated collaboration on the paper with one US academic who invited the other one since ‘he did similar studies with me’ (informal email discussion). Yet, as evidenced from the email correspondence between Olga and the invited coauthor the paper was produced solely by the two US coauthors and Olga was excluded from text production.

*I guess for now we have enough data. (American coauthor, email)*

*We take care of revisions. But I need your help. Could you please clarify which are these five citations? (American coauthor, email)*

While two reviewers from the US based conference were reported as brokers in the production of the RA during post submission stage, these are the two American coauthors who were most significantly involved in the text production and citation use as literacy brokers: by identifying the publication outlet, rewriting the paper and the argument, impacting citation use. The key changes in citation use and the impact of brokers involvement in both RAs are the main focus in the next sections.

### **Overview of salient changes in citation use in paired text histories**

Significant changes were made to the Russian medium RA during the post submission stage. Changes made stayed through to the published draft, indicating that the reviewers and editor agreed with the revisions suggested by two reviewers. The most salient change relates to the way methodology is supported by citations.

Majority of significant changes were made to citations used in methodology. Reviewer 2 requested reducing the number of references. Editorial assistant expressed a similar request from the editorial board:

*The authors make many references to the method which is absolutely unnecessary. (TH1, RUS, Reviewer 2)*

Further deletions of citations in methodology were made by the language editor. The effect of these deletions is to background methodology role in the paper. The editorial response confirms the requests to delete citations in methodology in line with the journal’s interests and these changes were maintained in the published draft. This example illustrates that methodology of the study is important in brokering in terms of citation use.

Furthermore, Reviewer 2 requested deleting references to online sources related to the Russian market statistics as being ‘*unreliable and inappropriate’*.

*References in research article to the data from ---, published on a marginal --- website is highly improper and absolutely unacceptable. --- refers to an ephemera website of unclear origin and edited by unknown people. (TH 1, RUS, Reviewer 2) (translated)*

Reviewer 1 suggests adding references to two Russian medium papers by a particular economist to so that Olga’s conclusions about the Russian market are comparatively presented.

*There has been given a simplified conclusion for the study by [Russian author]. It would be interesting to have conclusions -- for a wider spectrum of industries. (TH 1, Rus RA, Reviewer 1) (translated)*

Finally, the language editor changed an integral citation into non-integral and it makes way to the published draft. The effect of this reformulation is to background the authors of the cited papers. The language editor functions not purely as a language specialist responsible for ‘polishing’ a paper but as a discipline specialist, academic broker (Lillis & Curry, 2006). This stands in sharp contrast with the division between the two key academic and language groups of brokers suggested by Lillis and Curry (2006).

The most salient changes in citation use in the English medium RA is addition of citations made by the American coauthors (Figure 4) who say they will ‘*format/edit the paper*’:

*We will do formatting/editing (informal email discussion)*

There is clear evidence of their significant involvement in text production. While in Draft 2, a reference to an earlier study by the two co-authors was made by Olga, in published paper, five self-citations are used to introduce Russia as a transition economy and to claim novelty and to frame the current study as a continuation of the earlier studies by the two coauthors (Example 2). One self-reference was made in methodology to introduce the theoretical frame of this study.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Example 2** | |
| **﻿Draft 2 Introduction** | **﻿Draft 5 Introduction (maintained in publication)** |
| We can mention the paper [*[self-citation]*, 2012], which measures--; in Russia there have been no such studies in Russia. (original) | ﻿The term transition economy refers to -- *([self-citation] and [self-citation] 2008, 2011*). Most transition economies also qualify -- (*[self-citation]* and *[self-citation]* 2009a).  Perhaps the first -- study -- in the context of a transition economy (*[self-citation]* and *[self-citation]* 2012) investigated -- in [name of a European country]. --- Subsequent studies by *[self-citation]* and *[self-citation]* (2013) ---. |

In the English medium text draft sent by Olga, the emphasis is on signaling confirmation/similarity between her study and earlier studies while in the published paper there is a contrast where the central support is made via self-citations by the two American co-authors across the whole paper (Example 3). In the published paper, there is a total of 16 self-citations by Olga’s co-authors which are used to make the shift from confirmation towards signaling the contrast. This shift is clearly seen in the conclusion, Example 3, where self-citations support the finding and novelty claim.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Example 3** | |
| **﻿Draft 2 Conclusion** | **﻿Draft 5 Conclusion (maintained in publication)** |
| *The results confirm other studies* conclusions for developed and developing markets ---. (original) | The most surprising result of our analysis is the negative stock price reaction ---. *This is different from the results in the study conducted by [self-citation] (2012).* |

Furthermore, the co-authors self-cite in the conclusion in order to claim a lack of research and signal the need for further research. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly which of the two US-based co-authors made the changes from confirmation to contrast in the redrafting process.

Another salient change was addition of five references to online sources in methodology about the Russian economy. The foregrounding of the specific local economic context of the study and the explicit signaling of the context as being “different” (from the earlier studies published by American coauthors into mature and developing economies) — is a significant shift seen in the published version. Thus, the addition of self-citations as support for the argument initiated by the co-authors is used to “to jump the scales”, to secure the paper uptake in the prestigious Anglophone center conference proceedings and in the process ‘localising or parochializing the Russian scholar and her work.

What is significant here is about the impact of the two coauthors is that Olga was excluded from text production. Such an exclusion from the authoring process leads to two important points which needs to be made. First, an experienced female academic is excluded from text production by two experienced male coauthors. Second, self-citations are used by the co-authors to competitively promote their research by adding a comparative dimension.

### **Main author’s perspective: ‘But now it’s my method’**

**﻿**Olga, the main author, in her interview said while she was overall appreciative of the suggestions made by the reviewers of the Russian medium journal, she clearly signaled she was not happy with some of them. She does not agree with deleting the number of ‘*unnecessary*’ citations and ‘*unreliable*’ online references in her methodology in the opinion of Reviewer 2 as she sees these citations to be important:

*Some scholars [in Russia] say that methodology section should be brief. Nobody will read it, or too difficult to understand. [Reviewers] say “Please, do not be very specific with algorithm everybody knows (original) (TH 1, RUS, interview)*

She says she learnt the new methodology two years ago and she would like to share it with the local research community. But she had to agree to delete the references though she emphasized that she does not share the Reviewer 2 opinion.

*I think that not everyone is acquainted with this method. I knew nothing about this method --but now it’s my method. (original) (TH 1, RUS, interview) (original)*

*The authors are ready to delete those references from the article that the reviewer considers not appropriate for the research article genre and increase the number of references by focusing more on research results on [Russian author] rather than on the method description (TH 1, RUS, review response letter) (translated)*

While Olga sees methodology as core to her paper, she was not given an opportunity to foreground its importance. Given the need to sustain her annual research output, Olga said for the main part she was satisfied with the outcome.

Talking about the English medium RA, Olga at first said she overall appreciated the involvement of the two coauthors in text production.

*They helped me with language. It was about the argumentation, more persuasive from the point of view of the conference. More American authors, different results, persuasive from the point of language certainly because English is not my native language. (TH 1, RUS, interview) (original)*

The examples of the salient changes made to the paper by the US coauthors raise questions of whether such changes had to be made and why, since Olga expected help with ‘*presentation of results*’ in English. The shift in the overall argument of the article was evident to Olga, who acknowledged that it would be easier to publish if the paper meets the rhetorical requirements of the US conference committee. So, the changes made to the paper by her coauthors, as Olga stated, reflect the demand from the conference committee to focus primarily on ‘unusual’ results.

*They asked us to explain more clearly the results that are not common and paradoxical. (TH 1, RUS, interview 1) (original)*

The particular rhetoric of persuasion implied the change in argument and related citation use and is seen as a necessary step by Olga, who as a ‘local’ researcher is trying to publish in English out of her national context that is marginal to, in her words, the “*international*” English medium journals. At the end of the interview, she said she was frustrated with the collaboration:

*I'm not absolutely happy with our collaboration. I think it was from their side a little bit egoistic. Our contribution was much stronger in my mind, but --- it is very positive because I have learned new methods and new ideas. (Olga, INT2)*

Talking about her experience of collaboration, she said she believes her Russian medium texts are stronger than the English RA because she can control text production in her native language at all stages and she loses this control while working in English:

*When I did this one, there were two problems: first is that English is not my native language and other is that it was not totally depend on me and the last version was made by my coauthors.*

**Case 2. Ivan, sociology**

The paired text history below draws on 15 drafts, two interviews with the lead author, the lead author’s correspondence with his coauthors and with the two journals which accepted the papers for publication (Figure 4).

*Figure 4. ﻿Paired Text History 2 data set*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **﻿Russian RA** | **﻿English RA** |
| **Topic overlap** | Post-Soviet values | Muslim values |
| **Target journal** | Leading Russian medium journal in sociology | Leading English medium Anglophone center journal in sociology |
| **﻿RA drafts** | ﻿3 | ﻿12 |
| **Reviews** | - | 4 |
| **﻿Email discussions with coauthors** | - | 28 |
| **Email correspondence** | 2 | 2 |
| **﻿Interviews** | 2 (2,5 hours, total time) | |

### ﻿**Author and Brokers in text trajectories towards publication**

The English medium article was produced by a group of three researchers who have researched and coauthored for 2 years. The group consisted of three scholars: the most senior scholar, Ivan, has been involved in academic work for 27 years and is renowned in his field. There are two more authors, junior researchers in the research center Ivan heads who are currently masters students. Ivan explained that he built a research team for a research project to study values in the East. He said they finished research and wrote a paper in English without any target journal in mind.

*We just wrote a text.* (Ivan, INT2)

The Russian medium paper was written next as a further stage in their research project and after the above mentioned English medium paper was submitted to one leading Anglophone center journal. Ivan said they decided to do a similar study with Muslim countries (in comparison with Arab world) and test the same hypothesis, switch from focus on Arab context towards Post-Soviet space, and they expanded the project to Post-Soviet countries in their Russian medium paper. One of the master students wrote the original draft in Russian for the team which was then revised by Ivan before submission to a local Russian medium journal. The Russian medium RA was much needed by the two master’s students, so Ivan helped them to meet the degree requirement:

*Both coauthors needed VAK[[1]](#footnote-1) publications.* (Ivan, INT2)

Below, I first focus on the pre submission changes made to citations by Ivan to the Russian medium draft produced by a master student. Then, I focus on the post submission involvement of two academic brokers, the reviewers, both of whom are academic professionals, and the way they impacted citation use in the English paper.

### **Overview of salient changes in citation use**

﻿Ivan by being the most experienced scholar, who heads the research center, did his PhD in a leading Anglophone center university and has published extensively in English top tier Anglophone center journals made changes in citations to the draft produced by a master’s student. The changes made clearly signal that he is acting as a literacy broker to secure the publication to the much needed by the two co-authors publication. Among the few changes made to the draft, Ivan added one self-citation to their earlier study published in English journal.

The effect of adding a self-reference to a prestigious Anglophone center journal is the intension to secure publication in the Russian medium journal. By self-referencing to their recently English medium paper in a leading American journal he introduced a *comparative* perspective (Example 4). Example clearly shows his orientations in what counts as citeworthy to secure publication in a local journal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Example 4** | |
| **﻿Draft 2 Conclusion** | **﻿Draft 3 Conclusion (maintained in publication)** |
| ﻿- | *A similar trend* was seen by the authors in Arab countries (*[self-citation]*  2016). (translated) |

Salient changes were made to the English medium article by the research team in response to Reviewer 2 from the Anglophone center journal who ‘*recommended*’ adding more English medium citations to support the argument and provided lists of the authors to be cited.

*I would recommend the authors check the following literatures in this theory development. 1. Classic modernization theories (references), 2. Human development approach (references), 3. Public opinion research (references + dates) (Reviewer 2).*

The master’s student wrote to the research team that she decided to find out who their ‘*mystery reviewer*’ was. She was able to trace the exact works by this scholar by carefully reading the suggested by him literature. She identified the paper that was authored by Reviewer 2 by matching his comments in his review and footnotes in his earlier published English medium paper in a leading journal.

*The first editor decision was for us to revise and resubmit because one of the reviewers wanted us to cite his work very much. He was not supposed to reveal his identity, but he described his article in such a transparent way that we easily identified who he was. --- We --- cited his paper. Then, his second review was good.* (Ivan, INT2)

To secure publication in the prestigious journal Ivan said they cited his work (Example 5). They added a paragraph describing the study by Reviewer 2 to fit in the citation and Ivan said this minor change had no relevance for the overall argument, yet without the citation their paper could have been rejected.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Example 5** | |
| **﻿Draft 4 LR** | **﻿Draft 6 LR (maintained in publication)** |
| ﻿- | ﻿*[citation of Reviewer 2 article]*  (2010) studies determinants of individual democracy support in ---. However, according to ﻿*[citation of Reviewer 2 article]*, religiosity --- does not reach significance in eight out of ten states. |

Reviewer 1 also asked to study particular ‘*key*’ references and listed English medium papers published in Anglophone center journals (see Example 2):

*I think the authors do a very good job of incorporating the literature into their review. However, I do think they are missing a key part of the literature ---. (Reviewer 1).*

### **Main Author’s Perspective: ‘We cited him, and it was ok’**

While paper review is blind, by providing a comparative perspective and linking this study to the larger study about Muslim values in his anonymized self-citation of his English medium paper, Ivan seems be securing the paper publication in the Russian medium journal. Ivan said the paper received no criticisms and the submitted draft was published.

*There were no difficulties in publishing the paper.* (Ivan, INT2)

Ivan was sarcastic about the involvement of the academic professional broker and his demand to add more key references and the transparent pressure to cite Reviewer’s 2 paper. This indirect demand for citing a Reviewer’s 2 paper was evident to Ivan and the team. He said they ‘*did the job*’ meaning they added a reference to the paper which Reviewer 2 indirectly introduced meaning that in this case Reviewer 2 would not reject the paper.

*We did the job, we did that consciously: the person (the reviewer) was criticizing without good grounds. It was obvious. So, we found who this person was. It is possible in the age of the Internet. We cited him and everything was great.* (Ivan, INT2)

Ivan believes this step as necessary for a researcher writing out of his national context to a leading English medium journal. In practical terms, he said this paper provides his research team and the center with a published paper to secure their research center funding.

**Case 3. Nikolai, philosophy**

Here, I draw on 21 drafts, two interviews with the lead author, informal email discussions with a peer who is a member of the editorial board in a Russian journal, ﻿email correspondence with editors with three Russian journals, the first of which rejected the article. English medium RA is a ‘*directly translated*’ Russian medium RA according to Nikolai.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **﻿Russian RA** | **﻿English RA** |
| **Topic overlap** | Analytical philosophy (Descartes) | Analytical philosophy (Descartes) |
| **﻿RA drafts** | ﻿15 | ﻿6 |
| **Reviews** | 7 | 2 |
| **Email correspondence** | 36 | 8 |
| **﻿Interviews** | 2 (3 hours 15 min., total time) | |

### ﻿**Author and brokers in text trajectories towards publication**

Nikolai produced a Russian medium paper before submitting it to Russian medium Journal A. Four brokers were reported to have been involved in this text production at the pre submission and post submission stages: one journal editorial board member, who is Nikolai’s friend; the editor; Reviewer 1, and a fellow academic from a different discipline as a language professional. After a long email correspondence and requests to revise the paper for Journal A, Nikolai made a decision to withdraw his paper and submit it to Journal B where the paper was published.

This paired text histories are different from cases 1 and 2 in my study as Nikolai said he was simultaneously working on both RAs. He said the feedback he received while working on the Russian RA significantly helped him to produce the English text. He submitted the English medium RA to the university’s working paper series which are published in English. He said he had to publish an English medium paper as a part of the research grant that he had received from the university he works for. The paper was published without revisions. While papers significantly overlap in their production in time, space, content, and despite the fact that Nikolai say the English paper was a ‘*direct translation’,* there are significant changes made to citations in the English medium paper.

### **Overview of salient changes in citation use**

Here I first analyze the changes made to citation use on the RA trajectory towards publication with two Russian medium journals. Significant changes were noted from four brokers who were involved at post submission stage. The most significant change was to use direct quotations instead of intext references.

The majority of reviewers’ requests were related to the demand to provide direct quotations. The key point of criticism from Reviewer 1 from Journal 1 was that the author does not directly quote sources and ‘*only provides references’*. Reviewer 1 said the text was not clear without the exact words used by the cited authors. In his opinion directly quoting from each source is essential because the reader can see the exact words which the author used in the original source and thus verify the truth of the writer’s ideas.

*Formally he makes references, pages numbers are given everywhere, but it is totally unclear what exactly is on these pages, because the author quotes nothing and only references. That is why it is incredibly hard to read the text. --- We have to believe the author that Davidson suggested --- He (Davidson) surely introduced his method in exact terminology which are just absent when the text is rendered. (Translated)* (Reviewer 1, Journal 1, review)

Reviewer 1 clearly signals the importance of who the text belongs to as a way to distinguish between cited knowledge and the writer’s knowledge/contribution/ideas. She believes that only by quoting directly, Nikolai can demonstrate his contribution.

*It is impossible to distinguish between the author’s idea and the ideas of those (authors) he refers to. --- Who does the text before section 2 belongs to? Who is being interpreted? Descartes in Sellars' interpretation? Descartes in Davidson's interpretation? Descartes in (Nikolai name) interpretation? Nothing is clear! --- How to follow the writer's idea? (Translated)* (Reviewer 1, Journal 1, review)

Editor of Journal 1 echoes the same request for differentiating Garis’ opinion from the cited sources:

*K. asks to particularly emphasize your own point of view rather than try to combine points of view of others. (Translated)* (Friend, Journal 1, informal email correspondence with Nikolai)

Having received Reviewer 1 request for using direct quotations, Nikolai said he decided to discuss this review with Friend, who is a member of the editorial board of Journal 1 as he said he needed another opinion. Friend provided his own understanding that the ideas should be arranged into a coherent ‘*narrating and argumentation’*. The use of direct quotations was not mentioned.

*Could you revise the paper by making the text a single narrative --- When you write a text not following the standard template, then the editorial board will always make criticisms.* *(Translated)* (Friend, Journal 1, informal email correspondence)

Having revised the paper, Nikolai received the editorial board review with a repeated request for using direct quotations. Direct quotations are seen by the broker as a way to check if the writer has read and understood the cited literature.

*For a discussion of opinions of authors, it is highly important to quote directly. Otherwise, the reader can hardly understand, if the writer is correctly rendering a thinker. (We) cannot check them all. Saturate the text with direct quotations by reducing your own retellings. (Translated)* (Friend, Journal 1, email correspondence with Nikolai)

Nikolai said he decided not to revise the paper. Friend asked Nikolai to reconsider adding direct quotations to secure his paper publication. Yet, Nikolai decided to withdraw his paper and submit it to Journal 2. This example illustrates how the dominant discourse does not allow for any digressions.

*You could slightly revise the paper by adding direct quotations. Nobody will be checking it again.* (Friend, Journal 1, email correspondence with Nikolai)

*I am ready to add quotations, but not to revise it. Did anybody else read my paper ---? I was ready for serious work: decide what to revise and not, and at what price. But here it is simple: there is nothing to correct.* (Nikolai, email correspondence)

Nikolai said he asked a peer from Moscow to read his paper before submitting to Journal 2 as she had studied a similar topic before. The paper was published in Journal 2 without any changes in citation use.

*She read, got interested, though we hold opposite opinions, she gave no critical comments, she just asked me "Am I right that you mean here …" She asked questions for understanding, and --- the text grew. I did not have any text size limitations; I could afford that. The editorial board read my text and external colleagues.* (Nikolai, INT2) (translated)

Nikolai said while working on his Russian medium RA, he was ‘translating’ his paper into English. He sent his paper to a US based academic who works in a different field but has experience in revising/editing research papers in philosophy. She wrote to Nikolai that she made ‘a few small corrections’ (changed grammar, syntax suggestions) (informal email correspondence).

The editor of the working paper series, who Nikolai knows personally, asked Nikolai to ‘*to emphasize the problem’ (email correspondence, date)* without referring to his citation use. Nikolai replied said that the editor’s feedback is important and that he agreed to revise. While revising the paper he changed 15 footnotes into citations in the main text and 5 of them were changed into direct quotations.

*It is probably the reason that I try to kill a bird with two stones --- Anyway, revising the text is a usual thing. I feel there is no clear line and your words just supported my intuitions. (email correspondence with Journal 2 Editor, date)*

The email correspondence clearly signals that Nikolai uses references to the analysed texts and research literature in his replies to Editor to explain the problem.

*Here I relied on the traditional problem statement that started earlier than with Hegel in his work -- and in nowadays continued by --- Perry.* ﻿*[7 references] I mean, it is considered by them all to be a common topic. (email correspondence, Journal 2 Editor)*

*You are right, it is important to provide grounds for --- answer to this issue. (email correspondence, Journal 2 Editor)*

*A classic example is the endless hierarchy of meanings --- wrote about ---. But probably it is worth clarifying ---. (email correspondence, Journal 2 Editor)*

In this email correspondence Nikolai self-cites two papers explaining that he had already written about some issues. Yet, the two self-citations are absent in the published paper draft.

*I wrote about this example in my article ---, which I have sent you. In fact, --- writes about this example because ---. (email correspondence, Journal 2 Editor)*

*It is true, it differs. I wrote about it in greater detail in my article-introduction to the translated edition of --- (email correspondence, Journal 2 Editor)*

There are four important points to be made about citation use in this text production. First, while citation use was never a request from Editor in Journal 2, Nikolai made changes to citation use during revising the problem statement in line with the Editor questions within the paper and which were maintained in the published draft. So, citation use was the author’s decision in the process of revising the paper. Second, in the original draft there were 16 cases of citations referring to philosophers without dates of publication (See Swales, appeal to common knowledge). Nikolai added direct quotations in the English medium RA in contrast with the Russian medium RA where he rejected reviewer’s and Editor’s requests for adding direct quotations. Third, while Editor did not require any citation changes, the email correspondence between Nikolai and Editor clearly signals that Nikolai uses a significant number of citations in his answers to Editor questions about the problem statement in support his opinion and explanations. Fourth, in the email correspondence Nikolai cites his own papers saying that he had already wrote about some issues there. Yet, his two self-citations are absent in the published paper drafts in both languages.

### **Main author’s perspective: ‘Do we have to believe the author?’**

﻿Nikolai in his interview account said while he was overall appreciative of the suggestions made by the reviewers, Friend from the editorial board, editorial board and Editor’s comments as he said the feedback was useful to continue work on his Russian medium paper. At the same time, he was not happy with some revision suggestions related to citation use from Journal 1. Commenting on the persistent request for direct quotations, the author states that the brokers in Journal 1share a similar belief which he does not support.

*I do not see it as a problem at all. Direct quotation or indirect, in the form of retelling, citation depends on the writer's style and on the particular situation.* (Interview 2, Nikolai)

*If it is interpretation of somebody, who is citing Brendom, for example, this person must already be so famous, with high status, because his interpretation is what may be cited. And it makes sense, because his interpretation can be argued, you can write "he did not correctly understand".* (Interview 2, Nikolai)

He clearly signals that in his view the demand for citation use came from two reasons: a) the readers of his paper (all the brokers) did not know well his topic of research, so they needed exact words from the cited sources to ‘check’ if he ‘correctly’ explained the ideas from those sources, b) the small professional community this ‘correct’ citation use requires one to be ‘known’ by this community so that the paper’s uptake is secured.

*In my case, it seems to me, it was something different. The reviewer did not know well enough my theme --- plus I am an* ***unknown*** *author. That is why the reviewer, probably doubted if I* ***correctly*** *rendered the ideas of others. That is why there was a request for direct quotations. --- I think, the person, who read the works that I cited or was more or less familiar with the works of the authors I wrote about, would not have such doubts.* (Interview 2, Nikolai)

Use of citations in his view is closely linked to Journal requirements which have limits on how much one can write in the given space.

*It is strange to request adding direct quotations which are often too general/vague, when the journal strictly monitors the paper size, instead of a shorter retelling of the gist.* (Interview 2, Nikolai)

Nikolai said that after his paper was published in prestigious Journal 2 without direct citations, Journal 1 later accepted for publication two following papers written by Nikolai. He said he believes members of the editorial board in Journal 1 were aware of the paper having been accepted by Journal 2 and this fact secured his following papers uptake.

*After the Russian medium text was published by famous* ﻿*[Journal 2], and the editorial board of the Journal 1 could not but notice that, I have published two articles in* ﻿*[Journal 1] and this time there were no requests and questions.* (Nikolai, INT2)

*It means that that time, the mistake* ﻿*[he refers to Journal 1 paper submission] was most probably a wrong choice of a reviewer. Such things happen.* (Nikolai, INT2)

**Discussion**

In this paper I set out to explore two questions: *What changes were made to citation use in published RAs in two languages, by whom, why, and with what consequences/ what counts as citeworthy for knowledge making globally? How can paired analysis of text histories be used as a methodological tool to explore citation use and what light does it shed on the nature of knowledge production of research articles?*

My analysis of the citation changes made to six published RAs in three paired Text Histories has clearly demonstrated that citation use is high stake in knowledge production in both languages. What counts as citeworthy is normalized via brokering processes and power play at different levels of knowledge production (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Lillis & Curry, 2015). In both languages, brokers impacted citation use by asking the authors to delete, add, or change intext references. Olga, Ivan, and Nikolai make consequential decisions if to accept/reject brokers’ suggestions regarding citation use. My paired Text History shows who, when, and why was involved in the texts production and with what consequences.

Paired lens clearly shows the power relations at play around what gets cited at micro and macro levels. Uptake patterns are similar and different in terms of what gets cited in the two languages of production. In both languages, uptake depends on the *compliance* with reviews’ requests to add/delete citations in Russian local journals and only addition in English medium anglophone center journals. In all paired THs, linguistic medium of citations is significant: Russian medium journals require referencing Russian medium scholarship, while English medium center journals require English medium citations. This signals the increasing divide in knowledge circulation between locally produced knowledge and English medium scholarship (Lillis & Curry, 2010).

In both languages, uptake is secured at different stages of paper trajectories towards publication and has different consequences (Lillis & Curry, 2010). During pre-submission stage, Ivan self-cited his English medium paper to secure uptake of the Russian paper written in collaboration with his master students. In Olga’s case, coauthors self-referred to their earlier published English medium papers to accumulate power to secure the uptake in the highly *competitive* anglophone center context, but this coauthoring resulted in her losing power. Such a power shift clearly indicates how local knowledge gets refracted via English and turns into English medium center scholarship. During post submission stage, Olga was required by the Russian reviewers and the editor to delete in their views ‘*unnecessary*’ English medium citations in her methodology section which she says is the key. Nikolai was required to add direct quotations which are seen as ‘norm’ by the Russian medium journal brokers. By accepting the norm of what can be cited, Olga had her paper published; Nikolai did not.

Unexpectedly, citation practices happen via email correspondence. Nikolai responds to Editor’s questions and abundantly cites works to support his argument in the email correspondence. Nikolai says he values that his paper was read, and the comments were meaningful to him. Nikolai self-cited two papers in the correspondence but these self-references are absent in both published RAs. My paired analysis has revealed that though Nikolai said that he ‘translated’ the Russian medium RA into English, it was not just translation (Bennet, 2007) but continued work on production of a new text in a different language.

Uptake is related to what knowledge is treated as legitimized by the author and brokers and creates tensions. The paired THs have revealed that citations of sources written in the target language journal are seen as priority/legitimate in both languages of production to maintain the existing knowledge centers. This might confirm the earlier research into the existence of multiple centers in knowledge systems (polycentric) (Larson, 2018; Lillis & Curry, 2010) where all are trying to maintain their power. In this system, under the current evaluation regimes in academia, journals seem to become important power sustaining channels for different geopolities. The demand for direct quotations by Friend who is a board member, Editor, and editorial board was rejected by Nikolai and resulted in his paper rejection by Journal 1. Direct quotations are seen a way to legitimize ideas and claims made in the RA by the brokers in Journal 1 and as norms/conventions which are ‘universal’ to follow. Nikolai resistance to conform to the citing conventions is highly consequential. Submission of his paper to Journal 2 was successful and there was no citation use negotiation to secure the paper uptake.

My study has revealed that the category of literacy brokers can be fluid and changes due to the existing power relations. The power relations surrounding writing for publication show that Olga’s coauthors played the role of literacy brokers in English text production. Who performs the role of literacy broker at pre and post submission stages and with what consequences is often masked. Importantly, brokering can exclude authors from the text production to secure a paper uptake as is seen in Olga’s English medium paper. The suggestion to help Olga with ‘*editing’* made by her coauthors masked her exclusion from text production.

Paired analysis has revealed that different citations have different power in securing publication uptake in the two languages of production and there are tensions. Citation use is a salient aspect of negotiation among the author, co-authors, reviewers, and editors in the publication process in both languages. Olga decided to delete references to an online website, despite considering them important to the study, as they were considered to be unreliable by the Russian journal reviewer. By contrast, in her English medium paper no requests were made to delete references to online databases, analytical documents.

Importantly, brokers’ orientations about the linguistic medium of citations vary. Adding citations of 20 English medium papers identified by both reviewers as ‘key literature’ including citing a paper published by Reviewer 2 was seen as necessary to secure publishing Ivan’s paper in the English medium Anglophone centre journal. In both papers there were added (and *no citations were deleted*) citations to papers published in English-medium Anglophone centre journals. This signals the dominating status of English medium research publishing and centripetal forces in knowledge production and dissemination. The centripetal forces are maintained both by the leading author to secure the papers uptake and by the professional brokers (reviewers) who demanded citing Anglophone centre scholarship. This is similar to Olga’s Russian medium article, although here the literature recommended was Russian medium.

Brokers decide what can and cannot be cited. At the same time, citing is strongly connected to the author’s beliefs and values in knowledge making. Ivan, an experienced scholar, accepted the brokers’ suggestions related to adding ‘*key literature*’ English medium references. He signals citing references requested by reviewers has become a recognized ‘norm’ among experienced authors who have to accept the request to secure publication opportunities. Ivan’s own orientations impact significantly what he sees as citeworthy. Like Olga, Ivan experienced tensions because of the different epistemologies in publishing in two languages and his citation practices reflect these tensions.

**Conclusion**

The data has revealed that citation use in both languages become a point of negotiation and the powerful status of reviewers in gatekeeping empowers them to secure citations which they see citeworthy (their own papers, ‘good literature’) research by authors who are in an inferior/powerless position.

Practice approach to citations allowed me to explore knowledge production in two languages in the context of the complex dynamic of hybridity and hegemony in the actual written products. Paired THs analysis is useful as it extends earlier TH studies about knowledge production and circulation and makes visible the impact of brokers on knowledge production and circulation. The study has revealed that authors seek to secure publication uptake to meet research output requirements and thus they maintain the citation ‘norms’. Nikolai challenges the norm of using direct citations and as a result he experiences a publication failure with Journal 1. Brokers’ requests to cite Russian or English medium research also maintain the existing knowledge systems and hierarchy. At the same time, brokers themselves are part of the power relations and seek to increase their power.

My paired TH focus allows studying citation use at different levels of contexts, an immediate context and the context of larger knowledge systems. By focusing on what scholars cite in two languages of production, it is possible to empirically explore how knowledge is entextualised and recontextualized along the publication trajectories under the existing institutional and national evaluation regimes and ideologies across time and spaces. Paired lens serves as important contextual frame to explore what gets valued ‘here and now’, what gets cited to be published, in what language, and why. How power relations are played out in the trajectories of texts in two languages is seen via the notions of orientations and uptake. Orientations of authors and brokers create tensions around norms. Paired TH lens gives methodological consistency when we explore how knowledge is produced at the same time and circulates when there are two languages of production.
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**Appendix A**

*Figure A. Heuristic for tracking changes made to RA along its trajectory towards publication*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of change suggested by a broker to citation use** | **Category of broker** | **Broker’s comment/action** | **Author response** |
| Addition | Reviewer 1,  Subfield specialist | Add more references and add two particular references to one Russian scholar | Accepted |
| Addition | Reviewer 2,  Subfield specialist | Add more references to LR, results | Accepted |

***Institutional Description*:  1-2 brief paragraphs that describe the institutional factors that influence your research project (either the institution you are from or the institution in which your research is occurring). We will send you a set of questions a few weeks before the workshop to further prompt your thinking about how your context will need to be explained to fellow workshop participants.**

My research site is one research-intensive university in Russia, and I ethnographically explore their writing for publication practices in two languages, Russian and English. The pressure to publish has been increasing and particularly in English medium Anglophone center journals. While the Russian language was the second in the global academic research output before 1970s, now Russian scholarship is hardly visible, particularly in social sciences and humanities. One reason for this invisibility is the impact of the global indexes and databases (IF, journal quartile) which privilege English medium scholarship.

In my study I have revealed that experienced Russian scholars read primarily English medium literature and seek to get published in top tier English medium journals. Since citing is core to academic research publishing, I seek to explore what counts as citeworthy in contemporary academia. I explore what and why Russian scholars cite given that they are working in the periphery and underprivileged context (see Smirnova, Lillis, Hultgren, 2021), face formal demands for research output by the university, have their own interest and values in knowledge production and dissemination, and are involved in brokering processes seeking to secure publication opportunities in prestigious journals.

*Key Theorists*: A one-page digest of**key theorists and frames used in the choice of methods and research design**; this should highlight between 2 and 5 main perspectives that guide your work: the scholars you cite most often, or the “schools of thought” you draw from. Each entry should be just a few sentences long—enough to give readers an understanding of your methods and analytic frames. *This framing will be particularly important in this workshop setting: we will ask you to emphasize this material in your actual workshop introduction.*

**Key theories/theorists**

1. (New) academic literacies theory – Brian Street, Mary Lea, David Barton, Roz Ivanic, Theresa Lillis

Academic writing practices are rooted in specific cultural traditions and ways of constructing knowledge (Bazerman, 1988; Lea & Street, 1998; Prior, 1998), are embedded in relations of power (Canagarajah, 2002; Jones, Turner, Street, 1999), linked with identity (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Ivanic, 1998; Lillis, 2001), and shaped by complex patterns of access to and participation in a number of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998).

1. Geopolitics of academic knowledge production – Wallerstein, Kachru, Suresh Canagarajah, John Flowerdew, Theresa Lillis, Mary Jane Curry

The studies indicate that knowledge production is rooted in local histories of meaning making, culture, and disciplinary fields and at the same time, increasingly evaluation regimes are becoming a key focus of research attention in knowledge production since academies experience significant transformations as a result of shifting evaluation regimes which have become core to knowledge production worldwide (Bennet, 2007; Lillis, 2017; Feng, Beckett, Huang, 2013). RA has become a highly visible ‘core’ product or ‘exchange coin’ (Lillis & Curry, 2010) in knowledge economies. The dominance of English in research output measurement and assessment in universities across the world have resulted in significant shifts in what knowledge is *worth* publishing. Understanding what knowledge is considered worth publishing is in part related to what is considered *citeworthy* sincecitations are core to evaluation regimes*.*

1. Linguistically-oriented ethnography – David Barton, Scollon and Scollon, Grumpez, Blommaert, Lillis, Curry

Lillis and Curry (2010; 2019) usefully illustrate that by engaging with the larger ‘context’ of RA text production, in particular, exploring values and beliefs of writers, literacy brokers’ and gate keepers’ orientations surrounding academic publishing we can explore both micro and macro levels of power relations in knowledge production. Their text history approach seems to be methodologically significant in its ability to empirically reconstruct the process of writing for publication, with its dynamic and contested nature (Maybin & Lillis, 2015; Hynninen, 2020). Key is its ability to explore the relationship/impact of literacy brokers on text production and reveal how they impact knowledge making, how text production is rooted in power relations and ideologies surrounding knowledge production (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Lillis & Curry, 2015).

1. Citation as a type of social practice – e.g. Lillis et al 2010

Lillis, Hewings, & Vladimirou (2010) argue that majority of citation studies are overwhelmingly textual where analysis of citations as part of the internal micro-features of the text, which are then analysed in relation to larger textual or rhetorical frames. Citations represent an academic literacy practice because citation is a way of meaning making and is influenced by the existing ideologies in knowledge production (Lillis, Hewings, Vladimirou, 2010). Who/where/why gets cited varies across geopolitical locations/spaces is highly consequential (Lillis, Hewings, Vladimirou, 2010).

*Glossary*:  A list of any potentially context/culture-specific terms, both practical and profound; the glossary collectively produced will be further discussed during the workshop itself.

* I am not sure I understand what to put here. Could you make it more clear or give an example?

1. See Smirnova, Lillis, Hultgren for VAK list in Russian academia. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)