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ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis was to analyze the publications in English of three scholars in the faculty of economics at a public university in Central Mexico and explore the strategies they use to get their papers published. The insight gained from this two-phase case study, which includes a genre analysis of the participants’ publications and interviews to identify their publishing practices, might be useful to design workshops to support students in their academic enculturation processes. Moreover, the study of the practices identified in this research could be used for studies in other disciplines in the Mexican context.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

“Publish or perish” is the phrase that most clearly exemplifies the pressure exerted on scholars worldwide to publish their research findings on an ongoing basis (Bennet, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2017; Pearson & Vandrick, 2003). Although research articles are published in many languages, publishing in English grants international scholars access to a wider audience. Currently scholars from around the world have to cope with an increasing pressure to publish. Writing and publishing in English is fundamental in many professional activities that require conducting research, since the most prestigious journals are published in this language (Englander, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2006). However, there is an uneven publishing competition since the greatest number of research publications are contributions from the United States, followed by some European countries. In the last few years the participation from Latin American countries, Mexico included, has considerably increased although the figures still do not compare to the leading countries (UNESCO, 2010).

One of the main objectives for scholars is to have their research outcomes published; this grants them access to institutional resources and promotion. Although researchers can publish their papers in their native language, papers published in English seem to have more impact than those written in other languages. Academics are more likely to have their research publications cited more often if they publish in English (Lillis & Curry, 2013; Englander, 2014; Hyland, 2012b). Thus, writing in English enhances their job opportunities and careers.
However, publishing in English poses a considerable challenge for international scholars given the multiple variables involved in the process. Not only having a certain degree of proficiency in English is required, but also mastering the conventions of the specific genres involved. For example, the research article, as a specific genre in English, is shaped by specific conventions and linguistic and rhetorical features (Englander, 2014; Swales 2000, 2004), which are different from other languages.

Additionally, contributing to the field with content of quality, original research, and appropriate methodologies is undoubtedly also a highly demanding requirement for all researchers, regardless of the language they speak (Hyland, 2016). Thus, it is of utmost importance to analyze to what extent academic researchers who publish in non-Anglophone countries, also called international scholars, publish in English, the genres they use, and the strategies they employ to overcome the challenge this entails.

The aim of this research was to identify what and how scholars from one social science, economics, publish in English. The analysis follows a genre-based and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach. The approach of this research is qualitative; it is a case study based on the analysis of documents and semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions to gain in-depth insight into these scholars’ publishing practices (Yin, 2009). The interviews were designed and analyzed employing an inductive data analysis (Creswell, 2009), that is, finding patterns and categories of topics to group and analyze the findings.

1.1 Significance of the Research

Given the difficulties faced by researchers writing from the periphery to get their research published in international journals, the objective of this research was to identify to what extent researchers from the field of economics within a public university in Central
Mexico publish in English, what genres are dominant, where they publish, and what strategies these scholars use throughout the process.

The research publication process from peripheral countries has been analyzed from different perspectives. For example, Canagarajah (2001) has analyzed the discourse strategies employed by non-native speakers of English, especially periphery learners, to write academic texts, focusing mainly on the agency and creativity developed by these writers. Lillis and Curry (2006, 2010, 2013) have analyzed the publishing practices from researchers in different contexts, as well as their interaction with publishers and brokers.

In our context, there are studies regarding the strategies that Mexican scholars in scientific fields use to write in English (Hanauer & Englander, 2011; Bazerman, Keranen, & Encinas, 2012), that analyze how scientists write. However, there is little research in the Mexican context, and more specifically in social science. This study will shed light on the publication practices of Mexican scholars from the field of economics who publish in English as well as their publication strategies.

The reason of my interest in the field of economics is because I hold a bachelor’s degree in business management, which is somehow related to economics, and being these two areas part of the social sciences, I am familiar with the technical vocabulary used in this discipline. I also hold a bachelor’s degree in English teaching and have pursued a career as a teacher of English as a foreign language for many years. Thus, with this project I could integrate both disciplines.

The outcome of this research may set ground for developing successful strategies to apply within the branch of English for Specific Purposes, hereinafter referred to as ESP, and more particularly in the discourse communities of the discipline of Economics.
1.2 Setting of the Research

This research was conducted at a public university in Central Mexico, where researchers from different disciplines publish papers on a regular basis. The aim of the study was to analyze what scholars from the Faculty of Economics publish in English, the genres they employ, and the strategies they use to accomplish this task. This was done in two stages. The first stage comprised the analysis of publications from the faculty members; what they had published and where. This analysis was done using a genre and corpus-assisted discourse analysis, in order to identify their main linguistic and rhetorical features.

During the second stage, interviews were conducted to identify the strategies used by the scholars who participated in this research while writing academic papers in English, as well as the strategies they used to get their papers published. This will be explained in more detail in Chapter IV.

1.3 Research Questions

The research questions that guided this research were:

1. What have scholars in the Faculty of Economics published in English?
2. What are the main characteristics of their texts?
3. What do they report about their publishing practices?

1.4 Conclusions to Chapter I

Publishing their research findings is mandatory for faculty at public universities if they want to gain a promotion or continue receiving economic support from the institutions
where they work. Publishing is also a way to contribute to knowledge in their field. English has become the prevalent language to publish research on an international basis and citation indexes are a way to measure the impact and success of these publications internationally.

Despite the spread of English as a publishing language, the participation of some peripheral countries still falls behind the leading countries. In the Mexican context scholars contribute to knowledge with publications in English. The aim of this thesis was to analyze these successful practices in the School of Economics so that they might be used in other disciplines.

The information that sustains this thesis is organized as follows in the following chapters: Chapter II presents the literature review and the theoretical framework that supports the genre approach adopted for this research, and review of research conducted on publishing practices. In Chapter III the methodology and a description of the participants is detailed, as well as the data collection process. Chapter IV presents the results and data analysis. And finally, in Chapter V the conclusions, summary of findings and limitations of this research are presented.
Chapter II

Literature Review

Writing is alive when it is being written, read, remembered, contemplated, followed - when it is part of human activity. Otherwise it is dead on the page, devoid of meaning, devoid of influence, worthless.


2.1 Writing as a Sociocultural Practice

Writing is seen “as a mode of social action, not simply a means of communication” (Prior, 2006, p. 58) and it shapes participants, institutions and cultures by establishing social networking among readers, peers, reviewers, journal editors, conducting research and publishing. These ideas have their foundation on the sociocultural theory, whose initiator was Vygotsky in the second decade of the 1900s, and which is based on the belief that all human activity is influenced and mediated by sociocultural practices. Writing is a sociocultural practice that bears meaning mediated by the context and other texts within specific activities, as in the case of disciplinary writing. In order to participate within an academic discipline, its members need to get acquainted with the different textual forms involved in the construction of knowledge (Bazerman, 2005).

2.2 Previous Studies on Writing for Publication.

Writing for publication is a situated practice within disciplinary communities where participation is the means of learning and which entails interaction with other participants, as well as with journal editors, reviewers and in some cases literacy brokers (Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010a). It is only by engaging in publication that scholars learn to write academically
(Pearson & Vandrick, 2003). Even for researchers with more experience in publishing, as mentioned above, writing is by no means a solitary activity. The development of social, political and linguistic skills requires of participation in an increasingly competitive and globalized academic world.

Currently, many scholars from higher education institutions worldwide face great pressure to conduct research and publish their research findings in order to safeguard their job and their academic status. Publishing is also the means for scholars to be promoted to a higher academic rank and to share their knowledge with other members in their field of study; this is the best way of contributing to their discipline and participating in the academic conversation (Englander, 2014).

The spread of English as the language of academic research publication is correlated to the economic and social power of the United States. Thus, English has become the lingua franca for international publishing as a result of the significant growth of research publications throughout the world and the tough competition of universities and faculty members to fulfill their publication requirements (Flowerdew, 2013).

Thus, in order to publish in prestigious journals, academic scholars are increasingly subject to highly demanding requirements, among those, publishing in English (Englander, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010b; Pearson & Vandrick, 2003; Swales, 1990). These requirements seem to be intensified for scholars whose mother tongue is not English, sometimes referred to as NNS, Non Native Speakers of English, or international scholars, who “manage to survive in an increasingly English-dominated research world (Swales, 1990, p. 102).

Besides being constrained by the language barrier, scholars from developing countries are also restrained by institutional policies related to funding and opportunities to do research. For Lillis and Curry (2010b), there are three key aspects to be taken into account.
when analyzing these writing practices; geographical, geolinguistic and geopolitical. Geographical aspects refer to the region or more locally, to an institution or a department within an institution in particular. Geolinguistic factors refer to the languages used to publish and the status those languages have. And finally, geopolitical issues are related to the policies that frame research practices locally and internationally. Therefore, both the global and local context impact to a certain extent on granting researchers access to international publications.

2.2.1 Publication Processes

Publishing is, then, seen as a social practice which is ruled by power, that is, institutions grant or deny access to participants by establishing the specific conventions to follow in research papers (Cargill & Burgess, 2017; Englander, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010a, 2010b, 2013; Paltridge, 2017). Referring specifically to the field of writing for publication, besides being framed by sociocultural conventions and genres that must be followed so that scholars are granted access, it is also ruled by the specific writing-style requirements of each journal (Englander, 2014). In order to have their research papers accepted in a particular journal, scholars need to fulfill these specific requirements, which increase in accordance with the prestige of the journal, and its visibility, known as the impact factor. The most prestigious journals, generally published in English, measure their impact by means of the frequency of citations in other articles or journals – impact factor or publication metrics – updated yearly.

Globalization and its inherently social practices regulate research and publication by using standardized recognized measures such as the SSCI, Social Science Citation Index, which is an impact factor that was developed by Dr. Eugene Garfield, founder of the Institute
for Scientific Information (ISI), as an indicator of the quantity and quality of the academic written production (Englander, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010b).

Thus, scholars worldwide aim at having their papers published in journals with a high impact factor, but regardless of their background, researchers face a number of challenges throughout the publishing process. Corcoran (2017) divided the challenges faced by researchers into three different aspects; principles of academic writing as the first aspect; the format of the research article as a type of genre that comprises some others such as the abstract or the submission letter as the second aspect; and finally, mastering the academic grammar, which includes topics such as passive or active voice, punctuation, subject verb agreement, among others. The degree of English language competence seems to be correlated to some extent to scholars’ success in publishing (Englander, 2014; Flowerdew, 2000; Lillis & Curry, 2013) in addition to having academic credentials.

Hanauer, Sheridan, and Englander (2019) conducted a study to identify to what extent more pressure is exerted on international scholars whose first language is not English. The participants were Chinese and Mexican researchers who also have experience publishing in their first language. Despite the differences in their mother tongue, what these scholars had in common was that they felt under more pressure and anxiety than researchers whose mother tongue is English.

Some other authors have focused their research on the submission and rejection/acceptance process, and what they have found is that in many cases, the papers are rejected because there are significant differences in the way international scholars write in English as a second or even a third language (Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010b; Paltridge, 2017; Flowerdew, 1999). However, Swales (1990, 1996) emphasizes that not only international
scholars face difficulties to get their papers published, but also native speakers of English, especially novice scholars who are just getting acquainted with the publishing requirements.

In Mexico, there are a few studies on enculturation processes. Carrasco, Kent and Keranen (2012) analyzed the enculturation process that students in scientific PhD programs experience; and Encinas, Sánchez, Thomas-Ruzic and Trujeque (2019) conducted research on the authorship processes of English language teachers in Central Mexico to become active publishing participants within their discipline. These research projects analyzed the publishing process from different angles such as the establishment of networks among peers and with mentors, and the importance of mentoring support to facilitate researchers’ publishing process. The analysis and understanding of the publishing trajectories of authors is an effective way to provide support to other participants who are getting started in the publishing process within their discipline.

2.2.2 Research Networks

As previously mentioned, research done in the field of academic publishing has proven that in order to have their papers published in prestigious journals in English, scholars’ linguistic competence does not guarantee their access. Their contribution to their field with original research is a requirement (Hyland, 2016), as well as their participation in disciplinary networks which can facilitate their way into publishing (Lillis & Curry, 2010a, 2013). Gaining access to publication in prestigious journals requires material, financial and social resources. Peer reviewers, editors, collaborators and supervisors are some examples of social resources and publishing networks.

Networking is particularly important for scholars who write and publish in the “periphery” or in “off-network” locations and who may be subject to inequalities during the
research and publication processes. These inequalities encompass a wide range of disadvantages for international scholars that range from insufficient economic support to conduct research and lack of access to updated information, to differences in rhetorical conventions (Englander, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010b).

Regarding financial resources, many multilingual researchers require assistance to afford the cost of travel expenses to attend conferences in other places in order to meet other researchers within their field that enable them to create academic networks (Lillis & Curry, 2013). Likewise, some scholars need to pay for translation fees before submitting their research, translation that sometimes is done by peers or members of their networks.

Publishing is also regulated by gatekeepers who grant or deny access to publications in international journals in accordance with the compliance or non-compliance of certain requirements such as mastering the structure and style of research related papers. In order to meet the conventions of the appropriate genre related features, researchers need to develop the social networks required to have access to publication (Corcoran & Englander, 2016). Editors can then act as gatekeepers or literacy brokers (Lillis & Curry, 2006, 2010a, 2010b, 2013) who sometimes become part of the network by supporting the researchers with comments or suggestions to help them get their papers published successfully. Especially in multilingual contexts, the negotiation with gatekeepers seems to be a common practice that has been studied from different perspectives, such as the correspondence exchange between authors and editors.

Canagarajah (2005) adds to this topic by stating that in a globalized world, local contributions achieve a position after struggle and negotiation with gatekeepers. He also draws a distinction between the central and the periphery communities, being the latter those comprised of multilingual scholars (Canagarajah, 2005; Corcoran & Englander, 2016). If,
after receiving submissions from the periphery, editors consider that the research contributes to the field and it is worth having it edited, they might support international scholars in the publishing process with suggestions that finally grant them access to publication in prestigious journals (Bennet, 2014).

2.3 Publishing in the Social Sciences

As mentioned above, academic writing differs across disciplines. The conventions for writing and publishing research in the hard sciences are different from those in the social sciences and in the humanities. Even the methodologies used vary from discipline to discipline, and within the same discipline.

In Mexico, many of the researchers in the social sciences are scholars at universities – mainly public ones – who strengthen the bond between teaching and research. Publishing in the social sciences, as in other disciplines, is evaluated in accordance with the frequency of citations and the extent of its internationalization. The latter also makes reference to co-authorship, that is, papers written by researchers from different countries. It is worth mentioning that writing collaboratively enhances the likeliness of being cited more often. Co-authorship of research papers has increased in all areas, including the social sciences (England, 2014).

Many genres are employed in the social sciences besides research papers, as with other disciplines, for example, submission letters, abstracts, grant applications, among others, named as a genre chain by Swales (2004). Hicks (2004) categorizes publications in social science into four main types of literature: journal articles, books, national publications and non-scholarly publication. Journal articles have an international scope, most of them are written in English, and they are measured in SSCI bibliometrics in accordance with the
number of citations. Additionally, they are peer reviewed and display high quality — they are indexed. Referring specifically to publications in Economics, journal articles represent a significant percentage of the published research, whereas books display the lowest percentage.

Unlike hard sciences, social sciences are more aimed at a local context, for example, political and governmental issues within the local society (Hicks, 2004). Therefore, national publications account for a great amount of research in this field. However, local topics, due in part to the internet and globalization, have become more global and tend to spread across international contexts. Furthermore, much of social science is transdisciplinary supported, and thus, is often cited and referred in other publications, sometimes worldwide.

And finally, Hicks (2004) adds that non-scholar publications comprise articles in the different disciplines which are aimed at other audiences other than scholars. The main objective of this kind of articles’ is the dissemination of knowledge among the public in general. These texts portray different features than articles for scholars.

The focus of this research was on the field of Economics, as part of the social sciences. One of the objectives of this research was to explore the genres that Mexican scholars in Economics use in their discipline. Therefore, I studied research on publication in economics.

2.3.1 Previous Research on Publication in Economics

Although there is research on publication in the Social Sciences in general, to my knowledge, there is not much research regarding publications in English in the Mexican context in this field. This research focused on publications in English in the field of economics as well as on these researchers’ perceptions when publishing in English as off-network participants, that is, researchers whose native language is not English. Perales
(2018), whose work is mentioned below, has conducted research in this field in the Mexican context, but from a Systemic Functional Linguistics perspective. By analyzing publications in economics from an ESP approach, the outcome of this thesis might be useful for teaching purposes.

Nonetheless, in international contexts we can find research regarding publication in Economics. For example, Muresan (2000), who currently works in Bucharest, analyzed the way economists write in three genres; textbooks, news reports and research articles from an English for Publishing Purposes perspective. To do so, she examined and compared the moves used to introduce an argument and to persuade readers by means of hedging or other rhetorical devices such as the use of the first person singular pronoun within texts. She provided valuable insight of how economists write across different genres. As for the articles, she analyzed how the author’s voice is heard through their rhetorical choice, and she calls it the author’s omnipresence, a distinctive feature to gain the readers’ acceptance.

Bondi (2014) conducted research regarding self-mention and authorial stance in the humanities and social science in the European context. She compared how authors express authorial voice in abstracts in three disciplines; history as the representative of the humanities, as she expresses; economics for the social science, and linguistics as the intermediate case that can be classified both as social science or as part of the humanities. She combined discourse and corpus tools to identify keywords such as we or reference to the paper itself, as well as contrastive connectors such as “however” or “but”, which indicate authorial voice. In the same way, she identified how authors in the aforementioned fields use attitude and epistemic markers to attach significance to their contributing research paper.

Hajar and Mengyu (2019) from Malaysia, analyzed how researchers in economics employed engagement markers in both research articles and opinion pieces. They applied the
corpus analysis tool AntConc to identify how authors promote their readers’ participation through some linguistic choices proposed by Hyland (2005b), among which directives had the highest frequency. To conduct this research, the corpus was obtained from indexed journals in the case of research articles, and from the newspaper *The Economist*, for opinion pieces. One of the results of this analysis was that engagement markers were more widely used in research papers.

Shchemeleva (2019), who is working in St. Petersburg, also analyzed epistemic modality in research articles, but she oriented her research towards publications written in English as a lingua franca, since, as she mentions, currently the number of publications written in English as a lingua franca exceed those written by researchers whose mother tongue is English. It was addressed as a comparative study between the social sciences, -economics included - and the humanities, and the focus was on identifying clusters of stance expressions used throughout research articles from different disciplines in these categories to determine in what sections of the article they appear more frequently. To this end, she considered five sections within the research article: Introduction, Literature review, Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, and what she found was that it was in the Results and Discussion section where Epistemic Stance expressions were found the most (70%). Another finding was that regardless of the authors’ first language, it is the discipline conventions and the genre constrains what defines the use of epistemic stance expressions.

In the Mexican context, Perales (2018) compared the rhetorical choices for abstracts in research articles in the field of Economics written in English and Spanish, from a Systemic Functional Linguistics approach, and using a corpus-based analysis. The result was a contrastive analysis of the keywords that are more commonly used in English and in Spanish, and this shows that texts in Spanish seem to be more impersonal than the ones written in
English as the pronouns I and we tend to be avoided, and more reference is made to the paper itself than to the author. On the contrary, texts written in English are aimed at engaging and persuading the reader by means of using rhetorical devices.

As observed above, there is a research gap in the Latin American contexts, where little research has been conducted in economics, and to my knowledge there is no research on off-network economics researchers’ perceptions on their publication processes in English. This work contributes to gain insight into the successful practices in the field.

2.4 Approaches to Disciplinary Writing

Scholars belong to discourse communities and share particular fields of study. According to Swales (1990), discourse communities fulfill six depicting criteria: “common goals, participatory mechanisms, information exchange, community specific genres, a highly specialized terminology and a high general level of expertise” (p. 29). Scholars who publish research papers belong to these discourse communities. Although the concept of discourse community coined by Swales is widely recognized by academics, some authors question this concept. These claims are based on the fact that the idea of discourse communities arose from two theories; speech community, that is, communities linked by the same use of language, and on the other hand, the aim of an interpretive community is, as its name states, to interpret texts, basically literary ones. Thus, discourse communities lie between these two concepts. Some of the aspects related to discourse communities that have been challenged are related to their size, their purpose, their permanence in time, or more specifically, to what extent specific genre features are timeless, when referring to academic discourse communities in particular. Resulting from this controversy, in some contexts the concept of Communities of Practice is used instead, which in turn, has been criticized and adapted. The principles of
communities of practice are interaction, or mutual engagement; a common task, that is, a joint enterprise; and it also encloses the concepts of engagement and participation in the community (Barton & Tusting, 2005).

Hyland (2012b) describes the participation in discourse communities as establishing an identity; he claims that in order to forge an identity and participate actively and with sufficient competence as a member of any academic discipline, it is mandatory to adopt its practices and be able to employ the type of discourse used to communicate among them.

For Swales (1990) a discourse community is distinguished because it employs specific genres to communicate and achieve its objectives. Moreover, discourse communities share other characteristics; they require a high level of expertise and a highly specialized terminology. Hyland (2012b) adds that a discourse community is the means by which texts and participants interact into “a common rhetorical space”, in which specialized language is shared among its members. The writing conventions of each discipline are bound by specific practices framed by genres that in turn, are the core of discourse and social practices. Knowledge is spread in every discipline by means of different textual forms (Bazerman & Prior, 2005).

It is only when the language in use is framed by a specific genre in accordance with the context in which it is inserted that the competence displayed in writing goes beyond the linguistic domain and gains ground as discourse (Hyland, 2009). Thus, according to Russell (2002) writing is a “complex and continuously developing response to specialized text-based discourse communities, highly embedded in the differentiated practices of those communities” (p.5).

Writing in a particular discipline requires enculturation into the practices and the genres used in that community. Concomitantly, researchers need to know about their field of
study as well as about the specific conventions and social practices related to academic writing, which evolve at a fast pace, if they want to have their papers published in high-prestige international journals, which are mostly written in English.

2.4.1 Approaches to Genre Analysis

The word genre has its etymological root in Latin, from the word *genus*, which makes reference to a kind or type of things. Thus, genre is now used to define types of texts, as Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) explain, adding the fact that currently, genres also embrace text framing schemes that involve cultural and social knowledge across varied situations.

To understand the concept of genre in linguistics, and more specifically in English as a Second Language (ESL), the three approaches recognized as the foundations of genre, “understood as a construct to analyze discourse” should be analyzed; the Systemic Functional Linguistics, the New Rhetoric, and English for Specific Purposes (Hyon, 1996; Johns, 2002). The Australian tradition, which groundwork lies in the Systemic Functional Linguistics, is an approach that in the beginning was aimed at children and migrants in Australia; teaching them some of the genres that they were likely to use was a way of empowering them, especially migrants who were in linguistic disadvantage. This approach is also known as the Sydney School, and Halliday and Martin are some of its emblematic exponents. Language used at the level of genre involves making choices in the linguistic system, including grammar and lexical features, framed by the appropriate register and social context.

The second approach is the New Rhetoric approach or the North American tradition. Bazerman (2012), a central figure in the Rhetoric approach, sees genres as patterns of utterances that convey meaning in social interaction. Language is used and interpreted as the means to participate socially. Discourse is therefore studied in particular social interactions
which are not static, but rather undergo constant transformation. Genres, analyzed as linguistic features or discourse, grant power to the participants who have access to them. Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) highlight that genres in the Rhetorical tradition are underpinned by membership into a discourse community with background knowledge regarding social actions. One of the main characteristics of the Rhetoric approach is that, since it began in the North American context, it is aimed at participants whose mother tongue is English (Christie, 2008).

For Bazerman and Prior (2005) genre can be analyzed as text, as rhetoric and as practice. As a text, the focus of analysis is on the organization, the style and language used. On the other hand, when genre is seen as rhetoric, the focus is not only on the characteristics of the text, but also on its relation to the context and intertextual resources. Not only the writer conveys meaning to a text; texts are co-constructed and interpreted within the involved groups who create them (Bazerman, 2003; Canagarajah, 2013); writing is framed by the social practices of the discipline.

The third approach, the English for Specific Purposes Tradition (ESP), from which Swales (1990, 2004), Bhatia (1993) and Flowerdew (1999, 2000, 2013) are advocates, focuses on non-native speakers of English who need to use genre in professional and academic settings (Hyon, 1996). Swales, Bhatia and Flowerdew outstand among the main referents in the field. As in the other traditions the social context, herein referred to as discourse community, plays an important role to determine the genre, as well as the conventions that constrain the specific genre.

Swales (1990, 1996, 2004) has analyzed research articles from different perspectives that range from its organization to its content. As a result, he has categorized the research
Experimental articles are known as Research Articles per se. They present original research that other researchers may replicate later, and include original data collection to support the researcher’s findings and conclusions. Review articles, on the other hand, differ from the standard IMRD research article in their format as they do not present the methodology and results sections. They are mainly literature reviews, also known as report articles. The purpose of these review articles is to analyze an issue, to propose a model to solve a problem, or to describe a situation within the field. Unlike Research Articles, Review Articles do not present original data, but rather an analysis of previous research done by others. And finally, theoretical articles provide academic discussion that is not based on data. They present concepts and are argumentative.

Moreover, Swales (2004) adds another category which he calls shorter communications and which comprises as shorter articles or conference papers. As he adds, genres are interconnected and one genre may develop into another, that is, a conference paper might be published later as a research article.

Besides contributing with the aforementioned sub-categories of Research Articles, Swales has analyzed many of the genres involved within the publishing process – which he has named “occluded genres” – because they are “out of sight to outsiders and apprentices” (2004, p. 18), and which include correspondence exchanged between scholars and publishers such as the submission letter. This information exchange is part of publishing.

Publishing in a discipline is a way of participating in academic conversations with its members. In order to participate in the conversation, researchers need to know the specific conventions and practices of the discipline. Moreover, they need to persuade their readers of
the veracity of their claims in order to be acknowledged as recognized participants of their discipline. Being writing a social practice, the published texts are intertwined with social events and social practices. Among the main elements of social practices are the following: interaction among participants, personal beliefs and attitudes, and discourse. The concepts of genre and discourse are inherent components of any discipline of study. Genre, as discussed previously, shapes the way a text is organized, and the function it serves. Discourse, in turn, can be understood as the language used to represent a social practice with a particular rhetorical style. Therefore, discourse analysis goes beyond text analysis; it encompasses the inclusion of the social practices and the cultural context in the analysis to gain different understandings through the analysis of language patterns (Paltridge, 2006).

Disciplinary knowledge is constructed through interaction between the writer and the readers. Writers need to engage readers in the conversation by means of employing certain linguistic strategies such as stance and self-representation features, as well as citation mechanisms, according to their own expectations and understanding of their academic discipline (Hyland, 2004).

Hyland (2005b) categorizes the interactive linguistic devices into two categories: stance and engagement, and highlights that although they carry a specific function, sometimes they overlap, depending on the author’s intention. However, there is a clear distinction between them; he defines stance as a linguistic feature that portrays the way authors project themselves and express their opinions towards knowledge, whereas the purpose of engagement is to recognize their audience participation and gain their attention. It is also worth mentioning the concept of voice in academic writing, which Hyland and Sancho (2012) also associate and compare to the concept of stance. According to them, voice is seen as a dialogue that the author establishes with his or her readers; it is created while
negotiating with the reader, on whom the author exerts an effect, that is, it is the reader the one who recognizes the authorial voice, it emerges while reading the text, and it is connected to a unique style. On the other hand, stance is more author-oriented and it is displayed through the author’s rhetorical choices. This research focuses on analyzing stance and engagement only.

Regarding stance, in this model, Hyland (2005a) includes hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mention as elements that comprise stance markers; and directives and questions as elements that comprise engagement, among others. These will be analyzed and presented in this thesis.

**Stance**

Stance literally means the position where someone stands. When applied to authorial stance, Hyland (2005a) refers to stance as epistemic modality, that is, the way authors present their knowledge, interact and engage with their audience. This includes feelings, attitudes, as well as their commitment and point of view regarding the information they present. All of these elements are grouped by Hyland (2004; 2005a) as metadiscourse, that is, the distinctive linguistic attributes of each discipline. Hyland (2005a) defines metadiscourse as a linguistic term used in discourse analysis that defines the way in which language is employed by authors to communicate and interact with their readers. Metadiscourse markers convey an intended meaning by using rhetorical resources that are context dependent and differ across genres.

Therefore, stance is adopted through metadiscourse elements, and according to Hyland (2005b), it can be analyzed from three perspectives which are evidentiality, affect and presence. The first refers to the extent of agreement or support the author shows towards the
information presented; the affective approach is related to the beliefs and emotions displayed; and finally, presence indicates to what extent the author is visible in the text. For the purpose of this research, the way authors establish stance will be analyzed by means of modal verbs, and adverbs. These rhetorical choices denote what Hyland (2005b) labels “evidentiality”, that is, the degree of certainty authors assign to the statements they present. By analyzing these two elements, the writer’s attitude and intention can be disclosed. This is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

![Figure 1: Hyland (2005b). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse.]

For the purpose of this research, all the elements of this model were considered in the discourse analysis presented. It is by analyzing both stance and engagement that disciplinary writing can be pictured. Examples of each of these categories are illustrated in Chapter IV, except for asides, which were not found in their publications.

**Hedges and Boosters**

Scholarly discourse is characterized not only by specialized vocabulary, but also by a variety of strategies and practices related to the wide array of available possibilities that authors have to communicate and persuade readers. It is difficult to define the limits of a
specific discipline; interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary aspects have an effect on the authors’ rhetorical choice. There is, however, evidence of clear differences between the hard sciences and the social sciences, and what both share is the use of argumentative stylistic linguistic devices to engage their audiences (Hyland & Bondi, 2006).

*Hedges* and *boosters* are Hyland’s terms (2005a; 2005b), that comprise two linguistic strategies used to define the author’s approach towards the information presented. On the one hand, hedges are words that signal to what extent the author refrains from agreeing completely with a statement. These are particularly useful when the author wants to show respect for other members within the community, and allow a certain degree of judgement on whether the statement can be questioned, or the likelihood of an event.

On the other hand, *boosters* increase the force of a statement and they are used to show to what extent authors are convinced of the certainty of the information provided. Some of the linguistic choices to express boosters are adverbs such as definitely, undoubtedly, clearly, etc. Both *hedges* and *boosters* help the author to balance statements and to not display information as assertions, leaving this way a margin for questioning. The analysis of both hedges and boosters was integrated in this research in order to have a broad overview of how authors position themselves in regards to the data they present.

**Attitude Markers**

Attitude markers, as the name indicates, show the author’s feelings and own perception regarding the presented statements of information. They can be identified with the use of verbs of agreement such as agree, hope, believe, claim, etc.; and by means of adverbs and adjectives which show values; for example, frankly, obviously, surprisingly, naturally, appropriate, clear, etc. They “indicate the writer’s affective, rather than epistemic attitude to
textual information” (Hyland, 2004, p. 113), whether it is surprise, agreement, disagreement, disappointment, etc.

**Self-mention**

Self-mention is indicated by words such as I, me, mine, etc., in reference to the author’s own work, and it is a mechanism employed to be acknowledged by other participants within the disciplinary community. In the past, however, writers were advised to not use the pronoun I, and to keep their writing as impersonal and objective as possible. Nowadays things seem to have changed; if scholars want to gain entry into a discipline as reliable members, they must contribute to the field with new knowledge, and the only way of doing so is by using self-mention mechanisms to prove their authorship (Hyland, 2001b). Another way of recognizing their own work is by referring to their previous work – self-citation. In this research the way the participants use self-mention is analyzed.

**Engagement**

Engagement practice in metadiscourse, unlike stance, is aimed at the reader. The purpose of engagement markers is to anticipate readers’ objections or claims and get readers involved in the text to make them participate more actively and accept the writer’s point of view. It is through engagement markers that writers lead readers subtly throughout the text in order to avoid rejection of the information presented, and to facilitate their interpretation in the desired direction (Hyland 2005a; 2005b). Writers adapt their texts to suit the audience they aim to reach.
Reader mention

According to Hyland (2001a; 2004; 2005a; 2005b), one of the most explicit ways in which authors invite readers to participate is through reader mention. This can be done either by using the pronoun you or we, with interjections, or by making explicit reference to readers. By doing so, writers express solidarity with their readers and help them construct knowledge under certain assumptions. This engagement marker also helps readers to be recognized as active participants; it displays an open invitation to interact with the writer.

Directives

Directives belong into the category of addressee or engagement features and they are a linguistic device to get readers into academic dialogue (Hyland, 2001a). As texts are linked to previous texts (intertextuality), participants in the disciplinary conversation adopt a position towards the information presented. The use of directives varies from one discipline to another, but according to Hyland (2001a), “the humanities and social sciences employed more reader-oriented markers than the sciences and engineering”. These directives fulfill two main purposes; one is to grant the readers membership into the disciplinary conversation, as a principle of inclusiveness, and the other is to foresee possible objections to the author’s contribution, and overcoming them by using directives as a linguistic device.

According to Hyland (2002), directives can either be expressed by means of an imperative, a modal verb that indicates that the reader is requested to do something, or a clause that directs readers’ attention to something, such as It is essential to... Hyland further categorizes directives into textual, physical and cognitive acts. The first category refers readers to a specific part within the text. Physical acts, on the other hand, require readers to perform an activity, whether it is related to research or actually physical. And finally,
cognitive acts – which are considered to be the ones with the highest level of imposition – are those that ask the reader to consider information from the writer’s viewpoint.

Questions

The purpose of including questions within the text is to engage readers and develop a strong relationship with them. These questions also have the purpose of anticipating to possible objections and guiding readers towards important information (Hyland, 2005a). Questions clearly invite readers to participate in the conversation; their function is to serve as readers’ guidance, taking into account their needs and previous knowledge (Hyland, 2017).

Knowledge Reference

Citation is a mechanism to sustain knowledge and persuade readers about the reliability of the arguments presented. Citation techniques not only refer to stylistic conventions such as the APA format or to the different ways to cite, but also to the associated reporting verbs used by the researcher. Knowledge is outlined by a theoretical framework and both citations and the way their surrounding features are used, increase or decrease the force exerted on the arguments (Hyland, 2004).

Besides employing direct citations, authors also refer to shared knowledge as a means to anticipate any possible objections from readers and to engage them by inviting them to participate in the academic conversation. The use of knowledge reference markers places authors and readers into common ground and indicate to what extent they belong into the disciplinary community. These engaging discourse markers are used to anticipate readers’ objections and are an indication of how writers are aware of readers’ presence (Hyland, 2001a, 2005b).
Asides

Asides is the term used to describe any additional information that the author provides to direct the reader to personal comments, remarks or opinions regarding the topic presented (Hyland, 2005a). Although they are not very common, they provide an excellent way to engage readers as the discourse is interrupted to state the writer’s point of view or remark regarding the topic. This is an open invitation for the reader to participate in the academic dialogue and unlike those statements that are used to clarify information, the only function of asides is to create a stronger connection with readers.

2.5 Conclusions to Chapter II

Writing for publication is an inherent job demand for many scholars, and it is deemed as a whole process that entails social participation, the fulfillment of disciplinary and genre conventions, the choice of appropriate rhetorical and linguistic devices to help researchers gain a position as participants in the academic conversation, and the creation of supporting networks – broker interaction included – among many other aspects. This chapter covered the literature review available for some of the most important aspects that comprise writing for publication, and which were covered in this research. Among the most outstanding aspects are the approaches to genre and disciplinary writing and metadiscourse markers, framed by a sociocultural perspective. The thorough analysis of the aforementioned aspects provided the framework required to analyze the participants’ publications and answer the research questions defined in Chapter I.

Previous research in social science regarding publication was also reviewed, and more specifically for the field of economics. The most relevant research in publication in
economics is presented in this chapter to shed light on what has been done internationally and more locally.

The next chapter presents an overview of the methodology used to conduct this study, and a brief description of the process adopted to collect and analyze the data.
Chapter III

Methodology

This chapter details the methodology and instruments used to collect the data required to answer the research questions stated in Chapter I, aimed at examining what scholars in the faculty of economics write and publish in English, and the strategies they employ throughout the publishing process. In the first part, the context of the research is presented, along with a brief description of the participants. In the second part the methodology applied to conduct this qualitative research, the instrument used, and the data collection procedure are detailed.

This research was conducted as a case study since the analysis focused on three members of a Faculty in Economics at a public university; the study is qualitative and is supported by text analysis and personal interviews (Yin, 2009).

3.1 The context of the Research

This research was conducted at a highly prestigious public university in Central Mexico where teaching and research activities are intertwined. This public university holds a leading position due to both the quality of education and its researchers’ prestige. Being a large university, it comprises many faculties and areas of research; for my personal interest the focus of this study will be in the social sciences and specifically in the Faculty of Economics as I hold a bachelor’s degree in business and I am acquainted with the technical vocabulary economists employ.

The Faculty of Economics at the university where this research was conducted offers four bachelor’s degree programs, one of which is Economics. The other three are a degree in Actuarial Science, one in Finance and one in Territorial Management and Bio-cultural...
Identity. It also offers two Master’s programs; one in Economics and the other one in Economic Development and International Cooperation. Additionally, it offers a Doctorate program in Political Economy of Development.

There are thirty doctoral scholars at this faculty who both teach and conduct research. Twenty-seven of these scholars hold a National System Registration recognition, known as SNI (*Sistema Nacional de Investigadores*), which is granted to scholars who have contributed to their field. Along with the recognition, researchers who hold an SNI registration are awarded a grant which varies in accordance with their category level. The categories range from one to three, being three the highest recognition. Additionally, there is a C category that stands for Candidates. Thus, in this faculty, ten members out of the 27 who hold an SNI registration are candidates; fourteen of them hold a category one, and three are within category two. None of them held category three when this research was conducted. It is important to consider these details to understand the participants’ background and their workplace context.

### 3.2 Participants

The participants in this research were three scholars from the aforementioned Faculty of Economics who have at least five publications in English. They were listed in the SNI (National System of Researchers) as they have reached a high level of prestige with their publications. In order to maintain their SNI registration, researchers must comply with many requirements, such as publishing scholarly peer reviewed research on an ongoing basis and being active members in an academic institution. The participants will be identified with a pseudonym to protect their identity. Regarding their SNI status, the three participants, Laura,
Roberto and Amelia held an SNI registration when the data collection started, but Amelia lost it in 2019.

All the faculty members are required to publish research on an ongoing basis, and most of them have publications in Spanish. However, only these three participants have published at least five research articles in English. Thus, they were invited to participate in this study in order to analyze their publications in English, and identify the strategies they use to get their articles published.

3.3 Research Methodology

The research was conducted as a case study because it analyzes a particular group, that is, researchers who publish in economics, and who belong to the same institution. According to Yin (2009) case studies fulfill three conditions: they study a situation in its real context and are limited to a particular aspect or topic to be studied. This study meets these three conditions. Moreover, the data was collected from two sources, text analysis and interviews, which meets another characteristic for case studies as described by Yin (2009); having data from multiple sources. This guarantees triangulation of findings. The questions to be answered were:

1. What have scholars in the Faculty of Economics published in English?
2. What are the main characteristics of their texts?
3. What do they report about their publishing practices?

The type of case study presented in this thesis is descriptive (Yin, 2009). The aim of this research was to explore how scholars from the Economics Faculty write in English. The research was conducted in two stages.
The objective of the first stage was to identify the type of publications published, and later to perform a discourse analysis corpus-assisted of the distinctive metadiscourse features described in Hyland’s model (2005b) chart, Figure 1 (see section 2.4.1) in order to identify which of these rhetorical choices were used by these scholars when writing research articles. This model was used because it encloses the main metadiscourse markers employed by authors to interact with their audience. This model includes both stance and engagement markers (see a detailed explanation in Section 2.4.1).

In the second stage of the research, the scholars were interviewed to gain insight of their perceptions toward publishing in English, and the strategies they employ to have their papers published successfully. These interviews were very useful to gain insights on the participants’ perceptions and beliefs. Furthermore, the interviews were held “around their texts” (Lillis, 2009), that is, some interview questions were based on their publications, mainly on the ones analyzed in this research, in order to hear these writers’ voices firsthand. As Yin (2009) clearly defines, interviews are guided conversations in which the ultimate objective is to get unbiased information without posing questions that interviewees might find threatening, maintaining a friendly environment throughout the interview process.

3.4 Selection of the Sample Data

In order to obtain the sample data, I searched for the publications from each one of the members of the Faculty of Economics available online, in order to identify the scholars who had publications in English. This was done by checking all the names in the list of researchers at the Faculty of Economics, and verifying what kind of publications they had, and how many of these were journal articles written and published in English. After this exhaustive search
was completed, only three scholars were chosen because they fulfill the minimum number of published research articles in English that had been defined as a requirement to standardize the sample (five per scholar).

Thus, once the publications had been chosen, in the first stage I classified them according to their type of Research Article, based on Swales’ (2004) categorization (see Section 2.4.1). Later, the metadiscourse markers categories suggested in Hyland’s model (2005b), which denote authorial stance and engagement, were analyzed using the AntConc tool. This is an effective and easy to use tool for text analysis that facilitates searching for specific terms and concordances within electronic texts.

3.5 Instrument

In the second stage of this research, semi-structured interviews were held to identify what and how these scholars publish, their perceptions toward publishing, and what strategies they employ in the process of writing and publishing in English. This type of interview enabled to compare the scholars’ answers having the same starting point, but leaving some margin for variation, in order to fit specific characteristics of the scholar interviewed. There is room for negotiation in semi-structured interviews, which in turn provide more meaningful information (Mann, 2016). The interview questions in both Spanish and English are attached in Appendix A.

3.6 Data Collection Process

Once the publications had been defined, they were used as corpora, that is, the set of texts that comprise the sample used in this research; these texts share common characteristics
as they belong to the same academic discipline, thus providing useful insights into language choice and the way authors persuade their readers (Hyland, 2012a).

Cleaning the corpora was the next stage. All the formulas, graphs and footnotes were removed from the files and replaced with *** FORMULA, to focus only on the text. Additionally, the main sections of the article were marked with a heading to indicate where they started and finished. Since the authors did not use a standardized format, and in some cases did not indicate clearly the sections within the article, especially for the Methodology, and the Results or Findings, this process was done by identifying the transition words and the information presented, and separating the sections manually; for example, <METHODOLOGY> for the beginning of the section and </METHODOLOGY> with a slash to indicate that the section finished there.

Once the articles had been cleaned and were ready in plain text format files, I used the tagging service at http://ucrel-api.lancaster.ac.uk/claws/free.html to tag all the files with the parts of speech to facilitate the analysis. Then, using the AntConc tool for software analysis, I identified the categories of words that indicated either stance and/or engagement markers following Hyland’s model (2005b) using the concordances. In order to find these specific parts of speech, I also downloaded the tag-set that indicates the abbreviation for each of the categories tagged, at http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/claws7tags.html, to look for specific parts of speech such as modal verbs, adverbs or pronouns, among others. This tagging facilitated the search for specific parts of speech as indicators of stance or engagement markers. Since the number of outcomes was really big, I used the “show every Nth row” function from the AntConc tool to reduce the number of concordances and facilitate the analysis. This also allowed me to use a more random selection of the sample lines to analyze.
As for the second stage of the analysis, after conducting the interviews, I typed the transcript and categorized the answers in accordance with the topics discussed.

### 3.7 Conclusions to the Chapter

This chapter presented the most important aspects related to the methodology and the description of the participants, as well as the context in which the research was conducted. The next chapter presents the results and the data analysis, after all the information was gathered.
Chapter IV

RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter the results for the two stages of this research project are presented. As explained in Chapter III, the first stage comprised defining and categorizing the specific types of genre of the fifteen articles compiled from three senior scholars in Economics as defined by Swales (2004); that is, whether they are research-based articles, theoretical or literature review articles. This stage also details the corpus-based discourse analysis for these articles. This analysis helped to identify the main characteristics of their texts, by means of examining the distinctive linguistic features (metadiscourse markers) employed by these scholars, in order to obtain a broad overview of what and how the scholars in this faculty write and publish in English. Finally, in order to validate and triangulate the information obtained during the first stage, the second stage outlines the most outstanding aspects of the interviews.

4.1. Genre analysis of the Publications

The main characteristics of the fifteen articles analyzed in this thesis are detailed in this section. As general characteristics of the articles, most of them were written collaboratively, either with another researcher, or with up to five authors. This information is detailed in Table 1. It also includes the topics they discussed, and the journal where they were published.
Regarding the journals where the participants publish, they reported choosing these journals because they are specialized in the topics of their interest. That is, they are very

Table 1: Participants' articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Journal of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberto and four more authors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economic growth, balance of payments</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Nóesis Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles 2 and 3 were written by Roberto and a researcher from another public university</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>PSL Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wages and inflation</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Investigación Económica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capital accumulation</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Contaduría y Administración UNAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto and two more authors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic development model</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Published as chapter of a Routledge book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura and one of her Master's students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Productivity growth</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Ensayos sobre política económica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura and another researcher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exchange rate and inflation</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Ensayos sobre política económica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles 3 and 4: Laura and a researcher from the University of California</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cost of labor</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education in Mexico</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Journal of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trade Terms</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Foro Económico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of Amelia's articles were written collaboratively; three of them with the same network:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Journal of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Researchgate / conference paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Micro entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Revista de Estudios Gerenciales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Micro enterprises</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>International Journal of Humanities and Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Micro enterprises</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>International Review of Economics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Business development</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Researchgate / conference paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specialized journals within the field of economics and aimed at a very specific audience interested in those topics. Although they consider their research as having an international scope, not all their work is aimed at an international journal. In Roberto’s case, he has published in PSL Quarterly Review, which is a European journal based in Italy, and he also has book chapters published in Routledge’s books. He expressed his intention of being able to cover a wider audience by publishing in international journals, thus participating more actively in the international community. However, he reported that his publications have been published by different publishers and very seldom by the same.

Laura, on the other hand, has specialized in econometrics, so she directs her work toward the journals specialized in this topic. Two of her articles were published by the Central Bank of Colombia because that was the means to expand her research to Latin America. However, Bank of Colombia Journal currently does not accept any contributions from researchers who are not members of their teamwork. Therefore, she needs to find new journals to publish her work. Same as her colleagues, her articles are written in accordance with the topics and guidelines defined by the journal where she wants to publish, as she expressed:

Amelia has analyzed the journals where she thinks her articles are more likely to be published. As she always works with a stable network, sometimes one of the network participants is the one who has the contact with the editors and decides where to publish. The journal International Journal of Humanities and Social Science is based in the United States, and Revista de Estudios Gerenciales (Journal of Management Studies) is based in Colombia, which gives the possibility to expand their contributions into Latin American countries.

As observed above, these scholars employ the three types of research articles described by Swales (2004), i.e. research articles, review articles (Amelia and Laura) or theoretical
articles (only Roberto). Out of the fifteen articles analyzed, two are review articles; eleven are research articles, and two fall into the category of theoretical article. The number of pages ranges from fifteen to forty, and all the articles include either graphs, or formulas, or charts with figures that support either the models proposed or the data collected.

Regarding their specific genre characteristics, it should be noted that even for research articles written by the same author, these tend not to follow the exact same format probably due to the journal. To illustrate this, let us take Roberto’s articles; three of his articles are research articles, and two of them are theoretical. He does not indicate the methodology section with a subtitle in his research articles; however, it can be identified by the rhetorical choice he employs, and by the structure of his articles. In all the articles he states how the paper is organized at the beginning of the article. And, despite belonging to the same category (research), only two out of the three articles display the title of abstract at the beginning. As for Laura, in the same way as Roberto, she details how the research paper is organized in the introduction section. Four out of her five articles analyzed are research papers, and two were published in a Colombian Journal. These do not indicate the methodology section with a subtitle, whereas the other two do. This is due to the journal format requirements.

Unlike her colleagues, three of Amelia’s articles are divided into sections clearly stated that follow the same format: Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results and Conclusions, sometimes referred with a different subtitle, but basically following the same structure. One of her research articles follows the same structure, using different labels for the sections.

Roberto’s theoretical articles present a different approach to economic theories within academic settings, Routledge publishers and UNAM (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
México), supported by formulas and/or graphs. These articles do not have a methodology section.

Finally, Laura and Amelia’s review articles are organized differently. Amelia’s article presents the results obtained after the implementation of a government model to promote micro enterprises. She analyzes the impact of this model, sustained by its corresponding literature background. Being focused on results, the article presents charts that support the information. Laura’s review article, on the other hand, is basically a literature review presented at an economics forum; it is organized in three sections: an introduction, the historical background, and the conclusions. The reference section has only ten references, one of them a self-reference. This is the only article written by Laura individually, out of the five articles considered for her sample.

After this brief analysis, it can be observed that the research article is the most widely used by the participants in this study, which they later confirmed. Research articles are intended to disseminate new knowledge following disciplinary textual practices. It is by publishing that authors gain status and a position within their discipline. As Bondi (2014) states, authors portray themselves by means of their rhetorical choice. After analyzing research published in three disciplines, she found that writers’ visibility in the field of economics was higher compared with the other two disciplines (linguistics and history). As with Bondi’s results, either we or I is repeatedly used in these articles to express authorial stance. Bondi (2014) adds to her analysis that other ways of establishing stance or express authorial voice is by means of explicitly mentioning the aim of the paper, especially in the abstract section. The next example, from one of Laura’s articles illustrates this. It is not in the abstract, but in the introduction section where she overtly introduces the gap:
This paper attempts to help fill a serious gap in the literature on empirical cost-benefit analysis. Although we many find general discussions of the economic or social opportunity cost of labor, there is a notable absence of methodological guidelines as to how precisely to quantify this opportunity cost across occupational groups and different labor markets.

Bondi (2014) also highlights the purpose of employing contrastive connectors as the means to accentuate the importance of their contribution, and to gain readers’ attention to their work, since currently the academic world is saturated with information. Counter-arguments are used to fill a gap in research. Below I am quoting an example of how the research gap is indicated in one of Roberto’s articles:

These ideas have been the subject of multiple debates and empirical contrasts; however, to the best of our knowledge, there are no papers linking the capital scarcity to the external constraint on the economic growth.

These markers will be fully analyzed in more detail in the discourse analysis section. From this analysis it can also be observed that they have established publishing networks (Englander, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010a) that help them gain a position within their field, and spread their research scope internationally in some cases. Most articles were written with a researcher from another institution; this might extend their scope of recognition.

Regarding the topics covered, they are mainly local, as Hicks (2004) points out. However, due to globalization, these topics have become international. Therefore, the results shown and the models employed are applicable to regional problems (Latin American), or even to worldwide economic domain.
4.2. Articles Discourse Analysis

For scholars, publishing in the disciplines has become a requirement to maintain their position and to participate as members who contribute to the field. In order to do so, they must fulfill the genre’s conventions. It is by analyzing scholars’ texts and their rhetorical choices that it can be determined how they portray themselves within their discipline, since it is inserted in a social context, and how they establish authorial stance successfully and get their readers engaged.

4.2.1. Stance

Stance, understood as the way authors position themselves within a text in order to participate within a discipline (Hyland, 2005a), can be analyzed by means of some linguistic devices, known as metadiscourse markers, that serve a specific function. For the purpose of this analysis I focused on hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mention to analyze stance, as described in detail in Chapter II, and based on Hyland’s model (2005b). In order to portray themselves effectively within a discipline, researchers need to employ its specific discourse and use metadiscourse markers effectively, and it is by using these stance markers effectively that they gain recognition within their field.

Hedging is one of the metadiscourse elements most frequently analyzed; it is used to express to what extent writers agree with a proposition, and to show consideration towards their readers, leaving some margin for them to accept their statements (Hyland, 2005b). An adequate use of hedging devices allows researchers to be accepted within a disciplinary community as they leave some margin for the fully acceptance of their statements.

After analyzing the discourse of fifteen articles, I could observe that due to the fact that a considerable amount of the information presented in the discipline of economics is
sustained on models, and these are subject to other dependent variables, epistemic modality might be highly used as a hedging tool because these models are subject to producing different outcomes under different conditions. Thus, the models and outcomes they present cannot be stated as something definitive. This is the reason why I decided to analyze hedging through epistemic modality, which is also one of the metadiscourse devices that comprise Hyland’s analytical framework (2005b). well done!

In order to obtain a sample of how hedges are used by the participants in this research, I searched for epistemic modality markers, that is, modal verbs employed by authors to mitigate to some extent the force of their utterances. To do so, I searched for the tag “VM” Modal Verbs, and due to the fact that there was a significant amount of concordances, the samples were retrieved by applying the function showing every 10th row in the AntConc tool (see Chapter III, section 3.6), to reduce the number of cases and obtain a representative sample.

Figure 2 shows the extract of some concordance lines from the participants’ articles to illustrate the use of hedges in the context where these modals appear. An excerpt from the middle lines, after using the Nth function, was chosen to standardize the sample selection in all cases.
Figure 2: Use of Hedges

In line 43 Laura uses *might* to place herself in the reader’s position and state what they might infer from the information presented; she anticipates her readers’ reaction or objection towards this utterance. Might is used as a mitigating device to show deference towards their readers as not everybody would get to the same conclusion. The use of might enables her to gain a stronger stance as an economist in order to later refute the reasoning by adding *however* as a challenging statement and including an additional factor to be taken into consideration, in order to introduce the information she is trying to prove with her findings.

A summary of the migratory patterns by state is shown in Table A4 in the Appendix. Regarding the migration evidence presented, one *might* easily conclude that, because in some locations there is almost no immigration, then SOCL would be the same as the market wage (gross wage). However, this reasoning is far from correct once the phenomenon of a dual labor market is taken into account.
As we can see in line 45 of the concordances, Amelia’s work provides another good example of how hedges are used when presenting formulas, as these formulas are dependent on certain factors that may or may not happen. As such, they cannot be stated as definitive information. This hedging modality allows her to organize her text and to adopt a stance as a faculty member.

Rejecting the null hypothesis of similar means (Ho) *would* imply that the two populations are significantly different (specifically, expectations of category 1 *would* be above of category 2), and therefore one *would* expect a differentiated contribution to the economy from each one. However, if we fail to reject the null hypothesis, it *could* be assumed that the categories show equivalent behavior.

Similarly, in line 40, Roberto displays how the epistemic modality marker (*should*) is used to introduce assumptions from a given formula. *Should* the conditions be fulfilled, a certain result is expected. Otherwise, the results would change.

Now, suppose *g* takes on a value lower than .. 1, say .. 2; from [5] we gather that .. 2 *should* correspond to a given value .. 2+ .. 2; yet .. 2+ .. 2 is higher than .. 2, therefore: ***FORMULA consequently, *g*2 b2 is lower than n2 and the rate of unemployment is increasing.

These economics scholars seem to have refrained from presenting results as definitive; their results might be subject to many variables and to certain conditions that may change, depending on the combination of the factors involved. Thus, they use epistemic modality to express to what extent the information is dependent on certain parameters that must be previously fulfilled. The analysis of these hedging devices is context-dependent and these rhetorical choices enable these scholars to organize their publications (Hyland, 2017).
4.2.2. Boosters

Boosters, on the other hand, are devices that imprint force to claims. Unlike hedges, authors employ boosters to highlight information and to engage their readers (Hyland, 2004a). Figure 3 presents the extract of some concordance lines to illustrate the use of boosters among the participants. As in all the examples presented, the middle lines are shown to standardize the analysis and avoid bias. In order to obtain these concordances, first I searched for the tag general adverb. Then, as many of the results obtained were not useful for this analysis, I analyzed which were the words that were more repetitive and could illustrate how boosters are actually used by these participants. Finally, I did a final search with these adverbs; the results are shown below. The lines from the center are shown in figure 3.
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**Figure 3: Use of boosters**
In line 20 Laura employs the booster *clearly* to maintain authorial stance when she presents, in the methodology section, the reason why she is using an equation. By using a booster device, she enhances the information presented and tries to engage her readers. Moreover, she positions herself as a senior scholar by supporting her information with boosters; this shows how confident she is about the methodology she applied.

The convenience of Equation (8) relies on the fact that we can *clearly* identify what benefits (costs) are going to the government (taxes) and what benefits (costs) are going to workers (externalities) as result of changing jobs from the informal sector to the formal sector. In other words, Equation (8) gives us a stakeholder approach providing a means of allocating gains and losses among different groups in the economy.

Taking another example from Amelia, this one from the Literature Review Section, it can be observed that she begins a reference to some supporting information by using the word *indeed*, to express certainty about the information presented. By using the adverb indeed, she shows certainty towards the information presented, thus persuading her readers to accept the information as factual. She even highlights the importance of this reference by using the verb prove. This information is fundamental to support her research.

*Indeed*, Martinez (2009) proves that in Mexico exists a duality in the self-employment performance composed of some people who look for capital accumulation and others who use it to solve the lack of liquidity because of the shortage of formal employment.

And finally, in line 39 there is another concordance example from Roberto in which he emphasizes the importance of the information he presents by using *actually* as an introduction in order to emphasize. Moreover, he supports this information with a reference, many
formulas and some images that illustrate an economics trend to give more validity to his statements.

Actually, price stability predates the adoption of an inflation targeting regime by central banks; in nearly all inflation targets, inflation was already on a downward trend prior to the introduction of the new monetary policy consensus (Rochon & Rossi, 2006).

As it can be observed above, boosters are used by the participants to engage readers by getting their attention towards the information they consider to be more important. In two of the examples above, epistemic modality through the use of adverbs helps participants to position themselves as knowledgeable economists who contribute to the field with new analysis.

4.2.3. Attitude markers

Same as with the two previous metadiscourse elements, attitude markers are devices that authors employ to adopt authorial stance. Figure 4 shows some concordance lines obtained from examples of attitude markers. As in the previous case, I did the search of general adverbs, and then, after analyzing what were the most repetitive ones, I conducted another search in order to get the adverbs that illustrate how they are used as attitude markers.
In line 16 Amelia employs the adverb *curiously* to show surprise regarding the lack of use of an indicator in economics. By using the adverb curiously, she proves that she knows about the topic and she strengthens her position within the field.

Generally, consumer confidence is used to evaluate the level of economic stability of the people and to determine the actual and future flow of money, but, *curiously*, it is hardly employed to identify attitudes over time in different collectives, to conclude about the relative satisfaction of individuals by type of activity they perform or to calculate the optimism or pessimism with which they face future decisions.

In line 22 Laura, on the other hand, employs two attitude markers to indicate how an economic index is calculated. She introduces this information in the section she calls Background, after the Introduction, in which she provides the framework to sustain the rest of the article. She expresses both acceptance and disappointment when she contrasts how a
wage variable is calculated in the case she is presenting by first employing luckily and then sadly.

Labor heterogeneity forces us to contemplate different opportunity costs for a whole gamut of different types – discriminated by occupation, education, age, sex, etc. Luckily, most of these characteristics are reflected in the market wages that apply to the different qualities of labor at any given time and place. This permits us to use the market wage \( w_m \) as our entry point into the determination of SOCL. Sadly, however, the market wage that is typically reported is neither the effective demand price of the employer nor the effective supply price of the employee.

In line 31 Roberto employs the adverb paradoxically to show surprise. When writers use attitude markers they express their feelings towards the information presented; thus, this indicates that he is confident to express surprise as he is an expert in his field.

As for Argentina, Brazil and Mexico, their development gap has widened, in some cases very drastically with a fairly slight improvement towards the end of the period under analysis. In contradistinction, China has continuously been catching up vis-à-vis the US economy; China’s development gap has narrowed rapidly, paradoxically, since it opened up to international trade.

From the results obtained, it can be seen that these participants adopt affective stance towards the statements they present by using attitude markers. These allow them to portray themselves as knowledgeable participants who can participate in the academic conversation as they state their opinion. By using attitude markers, they also engage their readers; they guide their readers towards the information they highlight, making them notice what is relevant. Their disciplinary competence and authority is shown through the use of these attitude markers.
4.2.4. Self-mention

Self-mention is the mechanism that authors employ to make themselves visible within their text. It is highly important because that is one of the ways they have to show their participation explicitly. Figure 5 below presents some examples of self-mention among the participants in this research.

Figure 5: Self-Mention

The analysis of articles and search for the concordance of the first person pronoun indicated that only Laura mentions herself three times as “I” in one of her articles. The reason for this is could be that the articles analyzed from the participants in this study were all written collaboratively, except for this one below, which excerpt I am showing below to illustrate. Or, another reason to use I is to avoid using passive constructions. By using the pronoun “I” the author enhances her active role as a researcher.

In the first part I will present a general historical background. In part II, I will go over the work of Raul Prebisch, Flanders, Lewis, and Ronald Findlay, whose work is considered as the most important in this field.
As it can be observed, Laura refers to herself when she details how her article is organized; by doing so she proves her stance as participant in the field of economics. In all her other articles she employs we, as she usually writes in partnership.

Similarly, in line 17 from the image, Laura employs the pronoun we to describe the steps she followed to estimate a variable. This way, besides positioning herself as a member of the discipline who knows the genre conventions and who has gained a position within the field.

First, we estimate the age-earnings functions for each level of education. Then, taking into account some important costs of added years of study, we estimate the net present value of investment in human capital in each of four steps up the educational ladder. We estimate the internal rate of return associated with investment in each successive step considering different scenarios, two of which take into account prospective economic growth and mortality.

The way the pronoun we is used by the other participants is illustrated below.

In line 15 Roberto employs the pronoun we similarly. He introduces a suggestion after using the adverb however to challenge someone else’s perspective. This way he tries to engage his readers and make them accept his proposal under these assumptions.

However, we considered that this constraint may be modified by the rate of capital accumulation. After all, the constraints on the demand side could appear faster than those on the supply side if there is a supply side; or in the terms that we have utilized in this paper, if there is economic capacity.

Unlike stance markers, engagement markers are aimed at the reader; the objective is to get the readers’ attention and invite them to participate in the academic conversation.
As for self-reference, both Laura and Roberto cite themselves in one of the articles, whereas Amelia cites herself in four out of her five articles analyzed.

4.2.5. Reader mention

For the purpose of analyzing reader mentioned, I searched for concordances with the second pronoun you, but surprisingly, there were no results. What I found was that the word reader was used by only one of the participants. In the following figure we can observe how Laura employs the word reader or readers to invite them to participate actively within her text as illustrated in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Reader Mention

It is also important to highlight that she uses this strategy in three out of the five articles analyzed, so it might be a recurrent practice she employs. As we can observe, Laura makes use of this strategy to invite the reader to pay attention to something, or to guide readers...
towards the information that she considers more important for them. Two examples are analyzed in context.

In line 2 Laura anticipates what readers might be concerned about and addresses this question by naming them explicitly and then asking them to pay attention to how an economics indicator is measured. By doing so, she brings the readers into the text and makes them participate actively, overcoming any objection they may have to accept her proposal. This strategy allows her to position herself as an economist who has gained a position and reputation as a senior member in the field.

Some readers may ask why we used a real discount rate as low as 5 percent in this calculation. In the first place, note that we are measuring the returns that accrue to the average worker in each comparison that we make.

In line 6 we can see another example, this one from the introduction section of the article, in which Laura details how the article is organized and highlights readers’ participation by using explicitly the word reader, inviting readers to examine how some indicators were calculated and thus, strengthen her position as a publishing author who contributes to the field with new research.

Additionally, Appendix A provides a guide to help the reader understand how the estimates of the SOCL for male and female workers in 21 occupations and 32 Metropolitan Areas of the Mexican Republic were obtained.

4.2.6. Directives

Directives “instruct the reader to perform an action or to see things in a way determined by the author” (Hyland, 2002, p. 215-16). Although they may be seen as an imposition, it is
through the use of directives that authors engage their readers and establish a position in the discipline. Some examples are shown in the next figure.

Figure 7: Directives

In line 34 Amelia employs a directive from the cognitive act category, with emphatic purpose, which bears more imposition on readers. By using this type of directive Amelia directs readers’ attention towards what she considers to be important they notice, thus maintaining a strong stance as a participant member in the field of economics.

*It is important to note* that the unemployed are a minority group of those who did not work. **GRAPH.** In addition, professionals and assistants have a statistically higher mean than the remaining categories.

Laura’s example, in line 31 illustrates a textual act with internal reference, this one being the one that exerts the least imposition on readers. The author considers important that readers recall some information presented beforehand, as this information is used in this part of the text. This directive allows readers to participate actively and thus, engage them.
The four estimates for ln (age-education interaction) are 0.00125, 0.00604, 0.00921 and 0.01171 on average for education levels 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively (recall that our category of reference is level 1=primary school).

Below we can see another example, from Laura’s research article in line 27. This excerpt actually displays two examples of cognitive acts with rhetorical purpose which use the verbs suppose and assume. The imposition is higher than that exerted by textual acts. This kind of directive is intrinsically related to models in economics since many assumptions are made to calculate how changes in the variables affect the outcome.

Therefore, X and Y proportionally depend directly on K. Now, suppose that the real exchange rate, defined as the price ratio of domestic output to imported capital goods \((P/P^*)\), is given. This implies that the profitability rate \((r)\) in terms of \((P^*)\) is also given, because \((W/P)\) is fixed. Assume, further, that the growth rate of capital is composed of two parts, an autonomous component \((\quad)\) and an induced component which depends on \(r : \quad***\) FORMULA where \(h\) is the profitability elasticity of net capital accumulation.

And finally, in line 24 Roberto provides a short example that illustrates a textual act with an internal reference; the type of directives that exert the least imposition on readers. There are many directives such as this throughout the articles as they require supporting figures, graphs and tables.

It can be shown that the implied X was 1.02 during 1951-1981, 3.50 during 1982-2014, 3.06 in 1986-2014 and 3.23 during 1994-2014 (see table 1).

4.2.7. Questions.

Due to the fact that many variables in the formulas were replaced by question marks when the articles were converted to plain text, it was really difficult to find the questions
within the articles using the AntConc tool, so I did it manually. Below I am showing some examples of the type of questions found in the articles analyzed.

As I could observe, after analyzing all the questions in these articles, the data showed that questions are used either to introduce the research questions or to introduce a topic/problem and then answer it. Another case is to explain something about the methodology used to get the results obtained.

The next example shows how Laura, in one of her articles, poses a question that she immediately answers. By asking this question Laura highlights the importance of her research when she discusses her findings applied to a local context. This question engages her readers; her intention is to focus her readers’ attention on the question; a question that they may ask themselves.

What are the implications of these findings for the real exchange rate in Mexico? Being the real price that makes the real demand and real supply of foreign currency to be in equilibrium (Harberger, 1995 and 2004), the RER is obviously influenced by these market forces.

Another excerpt from one of Roberto’s articles shows how questions are used similarly. In order to engage readers, he poses a question that he immediately answers. With this strategy he is inviting readers to participate actively in this academic conversation, and to gain insight into this topic.

What are the driving forces behind Latin America’s poor performance? Needless to say, a number of factors call for the phenomenon. We argue that structural change in Latin America has failed chiefly because the process of economic liberalisation has involved a low gross investment to GDP ratio and a drastic increase of the income elasticity of imports.
4.2.8. Knowledge Reference

Writers in the disciplines do not only use direct and indirect citation when referring to common prior knowledge in their field of study, but also employ certain specific markers that indicate shared knowledge. These markers are employed to assume that readers recognize the information presented as widely accepted in the discipline. This is done by means of certain rhetorical choices such as of course, certainly, clearly, and certain verbs such as agree or know. Some examples found in the articles analyzed are presented below.

In the next example Laura employs the adverb clearly to emphasize how an inference should not be drawn. By using the phrase clearly erroneous, she pinpoints a mistake that must be avoided in the field, thus demonstrating her disciplinary knowledge domain, and inviting the reader to acknowledge this as an erroneous practice in the field of economics. By claiming attention on a wrong practice in her field, she anticipates possible objections that the reader is likely to raise.

For example, when the change in the terms of trade is a consequence of some exogenous shock, such as a change in tastes, technology or factor endowments, it is clearly erroneous to infer the total change in the country’s welfare solely from the direction of change in the terms of trade.

Using medians minimizes the influence of anomalies of these types. This is the reason why the sample median has a well-known reputation as a robust statistic, and is well suited for skewed distributions (like that of wages in an occupation). This was evidenced in the data used in this paper, which showed positively skewed wage distributions.
The latter example presents supporting information to explain why a certain methodology was used in that case. The phrase *a well-known reputation* serves as a marker that indicates that the writer, Laura in this case, is aware of her readers’ presence and prevents them from refuting her argument.

Roberto also makes use of many rhetorical choices to indicate knowledge reference. Some examples shown below illustrate what rhetorical choices he employs. Two examples are used to sustain information and the other two are used to refute information or a certain practice in the field. These markers are used when shared knowledge in the field is presented; in order to ensure that the markers are related to shared knowledge, they were analyzed in context. Many examples of reference knowledge markers can be found in Roberto’s articles.

*Clearly*, only a combination of both technical innovation and institutional innovation can engender constellations of successful industrialisation and economic development.

Although, *clearly*, such an assumption is not to be found in Thirlwall (1979), we follow it just for the sake of comparison. Both, Clavijo and Ros (2015) and Thirlwall (1979), consider that the long-run growth rate of output is equal to the growth rate of exports.

*One may agree* that a national system of technological innovation would contribute to substantially improve Latin Americas economic performance, *but it is hard to see how* Schumpeters approach to economic development, with its emphasis on the role of the state and institutions as driving forces of the constitution of markets and industrialisation, can be made compatible with the microeconomic- behavior-based, Washington Consensus laissez-faire approach to growth.
It is worth mentioning that the knowledge-reference analysis of markers was performed in context, that is, the marker was used to support a position or belief, making reference to previous background knowledge. It was interesting to see that no knowledge reference markers were found in Amelia’s articles.

4.2.9. Asides

As mentioned in Chapter II, section 2.4.1, asides are used to address readers’ attention to comments or remarks made by the author to state his or her point of view (Hyland, 2005a). They are not very common, though, as it can be observed in the publications analyzed, in which no asides were found.

4.3 Analysis of Interviews

The interviews were conducted individually, using the same questionnaire for all the participants in order to compare the results obtained and find patterns. Once the interviews had been conducted, they were transcribed and analyzed closely to find supporting information for the data presented in this thesis.

4.3.1 Networks

After analyzing the interviews, it could be observed that the three scholars share a number of commonalities despite their different educational background and previous professional experience. The three participants hold a Bachelor’s degree in Economics from a Mexican university. Roberto and Amelia obtained their Bachelor’s degree from the university where they are currently working, and Laura did her studies in a private institution.
Both Laura and Roberto received their doctorate degree from an American university, whereas Amelia did her doctorate studies in the north of Mexico. Undoubtedly, the universities where they studied were their starting point to conduct research. The three of them highlighted the importance of their networks. Each of them had a university professor who invited them to research with them and he or she was either their MA or PhD thesis supervisor, mentor or both. Thus, in these three cases, they had an experienced scholar who established a research network with them. Roberto states a clear example of this:

This professor is my mentor in economics. He was my teacher and I met him many years ago. It was a teacher-student relationship. I went to study a Master’s program with him and since then we have worked together. (Own translation)

Two of the participants, in turn, have become literacy brokers for their students and publish with them. These scholars now establish new publishing networks with their students, usually from the master’s programs offered at the university. As Lillis and Curry (2010a, 2013) state, these networks facilitate their way into publishing. Laura provides an example of this networking:

Regarding the other articles, there are certain requirements from the SNI and from the different programs here at the faculty, that incentive us, teachers, to write with our students. Therefore, many of the topics are related to our students’ thesis research. Sometimes, our publications are not the same as their thesis. We only use their database, which is useful to create something different. (Own translation)
As Roberto expressed, it was through a professor who invited him to collaborate on a project that he started conducting research and publishing, and later he did the same with one of his students. As for Amelia, it was also one of her professors the one who invited her to collaborate. Her case is a bit different as this professor is the leader of a publishing team. Although they are physically distant, they continue working and publishing online together. Laura also established a strong network connection with a professor from an American university where she obtained her master’s degree.

Regarding the organization of this publishing network, in all cases there is a leader in the project, and this scholar is the one who organizes how the work is done. Amelia commented the following on the topic:

> We are a team. Generally, all my research has been conducted collaboratively with a colleague. There is the one who proposes the idea, let’s say, the hypothesis of the document…then, as an academic body we brainstorm and share the tasks. We need to agree on the references and the theoretical framework and define the hypothesis. Then we have meetings as a follow up to see how we are doing. (Own translation)

During their first stage as publishers of journal articles, the three of them followed their mentor’s guidance; this scholar was the one who established contact with the journal and the one who guided them through the publication process. As they gained more experience, their roles changed, but not for the process as a whole. Although Roberto and Amelia now supervise other students’ contributions and write collaboratively, they stated that they do not feel completely confident to write in English by themselves. They think that their mentor is more competent in English than they are, and thus, is in charge of writing and editing the document. Roberto even stated that he has never tried to undergo the whole process by
himself. He feels that the quality of his mentor’s writing surpasses his, even though he did his PhD program at an American university and he was able to understand and even write his thesis by himself. For him, journal publishing is far more difficult than academic writing given the strict journal requirements they need to fulfill.

In Laura’s situation, this is completely different. She expressed that she is in charge of the whole process, from writing to editing and establishing communication with journal editors. When publishing collaboratively with students, she does the writing and her students support her with the database and methodological analysis. It is also she who sends journals to publishers and who is in charge of negotiation. She was the only one who mentioned that articles are not always accepted. Some of them have been rejected.

Their publishing experience varies among them. Laura has had experience publishing not only journal articles, but also complete books and even newspaper articles. The first two in English and the articles on the newspaper in Spanish, and only in one occasion.

When asked about networks, Roberto stated that the basis or foundation to establish networks is the theoretical framework.

With another colleague… we noticed that we agreed on certain research topics, and we started working together. It has always been because we share the same theoretical conceptualization because, there are different theoretical frameworks. I am a follower of the post-Keynesianism while others are more into the Neoclassical theory or the Marxism. (Own translation)

Whereas some economists follow the Marxism theory, others are Neoclassic or some others, as in his case, are Neo-Keynesian economists. Therefore, their theoretical orientation is certainly key to establish nexus among them, despite being physically distant. Besides having a network with his mentor, with whom he has always worked, he also holds video
calls with other researchers from other countries, particularly with a researcher from the university where she studied the PhD in the United States. He also invites other scholars from that university to present at his university.

Surprisingly, these three scholars’ networks are very stable and have lasted for more than fifteen years. This is probably due to the fact that in public universities in Mexico, scholars who can hold a tenure track position tend to continue working in for the same institution.

4.3 2. Participants’ English Proficiency

Concerning their proficiency in English, two participants reported that despite having graduated from post graduate programs in the United States, writing in English adds a burden to journal publishing. As Roberto reported:

The truth is, I have never written and sent an article on my own. I have always had my professor’s support. What I do is the theoretical part, but before we send an article, he is the one who reviews and makes any changes. (Own translation)

Laura stated that although she considers her competency in the English language as quite good, it is not her native language and it takes her longer to have a journal article ready than if it is written in Spanish.

The language is something that has a great impact because if I want to write something in Spanish, I know how to say it; but if I ask another person who is not an economist to translate it to English, it is very likely that this person will not do it correctly because there are ways and techniques, even technical words that are used in economics to express what we mean. (Own translation)
All of them added to the topic of the language barrier mentioning the issue of translation services. They reported that not only is the translation service very expensive but it is also inaccurate. The three of them referred to bad experiences with translating services.

Once we had the document translated, but we had to review it and correct many things that obviously, are very specialized. But it helps; it is quite helpful… depending on the objective. Once we did it ourselves and it was a very good document in English. The colleague who is more competent in English reviewed it and he said it was okay, so we sent it. It’s not necessary in some cases. It depends on the journal. Some documents do not require more “surgery”, as we call it. (Own translation)

Economics is a social science they consider as being more exact than other social sciences, based on models and technical assumptions that cannot be accurately translated by someone who is not an expert in economics, regardless of the translator’s English level. They would require a person who both has high competence in English, and knows the terminology. Lillis and Curry (2013) report on how international scholars deal with the challenges of publishing in English. Some pay for translation services before submitting their research but others as are the cases of the participants in this study solve the problem in their networks with those peers who are more proficient in English writing.

These three scholars have not paid for translation services. They consider it to be extremely expensive and in many cases useless. The writing has to be reorganized and done again as the ideas are not clearly expressed. However, Roberto mentioned that this translation service is provided by one of the journals where he publishes, as part of their publication process. This is a journal published by UNAM, the leading public university in
Mexico. Within the same issue, the journal has the articles both in Spanish and in English, so scholars can send the article in either language and they get their article published in both languages.

They use different strategies to write in English. Two of them report they use peer reviews in their research groups. Laura, the only one who writes and publishes independently uses software in order to self-correct her writing in English, Laura informed that she employs a software that helps her with grammar checking. This software sometimes marks some words as being used incorrectly, for example, words such as wage, repeated many times throughout the document, and which cannot be replaced by salary or income since it does not convey the same idea.

4.3.3. Publishing Practices

Regarding the journal where they publish their work, the three of them stated that they aim at publishing in indexed prestigious journals that are devoted to the topic of their interest. For example, Laura stated that she sends articles to journals which are specialized in the economics topic she studies; otherwise, they tend to be rejected. In economics, as in any other field, journals are specialized in topics of research.

Basically, the choice of journal is related to the topic of the article. I am particularly interested in indexed journals that have a certain impact factor. The first criteria to choose a journal is the topic of the article, and then, according to the topic, there is a range of journals where one can publish, so the second choice is based on the quality of the journal, for example. (Own translation)
It is worth mentioning that two of them, the women, also mentioned that they act as referees for journals, and this activity has enabled them to improve their own publishing practice as they get acquainted with the journal requirements on which they need to focus their attention. Amelia explains it as follows:

We also play the role of journal reviewers. This is very useful as we see things from another perspective. Obviously, we are very careful with the document details when we submit an article for peer review. We know what the journal evaluates. (Own translation)

These researchers are familiar with the publishing process, they master the conventions employed in economics, and they are experts in their fields. They have learned along their publishing journey, and they get adapted to the specific journal requirements. Nonetheless, despite employing the conventions of their field, they are not really aware of the linguistic choices they employ; they do it unconsciously. When asked about whether they interact with their audience, they acknowledge that they do so, but cannot explain exactly how they do it. Amelia commented on this topic:

I think that it is important to build a relationship with our readers because we are not physically connected but we can get connected through the way we write. As a reader, I really like a researcher and I follow him. I love the way he explains things and somehow, one feels more empathy with this researcher and his document. I think that creativity is something really important. (Own translation)

As for Laura, when asked about the use of I or we in her publications, she highlighted the importance of writing more impersonally, and how she avoids using personal pronouns
in her research. She even stressed that impersonal writing is an express requirement from one of the journals where she used to publish, a government-dependent Latin American Journal.

Most times I try to maintain my articles as impersonal as possible, but many times I use an I or a we. I think that this helps you to get closer to the reader. But in general, I make an effort to keep articles impersonal because there are journals in which this is not well seen in formal language, we could say. (Own translation)

However, Laura employs the pronoun we many times in the publications that were analyzed in this research. It is worth mentioning that in the article that she published on her own, she only employs the pronoun we three times, to indicate how the article is organized. See section 4.2.4 and figure 5 for examples of how Laura employs self-mention metadiscourse markers.

Finally, they all agreed on the fact that publishing is a practice that is ruled by the policies from the institution where they work. They are required to publish on a regular basis, and they are required to publish jointly with their students. This grants them access to funding resources and promotions. Their income increases in accordance with their category as scholars who publish. However, they also see publishing as the means to grow and achieve personal development. They recognize that they reach wider audiences if they write in English, and in Roberto’s case, he keeps track of the people who follow his articles. He said that if he writes in Spanish, his audience is mainly Mexican or from other Latin American countries, even from Spain, whereas if he writes in English, he has followers from countries in which English is used as a lingua franca. As he stated:
I try to publish in English because I think that will reach a wider audience.

Regarding the journal, I try publish in indexed journals with high impact factor. (Own translation)

As Lillis and Curry (2010b) state, geopolitical, geographical and geolinguistic aspects intervene in the publishing path, and both local and global contexts have an effect on publications. Due to its geographical proximity to the United States of America, Mexico has established strong connections with the U.S.A., which include academic issues. For example, two of the participants had the opportunity to study their doctorate at an American university, and still maintain academic networking links with American colleagues. Concerning geolinguistic aspects, in Mexico, as in many other countries, English is regarded as a prestigious language for publications, as the participants stated in the interviews. Regarding the geopolitical criterion, Mexico is part of Kachru’s (as cited in Lillis & Curry, 2010b) expanding circle. It is through their institutions, where they study their masters, PhD programs and professional development that scholars establish their networks in order to gain access to resources that allow them to carry out research, publish and participate in the field.
Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter a summary of the main findings and the significance and pedagogical implications of this research are presented. This chapter also presents the limitations of the study and possible lines of further research related to this topic. I conclude with a reflective account of my professional experience and motivation to write this thesis.

5.1. Summary of the main findings and their significance

This thesis approaches publishing in English from two different perspectives; a genre perspective that includes a corpus-assisted discourse analysis to identify the metadiscourse markers employed by the three participants in this research when publishing in English in the economics field, and qualitative interviews conducted to explore the strategies they use to write and publish in English.

Although there is research regarding publications in economics in English in the Mexican context, there is no research, to my knowledge, that combines these two approaches in the same study and in economics, so this study contributes to the understanding of publication practices in countries where English is not spoken as a first language.

This thesis presents qualitative research from a two-phase case study which objective was to analyze what three scholars in the field of economics have published in English and the strategies they employ to have their papers published. The requirement for the participants in this study was to have at least five articles published in English; the three participants are members of the faculty of economics at a public university, where they have to publish on a regular basis. Their articles were analyzed using a genre-based approach;
Swales (2004) subcategorizes the research article into three more detailed sub-types; i.e., the research article as such, which he calls experimental article, and which presents research outcomes after applying a methodology and processing original data. Review articles, on the other hand, are those that analyze research conducted previously; they are intended to gain insight into an issue within the field, and are also known as literature review articles. Finally, the objective of theoretical articles is to participate in academic discussion that is not sustained on data processing, but rather on arguments presented. Regarding the participants in this study, the main category of research article they employ is the experimental article, although there are also two review and two theoretical articles, as detailed in Chapter IV.

These articles were also analyzed using corpus-based discourse analysis in order to identify the main categories of metadiscourse markers the participants employed, based on Hyland’s model (2005b). As detailed in Chapter IV, these scholars employ rhetorical choices known as epistemic modality markers to gain stance within their field, and to mitigate criticism or rejection to their arguments. Knowledge is constructed through social interaction and therefore, academic persuasion plays an important role to get their papers accepted. But not only persuasion is needed to gain stance; another important aspect is engagement. Writers need to attract and maintain readers’ attention and anticipate their possible objections (Hyland 2001a).

It can be observed from the findings that despite having different educational background and professional experience, these scholars comply with the international practices of their disciplinary community. Writing is by no means a solitary activity; knowledge is socially constructed and is based on previous texts. Both stance and engagement markers provide the means to analyze the way writers and readers maintain disciplinary interaction. Stance markers reflect the way a writer portrays himself or herself
in the academic discipline, showing their presence through the use of pronouns, boosters and hedges that intensify or mitigate the message conveyed. On the other hand, the use of engagement markers indicates to what extent the writer is aware of the readers’ presence. Readers’ persuasion depends on establishing an interpersonal relationship with them (Hyland, 2001a); by anticipating objections or refusals through the alignment of a text with the readers’ expectations. This implies that the writer assumes that the readers to whom the text is aimed hold the same beliefs. The use of metadiscourse markers also indicates consensus among the members of a disciplinary community and colleagueship. The appropriate balance in the use of these markers denotes mastery of the disciplinary agreed conventions.

As it can be observed in the analysis detailed in Chapter IV, the participants follow the discursive conventions for publishing in English. The corpus-based discourse analysis was complemented and validated with personal interviews. The transcription and analysis of these interviews brought about valuable insight that can be useful for new scholars who are starting their publishing path.

The most significant outcomes for the interviews were categorized in accordance with the topic discussed. English competence seems to be a major challenge they need to overcome; in order to do so, they establish working networks with other colleagues and in some cases with students. In all cases, it was through a publishing network that they started their publishing in English career. Support from literacy brokers (Lillis & Curry, 2006) was determinant for starting their publishing career; in these three cases a teacher who invited them to participate in research projects. It must be highlighted that these networks are created and maintained by members who share the same theoretical framework.
As for the journals where they publish, the three of them highlighted the importance of the journal being indexed and prestigious. Moreover, the journals where they publish their outcomes are very specialized journals, not only in economics, but also in specific topics and methodologies within the discipline. For example, one of the participants expressed that her work is intended for economists whose area of study is econometrics, thus, she only publishes in journals that are very quantitative oriented and specialized in econometrics. Although they all publish internationally they mostly publish in Latin American journals.

Being part of a disciplinary community also entails participating actively, not only contributing to the field with their publications, but also acting as referees for journals. Two of the participants reported that this activity has enabled them to improve their own authorship as they need to master the journal conventions to accept or reject papers.

5.2. Research contributions

This study contributes to the field of writing for publication and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in the Mexican context. As mentioned before, due to globalization and an increasing global competition, scholars are expected to publish on a regular basis and to contribute to their discipline. Publishing in English enhances their likeliness of reaching other audiences and gaining international reputation. However, as expressed by the participants in this research, publishing in English requires a greater effort to meet the journal requirements. In many cases literacy brokers (Lillis & Curry, 2006) such as journal editors, academic peers or colleagues intervene to help researchers get their papers published.

This research analyzes some of the most important issues related to publishing in English by economics scholars whose mother tongue is Spanish and work in a Mexican public university.
5.3 Implications of findings

The findings for this research might be useful to conduct further research regarding the topic, and also to design a workshop to help both researchers and undergraduate students raise awareness of the importance of metadiscourse markers in the disciplines. Although senior scholars use stance and engagement markers, they are not aware of how and when it is appropriate to use them. A workshop intended to understand and foster the appropriate use of disciplinary discourse would certainly provide a solid foundation to assist researchers on the publishing path. For the institution where this research was conducted this research might be the starting point to conduct other similar studies in other faculties, and to design workshops to help novice publishers in their enculturation process.

On the other hand, raising awareness of the strategies employed by the participants will also shed light on the importance of creating publishing networks, providing useful tips for new scholars who intend to publish in English. These might help them overcome the problems they may face throughout the process, thus facilitating their incorporation into the disciplinary community. Moreover, this research might also raise participants’ awareness of their own publishing practices. As they expressed, they employ many discourse markers and publishing practices but they are not really aware of what and how they do it.

5.4 Limitations

One limitation of this research was the limited time to conduct the interviews. As these scholars were really busy, it was difficult to arrange an appointment to hold an interview and the allocated time was thirty minutes in average. Thus, it was important to
focus on the most important questions that would yield to answer the research questions and validate information.

5.5 Suggestions for further research

After conducting the interviews, some new questions regarding the scholars’ practices emerged. Due to time constraints they could not be answered but might be considered for further research. For example, it might be interesting to know why they do not publish in journals based in English speaking countries or to go deeper into the discourse analysis, for example, analyzing how they construct their identity in their discipline as L2 English speakers or as NNS of English.

Another possible line of research is to conduct studies in other disciplines in which this type of research has not been conducted, in order to gain insight into their specific practices. Some of the areas that might be subject to analysis are the humanities and other social science related disciplines. The findings will break new ground in English publication in the Mexican context from an ESP approach.

5.6 Reflective account

I undertook this research project as part of my professional development; having completed two majors, one in business management and another in teaching English as a foreign language. I thought that by doing this project as part of a master’s program requirement, I would somehow integrate these two disciplines, which I actually did. Knowing some of the specialized vocabulary in economics certainly helped me to get a better understanding of how discourse markers are used in a discipline. Moreover, as a teacher, I always bear in mind how these findings can help me to improve my teaching practice.
Writing this thesis was a considerable challenge; it takes time and discipline but the process also entails learning by doing. It is until the whole picture is completed that one realizes how much writing a thesis can contribute to an enculturation processes. It requires organizing a vast amount of information and focusing on the relevant data exclusively. Learning and applying these strategies will help me in my career as a teacher.
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Appendix

Interview Questions Guideline

Guía para entrevistas de investigadores de la Facultad de Economía

1. ¿Considera usted que los temas que aborda en sus artículos/libros/publicaciones son de ámbito local o internacional?

2. ¿Cómo decide el idioma y el lugar donde publica su trabajo? Editorial o revista, país.

3. ¿A qué tipo de audiencias está dirigido su trabajo?

4. ¿Tiene usted otro tipo de publicaciones fuera del ámbito académico? Publicaciones en periódicos o artículos para el público en general, por ejemplo.

5. ¿Cómo establece sus redes de trabajo (networking)?

6. ¿Cuáles son las estrategias que utiliza para escribir y publicar en inglés? Por ejemplo, veo que normalmente trabajan colaborativamente. ¿Cómo organizan su trabajo? ¿Alguno de ustedes está a cargo de la escritura, de la revisión, el contacto con la editorial o revista, por ejemplo?

7. ¿Qué sugeriría a los nuevos académicos para que puedan publicar en inglés?

8. ¿Utiliza usted alguna estrategia para interactuar con su audiencia?

9. ¿Qué factores toma usted en cuenta para adaptar sus textos a sus diferentes lectores?

10. ¿Qué tan visible para sus lectores considera estar usted en sus textos?
Interview Questions Guideline

1. Do you think that the topics you address in your articles/books/publications have a local or an international scope?

2. How do you decide the language and place to publish your work? Journal or country.

3. To what kinds of audiences is your work aimed at?

4. Do you have any publications other than academic? For example, publications on newspapers or articles aimed at a general audience.

5. How do you establish your publishing networks?

6. What are the strategies you employ to write and publish in English? For example, I see that normally you work collaboratively. How do you organize your work? Is any of you in charge of writing, reviewing, or getting in touch with the editors or journal, for example?

7. What would you suggest to new researchers so that they can publish in English?

8. Do you employ any strategy to interact with your audience?

9. What aspects do you take into account to adapt your texts to your different readers?

10. How visible are you to your readers in your texts?
Roberto’s Interview Transcription

Transcripción de Entrevista

1. ¿Considera usted que los temas que aborda en sus artículos, libros o publicaciones son de ámbito local o internacional?

La gran mayoría son internacional. Hay algunos de nivel nacional. Prácticamente local casi no he escrito nada. Sería nacional e internacional.

- Diría usted que en porcentaje…

Sería un 50 y 50% más o menos, sí.

2. ¿Cómo decide el idioma y el lugar donde publica?

Si es en una revista en el extranjero, pues es en inglés, ya sin más. Si es aquí, hay unas revistas, por ejemplo, Contaduría y Administración, la verdad es que ahí ellos hacen la traducción. Uno les puede enviar en inglés, o les puede uno enviar en español y ellos, si es en inglés, lo traducen al español y si está en español, ellos lo traducen al inglés. Y ya en investigación económica, ahí sí es opcional, uno lo puede enviar en inglés y solo lo van a publicar en inglés o en español y sólo lo van a publicar en español. Yo lo que hago es tratar de publicar en inglés porque pienso que va a tener más audiencia. Y en cuanto a qué revista, trato de que sea en revistas que sean de alto impacto. Que sean indexadas, que estén en los cuartiles internacionales, esa es la decisión. Así es como la tomo.

- ¿La que me dice usted que proporciona el servicio de traducción es únicamente una de ellas?

Sí, es Contaduría y Administración solamente. De hecho, la verdad es que yo no sabía que lo hacen así, pero de hecho yo envié el artículo en español, que suponía que siempre lo trabajaban en español, pero la primera sección de la revista es puro español y después ellos, en una segunda sección, ya ponen todos los artículos, todos los artículos los traducen al inglés.

- Pero los mismos artículos en la misma edición

Sí, el mismo artículo, por ejemplo, este está en español y aquí está su versión en inglés. Pero así con todos los artículos. No nada más uno, sino todos los artículos los publican tanto en inglés como en español, en la misma revista.

- ¿Y en esta revista usted publica un gran porcentaje de sus artículos?

No. La verdad es que… estoy tratando de pensar, pues creo que sólo en Investigación Económica es donde he repetido, porque en todas las demás, ha sido en una sola ocasión. Sólo en Investigación Económica creo que tengo tres. Pero en todos los demás ha sido una sola ocasión.
3. Ahora, ¿a qué tipo de audiencia está dirigido su trabajo? Es decir, si usted escribe en español o en inglés, ¿usted está pensando en una diferente audiencia?

En general son trabajos en los que el objetivo es llegar a economistas con digamos, nivel doctorado, cosas así. Pero sí hemos encontrado que, por ejemplo, si publicamos en español, pues la gente que más lo lee a uno es gente de México, gente de Latinoamérica, de España. Y en cambio, si es en inglés, pues ya son de otros países, no necesariamente de habla inglesa, pero sí de otros países también lo leen a uno. Entonces, le decía, en cuanto al nivel académico, como que es parejo. En ambos casos, en español o en inglés, es para el mismo, digamos nivel académico, pero más bien ya es que si uno publica en inglés, es otro tipo de audiencia, que son los de habla inglesa. Y ya los de español, de hecho, sí. Por ejemplo, los artículos que publicamos en inglés, difícilmente, no difícilmente, pero sí se nota una diferencia en la gente de Latinoamérica o de España que nos lee. Y al revés, si publicamos en español, no tanto los de habla inglesa nos lee. Hay una página que nos permite ver esto. Es esta Research Gate. Y ve que dice, porque me da la impresión que la conoce, entonces ve que dice, te leyó tal, ¿no? Entonces, cuando es un artículo en español, pues es casi puro latino, o mexicanos, o de España, y si es un artículo en inglés, pues es de Sudáfrica, me he encontrado así de Turquía, de Estados Unidos.

4. Ahora, hablando de lo que me decía, usted está enfocado básicamente hacia economistas, pero ¿tiene usted algún otro tipo de publicaciones fuera del ámbito académico, por ejemplo, periódicos, o artículos en revistas que no sean tan especializadas?

No. Mire, la verdad es que ahí sí creo que cometí un error en el sentido de que antes, yo creo que esto habrá dejado de pasar hace como un año, venían mucho de un periódico y el error al que me estoy refiriendo es que nunca dije a ver, déjenme los datos bien.

- ¡Ah! ¿Ellos lo buscaban?

Sí. Y siempre venían y me hacían entrevistas y eso es lo que se publicaba. Bueno, le estoy diciendo siempre como si fuera mucho, pero en realidad venían, no sé, como una vez cada dos meses y me hacían una entrevista y la publicaban. Pero la verdad es que desgraciadamente nunca tomé la iniciativa de preguntarles quiénes eran. Es que era una persona que venía muy de prisa, siempre. Y siempre me decía quiero hacerle una entrevista sobre el tipo de cambio, por qué se está devaluando. Ah, sí, adelante, y me entrevistaba, pero lo hacía muy rápido, entonces terminaba y bueno, muchas gracias y ya, se iba.

- Pero nunca le preguntó para qué periódico.

Haga de cuenta que las primeras veces pues venía y me decía, voy a decir cualquier cosa porque no me acuerdo, pero decía, vengo del Sol de Puebla, pero como que a mí se me hizo costumbre, y ya después, la verdad es que nunca lo decía y yo también ya nunca hice por preguntarle y dejó de venir y ve que de hecho aquí nos toman en cuenta eso también y dije, ajá, eso nunca lo he recuperado, y ya nunca lo encontré. Nunca supe.

- Pero ya no viene.
Ya no viene. Tiene como un año que ya no.

- Y en revistas o para el público en general, no.

No.

5. ¿Considera que todos sus artículos son artículos de investigación o tiene usted otras categorías?

Bueno, de hecho, las publicaciones más viejas son publicaciones que lo que hacíamos era, tomábamos una teoría y digamos, a lo mejor ya ésta tenía su evaluación empírica y lo que nosotros hacíamos era pues exponerla y hacer la regresión o el ejercicio estadístico para el presente digamos, ¿no? Después… esa es una forma. Luego otra cosa que hemos hecho es como usted dice, hacer una discusión puramente teórica de algunos temas y últimamente sí, lo que estamos haciendo es digamos hacer nuestra propia discusión teórica. Siempre tenemos que revisar qué dicen anteriores autores, pero ahora también metemos más qué es lo que nosotros pensamos, que es lo que nosotros queremos y usualmente sí tratamos de meter alguna evaluación empírica. Ahora en octubre va a salir una revista, un artículo en Review of Keynesian Economics y eso es lo que hacemos, hícimos una propuesta de una extensión a una teoría que ya existe, pero esta ya fue una extensión y aplicamos la teoría a Brasil, a Argentina, Chile y México.

- La mayoría digamos, de todos sus artículos ¿en qué categoría los pondría?

Los primeros, como digamos réplicas, sí investigación, pero aplicada. Y ya los últimos, de generación de conocimiento. Ve que estas son categorías que ahí establecen, entonces las primeras sí, yo las pondría en investigación aplicada, que es tomar algo que ya está, y lo replicamos. Y ahora, lo que estamos haciendo más bien es generar nosotros nuestros propios modelos. Porque el de Contaduría y Administración ese es una extensión que nosotros hicimos, del modelo de Thirwall.

- Este en particular de Routledge, el que está inserto en un libro como capítulo, ¿ese sería teórico?

Sí, ese sí. Muy teórico. Aunque ese también tiene datos empíricos, pero sí es una discusión muy teórica de qué se puede hacer con el modelo de desarrollo en México y América Latina en general.

6. A ver, mire, ahora, veo que usted trabaja mucho con el Dr. Perrotini. ¿Cómo establece usted sus redes de trabajo?

Bueno, con el Dr. Ignacio, más que nada es mi mentor en la economía. Él daba clases aquí hace muchos años y aquí lo conocí. Él me dio clases. Entonces, desde ahí se hizo la relación. Fui a estudiar con él la maestría a la UNAM y así empezamos. Fue una relación profesor-alumno, y desde entonces hemos estado trabajando juntos. Y ya después con otros profesores, voy a decir unos nombres que la verdad no sé si están ahí, por ejemplo, con el Dr. Zavaleta fue al revés, él fue mi alumno y entonces yo hice lo mismo que Ignacio hizo conmigo. Yo empecé a trabajar con él, empecé a meterlo y ya después empezamos a publicar juntos. Con
el profesor Camacho, pues él es un colega de acá. De repente vimos que teníamos ciertas afinidades en cuanto a temas de investigación. Empezamos a trabajar juntos y así fue como lo hicimos. Ha sido siempre casi que por afinidad de temas y de concepción teórica. Porque por ejemplo, aquí hay, no sé, por decirle algo, la teoría económica tiene diferentes concepciones, diferentes marcos teóricos. Yo estoy muy apegado a lo que le llamamos post-keynesianismo. Y por ejemplo hay profesores que están más en la teoría neoclásica, hay profesores que están más en el marxismo, entonces difícilmente voy a trabajar con ellos pues simplemente por la afinidad. En cambio, hay otros profesores que comparten mi visión. Y es así como nos juntamos. Establecemos alianza.

7. ¿Cuáles son las estrategias que usted utiliza para escribir y publicar en inglés? ¿Trabajan colaborativamente. ¿Cómo organizan su trabajo? ¿Quién escribe, quién revisa, quién tiene el contacto con la editorial?

Bueno, inicialmente Ignacio era el que hacía todo, porque él era la cabeza del proyecto. Digamos que yo trabajo mucho con él. Él trabaja también una parte con otros profesores y otros estudiantes ahora, pero quizá como el 70% de mis publicaciones son con él. Y sí, él es el que tiene los contactos, digamos para saber dónde se mandan las publicaciones. Antes, pues lo que él decía, lo que le mencionaba antes, mira Alberto, está tal cosa, tal marco teórico, por qué no lo checas y haces alguna regresión para ver si lo que dice ahí se cumple para nuestro caso. Entonces digamos que él ponía como esa guía y ya yo hacía la parte empírica y la descripción y él hacía más la parte teórica y la discusión de la parte teórica. Después de que me fui al doctorado, yo estudié el doctorado en la Universidad de Massachusetts. Digamos que las cosas han cambiado en el sentido de que yo ahora tengo algunos temas y lo que hago es que se los propongo a él. Yo hago la parte teórica, la parte empírica y le pido a él que me diga cómo lo ve, si lo cree correcto, porque él es alguien que sabe mucho y él aporta mucho. Lo que sí le puedo decir es que por ejemplo, yo creo que si yo solito escribiera el artículo, ya de entrada por el inglés seguramente no me lo recibirían. Yo hice el doctorado en Estados Unidos y no tuve problemas. O sea, todo era en inglés, hablar, escribir, las tareas, los trabajos, todo era en inglés, entonces no lo siento tanto como una barrera, pero ya en una revista de esas categorías, pues que vengan errores gramaticales o cosas así, ya es decir no de entrada. La idea podrá estar muy bien, pero no te lo vamos a recibir. La verdad es que nunca he hecho yo el ejercicio de hacer un artículo y yo enviarlo. Siempre con el apoyo de Ignacio, él le da el cambio y ya lo mandamos. Pero vamos, yo cuando estuve en Estados Unidos, nunca tuve un problema, así de algún profesor que me dijera, oye, aquí qué quisiste decir, no. La tesis la redacté yo, no me la redactaron. Mis profesores obviamente me evaluaron la tesis. Entonces, yo creo que sí es entendible mi inglés. Pero yo creo que si yo le doy un texto en inglés mío, nada más mío, y lo compara con ese, pues sí va a haber mucha diferencia. Es entendible lo que yo pongo, pero sí va a encontrar una diferencia de calidad, sobre todo eso, yo diría, de calidad. Una diferencia de calidad.

- ¿Y en Estados Unidos no estableció alianzas, así como las de acá?

Sí. Lo que pasa es que yo por ejemplo trabajé con un profesor que se llama Mohan Rao, y nosotros por ejemplo lo que hacemos es que cada mes platicamos como una hora, hora y
media por chat de lo que estamos haciendo, de lo que estamos investigando, pero él está muy metido en la parte del desarrollo económico visto desde la parte de la ética. Entonces la verdad es que escribes juntos no. Pero por ejemplo, precisamente por actividades que tenías yo allá, y que sigo manteniendo, voy a un congreso anual en Estados Unidos. De eso fue que me invitaron a postular un artículo para la revista Review of Keynesian Economics, que finalmente, lo platicé con Ignacio y lo postulamos juntos, pero sí, o sea que no habíamos alguien de los Estados Unidos con quien yo trabajé así como lo hago con Ignacio, pero sí se me han abierto puertas precisamente por las actividades que tenías allá. Tengo esta y una que no sé si se la di, pero es una de PSL Quarterly Review.

- Sí, aquí está.

Esa también fue por un profesor que conocí allá en Estados Unidos y él en su momento me dijo, oye, ¿por qué no nos envías algo para ver si te lo publicamos? Entonces, bueno, lo vieron bien y lo publicaron.

8. Ahora, ¿qué sugeriría a los nuevos académicos para que ellos puedan publicar en inglés? Con la experiencia y la trayectoria que ha tenido, ¿qué les podría sugerir?

¿Qué les puedo sugerir? Pues es que… no digo que no lo hagan, pero simplemente, si yo tuviera que decirle a alguien que no conozco que hay qué hacer. Leer mucho en inglés. Ahora a los chicos cuando les pongo las lecturas en inglés, sufren mucho y luego dicen, por qué en inglés, ¿por qué no en español? Y es lo que yo les digo, la verdad es que no tenemos una buena formación en inglés, en promedio, los estudiantes de acá. Yo estudié aquí y es lo que les cuento, que cuando yo empecé a tomar las clases con Ignacio, para mí fue muy difícil pues porque me daba las lecturas prácticamente en inglés. Entonces yo consumía prácticamente… si antes me tardaba no sé, tres horas en leer un artículo, pues ahora me tardaba 20, ¿no? Entonces eso es lo que les digo, así se empieza, pero tienen que empezar a hacerlo, a leer, porque leyendo, eso es algo que le aprendé a Ignacio, leyendo pues va a saber uno escribir. Entonces, pues eso es una cosa, leer mucho inglés, y no solamente eso. Ya para tener este tipo de contactos afuera y poder dialogar, pues tenemos que también intentar hablarlo, intentar hablarlo. Yo por ejemplo, cuando llegué a Estados Unidos, tenía el problema de que yo leía mucho. Ya ahí ya leía mucho en inglés, pero lo hablaba como lo leía. Entonces como las palabras no suenan igual, sí me encontré con ese problema. Entonces también eso y bueno, no solamente leer mucho en inglés, sino leer mucha literatura en economía porque por ejemplo, aquí hay estudiantes que de verdad son muy buenos para escuchar el inglés, para leerlo, pero como lo que hacen es escuchan muchas canciones en inglés, entonces está bien porque sí entrena el oído, pero luego cuando ya se enfrentan a los términos económicos y esas cosas, pues ya no es lo mismo, ¿no? Entonces pues eso, que lean mucho en inglés y mucha literatura económica en inglés.

9. Ahora, usted utiliza alguna estrategia para interactuar con su audiencia, para comunicarse con su audiencia.

¿Si yo escribo con alguna estrategia para la audiencia? Sí bueno, no sé si le estoy entendiendo. Siempre nosotros lo que hacemos es digamos, lo que hacemos en la introducción es decirles,
lo que nos motivó a hacer este trabajo es esto, ¿no? Por ejemplo, por decir algo, este año se cumplieron los 25 años de la Autonomía del Banco de México, entonces ahí hay una motivación muy grande y muy clara de por qué hacer un trabajo. Se cumple un aniversario de la autonomía, esa es una motivación y la pregunta es ¿eso qué resultados le ha dado a la economía mexicana? ¿Qué efectos hemos observado de que el Banco de México sea autónomo? Y entonces, a partir de ahí nosotros nos planteamos una pregunta, ¿para qué la autonomía? ¿para qué nos sirve?

- Lanzan la pregunta.

Exactamente. Y nosotros le decimos a la audiencia, esto es lo que nos está motivando, esta es la pregunta que queremos contestar. Esto es lo que se supone que se esperaría de esta situación, y nosotros lo que queremos mostrar es por qué se está cumpliendo o por qué no se está cumpliendo. Entonces así es como nosotros generamos la estrategia.

10. Ahora, ¿qué factores toma usted en cuenta cuando adapta a diferentes audiencias o a diferentes lectores?

Bueno, hay dos cosas ahí, cuando es puramente teórica, por ejemplo, cuando vamos a discutir algún tema por ejemplo del keynesianismo, básicamente no hacemos diferencia porque esperaríamos que en Europa y acá como que el keynesianismo es conocido de la misma forma. Definitivamente, ¿no? Ahora, ya cuando decimos, bueno, pero lo que queremos es explicar mediante el keynesianismo la baja tasa de crecimiento, por qué está tan baja. Más bien ahí lo que hacemos en el escrito, pues tratamos de incorporar todo lo que podamos conocer acerca de la región. Hacerlo más local, porque no es lo mismo el tipo de problemas que tienen allá, al tipo de problemas que tenemos nosotros. Entonces, una teoría le va a decir, si el gasto de gobierno aumenta, el ingreso va a aumentar. Y eso va a ser aquí y va a ser en China. Pero vamos a ver que la forma en la cual se incrementa el gasto aquí es diferente de la forma en la que se incrementa el gasto en China. Entonces esa es la parte que nosotros tratamos de diferenciar. Decimos, a ver, ¿cómo el gobierno chino ha manejado el gasto de gobierno? ¿Cómo el gobierno mexicano ha manejado el gasto de gobierno? Entonces, esa es la formal en la cual nosotros tratamos de adaptar. Y la verdad es que le digo, todos son para economistas, esa es la observación, la revista de Contaduría y Administración en realidad es una revista de economía. O sea, el nombre lo que pasa es que es de la facultad de contaduría y administración. Bueno, ya dudé si están juntas, es de la facultad de contaduría allá en la UNAM, pero el que la dirige es un economista. Entonces, si usted revisa la revista, se va a dar cuenta de que al contrario, son puros números de economía y números especiales de contaduría, o a veces números especiales de administración, pero básicamente es economía.

11. Básicamente sería eso. No sé si usted guste añadir algo más que pudiera ser de utilidad.

De hecho, fíjese que hace no mucho fui a la Dirección de Investigación y me encontré con la Maestra… este, se me fue su nombre. Casi estoy seguro que es Michelle. No, a lo mejor estoy mal. Bueno, pero puedo ir de nuevo y sé quién es. Y fui porque necesitaba yo demostrar lo del inglés aquí, entonces hice un examen y me fue bien. Pero me dijo la maestra, oiga y por
qué no hace un examen, que me dice que si uno hace ese, ya es de por vida. Ya no tiene uno
que estarlo renovando, porque ve que el TOEFL dura dos años. Y me dijo, ¿por qué no haces
el otro? La verdad sí me gustaría, pero yo creo que ha de ser a otro nivel. Sí, me dijo, pero
aquí podemos ayudarlo a prepararse. Entonces, ya hablando con la oficina encargada me
dijeron que había un programa de parte de la universidad donde apoyaban a los profesores
con cursos de redacción en inglés, pero cuando lo solicité, me dijeron que ya no. Que no
estaba disponible. Entonces eso estaría bien. A lo mejor hacer cursos de redacción. No es lo
mismo, pero le voy a comentar una anécdota en este sentido. No es lo mismo de lo que estoy
hablando. Nosotros hemos traído a conferencistas en inglés, pues yo he invitado a mis
profesores que tuve en Estados Unidos, a amigos que conocí y entonces hacemos el servicio
de traducción simultánea, y la verdad es que siempre es muy malo, muy malo. Y no es que
las personas no sepan inglés, los que vienen a hacer la traducción, sino el problema es con
los términos - entonces, por ejemplo, haga de cuenta, a lo mejor en un momento dado la
traducción es tipo de cambio y dicen tasa de conversión. Y aparentemente eso no tiene mayor
problema, pero cuando el alumno ya está muy familiarizado y luego aparte, uno va añadiendo
todos esos cambios, entonces el alumno se pierde, dice, pero por qué tasa de conversión, y
luego empiezan a pensar en eso, en vez de seguir la secuencia de la exposición. ¿A qué voy?
Pues a que, si se pudiera implementar un curso, no tendría que ser solamente un curso de
redacción en inglés, porque a lo mejor eso nos va a ayudar, pero más bien en cada área pues
debería de ser muy especializado o más técnico, una especialización. Porque puede uno
empezar a escribir, pero no es lo mismo empezar a escribir cualquier cosa que escribir una
cuestión ya más técnica. Y le digo, pues yo creo que eso y esta cuestión de leer en inglés para
poder mejorar uno.