



The place of Eastern European researchers in international discourse: critical discourse analysis applied to corpora from specialized journals¹

Discourse & Society
22(2) 1–19

© The Author(s) 2011

Reprints and permission: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0957926510392129

<http://das.sagepub.com>



Elena Tarasheva

New Bulgarian University, Bulgaria

Abstract

The present study explores relations of domination in publishing research papers. It assesses the production of articles by authors from the former communist bloc, called here symbolically ‘the East’, against influences from ‘the West’.

Knowing that in the past the research scene differed significantly in the two parts of the world, we ask how researchers from the former Eastern bloc fare nowadays on the international scene: do they publish research which brings its own specific contribution; do they differ from their Western colleagues in terms of methodology, in the authorities they quote etc.? We also engage in an analysis of the circumstances of those who contribute to journals to establish factors which stimulate publications.

The conclusions concern the place of Eastern European researchers in international linguistics discourse and the sociolinguistic factors shaping the situation.

Keywords

Central and Eastern Europe, corpora, critical discourse analysis, educational backgrounds, linguistics, search engines

Introduction

Linguistics has undeniably borne the mark of ideologies but the idea that the academic discipline may have one ‘face’ in the West, and a totally different one in the East has been

Corresponding author:

Elena Tarasheva, New Bulgarian University, Bulgaria.

Email: etarasheva@nbu.bg

either taken for granted or ignored so far. Many have felt that the practice of teaching linguistics in the former communist bloc was marred by neglect for works considered to belong to the ‘ideological enemy’. Among the authors shunned in those times were names such as Chomsky, Halliday and Firth – researchers who have had a formative impact on linguistics in the 20th century. While studying in socialist Bulgaria in the 1970s and 1980s of the last century (as I did), or any other Soviet satellites, one would have learned that any theory which had no Marxist grounding ‘should be either converted to Marxism or liquidated’ (Skolimowski, 1965: 238). That is why it is reasonable to expect that the East had its own version of linguistics – ignoring Western authorities and methodologies but propounding its own bias and orientations. Nowadays, when the bloc has disbanded, what is the fate of its offspring?

Scientometrics has established a reduction in the published production from the ex-communist countries since the 1990s. Braun and Schubert (1996), researching publications from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia, claim that the efforts of the research communities in these countries focus not merely on the struggle to maintain the quantity, but also ‘to conform to the European/world standards’. The authors blame the economic situation, which makes it expedient to master what they call ‘compensation mechanisms’, among them co-operation with rich neighbours. In the authors’ native Hungary, this method, in their opinion, has even been exhausted. Ironically, Schubert happens to be the most quoted Eastern European author in the field of Social Sciences and Humanities, according to Thompson Reuter’s website, IZI Web of Knowledge.

Likewise, at the beginning of this century, Prpić (2007) established that Croatian researchers have published less in recent years, but that they follow basic global trends in the structure of publications, especially in the rise in foreign and co-authored works. She concludes that ‘the gap between the improved scientific performance of the researchers and the conditions in which they work has deepened. Scientific productivity still lags behind the productivity of the (developed) countries’.

Yet another theoretical field – contrastive rhetoric – investigates the written production of Eastern Europeans. Its focus is the style of the publications. Yakhontova writes:

Currently, many of our scholars pay much attention to the possibilities of submitting their works to international journals published in English; it has become quite evident to them that such publications are the most effective means of presenting their ideas and communicating with other researchers. The publishing of papers, or at least conference abstracts in English, has become also a matter of prestige and a prerequisite for promotion at universities and other academic institutions. (2006: 153)

It transpires that researchers from the ex-communist countries join the international community late and try to make themselves known for the first time since the fall of communism. Further, Yakhontova (2006) suggests that writing with colleagues from the West improves the quality of the articles. The main fallacy of Russian researchers, in her opinion, is that they were never taught to write according to the standards accepted in the West. As established by authors quoted in her article, the Slavonic rhetoric style differs significantly from what is traditionally expected in anglophone journals. While Slavonic rhetoric is high-context – a lot is perceived from the context and not from the written

page – imaginative and even poetic, Anglo-American styles are low-context (the whole message is contained in the writing, nothing transpires from the context), matter-of-fact and formally structured.

The quest for distinctions in rhetoric is epitomized in Galtung's work (1981), much quoted but also widely criticized, where writing styles are classified into saxonic, teutonic, gallic and nipponic, depending on the nationality of the writer. Many authors note a patronizing attitude to non-anglophone styles, among them Kaplan (1980: 401): 'the foreign student article is out of focus because the foreign student is employing a rhetoric and a sequence of thought which violates the expectations of the native reader'.

Swales (1998), for his part, voices the opinion that the drive to make authors from non-anglophone nations conform to saxonic styles poses the danger of losing their own culture:

Another kind of threat to sustaining local academic languages comes from the well-attested tendency of off-centre scholars to try and publish 'their best in the west', offering more minor works for local publication. A third and relatively new trend is for promotion in more and more countries to become much more directly tied to publication in international refereed journals, which are of course predominantly English-language publications. This is by no means always a sensible policy, because, in many applied fields, perhaps most crucially in agricultural and ecological sciences and in preventive medicine, the advantages of developing local research and publication traditions is clearly of benefit to many parties, from government ministers, to those concerned with environmental issues, to agricultural extension officers, and social workers. (1998: 1)

Truthful as these arguments might be, they should not imply that Eastern researchers are advised to desist from participating in the international discourse on linguistic matters.

Furthermore, it seems that style is a minor impediment to writing for international journals in comparison with conceptual blanks in the making of the discipline of Linguistics. Issers (1996) writes:

In democratic countries analyses of political rhetoric have a well-established tradition; the process of image building is subject to specialized research ... In this country [Russia], where the right to rhetorical strategies for 70 years was usurped by one party, such studies, if conducted at all, were 'for authorized access only'. (author's translation from Russian)

To summarize, it appears that when it comes to publishing for international audiences, Eastern scholars suffer from boundaries placed between linguistics and the political dimension of language. Furthermore, they are predisposed to write in styles unacceptable for general audiences and unaware of those established around the world. Additionally, economic reasons prevent them from reading widely, because specialized publications nowadays come at prices well above their incomes. With these drawbacks, do Easterners publish internationally and what do they publish?

The theoretical framework

This work proceeds from the assumption that Linguistics in the ex-communist countries was heavily damaged by ideological factors. Nowadays, as the communist bloc no

longer exists, I try to establish the place of Eastern European linguists on a globalized international stage by focusing on a sub-discipline which is heavily ideological – critical discourse analysis (CDA).

The purpose of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is to analyse ‘opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language’ (Wodak, 1995: 204). CDA ‘studies real, and often extended, instances of social interaction which take (partially) linguistic form. The critical approach is distinctive in its view of (a) the relationship between language and society, and (b) the relationship between analysis and the practices analysed’ (Wodak, 1997: 173).

For the present research, CDA is both method and object of investigation. The extended instance of social interaction which takes a linguistic form –; i.e. the object of the study – is the publication of articles in eight journals published by Sage, on the one hand, and the publication of articles on a site specializing in research from Central and Eastern Europe, on the other. The social practices studied here are the education of the authors of these articles, the influences from Eastern and Western methodologies and authorities, and – in the end – the place of researchers from the former communist bloc, as well as the state of the academic discipline which studies the social role of language.

A method of triangulating the data is scientometrics, the discipline analysing science. Its purpose is to measure the impact of people and ideas; its methodology is to track how many writings quote an author, a key term or a publication. Despite the promise such an approach holds, however, scientometrics cannot by itself determine the place of a discipline or researcher. The problem is that a lot depends on the database used to track quotations. Thus, three of the popular quotation sites: *Pro Quest*, *Scopus* and *IZI Web of Knowledge* return different data for the same search, because they include different bases. Secondly, mere figures do not explain what the situation in a field is and which factors have impact on it. Finally, regrettably little can be found about researchers from the former communist bloc on these websites. Nevertheless, scientometrics is a valuable source of statistical data and it will be employed here for what it is worth. I select to work with the *IZI Web of Knowledge*, because it specializes in Arts and Humanities and because although based in America, as all the others, it is open for European research.

Methodology

In the first instance, I conducted a case study on eight ‘Western’ journals which publish CDA research to establish the number of articles by Eastern Europeans. Data are also derived by content analysis. By definition, content analysis ‘attempts to infer structural relations from a multitude of documents, while keeping an eye on the social context in which they were produced’ (Krippendorff, 2004: 25). The structural relations of interest to this research are:

- the concept of locality
- dominant methodologies
- recurrent names in the reference lists.

Two sources provide data for the content analysis: the articles published in the journals and biographical data about their authors. The articles are explored to find answers to the questions:

- What topics do Easterners tackle?
- Which authors are quoted more often than others?
- Which methods prevail in the research published by the journals?

A significant parameter is the pattern of work. Investigating the rhetoric in international economics journals, Shaw and Vassileva (2000) observe that in Danish and British journals joint authorship predominates since 1993, but is hardly found before 1973. It transpires that a pattern where researchers collaborate on a project and co-author articles has become the norm, while individual efforts are a thing of the past. That is why the parameter ‘collaboration’ is included in my study.

The biographies of the respective authors are analysed to find answers to the following questions:

- Where are they based?
- How do they project their identity?
- Where did they get their qualifications?
- Do they hold posts in international organizations?
- How much do they publish and are they quoted?

Corpora

The journals for this study are selected from the Sage website as returning the greatest number of hits with the key phrase ‘critical discourse analysis’. The list of journals is as follows:

- *Communication Research*
- *Crime, Media, Culture*
- *Cross-Cultural Research*
- *Discourse & Communication*
- *Discourse & Society*
- *Discourse Studies*
- *Media, Culture & Society*
- *Theory, Culture & Society*

The interaction in international journals is situated in a social reality where researchers from various countries have the opportunity to offer articles for publication while the editors have the power to select what they deem relevant to the objectives of the journal and of interest to its international audience. Most journals announce that they open their pages for a wide international community of researchers, for example: ‘Discourse & Society is an international journal. Its board members, contributors and readers are from many different countries, and this will also be reflected in the variety of the topics,

approaches and cultural backgrounds of its articles' (see the D&S website). There is even a suggestion that preference is given to 'papers that come from regions of the world from where we receive few papers' (publication criteria online).

The issues of the eight journals over a period of 20 years – between January 1990 and January 2010 – are explored from the website of the publisher Sage. The search engine there allows investigations based on the option 'affiliation', which helped establish authors belonging to institutions –; mainly universities – based in the former socialist countries. As search operators, I chose the country names and the national adjectives of the countries from the former communist bloc. To make sure that no authors are left out – because the article may not have been referenced with the author's affiliation, for example, or the university bears the name of a city without the country (as often happens) – separate searches were generated with the titles of the major universities in these countries. Finally, searches for the country and nationality names were conducted, unrelated to a specific search field. In this way, the number of Eastern Europeans who have published articles in the selected Sage journals over the specified period was established.

The articles are then analysed for the methodologies used there and the topics explored. A sub-corpus is created from the lists of references studied via the *Wordsmith Tools* (Scott, 1999).

Separate searches establish biographical data about the authors. These come mostly from university websites giving information about their affiliated researchers.

Further on, the website Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL) is searched for articles on discourse analysis. The website offers work by Central and Eastern European researchers published in local journals. As no journal specializes in Discourse Studies, articles on this topic were elicited through a search with the key phrase 'discourse analysis'. The search for 'critical discourse analysis' returns two sets of data, some of which overlap and one empty category. Therefore, I decided to net for a wider category of 'discourse analysis'. The content analysis and the analysis of the biographical data of the authors are juxtaposed to those found on the Sage website. A sub-corpus is created from the reference lists of the articles to study the frequency of reference to authorities. It is processed by the Wordsmith package (Scott, 1999).

Articles in the Sage journals

Between 1990 and 2010, 5699 articles were published in the eight journals selected for this study. Thirty-nine, or 0.68%, could be attributed to authors who relate to an ex-communist country by birth or affiliation to a university based there. This means slightly more than one article per year by a group of 17 countries. For the sake of comparison, the same number of articles – 39 – was published by Israeli authors alone over the same period in the same set of journals. It was also found that 828 articles, or 14.5 percent, were authored by UK-affiliated researchers and 104 by Chinese authors. Therefore, the publications of authors from the ex-communist bloc can be qualified as sporadic, rather than the accepted practice. The amount is small as a percentage and in absolute numbers.

According to the editor of three of the researched journals, the data of all papers rejected by board members in one of the journals, *Discourse & Society*, for the last 10

years show that only about three papers from Eastern Europe have been rejected, among them one by an Eastern European living in the UK, and one by an author who had published several papers in *Discourse & Society*. The conclusion must be that if there are few Eastern European papers, it is *not* because they are rejected more than others, but simply because submissions from Eastern Europe hardly ever occur.

The production of research articles varies for the different countries:

Slovenia – 11	Bulgaria – 3	Estonia – 2
Poland – 6	Czech Republic – 3	Bosnia – 1
Romania – 5	Hungary – 3	Serbia – 1
Russia – 4		

The number is greater than 39 because an article can have authors from more than one country. From Slovenia, the University of Ljubljana stands out with its research in Media studies, while the University in Maribor demonstrates expertise in Computational Linguistics. Unfortunately, these are the only cases where schools have been established among the universities from Eastern Europe.

Book reviews have been excluded from this study because they do not present cases of reporting research. Despite this fact, it is worth mentioning the significant number of book reviews from Serbia – seven, all of which are authored by the same person. None of the reviewed books, however, is written by Eastern authors. Despite the prolific production of reviews, no original studies by this author can be found on the Sage website.

Five of the articles are a product of collaboration with colleagues from different countries on large-scale international projects. More often than not, publishing the proceeds of such research is a requirement of the financing organization, which explains why the ex-communist researchers decided to contribute to an international journal. The publishing policies of the journals, for their part, give preference to such reports, which makes it clear why the contributions found their place on the pages of the journal.

Slovenia, once again, stands out with collaborations. Three articles are authored by teams of Slovenian authors only and one includes a participant from Serbia. Two tandems are prominent: Karmen Erjavec and Zala Volcic, on the one hand, and Ivan Leudar and Jiří Nekvapil, on the other. Both members of the former pair are originally from Slovenia, but while Erjavec settled to a career in Ljubljana, Volcic holds an academic position at Queensland University in Australia. While the senior partner in this tandem is the one based at an Eastern university, the other tandem appears created around a Western-based scholar. Ivan Leudar from Manchester University collaborates with his Czech colleague Jiří Nekvapil. The latter is listed as ‘an affiliated researcher’ at Manchester University.

Furthermore, the authors based in post-communist countries only write in teams when they are based in a Western university, except for the Slovenians. In such cases, the team always includes an ex-patriot from their own country. By contrast, most of the Western research published in the journals under investigation here have been conducted in teams, more often than not international.

Three authors have published more than one article in the journals under investigation here: Michail Minkov from Bulgaria, Isabela Ietcu-Fairclough or Preoteasa from Romania and Cristian Tileagă, now based at Loughborough University, UK. The latter two are

well-travelled and have specialized at various universities in the West, while the former specialized at a Slovenian business school and co-authored a book with Geert Hofstede.

The data so far seem to suggest that researchers from Eastern European countries need the incentive of participating in an international project in order to publish papers in the international journals concerned with critical discourse analysis. It appears as if only Slovenian researchers are exempt from this rule.

As for the content, some of the articles describe the outcomes of an international project; others report dissertations done as part of advanced studies at Western universities. Only one person published findings from a dissertation written and defended at home and it differs significantly from the direction of the main bulk of articles. Its topic is the use of reported speech in English newspapers – a subject grounded in grammar and with obvious pedagogical implications, more typical of cultural studies research than of CDA. Thereby, knowledge of research agendas and methods comes from direct contact with the realities outside the native ex-communist country.

All the authors from post-communist countries explore topics from their native countries, usually in comparison with the Western country where they studied. No articles on topics connected with other countries are associated with their names. Contrarily, the search by country and nationality names returns data that Eastern European topics are tackled by authors from the UK, Australia, Canada and the USA who have no apparent links to the respective post-communist countries.

The problems raised with the respective researches echo the agenda of public life: co-existence of religious communities, integration of minority groups, the repercussions of globalization on ethnic groups, re-drawing political boundaries and national identity, etc. What Easterners add is the search for specific national projections. While Western research tackles issues as specific for the West as the problem of migrants, for example, no topics characteristic of the East can be found. All the Eastern European authors seem to blend cohesively into CDA discourse, contributing only native knowledge concerning the social context of the discourses.

Below is an indicative list of methods applied by researchers from Eastern Europe in the articles from the corpus for this study:

- Slovenia – Van Dijk, macrostructures, Labov (discourse types), Bell (news values)
- Serbia – Bernstein (re-contextualization)
- Romania – Fairclough (public space dialogue)
- Russia – Fairclough (discursive aspects of social change)
- Estonia – Fairclough (indirect perception analysis)

The theoretical influences on the researches can be summarized as follows: rhetoric analysis, social-psychological research, media analysis, genre analysis, metaphor studies, analysis of cognitive processes. Apparently, none of these theoretical frameworks derives from 'socialist' linguistics. It is the case rather that the list strikes as a replica of the established formative influences on CDA formulated by Blommaert and Bucaen (2000: 454) for European CDA. On the part of linguistics, Hallidayan systemic-functional linguistics is at work, combined with Lakoff-inspired approaches to metaphor, modern argumentation theory, Van Dijk's framework for analysing discourse as a social practice

and various theories of the narrative, plus social psychology. None of these were part of university curricula under communism. Thus, the discipline of CDA is practised by the Eastern Europeans within its rightful Western boundaries, which is no surprise, as the authors have educational experience from the West.

By frequency, the most quoted names are (the figures indicate the number of quotations in the reference lists for the researched period):

Teun van Dijk (505)	Hall (242)	Kress (175)
Foucault (464)	Wodak (216)	Adorno (155)
Bourdieu (380)	Wetherell (203)	Schiffirin (143)
Habermas (365)	Halliday (197)	Fowler (139)
Fairclough (341)	Billig (192)	Van Leeuwen (122)
Schegloff (313)	Bakhtin (147)	Coulthard (120)
Giddens (291)	Marx (179)	

Of those names, only Fairclough has been associated with a university in Eastern Europe – in Bucharest, Romania. This fact explains his popularity among Romanian authors, on the one hand, and the active role Romanians take in publishing their research in the Sage journals, on the other. For his part, Bakhtin is a Russian scholar, but his fame mainly derives from interpretations of his research since 1980, when he became extremely popular in the West. On the whole, the scene is dominated by authorities that come from the ‘West’.

Authors based in Eastern European countries are also quoted but the figures are considerably smaller than those for the Western authorities:

Bauman (118)	Jakubowicz (12)	Tulviste (3)
Splichal (15)	C. Ilie (7)	Biryukov and Sergeyev (3)
Nekvapil (14)	Z. Volcic (5)	Iordanova (3)
Erjavec (13)		

Z. Bauman (discussed in detail further in the article) has both UK and Polish affiliations. His work is quoted nearly 10 times as much as the genuinely ‘Eastern’ researchers following him.

In conclusion, it is quite clear that CDA is a ‘Western’ discipline, with sporadic and minor ‘Eastern’ contributions. The knowledge needed to prepare articles for international journals is clearly derived from study abroad or collaborations with Western colleagues.

Biographical data

The research established 40 authors who have contributed to the international journals studied here. Ten of them obtained their highest degrees – PhD or MA – at universities in Western Europe, 15 did specializations abroad, and 18 are members of international organizations or took part in international research projects. The sum total is bigger than 40, because some of them belong to more than one category, i.e. they both took degrees abroad and are members of international organizations. In effect, only one person published without studying or specializing abroad.

On the issue of migration, seven of the authors are now based at universities outside their native country. Dina Iordanova (according to data from her web page) speaks

directly of emigrating from Bulgaria in the 1990s. While she explicitly mentions her Bulgarian origins and the PhD degree she gained in Bulgaria, her career is exclusively linked to universities in the USA and Western Europe. She is now head of a department at a major British university. The Web of Knowledge returns eight records of her publications and they are all on topics about the Bulgarian, Serbian and Greek cinema, i.e. the Balkans. The only exception is an article about the cinema in Hungary, not a Balkan country but a part of the Soviet bloc. Another person who is at the head of an academic department, this time in Sweden, Cornelia Ilie, does not mention explicitly her Romanian origins on her web page. Eight records are found for her on the Web of Knowledge, but only one of them relates to Romania.

One of the researchers, Z. Bauman, is Emeritus Professor of both the universities of Warsaw and Leeds. He was exiled to England during communism, but since then has returned to his native country. He has always taken pride in his own nationality and calls himself a Polish sociologist, although in a public interview (Yacobsen et al., 2006) he admits that communism restricted sociology as a science. Another interesting return is performed by a Hungarian researcher, who emigrated to Australia but then returned to her native country as a visiting scholar to the Open University.

Speaking of prestigious posts held by authors working in their native countries, among the authors for this survey are three editors of international journals, an independent expert on information society and media for the European Commission and a member of the Intergovernmental Council of the UNESCO 'Information for All'. Obviously, another factor which motivates publishing in international journals is leading positions in international organizations.

On the whole, all the ex-patriots and those holding high-ranking posts in international organizations have a much more prolific production of books and articles, according to the data in the Web of Knowledge. Only five authors working from the East return data of publications quoted in international journals. Any observer will be once again tempted to conclude that something in the ex-communist countries prevents researchers from publishing internationally.

The concept of nationality

Firstly, a discussion of the concept of nationality is in order. Common sense associates nationality with the place of birth, or residence, but the survey of authorship in the Sage journals adds two further dimensions: academic tenure and participation in international projects. Thus, the editor of the journal, Teun van Dijk, according to his website is born in the Netherlands, but is currently based in Spain as a visiting professor. He has also held academic positions in Germany, Mexico, Brazil and Chile, which makes it difficult to label him 'a Dutch researcher'. One of his co-editors, Ruth Wodak (according to data from her website), while originally from Austria, is presented as a member of an international team working on a project funded by the British Economic and Social Research Council (ERSC) for one of her publications and as a member of an Austrian–Australian collaboration for another. She is currently a professor at Lancaster University, UK. Therefore, globalization appears to have re-drawn nationality descriptors, so that labels are too narrow to apply.

The identities of the Eastern European authors in this study, for their part, are constructed differently. It is usually the case that they were born in an ex-communist country, then specialized at a Western university. Furthermore, the research they publish applies methodologies learned at the Western university. For example, Karmen Erjavec (according to data from her web page) did her doctoral media studies in Salzburg, Austria. The article she publishes in *Discourse & Society* is about the media representation of Roma minorities in Slovenia. She applies Halliday's model of transitivity, as well as Stewart Hall's analytical framework for media representations. When she quotes Slovenian, Romanian or Bulgarian authors, it is about the place of Roma populations in the region.

Veronika Kalmus, likewise, was born in Estonia (according to data from her web page), did her Master's degree in Sociology in Oslo (Norway) on youth behaviour in consumer society. Her publication in the journal is about the ethno-political socialization of Estonian and Russian children. She applies Van Dijk's model of group representations and quotes Estonian sources, mainly concerning the situation of Estonian children, while her theoretical framework is entirely based on Western references.

Therefore, the mobility of Eastern Europeans follows a pattern different from that of their Western colleagues. They get a first degree in their native country, then a second degree from a Western university and either return to their native country or emigrate. Descriptors of various academic posts held in different countries, or participations in international projects, are rarely found. Their publications combine expertise from their own country with Western knowledge acquired in the course of specializations abroad or emigration. It is fairly obvious, however, that the theoretical models tend to be Western, while knowledge of local events is native.

Finally, an interesting factor is the subject specialities of the publishing authors. It appears as if Psychology and Media Studies top the list:

Psychology – 10	Sociology – 4	Anthropology – 1
Media Studies – 7	Cultural Studies – 2	Geography – 1
Linguistics – 6	Diplomacy – 2	Philosophy – 1
Philology – 5	Literature – 2	

However, if the data for Linguistics and Philology are collated as basically the same field, it would transpire that looking for social implications in language use is, in its essence, a linguistic discipline with contributions from other fields.

Cross check

A search in the Web of Knowledge for the key phrase 'critical discourse analysis', restricted to the field of Arts and Humanities, returns the top authors who have published the greatest number of articles. The first figure gives the number of articles and the percentage is calculated per 500:

Wodak, R.	6	1.2000%
Erjavec, K.	5	1.0000%
Van Dijk, T.A.	5	1.0000%

Augoustinos, M.	4	0.8000%
Hengst, J.A.	4	0.8000%
Jaworski, A.	4	0.8000%
Rapley, M.	4	0.8000%
Tracy, K.	4	0.8000%
Billig, M.	3	0.6000%
Bucholtz, M.	3	0.6000%

The first three places coincide with our findings from the case study of the selected Sage journals. As can be seen, one Eastern European author, Karmen Erjavec, comes second among the most prolific authors on discourse analysis and features prominently in my research as well. Adam Jaworski has also held a teaching post in Eastern Europe, Poland, but is now based at Cardiff University. Furthermore, all the other major figures in critical discourse analysis are researchers working in Western European, American or Australian universities.

The most quoted article is written by a psychologist based at the Open University, UK:

Wetherell, M. (1998) 'Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-structuralism in Dialogue', *Discourse & Society* 9(3): 387–412.

It is worth mentioning that 315 quotations of this title have been noted, which is more than three times that of the next title on the list:

Hardy, C., Palmer, I. and Phillips, N. (2000) 'Discourse as a Strategic Resource', *Human Relations* 53(9): 1115–23.

The three authors are specialized in organization studies in Australian universities. The third most quoted article is by a sociologist – M. Billig from Loughborough University in the UK – and discusses problems with Schegloff's conversation analysis. The next most quoted article relates CDA to education. It is written by the Australian educationalist Alan Luke. Until the 70th position, with eight listed citations, not a single name of an author from Eastern Europe is to be found. Eight citation records are established for two of Karmen Erjavec's articles, both published in *Discourse & Society*: "'War on Terrorism' as a Discursive Battleground: Serbian Recontextualization of G.W. Bush's Discourse', written with Z. Volcic in 2007, and 'Media Representation of the Discrimination against the Roma in Eastern Europe: The Case of Slovenia' in 2001. Other Eastern European authors have records of 30 citations, but they do not contain CDA as a key word. These data corroborate the finding of this study that Eastern Europeans rarely write discourse studies and are, respectively, less often cited by their colleagues from the West.

Further, it is no surprise that the language of the most quoted articles on CDA is English. The percentage is 98.6 percent, which compares overwhelmingly to 0.8 percent for German and 0.4 percent for Spanish.

It appears that one of the journals studied for this research – *Discourse & Society* – tops the list of the most authoritative works in critical discourse analysis, and another one – *Discourse Studies* – comes fifth, according to the data from IZI Web of Knowledge:

<i>Discourse & Society</i>	116	23.2%
<i>Journal of Pragmatics</i>	36	7.2%
<i>Language in Society</i>	18	3.6%
<i>Applied Linguistics</i>	16	3.2%
<i>Discourse Studies</i>	11	2.2%

Our finding that psychologists feature more often than other specialists is also corroborated by the classification of the most quoted works by field on the Web of Knowledge:

<i>Behavioral Sciences</i>	380	76.0%
<i>Communication</i>	341	68.20%
<i>Psychology</i>	289	57.80%
<i>Linguistics</i>	220	44.00%
<i>Sociology</i>	181	36.20%
<i>Health Care Sciences & Services</i>	58	11.60%

On the whole, the data from scientometrics corroborate the findings of our case study on the place of Eastern European researchers in the discipline of CDA: that it is a Western-dominated discipline but Slovenia has gained a prominent position in the research published internationally. Other Eastern European nations need the stimulus of experience abroad to venture contributions to international journals.

Eastern research

On the website for publishing research from Central and Eastern European countries (CEEOL), the phrase ‘discourse analysis’ returns 93 results from 1998. This means seven publications per year, which is a significant improvement on the one per year in the Sage journals. Therefore, Easterners have something to say about discourse analysis, but they prefer to share their findings with other Easterners through the agency of home-based journals.

The articles split into the following fields:

Philology/Linguistics – 30	Education – 2
Politics/Policy Studies – 21	Foreign Language Learning – 2
Sociology/Social Studies – 18	Anthropology – 2
Culture and Society – 9	History – 2
Literature – 3	Gender Studies – 1
Philosophy – 2	Slavic Studies – 1

From the disciplinary division done by the owners of the website, it is immediately obvious that the first three fields where articles applying discourse analysis come from in the Sage journals (that is, Psychology, Communication Studies and Media Studies) are not included in this list at all. While Psychology exists as a field on CEEOL but apparently does not engage in discourse studies, Communication and Media Studies do not feature in the nomenclature of the research fields at all. On the website, only three journals are listed as dealing with media studies and they are classified, respectively, as ‘Culture and Society’,

‘A Review Journal’ and ‘Political Studies’. Such taxonomy obviously precludes linguistic involvement. The existence of Cultural Studies (CS), for its part, does not compensate the gap left by Media Studies, because CS specializes in researching culture for the purposes of foreign language teaching. These data suggest that in the former communist bloc, exploring local media has not risen to the status of a discipline in its own right. Inasmuch as such a subject informs about trends and attitudes in society, the findings corroborate Issers’ (1996) claim that the political aspect of language is not studied in the former communist bloc.²

As can be seen, a third of the articles have been written by linguists. Almost half of them, 13, present introductions to critical discourse analysis without actually engaging in analysis. Seven have pedagogic aims – that is, present language forms suitable for classroom tasks, assess teacher or learner language, etc. Two deal with linguistic peculiarities of different genres, without analysing the social implications. Only eight articles report actual CDA studies. Given the fact that the search term which elicited the data was ‘discourse analysis’, such findings should not surprise us. However, it is also obvious that linguists in Eastern Europe tend to report what is happening in CDA but rarely apply the methods themselves.

The articles of political scientists and sociologists, for their part, present studies, rather than introductions to the field. This suggests that language as a social semiotic is left in the hands of the social sciences and less often to linguists. Like the data about Slovenia from the Sage website, the subject of Cultural Studies in Romania appears to have gained solid ground; however, the step towards exploring the social implications of language use is yet to be taken in the former communist countries.

The topics covered by the researchers can be summarized as follows:

- Accession to the EU – e.g. the debate in the respective countries, the language of EU documents, etc.
- Transition from communism – e.g. the discourse of dissidents, records of the times of communism, the Romanian TV revolution, etc.
- Issues of democracy – e.g. the identity of the citizens of the Baltic states, the circumstances of the Roma population, the concept of neo-conservatism as applied to the new democracies.

Comparing with the data from the Sage journals, it appears that the topics here are much more specific for Eastern Europe. A good reason for publishing on a regional website is sharing problems with peers.

The only researchers who deal with subject matter unrelated to their own country are the linguists who research the life in a target country – the UK, France or Italy – with a view of presenting it to students of the respective language.

Unlike the number of Eastern Europeans on the pages of the Sage journals, the Western researchers on the CEEOL website appear proportionally more numerous, as can be seen from the list of researchers by nationality, about 13 percent:

14 Romanian	5 Serbian	1 British
12 Lithuanian	4 Bulgarian	1 French
10 Czech	4 Croatian	1 Georgian
8 Estonian	4 Slovak	1 Spanish

8 Polish	3 German	1 Swedish
6 American	2 Brazilian	1 Swiss
5 Hungarian	2 Slovenian	
5 Russian	1 Austrian	

This classification is based on the academic affiliation announced in the journal. By birth, however, only one person is American and her article is printed as a significant contribution to the field of gender studies. The French contributor is also included as an honoured practitioner in the field of discourse studies, quoted by many of the other contributors. People who publish as guests are the Brazilian, Austrian, Swiss and Spanish authors. The other non-Eastern Europeans, in fact, started their careers in Central and Eastern Europe. While Eastern Europeans contribute to ‘Western journals’ as ordinary authors, ‘Westerners’ tend to get an honorary treatment on the website for Eastern research.

Furthermore, some of the ex-patriot authors on CEEOL published while specializing abroad, while others are still based in American, British and Swedish universities. Many of them write in their mother tongue for the CEEOL journals, while most of their other articles are in English. Also, their contributions to CEEOL relate to the genre ‘introduction to the field’, while in ‘Western’ journals they publish reports of studies. This is another fact which corroborates the claim that CDA is a Western discipline, being slowly exported to the East. Comparing the quality of the publications in the two types of journals is beyond the objectives of this study, but following Swales’ (1998) quotation, it may be well worth exploring it in a separate study.

On the whole, 7 out of 97 authors are ex-patriots or emigrants from their countries. Tenure in an Eastern European country different from the native one is observed for two of the authors. A Georgian, after obtaining a Master’s degree from the Central European University in Budapest, Hungary, is currently based there in an administrative post. Another case is a Romanian, holding a post at the American University in Bulgaria. The fact is important, however, that an American university and an Open-Society-funded university in Central Europe are implicated, rather than genuinely Eastern European institutions. It may be that Central and Eastern European universities do not attract Eastern researchers as much as Western ones.

Furthermore, 15 authors acknowledge studies in Western universities, while 5 acknowledge studies in other Eastern European countries. Compared to the situation with the authors on the Sage website, where all but one of the authors specialized in the West, the difference is significant. Authors seem to need academic experience abroad only when they publish for international journals.

As for collaborations, 15 articles (or 16 percent) have joint authorship. This mode of work is typical of all the Western guests. Of the Easterners, only two mixed teams can be found – a German and a Romanian, and two Croatians and a Serbian. The result of joint efforts are two articles from the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Estonia and Russia, each. One piece of teamwork comes from Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia and Croatia. Nevertheless, the number of collaborators never exceeds three, and the works are not announced as multinational projects – because, in fact, the countries involved are at best two. One article reports findings from a large international project – the Dioscuri Project, a large venture in which most Central and Eastern European countries were involved.

The team publishing the article on CEEOL, however, is entirely Czech, from Masaryk University in Brno. If this criterion is a benchmark to go by, Eastern Europeans seem to slowly adopt joint authorship as a method of work. This fact may also be significant with a view of applying the type of multidisciplinary approach needed for CDA.

Unlike the articles on the Sage website, where constructing a list of methodologies was based on clear-cut sections in the articles, the corpus from CEEOL does not allow such ease. The theoretical frameworks either mainly include definitions of concepts, or outline broad disciplinary fields which cannot act as research methodologies; many authors mention which approaches are inadequate for the purposes of the respective researches, but very few concrete analytical procedures have been specified in the sections on theoretical frameworks.

Additionally, the corpora are constructed in idiosyncratic ways. On the one hand, extremely ambitious corpora exist including thousands of texts from several different genres. As no concrete parameters are mentioned, such as the number of words, or the principle of selection of materials, it transpires that the corpus is, in fact, the bulk of texts explored for the research, rather than a corpus per se. More often than not, these formations serve as a source of quotations supporting the observations of the author, rather than construct a consistent body of texts warranting conclusions. On the other hand, extremely small corpora are used, such as a collection of three speeches, which hardly serve as sufficient material for conclusions (McEnery et al., 2006: 72ff). Linguistic software for exploring corpora is never mentioned.

A few examples of methodologies are:

- Semiotic Analysis of the Text – Fairclough and Fowler
- Use of Oral Narratives in Historical Reconstruction – Shottler
- Metaphors – Johnson and Lakoff
- News Macrostructure – Van Dijk
- In- and out-group identities – Hodge and Kress
- Discourse Strategies – Paul Chilton
- National Identities – Hayden
- Discursive Genres – Maingueneau
- Sociology of Communication – Goffman
- Cognitive Grammar – Langacker
- Media Discourse Analysis – Fairclough

In essence, the references appear quite similar to those on the Sage website. However, when it comes to Russian authors, a few surprises occur. For instance, the theoretical model for analysing speech acts in political campaigns is based on Wierzbicka (written in Russian, in a journal called *Novelties in Linguistics Abroad*), rather than on any of the top researchers established via a Scholar search: Austin, Searle, Levinson, Van Dijk, Schegloff, Blum-Kulka and M. Bierwisch. Likewise, a model for analysing political discourse is based on Kitaigorodskaya, while the most quoted researchers established by Scholar are Fairclough, Wodak, Chilton and Schmidt. The definition of discourse in Russian articles comes from Lassan – an author unavailable in any other language than Russian. Furthermore, the model for cognitive semantic analysis in

political campaigns is provided by Issers (1996). Searching for the article, a copy appears on commercial websites selling essays to students. Furthermore, the references go as far back as 1968. These findings hold true for Baltic authors who write in Russian. Such data warrant the conclusion that a parallel linguistics used to exist in Russia and it has its own authorities different from those in other parts of the world. However, their popularity is restricted to the community of Russian and Russian-speaking researchers.

The sub-corpus of the lists of references reveals the following outstanding recurrences of quoted authors:

Van Dijk, T.A. 41	Johnson, M. 13	Fowler, R. 6
Wodak, R. 39	Hennoste, T. 11	Giddens, A. 6
Foucault, M. 35	Kress, G. 11	Kendon, A. 6
Lakoff, G. 23	Bugarski, R. 11	Laclau, E. 6
Fairclough, N. 21	Tragel, I. 10	Maingueneau 6
Kavolis, V. 14	Langacker, R. 9	Mouffe, 6
Meyer, M. 14	Reizigl, M. 8	
Bourdieu, P. 13	Szabo, M. 7	

It is only natural that authors writing in the lingua franca, English and, incidentally, French, get more quotations than those who publish in their respective native tongues. On the whole, the list is quite similar to that on the Sage website. Despite this fact, a few names of researchers from the communist bloc make an appearance as most frequently quoted in connection with discourse analysis. The first such name is Vytautas Kavolis – a Lithuanian-born American sociologist, literary critic and culture historian. Secondly, Tiit Hennoste, an Estonian researcher from Tartu University, has published widely in his mother tongue on text linguistics. In third place is R. Bugarski, a professor of social science at the University of Belgrade in Serbia. Ilona Tragel (see website) is associate professor of general linguistics at Tartu University in Estonia. Finally, Marton Szabo is a Hungarian political scientist.

However, Kavolis is extensively quoted in two articles only – one in Estonian comparing his methods of cultural analysis with Foucault's and one in Lithuanian on sociology. Unlike him, Hennoste is cited by his countrymen only, but the references occur over four articles. Bugarski, for his part, is quoted by three authors of Serbian origin. Likewise, Tragel and Szabo are cited by compatriots of theirs.

Conclusions

Data from content analysis, inspection of educational backgrounds and sociometrics show that:

1. Researchers from the former Eastern bloc do not publish as often as their colleagues from the West on the subject of discourse and society. Moreover, they rarely publish in international journals, unless they have had some experience in Western European universities. This should raise serious questions about the higher education in the former communist countries, about the exposure to recent

literature and about international collaboration and exchange between the East and the West.

2. When publishing in Western journals, Easterners meticulously follow Western norms, but this can happen because they have had academic experience in the West. Eastern research, for its part, was shown to contain features which would appear as faults in academic writing and research, such as idiosyncratic quotation lists, odd use of corpora and elusive research design.
3. It is fairly obvious that the discipline selected for this study, critical discourse analysis, is a novelty for Eastern linguistics – a fact corroborated by the introductory nature of the articles on CDA on CEEOL, by the relative lack of authorities in local cultures and by the avoidance of actual analysis. Be it because heavily ideological fields are avoided, or because of the felt lack of competence in the sociological sphere, linguists leave it to political scientists and sociologists. It stands to reason to argue that the inertia continues from the period of communism when seeking social underpinnings was largely discouraged. However, researching the social implications of language can benefit the social development in these countries and efforts should not be spared to develop this field.
4. At the same time, it seems as if in Russia a parallel discipline exists, upon the findings of which several researches still thrive. It apparently does not make sense in a globalizing world to have insular schools of thought which avoid each other and carve separate niches for themselves, while heading in the same direction. There should be more incentive for collaborations.
5. It would appear as if adopting the method of collaborating on research is slowly gaining ground in Central and Eastern Europe. A lot can be expected from this approach by way of multidisciplinary, participation in international projects, etc.
6. Eastern Europeans publish research which brings its specific contribution in the sense that they explore typical global problems and reveal the situation in their native country. They rarely propose issues of interest to their specific societies and hardly ever deal with realities outside their native country and the Western country where they studied. Quite contrarily, Westerners boldly explore issues in countries to which they have no relation and by this token they display more confidence.

Notes

1. Note from the Editor: reactions (maximum 2000 words) to this article are welcome until 1 November 2011.
2. In 2009, the University of Warsaw launched a series of conferences on Political Linguistics, which is obviously a positive feature for the development of this field in Eastern Europe.

References

- Braun, T. and Schubert, A. (1996) 'Indicators of Research Output in the Sciences from 5 Central European Countries, 1990–1994', *Scientometrics* 36: 145–65.
- Blommaert, J. and Bucaen, C. (2000) 'Critical Discourse Analysis', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29: 447–66.
- Galtung, J. (1981) 'Structure, Culture and Intellectual Style: An Essay Comparing Saxon, Teutonic, Gallic and Nipponic Approaches', *Social Science Information* 6: 817–56.

- Issers, O. (1996) Иссерс 'Что говорят политики, чтобы нравиться своему народу' Вестник Омского университета 1: 71–4. Available at: www.philology.ru/linguistics2/issers-96.htm
- Kaplan, R.B. (ed.) (1980) *On the Scope of Applied Linguistics*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McEnery, T., Xiao, R. and Tono, Y. (2006) *Corpus-Based Language Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Prpić, K. (2007) 'Changes of Scientific Knowledge Production and Research Productivity in a Transitional Society', *Scientometrics* 72(3): 487–511.
- Scott, M. (1999) *Wordsmith Tools Software*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shaw, P. and Vassileva, I. (2000) 'Co-evolving Academic Rhetoric across Culture: Britain, Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany in the 20th Century', *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(2).
- Skolimowski, H. (1965) 'Analytical–Linguistic Marxism in Poland', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 26(2) (April–June): 235–58.
- Swales, J. (1998) 'Language, Science and Scholarship', *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching* 8: 1–18.
- Wodak, R. (1995) 'Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis', in *Language and Ideology*. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.
- Wodak, R. (1997) 'Critical Discourse Analysis and the Study of Doctor Patient Interaction', in *The Construction of Professional Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Yakhontova, T. (2006) 'Bakhtin at Home and Abroad', *JAC* 17(1): 153–67.
- Yacobsen, M.H., Tester, K. and Bauman, Z. (2006) 'Bauman before Exile: A Conversation with Zygmunt Bauman', *Polish Sociological Review* 3(155). Available at: www.ceeol.com

Websites

- Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL) – www.ceeol.com/ (accessed 22.08.10).
- Discourse & Society* – www.uk.sagepub.com/journalsProdDesc.nav?prodId=Journal200873 (accessed 22.08.10). (Publication criteria for *Discourse & Society* – www.discourses.org/journals/Pre-Review.pdf)
- Highly Cited – <http://hcr3.iziknowledge.com/home.cgi> (accessed 10.08.10).
- Karmen Erjavec – <http://old.fdv.uni-lj.si/osebne/Erjavec.htm> (accessed 20.08.10).
- Tiit Hennoste – www.cl.ut.ee/inimesed/thennoste/ (accessed 22.08.10).
- Cornelia Ilie – www.coepolcon.fi/researchers/46/cornelia-ilie (accessed 20.08.10).
- Dina Iordanova – www.standrews.ac.uk/filmstudies/staff.php?staffid=2 (accessed 20.08.10).
- Veronika Kalmus – www.etis.ee/portaal/izikuCV.aspx?TextBoxName=kalmus&PersonVID=10772&lang=et&FromUrl=izikud.aspx (accessed 20.08.10).
- Ilona Trigel – www.fl.ut.ee/412064 (accessed 22.08.10).
- Teun van Dijk – www.discourses.org/ (accessed 22.08.10).
- Zala Volcic – <http://cccs.uq.edu.au/index.html?page=76905&pid=0> (accessed 22.08.10).
- Ruth Wodak – www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/profiles/265 (accessed 22.08.10).

Elena Tarasheva is currently Director of Studies of the programme English Studies at the New Bulgarian University. She graduated in English Philology from Veliko Turnovo University in Bulgaria, specialized in British Cultural Studies at Strathclyde University in Glasgow, UK, received a PhD in Mathematical Linguistics from the Bulgarian Academy of Science.