

Sociomaterial Paradoxes in Global Academic Publishing: Academic Literacies at the Intersection of Practice and Policy

Angela Rounsaville and Pavel Zemliansky

The creeping dominance of Anglophone-center journals as the most viable publication venues worldwide has resulted in the ubiquity of English as “the language” for academic publishing as well as the preeminence of Western forms of genre and research conventions. Citing 2004 data from *Ulrich’s Periodical Directory*, Lillis and Curry note that 74% of the periodicals listed that year were published in English. Drawing from the Institute for Scientific Information, they cite that 90% of social science articles were published in English (“Interactions with Literacy Brokers” 4). Clearly, academics who write outside of the centralized Anglophone center, which includes the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia, have experienced increasing pressure to publish in English (Canagarajah, *Geopolitics*, “Nondiscursive’ Requirements”; Horner et al.; Lillis and Curry, *Academic Writing*, “Interactions with Literacy Brokers”; Tardy). Such increased pressure is exacerbated through ties to increased rewards, as publishing in English can yield higher salaries and/or increased research funding because economic and disciplinary mobility are often tightly linked with English language publications. Thus, functioning like

Angela Rounsaville is an associate professor and director of first year writing at the University of Central Florida. Her scholarship centers on transnational literacy, rhetorical genre studies, transfer, and multilingual/translingual writing. Previous work has appeared in *Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators*, *Written Communication*, *Research in the Teaching of English*, and *Composition Forum*. She, along with Pavel Zemliansky, received a CCCC’s Research Initiative Grant (2017–2018), which funded the larger project that this article draws from. **Pavel Zemliansky** is an associate professor in the Academic Language Program at Oslo Metropolitan University in Oslo, Norway. His research interests include professional and technical communication, particularly in international contexts, online teaching and learning, and teaching writing in the disciplines. His previous work appeared in *IEEE Transactions for Professional Communication*, *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, and other outlets. Together with Kirk St. Amant, he is the winner of the 2017 CCCC Award for Best Original Collection of Essays in Technical and Scientific Communication for the book *Rethinking Post-Communist Rhetoric: Perspectives on Rhetoric, Writing, and Professional Communication in Post-Soviet Spaces*.

an economy of English, this “academic marketplace” (Lillis and Curry, *Academic Writing* 1) of “academic capitalism” (Slaughter and Leslie), privileges an Anglophone center over multilingual peripheries as scholars perform the ongoing intellectual work of literacy brokers to succeed (Lillis and Curry, “Interactions with Literacy Brokers” 5).

These sets of conditions have implications for both the particular topic of Anglophone publishing regimes as well as the changing nature of academic literacy in the churn of globalization. In this article, we turn to Ukraine as an exemplar case for how literacy is changing for research writers in what we are terming global “edge” countries who are driven to join the Anglophone publishing center. This drive is sometimes personal but more often political and economic as writers’ livelihoods are tethered to the outcomes of publishing in English, and research universities’ funding is tied to large-scale output in pre-defined Anglophone publication venues. We define “edge” countries as those operating within a transitional, liminal, and often contradictory set of regulations, expectations, and norms around (a) the local use and politics of mono and multilingualism and the increasing ubiquity of an expectation of English fluency for job candidates in the workforce; (b) educational mandates that seek to drive a local knowledge economy to an Anglophone center; (c) de facto if not de jure participation in larger economic and political entities such as the EU or other forms of regional, Anglophone consolidation; and (d) internal economic volatility that delimits a writer’s even access to literacy’s social practices and technical skills.

Specifically, in this article, we investigate the implications of publishing as a multilingual faculty from the edge of the global knowledge economy in a particular historical and geopolitical nexus—the post-soviet space of Ukraine—through analysis of qualitative interviews with four multilingual research faculty.¹ For our purposes, we connect the explicit work on the sociomateriality of literacy (see, e.g., Canagarajah, *Geopolitics*, “‘Nondiscursive’ Requirements”; Micciche; Vieira) to an academic literacies model (see, e.g., Lea and Street) to view how scholars negotiate their professional academic writing requirements across multiple languages and geographical contexts while at the same time managing the contradictions of institutional rules and regulations within Ukraine. Analysis reveals multilingual faculty who are under pressure to publish through national and local regulatory policies and incentives, which are at the same time demanding publishing requirements that are not institutionally supported. While some faculty participants work in self-sponsored ways to develop English language academic literacy, the more common experience was lack of or limited contexts in which to practice or improve English language academic literacy. Within this paradoxical writing context, multilingual faculty also negotiate the discourse conventions and discourse structures of English writing and publishing that include cultural, rhetorical, lexical, and genre differences. Core findings demonstrate

how gaps between policy requirements without institutional support mediate English language academic literacy for these Ukrainian participants. Findings also offer insight into how faculty manage this gap—to varying degrees of success—in their striving for professional recognition and mobility.

Such findings underscore the changing conditions and nature of academic literacy as globalizing processes reconfigure how international research faculty experience a core feature of their profession: academic writing and publishing. These writers work within a set of paradoxes around the simultaneously expanding and constricting nature of English language academic literacy at the intersection of stratified opportunities for practicing lived academic English and a complex of material constraints and demands. English is expanding as are publishing demands and yet resources range from static to diminishing to out of reach. Literacy in this context is wedged among these countervailing forces as writers work to deliver research articles whose publication and distribution in approved scholarly forums impact job mobility and livelihood. Persistent shifts in writing demands and writing support combine with moments of larger political, economic, and historical transformations to generate a situation characterized by the pursuit over the accomplishment of English academic literacy. Moreover, these cases reveal the double-bind nature of academic literacy as Ukraine research faculty are both compelled by the presence of material forces (rules, regulations, wars, economic transformations) and undermined by the absence of material infrastructure to address those forces vis-à-vis opportunities for social practice. Ultimately, we argue that academic literacy production in this type of edge knowledge economy context is driven, in part, by the uneven splitting and misalignment of social practice and social need from material forces and their reinforcements; within this paradox, both writers (financially) and readers (intellectually) pay a price.

From these findings, we merge and reimagine two strands of literacy studies scholarship: theories of literacy accumulation and lag (Brandt; Keller; Lagman) and sociomaterial perspectives on literacy (Micciche; Vieira). Recent research has emphasized the ways in which literacy is social and material at once. Our study affirms this view and forwards an additional consideration: *how* and *why* literacy shores up its social and material origins and impacts and how those combine for writers is not a fixed or evenly felt phenomenon. Rather, our study suggests that the sociomateriality of literacy will be experienced differently depending on a writer's relation to high-value literacy practices (which themselves shift over time and across context), and a writer's power to direct or evade the linguistic, political, and economic policies that confine and define literacy (which also fluctuate). We suggest that at base and in fundamental ways, these dynamics affect how writers experience literacy accumulation and lag. These conclusions are both consistent

with and exceed theories of literacy lag and accumulation found within United States-based studies, and affirm, as other studies have done, the need to observe and, when applicable, reconsider literacy from the perspective of globalization.

FROM SOCIAL TO SOCIOMATERIAL PERSPECTIVES IN LITERACY AND PUBLISHING PRACTICES

The theoretical and methodological orientation of this article builds on Lillis and Curry's years of study into academic publishing and academic literacies as social practice to include the sociomaterial dimensions of multilingual academic writing in countries at the edge of the Anglophone center. For our purposes, we extend the already potent academic literacies as social practice model to include explicit and persistent accounting for the "hard" economic, material, and cultural infrastructures that compel, mediate, and impact the systems of valuation around language and literacy. Language and literacy use are, of course, often ideological and political, especially in such a high-stakes, competitive activity as academic publishing. According to Lillis and Curry (*Academic Writing*), Anglophone scholars are often not aware of this centrality of English and of the advantages in the publishing game they possess because they can write in English. In this way, "geopolitical location—of scholars, texts, language—is central to the politics of academic text production" (*Academic Writing* 5). If their argument is correct, then to study international academic publishing means not only to study its linguistic aspects (e.g., the level of English proficiency required of authors), but to account for the uneven distribution of social, cultural, political, economic, and infrastructural assets of the international publishing enterprise.

Expanding on a social practices paradigm, such concerns can be addressed through shifting the field's attention from the social to the combined sociomaterial dimensions of literacy practice (Micciche; Vieira). Vieira, in providing her definition of sociomaterialist literacy studies, foregrounds "the surfaces, tools of inscriptions, scriptural systems, and bodies people use to write and read, as well as the infrastructures that facilitate writings' dispersal" (13). Literacy's materiality also includes formal institutions and bureaucracies as well as "strong texts" (Vieira 13): documents whose consequences have been so reified as to render them more material-like than social in nature, with the important caveat that "these aspects of literacy are irreducibly material, but they are also irreducibly social" (Vieira 13). Such description is exemplified in Prendergast's admonition that "global English is not a technologically perfect medium for communication of ideas, information, or even friendship. Global English is borders, visas, tabloids, the corporeal bodies that they regulate, and the resources that support them" (148). In this example, practices that appear to be built from and patterned across social

agreement—like global Englishes or academic literacies—are only operable and sustainable as they bolster and are bolstered by human bodies, strong texts, and legal systems. Thus, materiality is more than the context or background scene for emplacing literacy practices: Materials both make and mediate their possibility.

While direct theoretical explication of the material dimensions of literacy is more recent, researchers have been chronicling the “non-discursive” dimensions of academic literacy and publishing for some time (Canagarajah, “‘Nondiscursive’ Requirements” 435). For instance, in their study of the impacts of exporting academic writing to Kenya, Tanzania, and Zaire, researchers Muchiri, Mulamba, Myers, and Ndoloi cited the length of train rides between home and university, the unpredictable opening and closing of universities as part of political tensions and transitions, the “that lack of money and time by faculty members . . . as important in marginalizing research” (185), and the uneven access to “North American and European journals, conferences, [and] experts” (185). Canagarajah’s work on the geopolitics of academic writing in Sri Lanka similarly argued for materializing studies of academic literacy to account for how “[p]eriphery knowledge is marginalized in favor of center thinking. . . . [with] these forms of domination . . . [having] implications for the material inequities and power differences in geopolitical relations” (*Geopolitics* 238). In this work, Canagarajah referenced faculty access to expensive databases as one of many examples of how economic and political factors impinge on academic production. In a later work, Canagarajah argued that these types of “non-discursive” factors negatively affect “periphery scholars” who wish to participate in the international academic publishing market (“‘Nondiscursive’ Requirements” 435). The critical point here is that non-discursive or material factors, such as policies, regulations, and material access to academic markets, tend to affect how often researchers from non-English-using environments get published and how difficult it is for them to enter into this international knowledge economy.

The studies just discussed not only provide evidence for the sociomaterial dynamics within global publishing but also speak to an urgency in recognizing and attending to these in lived experience. Our study addresses this need and asks how scholarly writing and writers are impacted as universities across the world turn to internationalization efforts for prestige, economic necessity, and as the cultural by-product of globalization. Adding to this urgency is the speed with which material infrastructures around multilingual faculties’ writing changes, often toward more challenges. Linking an academic literacies model—which foregrounds “epistemological issues and social processes” (Lea and Street 369)—with a materialist model—which emphasizes language policies, publishing constraints, and economic conditions and contradictions—helps explain the profound impacts of this trajectory on lives and literacy.

SITUATING ENGLISH LANGUAGE PUBLISHING IN A
SOCIOHISTORICAL CONTEXT: THE CASE OF UKRAINE

The critical sociohistorical context of English academic publishing in Ukraine includes national policies and state run organizations, its position as a post-Soviet bloc country, and its location in nations and regions where “English is used as a foreign language and increasingly as an instrumental language in education, commerce, and other areas” (Lillis and Curry, “Interactions with Literacy Brokers” 5). In this section, we describe this context as it relates to our study findings.

Ukraine, like other countries in the former USSR, is part of post-Soviet bloc transformations, which include sweeping reforms in politics, economy, and education, and which also includes how members of academe are evaluated and rewarded for their research. Specifically, in the post-1991 independence period, Ukraine began the long process of higher education reform, with aspirations to integrate with European and other global research networks. Even with allowing for more Western models of privatization, Ukraine higher education retained intensive oversight and regulation by the state, which continued the Soviet tradition of “national government [having] considerable authority over the higher education system, through stringent regulation and funding” (Hladchenko et al. 111). Between 1991 and the contemporary period, a range of transformations and knowledge economy models vied for dominance. The outcome of such persistent reformulation has been “a disparity between knowledge/research, earning money, and the quantitative criteria” (Hladchenko et al. 121).

An accelerated period of transition in higher education can be linked to a 2009 initiative to confer direct government support for research initiatives in the Ukrainian system as universities worked to align themselves with European education models; this endeavor further catalyzed the 2005 expansion of the Bologna process (Zemliansky and St. Amant).² Most influential for understanding our study are policies and initiatives launched following the 2014 “revolution of dignity;”³ when Ukrainian systems of higher education underwent their swiftest reform toward European integration, with powerful impacts on the working lives of university faculty (Hladchenko and Westerheijden). Changes included a redistribution of teaching to scholarly activity, such as more time allocated to research and a change in “requirements to the scientific titles” (Hladchenko and Westerheijden 153). These shifts meant increased requirements for research and scholarly productivity and publishing in western academic outlets, with oversight from the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science,⁴ as well as centralized use of English as the language of consequence in university life.

At this time, English, not Russian, began to dominate. Requirements for some level of English proficiency in higher education had existed for some time,

first in the USSR and then in independent Ukraine, although these courses aimed toward that goal hardly resulted in usable English. Of course, before the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the Eastern Bloc, there was no need for Ukrainian scholars to be proficient in writing and publishing in English. While reading and understanding foreign language scholarship could be seen as necessary for the advancement of science in the former USSR (especially for national security and defense-related fields), there was no opportunity for Soviet researchers to publish internationally (Zemliansky and St. Amant). The select few who were allowed to attend academic conferences abroad got by with whatever minimal English skills they had. After the collapse of the Eastern Bloc and the increased academic and professional contacts with the West, English became much more important in the Ukrainian higher education system. But the power of English has become cemented through policy in this post-revolution-of-dignity period. In fact, it is now a requirement that all graduate students pass an exam in English.

A second vital change has been the increased pressure to publish in venues outside of Ukraine and in forums that are indexed in international databases. For example, as Nazarovets et al. noted, even during the current austere budgetary environment, the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science has issued requirements of more publications to Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus. As a matter of policy, such publications are tied to income. Hladchenko and Westerheijden described how “scientific degrees and titles provide additional payment to the salary of academics. In particular 15% and 35% of salary increase for the scientific degrees of candidate and doctor and 25% and 33% for the scientific titles of associate professor and professor” (156). Moreover, to even get to this career stage, the Ministry now requires that applicants for positions of associate professor and full professor have WoS and Scopus publications, and applicants for a PhD degree must have publications “in scientific periodicals of other countries” (Nazarovets et al. 11). Stavytsky described such push for inclusion in these indices as an “arms race” among Ukrainian academics, many of whom are trying to gather as many indexed articles as possible, which has led to so-called “advisory firms” (Stavytsky 111, 112) to help academics with high-impact journal placement. Ironically, these steps have reduced the very value of the publications they were supposed to raise. Such examples highlight the complicated relationship between the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and the country’s universities. While most recently the government has pushed to decentralize this relationship and to give universities more autonomy, the highly centralized structure of the Ukrainian higher education system is still largely intact. As major strategic development decisions are made by the Ministry, universities are expected to comply (Osipian).

While language, literacy, and demands on publication changed, access to professional development needs became less certain. Inconsistencies can be tied to what Hladchenko and Westerheijden call the “means-ends decoupling at the nation-state level” in Ukraine, in which policies and practices of the state are not articulated to desired outcomes (152). In other words, such decoupling means that state-level mandates—to publish outside of Ukraine and in English, for example—are established without the actionable processes needed to produce the measured outcomes. Such severing is attributed to the maladministered implementation of the German-style research university within a country transitioning out of Soviet-style political, economic, and academic culture, which resulted in institutional complexity and confusion at local levels. As Hladchenko and Westerheijden noted, the institutional logic demanded by an innovation-driven research university was not easily mapped onto a government model, inherited from the USSR, that maintained centralized control over the concentration and allocation of resources.

In addition to constraints in political culture, Shevchenko reported on the impact of the Ukraine-Russia war on scholarly output. She partially attributed higher education’s inability to financially support scholarship to the ongoing crisis between Ukraine and Russia, arguing that “the redistribution of state budget funds from [the] social sphere to defense forces change[d] in the system of education” (238). While this reallocation of resources has not devastated educational spending, as Ukraine still spends more on education per percentage of GDP than does the United States, for example (World Bank), it does reflect the ways in which financial support for research initiatives prescribed by the Ministry of Education are situated within geopolitical contexts. War economics, political economies, and knowledge economies are interlinked, with implications for literacy and publishing practices. Our study of Ukraine highlights the articulation between state-level language, literacy, and publishing demands and multiple economies, which, as we show in our analysis, is further exacerbated by additional paradoxes experienced on the individual level.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: ACADEMIC LITERACIES AS A SOCIOMATERIAL PRACTICE

In this section, we review our research methods and further contextualize our research participants (beyond the sociohistorical context provided in the previous section). Data collection included semi-structured interviews on the nature of our participants’ changing literacy and language practices and how those practices intersect with the material infrastructure of professional and national writing and publishing environments (i.e., national language policy, journal criteria,

etc.). All research subjects regularly publish and/or teach or function in other academic capacities in at least two different languages. Interviews were conducted in person in Ukraine in both Ukrainian and in English. Such interviews were possible because Pavel Zemliansky, as a native of Ukraine, is fluent in Ukrainian and Russian and received his undergraduate education there, though at a different university from the one discussed in this study. Although he worked in Ukrainian academia briefly in the 1990s as an adjunct instructor of English, he was able to use his professional contacts for study recruitment. While Angela Rounsaville does not have ties to Ukraine or the language, she often works with issues of global and transnational literacy.

For the interview analysis, we applied a sociomaterialist approach to an academic literacies studies framework through line-by-line coding.⁵ We worked through a recursive coding process to better understand the relationships between social practice and material influence. Drawing from constructs such as institutions, practices, motivations, and strong texts, we developed the following coding scheme: stated exigency for publishing in English, regulatory and bureaucratic factors, literacy practices connected to discourse and discourse structures being negotiated, lack of or limited context to learn the English now required for publishing, and practices and locations for self-sponsored English literacy learning. Our goal in coding was to find patterns across the comparative data set that allowed us to theorize how multilingual disciplinary faculty manage and experience their professional lives and to better understand the relationships between social practice and material influence.

As stated, our study participants, anonymized throughout this article, were all active multilingual research faculty in Ukraine, and all worked at the same comprehensive public university: The National Technical University Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute (NTU KhPI). Kharkiv, the city where the university is located, lies in the northeast of the country and has over one million inhabitants. It is a major industrial, educational, and cultural hub. Despite being only 200 km (120 miles) from the epicenter of the Russian-backed separatist insurgency in the Donbas region, the immediate effects of the insurgency are not felt in the city. NTU KhPI has 12,700 students and just under 1,600 academic faculty members (*Times Higher Education*). By Ukraine's standards, NTU KhPI is a large school, and according to the University's own data, NTU KhPI is an institution with "high research output" (NTU KhPI). The university awards bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. Engineering and natural science specialties dominate, but there is also a sizable number of social sciences, humanities, and business programs. The University ranks in the top 10 among Ukrainian educational institutions and is included in many international educational ranking systems (NTU KhPI). Understanding these participants' standing within their institution

as well as their primary professional writing and working activities gives helpful context to the findings that we later narrate. Table 1 provides further context.

Table 1: Contextual Data for Participants' Educational and Professional Responsibilities

Participant	Educational and Professional Background	Current Employment and Research Area	Languages	Recent English Language Publications
V.	Doctorate of sciences in technical electrochemistry	Professor in the general and organic chemistry department. Work connects with chemistry in teaching chemistry and training chemistry students who come to our university from foreign countries and want to study in English in their first course.	Ukrainian Russian English	65 currently in Scopus; 17 in 2019; 8 in 2020 as of July; 5 in press
K.	Sociological faculty at Kharkiv National University College with 10 years of teaching experience in Beketov National University of Urban Economy and a PhD in political science obtained in 2015	Associate professor in the department of Philosophy and Political Science in the O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy. In addition, K. is a vice-dean of the Faculty of Electricity and City Light.	Ukrainian Russian English	1 publication in English per year
G.	Psycholinguistics, structural and applied linguistics Graduated from the Theological Department at Kharkiv State University in 1982	Head of the Cross-Culture Communication and Media Department with primary responsibility of running the university-wide media program.	Ukrainian English German French Russian	1 publication in English per year

Continued on next page

Table 1: Continued

	Currently working on a second dissertation on sociological training. Has two degrees, which is why this second dissertation is devoted to the impact of the Internet on our society.	For example, G. is responsible for teaching the English program at this university and training young scientists.		
L.	<p>Graduated from Kharkiv Polytechnical Institute. Received a PhD in Moscow at the Institute of Control Science of the Academy of Science of the USSR.</p> <p>After graduation from the Institute of Control Science, L. worked for some years in the scientific institute industry.</p> <p>In 1983, L. began a university career first as a lecturer, then moving to associate professor, professor, and is now head of the department.</p>	Professor and the head of the Department of Computer Mathematics and Data Analysis at Kharkiv Polytechnical Institute	Ukrainian, Russian, English	5–7 publications in English per year

Source: Transcription of participants' interview comments.

While our study focused on the use of English in publishing, Ukraine has a complicated linguistic landscape beyond English worth noting. Somewhat contrary to Western assumptions, Ukraine is not separated into “Russian-speaking” and “Ukrainian-speaking” regions. While there is a certain level of preference for one language over the other in different regions, (the further west one goes, the less Russian one hears), most Ukrainians use both languages, at least in daily tasks. According to Lakhtikova (2017), even the majority of the population of eastern Ukraine, which is considered in the West to be “Russian-speaking,” is bilingual (144). Moreover, it is important to distinguish between linguistic abilities and preferences as these can sometimes be used to explain one’s political preferences (Lakhtikova 144). For instance, in certain circles, refusing to use the Ukrainian language can get you labeled you as “pro-Russian.” This

linguistic landscape has resulted in large part from the fact that, during Soviet times, schooling at all levels included mandatory courses in both Russian and Ukrainian languages and literature; it is also due to the formerly free movement of people between linguistically diverse regions within Ukraine and between Ukraine and Russia. We did not inquire about the level of Ukrainian/Russian bilingualism during the interviews, but it is safe to assume that our participants are proficient in both languages.

While subject to the general pressures to publish in English and in international journals, our participants do have employment, generational, linguistic, and educational differences. The biggest difference appears in their publication output and in their disciplinary research homes. As faculty, the participants represent the following disciplines: chemistry (V.),⁶ political science (K.), applied linguistics and sociology (G.), and computer science and mathematics (L.). All participants work in either the hard or social sciences. Commonalities include languages used for writing and each participant's advanced career status. Generational differences—a feature that becomes important when understanding participants' prior knowledge base and resources from which they pull academic writing knowledge—are also apparent. For instance, all but K. attained their initial professional training during the Soviet era and have worked through the political and economic transformations in Ukraine. While V. doesn't recall the dates of his early education in the excerpts above, he does talk elsewhere about these generational divides. The table above, with these distinctions, provides a touchstone for the following section, which covers institutional expectations about publishing among our participants.

INSTITUTIONAL MANDATES WITHOUT INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Like many multilingual faculty who must write and publish from the edge of the Anglophone center, our study participants are part of a growing field of scholars who are pressured to publish in English through a nexus of national, regional, and supranational policy decisions and evaluation mechanisms. In this section, we first report on how participants viewed and interpreted those external pressures, especially as they relate to national, Ukraine-specific regulatory policies for publishing in English. We then report on how these expectations combined with what one participant so poignantly called the absence of “language surroundings” (V.). Taken together, this first set of findings shows that while there were little to no institutionally sponsored support systems to develop English language academic literacy, faculty were under strong institutional mandates to write and publish in English.

While additional regulations and policy constraints might be present, our interview participants focused their comments on how the regulatory, bureaucratic, and financial factors in research, writing, and publishing linked to Ukrainian governmental and university-level regulation of disciplinary writing and publishing. K., for instance, explained how national ratings for universities are based on “the amount of publications in worldwide magazines” and how the university system monetizes these ratings through pay raises. As K. noted, an indirect, but powerful incentive to publish in English comes from the possibility to “gain 15 percent more money when we teaching in English and when we publish in English.” Likewise, V. also linked the financial incentive of publishing in English to a larger incentive network around publishing in international journals because “it’s one of the requirements to obtain the status of the scientific university.” V. described, “if we publish in foreign English, especially in Scopus, we obtain €2,050.00 for each paper. . . . For each citation, we will obtain €1,000.00. . . . if the citation will be from the foreign, but not from our own.”

While state and institutional mandates, bolstered by financial carrots, were a common explanation for why participants felt compelled to publish in English, in the case of two participants, these combined with a kind of patriotic rationale that was tied to the desire to elevate Ukrainian science. This is best captured by what G. called the competitive “market of education” of the “common European space.” The following interview response from K. echoes this motivation to compete and win in the context of the regulatory pressures previously discussed:

I think that not only for me, but also for every Ukrainian scientist, it’s very important to publish in English, not in Ukraine, not in Russian, not in Polish, not in even French, in English. . . . because we all know that English is the language of international communication and in science, we can see it in the best way, because only English publications can be indexing in world indexing systems such as Google. Only English language publication can show you as a scientist on the world area, can represent you as a scientist. . . . I really want Ukrainian science to be a world science, to be international science. I really want Ukrainian scientists to go abroad to spread some ideas. Maybe ideas of national science, ideas of national political culture, ideas maybe of national social culture, like this way.

K. went on to emphasize that his primary objective is European publications in English. To further understand the regulatory challenge to K.’s desire for “Ukrainian science to be a world science, to be international science,” it is helpful to consider the role that publication indexing and search systems like Google play in advancing or diminishing the number, type, and circulation of professional academic publications that may include authors from non-Anglophone centers. World indexing, a metric that our participants are being judged on, is tied to impact factor (IF) formulations whose algorithms “are heavily biased toward English-medium journals published in Anglophone contexts” (Lillis and

Curry, *Academic Writing* 18). While this does not mean automatic dismissal of manuscripts coming from multilingual writers in non-Anglophone contexts, it is also the case, as described by all participants, that the lack of or limited contexts in which to practice English academic literacy, combined with the complex discursive distinctions between the English language and academic writing in the Ukrainian or Russian language, creates barriers when writing for English language publications. “Most journals that do not publish in English are excluded [from indexing], thus English language journals tend to enjoy higher IFs, which in turn contribute to the on-going privileging of English” (*Academic Writing* 18). Participants also underscored the indirect ways in which English dominated and was incentivized in publishing. In response to our question whether faculty are encouraged to publish in English in particular, K. noted, “Maybe not directly in such way, but yes.” Thus, while English academic literacy is being further elevated and reified as the only language for academic publishing, multilingual scholars like the ones we interviewed for this study are pushed to accept monolingual publishing as a primary exchange for workplace compensation, even in instances lacking direct acknowledgement of those mechanisms or support for training toward successful publication.

Direct and indirect regulatory pressures collided with an absent and even contrary support system despite the need to achieve the state-required outcomes for faculty publishing. In their interview comments, participants documented such paradoxes when describing their encounters with English academic literacy. According to G., while English academic literacy is a *de facto* requirement for professional mobility, the baseline problem is “lack of practice, first of all.” G. then linked this concern to a broader institutional ecology: “Lack of visas to foreign countries, also to visit to universities. You can’t go to some kind of sabbatical, scholarship.” Elsewhere in the interview, G. opined that “there’s no writing, no reading, no socializing in academic discourse. We have no grants. We have no support programs, practically, in my area.” He ultimately connected this lack of ability to practice English to the “economical factor” of Ukraine’s status in the world economy. The paradox apparent here is that faculty must publish in English, and yet they have limited means for obtaining the academic literacy and the academic network necessary for fulfilling that mandate. L. placed this predicament within a specific historical context, contrasting his current pressure with those experienced when Ukraine was part of the Soviet Union.

The education system in Soviet Union, it was high-level education system, of course. The problem was that the connections with the colleagues from abroad was very difficult. In fact, it was the problem because the level of teaching, level of scientific research was very high. But now we have another situation. It is very easy to connect with our colleagues but have very restricted resources.

From a historical perspective, the present financial constraints described by all of our participants, three of whom have been part of their profession before, during, and after Ukraine's transformation to an independent country, highlight a generational challenge and consciousness. While Soviet-era barriers included access to foreign colleagues, "the level of teaching, level of scientific research was very high" (L.). Today's concerns, with Ukrainian faculty now vying for publication space and research prestige within the global academic publishing marketplace and material resources, which in turn affect access to English, are the central factors in success. Compounding this problem is the need to not only publish in English, but also to publish innovative and cutting-edge results of scientific studies. As L. noted, "In order to publish new scientific results, it is necessary to obtain these results. Now the situation for scientific work is not very good" due to the lack of material support within the universities as well as the limited travel and contact with international faculty working in similar research areas. Such findings emphasize the incongruous link between English, English publishing, and monetary resources, particularly for multilingual faculty in non-Anglophone centers.

In response to such tenuous positioning for the multilingual faculty participants described above, several participants did outline self-sponsored ways in which they initiated English literacy study and worked to create opportunities for language practice that worked around barriers such as lack of courses, lack of finances, and lack of generalized context due to national language policies. Extensive reading in English, the personal study of journal article models, and actively searching out means for translation were the primary methods for English academic literacy immersion. Collecting and reading models and using the internet were the most popular ways to "dive into the discourse," as G. explained:

I study the requirements of different journals concerning styles, and, so to say, requirements of papers. Also, Google helps me, so to say, concerning terminology, etymological context. If I want to check, for example, the ability of some use of terms, so to say, I use Google.

In these ways, through persistent searching for and translation of academic terms, faculty built their own contexts of English language activity by finding or devising locations to practice English that would help them publish. While all participants had access to English language models and Google searches, fewer participants were able to capitalize on other aspects of their position to hone their academic literacy skills. In particular, participants who worked with Ukrainian doctoral students had more opportunity to contrive useful English "language surroundings" (V.) because of the need to mentor those students in English language publishing. G., for example, took it upon himself to translate

students' professional papers from Ukrainian or Russian to English. Of course, given that this opportunity only seemed available for one of four of our participants, it highlights the uneven nature of self-sponsored English language learning activity. While all faculty can read models, not all will work with doctoral students to gain additional avenues to "dive into the discourse" (G.).

Findings in this section reveal the paradoxical writing and publishing context within which our multilingual Ukrainian participants must enact academic literacy. Not only is the context paradoxical, but the stakes of negotiating that context, in which there is pressure to publish in English but a lack of the systematic support for any kind of consistent or widespread ability to publish, link to professional and economic mobility. These faculty must not merely acquire English academic literacy; they also must manage regulatory and bureaucratic contexts that limit their access and exposure to English academic literacy. Nonetheless, the pressures to publish remain. While some faculty have found for themselves or are in an academic rank where they can develop English writing proficiency, the more common refrain from participants was frustration over the ongoing need to negotiate and make sense of English discourse and discourse structures. The following section presents those results.

NEGOTIATING SOCIOMATERIAL LITERACIES FROM THE EDGE OF THE ANGLOPHONE CENTER

Despite the context described above, our participants continued to negotiate the movement between their local language and literacy knowledge and the English language academic literacies that their publications must target. Types of negotiations take on a variety of forms and are most often associated with what we call discourse features and discourse structures. We distinguish between the two in the following ways: Discourse features refer to lexical, stylistic, rhetorical, formatting, and forum or genre characteristics that may differ between Ukrainian and Russian academic writing and English language academic writing; discourse structures, on the other hand, refer to literacy challenges that exist beyond the text itself and are linked to broader sociocultural and sociohistorical factors that exacerbate the difficulties already present in cross-cultural writing activity. This is particularly true when shifts in larger discursive expectations create a lag between prior knowledge of textual features and newly established expectations in larger discourse structures.

Interview comments from L. revealed how lexical differences were a prominent category for literacy negotiation and centered around types of Englishes required for different writing situations. L. distinguished between types of

Englishes necessary for conversational English and for academic writing. As he noted, “Everyday language and scientific language it is very different part. Essential, in this field, it is of course this special scientific and technical terminology. The most difficult is connected there’s a situation the terminology is change with [from] speak.” As L. laments, difficulties in shifts in specialized Englishes are even further exacerbated because he is writing for two different fields, mathematics and computer science, each of which have their own terminology and journal requirements. Such variations in academic and technical discourse are further alienated from everyday English speech. What might appear from an outsider’s perspective like a single act of moving between Ukrainian and English academic writing is in fact a complex negotiation between language, register, and lexical and terminological expectations, all of which intersect with discipline and journal specific expectations. L. stressed several times that the jargon required is not connected to either the everyday English or the teaching English that dominates his university setting, noting, “it is really problem.”

L. noted two additional complications of his engagement in English academic literacy: The first appears to be sociocultural, while the second relates to how the acceleration of technological innovations correspond to a “rapid change” in specialized terminology and jargon. First, L. lamented how “problem[s] arise when we prepare some documents which contain some administrative or financial part.” He went on to explain that “one of our project[s] was connected with application of artificial intelligence in process of manufacture. Scientific part, we write result. But after that start background, timetable, requirements, milestones, and so on. In our project, it is only in Russian calendar.” The issue here moves beyond lexical differences to include how L.’s project was tied to his sociocultural and historical context. What he might consider rich and useful background knowledge if writing for a Russian or Ukrainian journal and audience became classified as a “problem” when considered in English for an English publication. But, for L., while the complications did affect his work, he intimated, “[T]hat what’s the most difficult are connected to the rapid change of technology. Rapid change. We have no special textbook which help how to find the way in this way.” The reality of accelerating technology means that there is also a necessary accelerated language acquisition that is associated with writing and researching about that technology; this is compounded by L. already having to work with English as an additional language. The “rapid change in technology” places L. in a position where he and others are having to keep up with changing technical language across fields in the midst of sociocultural literacy distinctions while also shuttling between types of English and Ukrainian. L.’s comments, when combined with similar remarks by K., start to point to how such multifaceted and ubiquitous literacy negotiation seemed most prominent for participants who

have worked as professional academic writers and researchers for a period of time both before and after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Interestingly, unlike L., who found specialized discourse more challenging than everyday English and who showed concern over the ever-shifting types of specialized discourses associated with technological change, V. noted his preference for disciplinary language. V.'s principle concerns, on the other hand, centered around terminological and definitional differences and the structure of the articles required for English language publications and those he was accustomed to; such statements were echoed in interviews with K. and G. and are linked, in their explanations, to cultural differences in both academic writing and academic culture more generally. For instance, translation between terms and genre expectations are central to V.'s experience negotiating culturally and linguistically distinct approaches to academic literacy. V. described the different requirements across types of academic writing:

It's not only in the definitions. It's also in the structure of papers, because we construct our papers very shortly. We don't write in detail the methodic of experiment, but in the foreign papers, we need to write the accuracy of experiment, the detailed methodic of experimental part of the working. They have different construction pattern. In some journals, we have so-called templates. It help us to construct a paper. Of course, requirements to pictures, to figures, the requirements are different.

Both K. and G. equated such genre differences, in particular, with more stringent "Western requirements" and with what G. called the "cross cultural communication factor [and] differences in academic culture." While Russian and Ukrainian academic writing are connected to "more freedom concerning requirements" (G.), English academic writing is tied to "tough requirements concerning scientific style and references" (G.). From an academic literacies perspective, technical factors, such as style, references, and formatting, are linked to larger cultural and social institutions. Challenges in moving between types of so-called technical aspects of writing are in fact challenges in moving between culture-specific approaches to writing that have developed historically within quite particular contexts. While interview comments support that view, they also reveal how assumptions about the links between academic literacies and sociocultural contexts are also culturally specific.

This final point, about the ways in which the sociocultural dimensions of literacy come at writers through multiple valences, captures one of the most elusive features of academic literacy negotiation for international, multilingual faculty: writing at the continual, shifting, and at times conflicting intersections of cultural, historical, geopolitical, and linguistic knowledge as it impacts research, writing, and publishing. Lillis and Curry have suggested that geographical and

geopolitical realities are as present in how academic literacies are experienced and negotiated as the more commonly referenced impacts of culture, history, and institutions. Professional academic writing is not only developed through cultural and community use and consensus (replete with frictions to be negotiated when writing as a community outsider) but “local, national, and supranational” (Lillis and Curry, “Interactions with Literacy Brokers” 6) politics and related activity also mediate literacy learning and practice. The following interview response by K. reveals the role of geopolitics when publishing in a global context:

Every time when we write an article to some foreign magazine or some foreign university, we should take into account the cultural difference center, maybe some cultural uniqueness of this part of the city. We’re speaking about United States. Writing applications in the United States, it’s not good to describe government in negative way, negative forms.

Writing, for example, in Estonia, they are keen on electronic government. I would say electronic connections between people and the government, so they’ll like to hear that if the system is very good, it is only one way. It’s in a unique way to make connections between people and government. . . . Every country, every national scientific school has these particular things and we should take that into account.

In this extended comment, K. connected discursive and rhetorical barriers in writing to political cultures across geopolitical regions. The heart of the difficulty, though, in his rendering, was how to diagnose governmental preferences vis-à-vis those countries’ political identities. As a result, K. challenged himself not only to write anticipating Western requirements but also to appeal to government agencies as part of this complex web of academic literacy. His concern with how political centers as audiences will respond to his writing underscores the ways in which the interpretations of geopolitical differences (warranted or not) can become just as fundamental a feature of academic writing as a genre or forum’s lexical or stylistic conventions.

Taken together, the discourse conventions and discourse structures discussed by our participants embed within the paradoxical context discussed in the previous section. As a whole, textual features, discourse structures, and institutional context make up the core of what academic literacy looks and feels like for these multilingual faculty. Critically, though, as we know from literacy studies research, the negotiation of discourse conventions cannot be separated from other contextual factors even if they seem to be challenges functioning in isolation. The previous interview comments revealed participants’ textual negotiations across literacies as well as how those are bound up in larger processes. On the whole, participants’ mentions of struggling with various conventions—lexical, stylistic, rhetorical, formatting, and forum or genre differences—unite

them in patterned social practices. But, as we have been suggesting throughout this article, it is critical to embed these findings within the larger context of a post-Soviet Ukraine, English language context where faculty strive to contribute their expertise to English language journals from a multilingual, non-Anglophone center. Each participant offered a unique vantage into these intersections of practice and policy.

CONFRONTING DISCORD IN ACADEMIC LITERACY AND GLOBAL PUBLISHING

Our analysis details core incongruities in the writing lives of four Ukrainian research faculty and demonstrates the ways in which the gap between policy requirements without structural backing mediate English language academic literacy at the edge of the Anglophone knowledge economy. As we have documented, these findings offer insight into how faculty manage this gap—to varying degrees of success—in their striving for professional recognition and mobility. Critical to these conclusions are the ways in which faculty are additionally caught up within the larger political, economic, and historical transformations specific to academic life and work within Ukraine. While the particularities of the Ukrainian context are imperative for grounding our participants in the realities of policy and practice, we end by extrapolating to broader points. Our case study, while rich in the local policies, language traditions, and geopolitical conditions necessary to give literacy shape and meaning, also provides a particular scope to the larger phenomenon of writing and publishing at the edge of an Anglophone center. Specifically, this study emphasizes (a) how high stakes academic literacy and publishing is both compelled by the presence of rules, regulations, wars, and economic transformations and undermined by the absence of material infrastructure to address those forces; and thus (b) reveals how academic literacy and publishing in this knowledge economy context is characterized, in part, by a seemingly irreconcilable discord between social practices and material forces. Outcomes relevant for writing and literacy scholars are varied, and we expound on them here.

This study takes place within the context of globalization and the expansion of Anglophone and international English language journals as markers of scholarly prestige and as venues for disciplinary and economic mobility. A core characteristic of this historical period is the movement of an English academic journal regime into edge and periphery countries. Notable in our participants' interviews about working and publishing during this expansion are the ways that, despite creative negotiations with academic literacy, it can be difficult to

gain traction in the global publishing game. In the specific cases presented here, participants' professional writing was mediated and constrained by a layered landscape that included generational status vis-à-vis learning to write academically both before and after the fall of the Soviet Union; shifting decisions by the Ukrainian Ministry of Education around research regulations, requirements, and resources for English language publication; the changing status of journals with Scopus and their related impact factors as new journals and new scholarly epicenters (such as Ukraine) enter the arms race of international publishing; and the internal shifts and advancements in scientific and technological fields that bring along with them an ever-changing set of technical and disciplinary jargon that faculty must learn and deploy.

Complications to successful publishing should not be underestimated, and key among them are contributing academic knowledge within a context where literacy requirements are multiple, contradictory, and shifting. As we have chronicled through the analysis of interviews with V., K., L., and G., they write through multiple knowledge economies and their requisite literacy histories. As such, these writers are not only caught between prior and more ascendant forms of literacy but are also writing in the churn of national and supranational interests. For example, participants referenced the European Union, international journal standard and indexes, the former USSR, the Ukraine Ministry of Education, and university-specific workplace guidelines. Critically, these entities must also be understood as operating within contemporary geopolitical struggles that also include Russia, the United States, the status of English as it absorbs the global knowledge economy, and the shifting relations among them. Put simply, literacy is overdetermined.

With an overdetermined literacy wedged among countervailing forces, we observe notions of accumulation and lag from the perspective of globalization (Brandt; Keller). Eileen Lagman, in her study of literacy loss and Filipino migrant workers, has argued that, unlike the writers in Brandt's study, for her participants, "the accumulation of multiple literacies appears impossible if not arbitrary" (34) as her "informants articulated the notion that literacy seemed to fail them or even simply fade away in importance" (32); literacy becomes "liquefied" (32). Unlike Lagman's study, in which such lack and loss dominate, for our participants, accumulation does occur, but with attendant fissures and gaps. Thus, accumulation in our study reveals less about individual literacy loss and more about the layering of compatible and incompatible literacy resources and repertoires over a lifetime as they attain use value or not in the face of shifting expectations from the global knowledge economy. In this way, we conclude by further extending how accumulation and lag function in global and transnational contexts to include the ways that lived literacy is compelled by and binds to regu-

latory misalignments, realignments, and restructurings that come in response to such changing geopolitical desires and volatilities. Resultant literacy lag is characterized by the ongoing and unpredictable cycle of severing and reconciliation between multiple forms of language and literacy practice and a vast range of local, national, and supranational expectations and infrastructures.

Within this globalized publishing context of Ukraine, literacy is dispersed across institutions, economies, regions, and languages. For the writers we interviewed, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to pinpoint an origin of or end from which to initiate learning or to catch up to academic standards even while writers strain to adapt to new and changing literacy demands. Multiple interconnected, yet ideologically and politically distinct actors place demands on writers' time, abilities, and allegiances. Thus, like Brandt's writers, our participants experience the "piling up and extending out of literacy" and are forced to write "amid a material and ideological surplus" (75). Unlike Brandt's writers, our study of Ukraine research faculty captures accumulation at the intersection of manifold forms of economic and social transformations within a globalized knowledge economy. Brandt documented literacy during mid-twentieth century United States industrialization and modernization, with writers moving from rural areas to urban centers within Midwest states. This setting, coupled with her sociological focus, showcased the profound impact that changes to regional economic structures had across multiple generations of writers, especially as these transformations affected whose literacy was useful and valued and why. While we did observe an economic and temporal explanation for the paradox of accumulation and lag (e.g., the historical trajectory in academic literacy pre- and post-Soviet Union), our participants also described divergent temporal and historical trajectories, such as the increasing pull towards Westernization vis-à-vis Europe, the EU, and the Bologna process. Altogether, literacy accumulation and literacy lag occur among and because of these larger, sometimes deviating transformations.

It is important to recognize that more and more multilingual faculty—especially those outside of Anglophone centers—are getting pulled into the potentially untenable situation just elaborated. We say untenable not because multilingual faculty cannot learn new and more creative ways to publish successfully; they have and they do, as our participants' remarks have demonstrated. Rather, we note that despite active pursuit of an academic literacy tied to global publishing indices where English literacy is prime cultural capital, the publishing context for these writers remains unpredictable and volatile. To not keep up affects one's livelihood. Yet, as all of our participants explained, keeping up is often outside of an individual's agency. This raises the question as to whether the most common suggestions for addressing literacy practice and skill are alone

sufficient (e.g., increased coursework in English language academic literacy such as English for Academic Purposes and English for Specific Purposes). Such a singular solution places the burden for writing and publishing success on the writer. While writers might match expectations for a time, it seems likely, given ours and others' findings, that those expectations will inevitably change. As all of our participants described, they are being asked to publish in a highly competitive global environment but without equitable access to the primary materials and resources demanded by that industry. Our participants' experiences show how academic writing is placed into a direct one-to-one relationship between production and pay; when mediated by shifting material infrastructures, alignment between that transaction is elusive at best.

NOTES

1. The data presented in this article is part of a larger, IRB-approved project on multilingual university faculty from Norway, Ukraine, and the United States. This project was supported by a 2017–2018 CCCC research grant for our project, *Academic and Professional Multilingual Literacies in Sociomaterial Contexts: A Multi-Institutional Study in Norway, Ukraine, and the U.S.* In this article, we focus exclusively on four multilingual university faculty from Ukraine to understand how advanced, multilingual faculty shuttle between academic and professional literacies in two or more languages and how these faculty negotiate these variations in changing and high-stakes contexts.

2. In Europe, multilingualism of university faculty stems both from the tradition of open borders and from government policies. The Bologna process was designed to integrate various national European educational systems into a closer-knit network with goal of educational standardization. To learn more about the Bologna process, see “The Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area,” https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/higher-education/bologna-process-and-european-higher-education-area_en.

3. For useful overviews of the 2014 “revolution of dignity” in Ukraine and of its subsequent impact on Ukrainian higher education, including the impact of the Russian annexation of the Crimean peninsula and the Russian-supported separatist insurgency in the Donbas region and the impact of that insurgency on higher education in Ukraine, see: Yuriy Shveda and Joung Ho Park; Anatoly Oleksiyenko and Myroslava Hladchenko.

4. According to the Ukraine's Ministry of Education and Science website, the Ministry's function “is the formation and implementation of the state policy in the field of education and science” (Ukraine MES website), which includes direct and indirect oversight and control. For instance, the Ministry engages in general policy setting and also approves the appointment of university rectors (presidents). Moreover, the Ministry plays a role in mandating—or at least strongly suggesting—an increased attention to publishing in English, with particular attention to WoS- or Scopus-indexed publications as markers of research quality.

5. To learn more about an academic literacies studies framework, see Lea and Street “The ‘Academic Literacies’ Model” and Lea and Street “Student Writing in Higher Education.”

6. We have chosen to anonymize our participants by using the first letter of their first name rather than assign pseudonyms.

WORKS CITED

- Brandt, Deborah. *Literacy in American Lives*. Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2002.
- . “‘Nondiscursive’ Requirements in Academic Publishing, Material Resources of Periphery Scholars, and the Politics of Knowledge Production.” *Written Communication*, vol. 13, no. 4, 1996, pp. 435–72.
- “Government Expenditure on Education, Total (% of GDP) - Ukraine.” *Data*, The World Bank, data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.XPD.TOTL.GD.ZS?end=2017&locations=UA&start=1970&view=chart.
- Grančay, Martin, Jolita Vveinhardt, and Erika Šumilo. “Publish or Perish: How Central and Eastern European Economists Have Dealt with the Ever-Increasing Academic Publishing Requirements 2000–2015.” *Scientometrics*, vol. 111, no. 3, 2017, pp. 1813–37.
- Grytsyk, Nadia. “Implementing European Standards in the ESP Curriculum for Students of Non-linguistic Specialties in Ukrainian Universities.” *Advanced Education*, 2016, pp. 4–8.
- Hladchenko, Myroslava. “Academic Identities in Ukrainian Research Universities Under Conditions of Means-Ends Decoupling at the State Level.” *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2020, pp. 244–57.
- Hladchenko, Myroslava, and Don Westerheijden. “Means-Ends Decoupling and Academic Identities in Ukrainian University after the Revolution of Dignity.” *European Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2018, pp. 152–67.
- Hladchenko, Myroslava, Harry F. de Boer, and Don F. Westerheijden. “Establishing research universities in Ukrainian higher education: the incomplete journey of a structural reform.” *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2016, pp. 111–25.
- Horner, Bruce, Samantha NeChamp, and Christiane Donahue. “Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 63, no. 2, 2011, pp. 269–99.
- Keller, Daniel. *Chasing Literacy: Reading and Writing in an Age of Acceleration*. UP of Colorado, 2013.
- Lagman, Eileen. “Literacy Remains: Loss and Affects in Transnational Literacies.” *College English*, vol. 81, no. 1, 2018, pp. 27–49.
- Lakhtikova, Anastasia. “Understanding Passive Bilingualism in Eastern Ukraine.” *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2017, pp. 144–73.
- Lea, Mary R., and Brian Street. “The ‘Academic Literacies’ Model: Theory and Applications.” *Theory into Practice*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 368–77.
- . “Student Writing in Higher Education: An Academic Literacies Approach.” *Approaching Difficulties in Literacy Development: Assessment, Pedagogy, and Programmes*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2009, p. 260.
- Lillis, Theresa, and Mary Jane Curry. *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. Routledge, 2010.
- . “Professional Academic Writing by Multilingual Scholars: Interactions with Literacy Brokers in the Production of English-Medium Texts.” *Written Communication*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2006, pp. 3–35.
- Miciche, Laura R. “Writing Material.” *College English*, vol. 76, no. 6, 2014, pp. 488–505.
- “Mission, Functions and Strategy.” *Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine*, mon.gov.ua/eng/ministerstvo/pro-ministerstvo/misiya-ta-funkciyi.
- Muchiri, Mary, et al. “Importing Composition: Teaching and Researching Academic Writing beyond North America.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 42, no. 2, 1995, pp. 175–98.

- “National Technical University Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute.” *Times Higher Education*, 4 Feb. 2020, www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/national-technical-university-kharkiv-polytechnic-institute.
- Oleksiyenko, Anatoly. “Higher Education Reforms and Center-Periphery Dilemmas: Ukrainian Universities between Neo-Soviet and Neo-liberal Contestations.” *Globalisation and Higher Education Reforms*. Springer, Cham, 2016, p. 133–48.
- Osipian, Ararat L. “University Autonomy in Ukraine: Higher Education Corruption and the State.” *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, vol. 50, no. 5, 2017, pp. 233–43.
- Prendergast, Catherine. *Buying into English: Language and Investment in the New Capitalist World*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2008.
- “Rankings of the University.” *National Technical University Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute*, www.kpi.kharkov.ua/eng/about-ntu-khpi/rankings-of-the-university/.
- Shevchenko, Valentina. “The Reform of the Higher Education of Ukraine in the Conditions of the Military-Political Crisis.” *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 65, 2019, pp. 237–53.
- Shveda, Yuriy, and Joung Ho Park. “Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity: The Dynamics of Euro-maidan.” *Journal of Eurasian Studies*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2016, pp. 85–91.
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. John Hopkins UP, 1999.
- Stavytsky, Andriy. “Challenges for Higher Education: The Case of Ukraine.” *Sustainable Futures for Higher Education*, edited by Jaan Valsiner, Anastasia Lutsenko, and Alexandra Antoniouk, Springer Cham, 2018, pp. 109–13.
- Tardy, Christine. “The Role of English in Scientific Communication: Lingua Franca or Tyrannosaurus Rex?” *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2004, pp. 247–69.
- Vieira, Kate. *American by Paper: How Documents Matter in Immigrant Literacy*. U of Minnesota P, 2016.
- Zemliansky, Pavel, and Kirk Amant. “The State of Technical Communication in the Former USSR: A Review of Literature.” *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2013, pp. 237–60.

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner.
Further reproduction prohibited without permission.