Editorial

Welcome to the spring 2024 issue of *Ibérica*. We start by celebrating the inclusion of our journal in the best quartile (Q1) of Scimago Ranking for Linguistics and Language. This fantastic achievement would not have been possible without the valuable contributions by our authors, reviewers, International Advisory Board and Editorial Board members. A big thank you and *kudos* to all those who have made it possible! This ranking of *Ibérica* is a clear recognition of the high quality and impact of its published research, as well as its broad international scope and outreach.

The contributions for this issue have been authored by researchers based across different continents, such as Asia, Europe, and North America, and include several research collaborations. The contributors for Issue 47 are affiliated with universities in mainland China, Hong Kong, Japan, Montenegro, Poland, Spain, the UK, and the US. The issue contains 1 forum article, 12 research articles and 4 book reviews which cover different areas of LSP research. The range of topics and innovative proposals included in this issue attests to ongoing developments in the field of LSP in the age of fast technological development and intersections with theoretical and methodological perspectives from other related fields.

Back in 2022, we launched the “Forum” section in order to provide space for critical reflections on our research field and to explore new research directions. This section turned out to be an important venue to discuss timely issues and to raise concerns about state-of-the art in LSP. In her contribution to Issue 47, Hilary Nesi asks: Are we witnessing the death of dictionaries? This question is relevant both within and beyond the field of LSP, as digital technologies, and in particular Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, impact the behaviours of language users, including LSP teachers and learners. As AI-powered tools seem to have disrupted the traditional link between corpora and lexicography, Nesi voices two concerns: 1) that LLMs may skew language learners’ vocabulary choices and writing styles, making their language uses closer to the type of texts that are overrepresented on the internet (e.g. journalism); and 2) that AI applications provide quick solutions to language problems but do not explain the reasoning behind these solutions. Will the growing amount of
AI-generated text with its skewed lexical choices eventually affect LSP registers? As technology gains agency in shaping our language uses, Nesi argues, it is important for LSP practitioners to focus on critical evaluation and awareness raising among all kinds of learners, regardless of whether they use traditional dictionary entries, AI tools, or a mixture of both.

The two guest articles address the concern raised in Anna Mauranen’s (2022) forum contribution to our volume 44: Where is spoken interaction in LSP? Suresh Canagarajah and Eric Friginal approach this topic from very different methodological perspectives. In his article “Communication for Specific Purposes as Translingual”, Suresh Canagarajah argues that we need to go beyond language in our analyses of workplace interaction and to consider the interplay between human and non-human agents with regard to the use of various semiotic resources. To illustrate his theoretical argument, Canagarajah zooms in on the genre of Research Group Meetings (Swales, 2004) to analyse a piece of interaction by international STEM scholars working at a midwestern American university. His in-depth interactional analysis shows that, despite their variable grammatical proficiency in English, these scholars communicate effectively because they draw from a diversified translingual assemblage and collaborate for joint outcomes adopting reciprocal communicative strategies. Canagarajah concludes with a pedagogical proposal to focus on cultivating the dispositions to negotiate translingual repertoires, material ecologies, and social networks for more inclusive outcomes in communication for specific purposes. This guest contribution raises numerous questions about underlying assumptions in LSP and lives up to the author’s reputation as a mover and shaker in applied linguistics.

Eric Friginal’s article approaches professional talk from a corpus-analytical perspective and proposes a corpus-based framework that can be applied by future studies. Although corpus linguistics has informed LSP research for decades (e.g. Hyland & Jiang, 2021), most studies have focused on written discourse. Friginal’s research, on the other hand, engages with real-world, recorded, and transcribed spoken communication in the workplace. After outlining the theoretical underpinnings of his approach and its inspiration in broader corpus linguistics, Friginal examines telephone/telephony-mediated interactions by both English L1 and L2 speakers working in call centres and in aviation. For example, he shows how the use of politeness markers varies between US, Indian, and Filipino pilots, and how American English speakers are less likely to use these markers compared to their counterparts from
South Asia. Finally, Friginal discusses current limitations and challenges in corpus-based research of spoken professional interaction (particularly with regard to data collection) and possibilities of using generative AI application to facilitate this kind of research. He concludes with a call for action, showing how his research findings can inform language policy, training and assessment in LSP.

The following three articles adopt corpus-based approaches to study workplace communication, popular science and academic discourse. Detong Xia, Matt Kessler, Yudi Chen, and Hye Pae zoom in on phrase frames – recurring multi-word sequences with a variable slot – in workplace email communication. Their focus is on work-related requests. Next, Jordan Batchelor examines stance expressions in science news articles and questions whose stance such texts are meant to convey. In the following paper, Javier Pérez-Guerra, Elizaveta Smirnova and Elena Kostareva address the popular topic of disciplinary discourse. Their study focuses on expressing cause and effect in the hard and soft disciplines.

Next, we include two studies related to LSP pedagogy. Qing Xie examines individual differences and non-English-majors’ engagement in business English language classrooms in the Chinese university context. Hassan Nejadghanbar, Guangwei Hu and Matin Mohammadi explore language-related critical incidents reported by ESP teachers in Iran.

Research on vocabulary has long been of interest to LSP. This issue includes three studies that deal with related topics, such as lexical profiling, lexical density, and lexical complexity in both spoken and written discourse. Milica Vuković-Stamatović and Dragana Čarapić measure vocabulary profile, lexical density and speech rate in science podcasts and discuss how adequate these podcasts are for EAP and ESP listening. Drawing on a corpus-based approach, Irene Castellano-Risko focuses on lexical coverage in academic seminars in an EMI context. Ana Cristina Lahuerta Martínez links lexical and syntactic complexity in connection to the quality of academic writing.

The last two articles in this issue engage with socio-cultural dimensions of academic writing in English outside the anglophone world. Iga Maria Lehman, Adam Bednarek, and Łukasz Sułkowski examine the role of reader-inclusive authorial voice in the process of academic socialization of Management and English Philology students in Poland. Tomoyuki Kawase analyses culture-specific features and their acceptability with a focus on coherence features in published research articles by Japanese authors.
The issue finishes with four reviews of recently published titles, including two research-based edited volumes, a research monograph, and a textbook: *Genre in English Medical Writing, 1500-1820*, ed. by Taavitsainen and colleagues; *Reflexively Speaking: Metadiscourse in English as a Lingua Franca*, by Anna Mauranen; *Data and Methods in Corpus Linguistics: Comparative Approaches*, edited by Ole Schützler and Julia Schlüter; and *Español académico como LE/L2. Destrezas, competencias y movilidad universitaria*, by Susana Pastor Cesteros. The inclusion of an historical perspective on LSP, as well as a book on academic Spanish, are noteworthy.

We conclude by thanking the AELFE Board and the President of AELFE, Jesús García-Laborda, for their continued support of the journal. We also express our gratitude to the Editorial and International Advisory Boards who have helped to build up the reputation of *Ibérica*. As always, our heartfelt thanks go to our reviewers. Without your competence and dedication, *Ibérica* would not be where it is today. The articles included in this issue have benefited greatly from our reviewers’ insightful and constructive comments. They are listed here in alphabetical order of their first names: Adrienn Károly, Aintzane Doiz, Ana Bocanegra, Ana María Fernández Vallejo, Geert Jacobs, Gibson Ferguson, Hanne Roothooft, Joanna Zou, Juan Carlos Palmer, Laurence De Backer, Łukasz Grabowski, Magdalena Szczyrbak, María de los Ángeles Orts Llopis, Marilia Torres, Martín Aoiz Pinillos, Miguel A. Vela Tafalla, Miguel Fernández, Philip Montgomery, Philippe Millot, Pilar Mur, Rosa Lorés, Rosana Villares, Sanghee Park, Sara Hillman, Shirley Thomas, Stefania Consonni, Stefania Maci, and Turo Hiltunen. We are also grateful to the members of our Editorial Team, particularly Digital Content Manager Edgar Bernad Mechó and Book Reviews Editor Jesús García Laborda for their collaboration. We would particularly like to thank editorial assistants Edurne Garde and Pilar Gerns, and editorial coordinator Damoso Izquierdo, for their valuable contributions to producing this issue and for their dedication to the journal.
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