

Introduction to the thematic issue: participating in academic publishing—consequences of linguistic policies and practices

Mary Jane Curry · Theresa Lillis

Received: 15 April 2013 / Accepted: 25 April 2013 / Published online: 30 April 2013
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

The rise of English as the presumed global medium of scholarly publishing has resulted in both obvious and less obvious consequences for individual scholars, journals, institutions of higher education and knowledge production more broadly (Lillis and Curry 2010). A body of research emerging in the past 10 to 15 years has explored these consequences mainly in terms of how individual multilingual scholars working outside of Anglophone contexts respond to the growing pressure to publish in high-status, English-medium journals. Researchers have used qualitative/ethnographic methodologies (e.g., Canagarajah 2002; Curry and Lillis 2004, 2010; Flowerdew 2000; Flowerdew and Li 2009; Lillis and Curry 2006; Lillis 2008) as well as quantitative/survey and bibliometric methodologies (e.g., Hanauer and Englander 2011; Olsson and Sheridan 2012; Tjissen 2007) to investigate and document scholars' experiences. Key findings index the tensions between scholars' desires and commitments to publish in multiple languages, their often-restricted access to the material resources needed to conduct and distribute their research, the limitations of language and writing support that translators and editors—when available—can provide, and the potential biases of journal reviewers and editors against research and writing coming from outside the Anglophone 'centre'. Much less examined has been the role of national, transnational and institutional (language) policies in exerting and extending the pressure for scholars worldwide to publish in high status English-medium journals (but see Lillis and Curry 2010).

M. J. Curry (✉)

Department of Teaching, Curriculum, and Change Margaret Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester, 474 LeChase Hall, P.O. Box 270427, Rochester, NY 14627, USA
e-mail: mjcurry@warner.rochester.edu

T. Lillis

Faculty of Education and Language Studies, Centre for Language and Communication, The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK
e-mail: theresa.lillis@open.ac.uk

Yet against the backdrop of increased competition for research funding and universities' drive to attract globally mobile students, which currently characterize 'globalised' higher education, it is increasingly important to examine both the codified and uncoded policies about research output that regulate the work of multilingual scholars. Publishing certain types of research in certain types of outlets has come to be seen as a key measure of research productivity and quality, not only of individual scholars, but also academic departments and universities and institutions of higher education listed in worldwide rankings (Lillis and Curry 2013). Embedded in the range of policies that include and measure publications activity are linguistic policies, whether these policies are implicit or explicit (Shohamy 2006). This thematic issue addresses the consequences of such policies for individual scholars, the local research activity they are involved in, and the production and distribution of knowledge in academic journals globally.

The historical trend by which English has been replacing Latin, German and French as successive dominant languages of scholarship broadly (Crystal 1997), has been exacerbated by the rise of journal and citation indexes produced by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), now part of Thomson Reuters. Despite the existence of other indexes both within and outside of Anglophone-centre contexts (see Lillis and Curry, Chapter 1), ISI's Science Citation Index, Social Science Citation Index and Arts and Humanities Citation Index comprise a powerful set of arbiters of supposed journal 'quality'. Additionally, the growing use in evaluation and rewards systems of the impact factor, calculated officially from the journals included in ISI indexes (Garfield 1972), has reinforced the prestige of the Thomson Reuters indexes to the point of hegemony. Because one core criterion for journals to be included in the ISI indexes is that journal contents use at least some English, the linguistic medium of English becomes implicitly if not explicitly embedded in journal publication evaluation policies. Indeed, around the world governments and institutions of higher education and research are increasingly including publication in the journals comprising these indexes, particularly those with impact factors, in their policies for hiring, tenuring, and promoting scholars as well as for awarding salary raises and research grants (Lillis and Curry, 2010). Further, in many geopolitical contexts, the total publishing activity of scholars, for example, within a department or institution, is tracked for the purpose of determining how monies, including bonuses and research funds, will be allocated. Therefore, the stakes are high for individual scholars as well their departments and institutions, yet it is by no means clear that policymakers are cognizant of the resources needed to achieve the types of publishing that their policies call for, what the consequences of these policies might be, or what are the views of scholars, journal editors and academic leaders on these policies and related practices.

To explore these phenomena, the four articles included in this issue examine how policies at local, national and transnational levels are enacting and enforcing the high status of English-medium publishing and the impact of such policies on scholars, journal editors and the production of research and institutional practices in key geolinguistic contexts: South Korea, Mexico, Turkey, western Europe and China. To do so, the articles draw on a number of theoretical frameworks (discussed below) and research methodologies, from content analysis of policy documents to

analysis of publications output to interviews with scholars and journal editors in order to investigate how contemporary policies related to scholarly journal publishing are being enacted and what their effects are.

Overview of articles in this issue

The issue opens with Hikyoung Lee and Kathy Lee's analysis of how neoliberal ideology is playing out in publishing policies in a prominent South Korean university, focusing on its effects on the role of English—how learning and using English are contextualized in a neo-liberal ideology in the face of shifting market forces and a changing economy. One manifestation of these policies is monetary bonuses offered to South Korean scholars for English-medium publishing. Lee and Lee demonstrate how this commodification of scholarly publishing supports the neo-liberal ideology of self-improvement. The second article, by Karen Englander and Sedef Uzuner-Smith, uses the notion of 'figured worlds' (Holland et al. 1998) to examine how scholars located in the global 'periphery' are construed in policy documents of a powerful supra-national organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Taking the cases of Mexico and Turkey, which are classified as 'lower-middle-income' by the World Bank, the authors examine the discourses in a 2009 OECD report on higher education and globalization that promotes an ideology of knowledge as commodity as being key to the economic development of such countries. Next, Haiyeng Feng, Gulbahar Beckett and Dawang Huang present an overview of 30 years of publishing policies in China. They examine the recent shift in internationalization policy in China evident in its 'going-out' policy—from export- to import-export-oriented internationalization—and the impact of this shift on scholarly publishing activity. This change from earlier 'accommodationist' policies that put pressure on scholars and graduate students to publish in highly ranked English-medium journals is now matched by a parallel pressure to ensure that Chinese knowledge is made available globally, leading to complex decisions and challenges being faced by Chinese scholars. In the final article, Laurie Anderson takes as her topic the publishing activity of a cohort of young, highly mobile scholars participating in the Max Weber Programme (MWP) in Florence, Italy. Anderson focuses on how, against a backdrop of espoused multilingualism in the European Union, English is often naturalized as the academic language *primus inter pares*. Although some scholars in the MWP prefer to, and manage to, work in other languages, Anderson's study emphasises how the imperative for the use of English as the medium of scholarly exchange is felt in the European context.

Taken together, these articles document and explore a range of policies and practices related to the production and distribution of knowledge on a global scale, through the lens of individuals' and institutions' responses to policy pressures. Even as these studies illuminate the fast-paced changes taking place in publication policies and the practices emerging in response, they confirm that policies imposed by institutions and government often create demands whose implications may not be immediately evident to policymakers. Indeed, the continual raising of evaluation

standards for scholarly journal publication—from publishing in ‘international’ or ‘foreign’ journals to publishing ‘in English’ to publishing ‘in indexed journals’ to publishing in ISI-indexed journals has a number of important consequences (Lillis and Curry 2010). Locally and globally, the pressure to publish in particular journals that value certain types of research problems, methodologies, and theoretical stances contributes to what has been called an ‘academic monoculture’ (Mingers and Wilcott 2010). To meet these thresholds, multilingual scholars are increasingly seeking out and devoting considerable resources to an enterprise that may not advance their personal goals for knowledge production and distribution in their local contexts or more broadly. In the local context, publishing policies that privilege high status English-medium publishing can have negative effects on local languages as used in education and the development of their academic registers (see chapters in Ammon 2001). Effects on research culture more broadly include the contouring of research activity toward what is valued by Anglophone-center countries, resulting in less research being disseminated locally for the benefit of local society (Lillis and Curry 2010). As policies across multiple scales continue to change, it is clear that more studies on the effects of publications policies will be needed. The aim of this special issue is to begin this effort through explorations of these effects in a range of geolinguistic contexts.

A note on language of communication in this thematic issue: In responding to our call for proposals, interested multilingual scholars asked whether we could accept articles in languages other than English. Unfortunately, the publisher was not willing to include these.

References

- Ammon, U. (Ed.). (2001). *The dominance of English as a language of science: Effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 663–688.
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2010). Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(4), 281–295.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 127–150.
- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 1–16.
- Garfield, E. (1972). Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation. *Science*, 178, 471–479.
- Hanauer, D., & Englander, K. (2011). Quantifying the burden of writing research articles in a second language: Data from Mexican scientists. *Written Communication*, 28, 403–416.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lillis, T. (2008). Ethnography as method, methodology, and “deep theorizing”: Closing the gap between text and context in academic writing research. *Written Communication*, 25(3), 353–388.
- Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication*, 23(1), 3–35.

- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
- Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2013). English, scientific publishing and participation in the global knowledge economy. In E. Erling & P. Sargeant (Eds.), *English and international development* (pp. 220–242). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mingers, J., & Wilcott, H. (2010). *Moulding the one-dimensional academic: The performative effects of journal ranking lists*. Kent Business School Working Papers Series, Paper No. 239. ISSN 1748-7595.
- Olsson, A., & Sheridan, V. (2012). A case study of Swedish scholars' experiences with and perceptions of use of English in academic publishing. *Written Communication*, 29, 33–54.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Tjissen, R. J. W. (2007). Africa's contribution to the worldwide research literature: New analytical perspectives, trends, and performance indicators. *Scientometrics*, 71(2), 303–327.