The limits of translingualism:
In search of complementary
forms of resistance

Anna Kristina Hultgren, Open University
Julia Molinari, Open University

Academic publishing has undergone profound changes in recent years with ever-increasing inequalities between different groups of scholars (Global South vs Global North; Junior vs Established; Male vs Female, etc.). To counter some of this imbalance, recent theoretical developments in Socio- and Applied Linguistics have turned to translingual writing – here understood broadly as communicative innovations aimed at diversifying the academic register and moving away from the sole use of standard English. While recognizing translingual writing as a powerful and important subversion strategy, in this paper, we join others calling for mobilizing sociological theories that pay attention to structure as well as agency. We suggest that despite its many merits, translingual writing is ill-equipped to overturn the wealth, might and power of the current global academic publishing regime, which works inherently to maintain the status quo and to curb creative innovation. We conclude by advocating complementary forms of resistance to challenge and disrupt entrenched systemic inequalities.

Keywords: Academic writing, inequality, translingual writing, structure-agency, resistance

1   Introduction

It has long been recognized that the "publish or perish" culture creates and exacerbates inequalities in global academic publishing (Canagarajah, 2002; Flowerdew & Habibie, 2021; Lillis & Curry, 2010). Participation in global knowledge production correlates strongly with wealth, resources and power, with scholars in the Global North controlling the vast majority of global knowledge production. O'Neil (2018) shows that only 10 countries in the world – some of the wealthiest ones – produce well over half of the world's total academic output (63.3%) with the remaining 221 producing the rest. In other words, the publication of academic output is concentrated in a small minority of rich countries, although

China has recently overtaken the US to become the pre-eminent producer of global research papers (Ware & Mabe, 2015). Concurrently, Socio- and Applied Linguists have taken a particular interest in the extent to which scholars are disadvantaged by having to publish their output in English, a language that is not the first for the vast majority (Corcoran, 2019; Demeter, 2020; Flowerdew & Habibie, 2021).

While translingual writing has been proposed as a strategy to challenge existing power structures and inequities in global academic publishing, this paper joins those who have equally called for mobilizing sociological theories that pay attention to structure in addition to agency (Canagarajah, 2022a, 2022b; Kuteeva, 2022). In line with Kuteeva's call for "changing structures", we argue that translingual writing is more likely to be effective as a resistance strategy if academics simultaneously challenge the power structures and inequalities in global academic publishing that prevent different forms of writing from emerging. Canagarajah too, orienting to both structure and agency (2022a, 2022b), draws on Agha's (2005) notion of 'enregistrement' to argue that translingual agency may face "divergent uptakes" and not necessarily be received or interpreted in the way it was intended, particularly as academic writing often spans vastly across geopolities (2022b).

The contribution of this article is to build on this previous and important work that has acknowledged the duality of structure alongside agency, while also starting to articulate the sociological theories and types of resistance strategies we need to engage with in order to destabilize existing structures. Indeed, as we will argue, on its own, and despite its merits, there are questions around the potential of translingual writing to bring about transformative and sustained change. We therefore propose three additional forms of resistance that target more directly the might, wealth and power of the global publishing industry and academic evaluation regimes. These additional strategies need not come in lieu of other resistance strategies, but we would suggest that they can double their force and bring about change faster and in a more sustained way.

In making this argument, we join calls for Socio- and Applied Linguists to engage with the political economic structures that allow linguistic and other forms of injustice to emerge. It is these structures that are associated with the rise and influence of Global English (see Block, 2018a; Gal, 1989; O'Regan, 2021). To highlight the deeper structural mechanisms of academic publishing and its audit regimes, we foreground the agency-structure concerns of classical sociology and index the extent to which structural constraints curtail the well-intentioned and important emphasis that translingual research places on individual agency and on the right of authors to express themselves multilingually. In the next section, we start out with a theorization of translingual writing.

2 Theorizing translingual writing

Galvanized by the Black Lives Matter movement and inequalities exposed by the Covid pandemic, Socio- and Applied Linguists have recently renewed their calls for social justice and a decolonization of education. Concepts such as translingual and translocal writing have been hailed as promising ways forward of addressing linguistic, social and epistemic injustice in academic knowledge production by diversifying the manners and modes in which knowledge is being produced and disseminated. In this article, we theorize "translingual writing" as having risen

out of the "trans-super-poly-metro movement" (Pennycook, 2016) and other recent challenges in Socio- and Applied Linguistics to the ontological status of "named" languages (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006). In this line of thinking, scholars have drawn attention to language users' recourse to myriads of linguistic and semiotic resources from different known "languages", highlighting and celebrating the communicative agency of speakers. Scholarship on "translanguaging", and other related movements such as "linguistic citizenship" and "decolonialisation", also seek to challenge established ontologies reliant on languages as nameable entities, emphasizing instead grassroot protest against established linguistic and epistemic norms (Canagarajah, 2022a; Makoni et al., 2022; Pennycook & Makoni, 2019; Stroud & Kerfoot, 2020). Languages, in these theories, are not seen as a priori countable entities such as "English", "Xhosa" and "Bangla" but as an assemblage of communicative resources constructed in and through communicative practice. Rampton proposes: "Instead of seeing multilingualism as a plurality of 'named languages', […] we should approach it as a repertoire of styles and linguistic resources, tuned to particular communicative settings and spheres of life" (2019, p. 1). The "trans-super-poly-metro movement" recognizes the "coloniality of language" (Veronelli, 2015) – an understanding of language inherited from the colonial project – and seeks to promote and legitimize not only alternative forms of expression but also other ways of knowing and being, revalorizing ontologies and epistemologies associated with the Global South while challenging and questioning the hegemonies of the Global North (Canagarajah, 2022a; Pennycook & Makoni, 2019; Stroud & Kerfoot, 2020).

However, while the dissolution of boundaries between named language makes sense in sociolinguistic scholarship, which tends to prioritize analytic attention to spontaneous vernacular speech, it is perhaps rather more difficult not to distinguish between different codes in the written medium[1] where norms of correctness and standard language ideologies are codified and, in some respects at least, more heavily regulated and sanctioned. It is these norms, standard language ideologies and boundaries between named languages that Canagarajah (2022a, 2022b) and other scholars can be seen as intentionally playing with for the transformative project of translingual writing to have the desired effects (Kuteeva, 2022). However, challenges to established norms are potentially riskier in writing, particularly in academic writing, than in speech. As noted above, the riskiness comes from the pervasiveness of academic norms and gatekeeping policies and practices as well as politico-economic structures, all of which combine to curtail the agency of translingual writers. Therefore, in the next section, we revisit some of the structure/agency debate before moving on to discussing the strengths and limits of translingual writing as a resistance strategy. In the spirit of being constructive, the second half of the paper is devoted to suggesting three other forms of resistance that could double the force of translingual writing as a transformative project.

---

[1] We are grateful to Maria Kuteeva for this point.

3 Revisiting social structures to theorize linguistic frameworks

Although not a binary, the classical distinction in sociology between structure and agency serves as a useful framework in which to review recent scholarship on translingual writing. The distinction pertains to the extent to which social actors (here academic writers) are free to make their own communicative choices (agency) and the extent to which those choices are shaped by social structures, be it norms, ideologies or material resources (structure). Over the past few decades, Socio- and Applied Linguists have, in line with the social and human sciences more broadly (Cetina et al., 2001), taken a turn to practice, foregrounding language users' agentic communicative practices over structural constraints. As noted earlier, within this turn to practice, the deconstruction of clearly demarcated languages, and their disassociation from particular nation states and colonial projects, is believed to have a liberating and transformative effect on people in marginalized communities.

Some, however, have seen the foregrounding of speakers' communicative agency as obscuring attention to social structures that constrain and limit the transformative potential of linguistic creativity. Salö writes: "In the last few decades, a number of well-positioned scholars have argued that, counterintuitively, the socially interested language sciences are often weakly anchored in social theory" (2018, p. 524). Similar lamentations about weak or implicit reference to social theory in applied linguistics are what have spurred recent emerging attention to social theory in the teaching and scholarship of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). As the editors of and contributors to the series on *Social Theory for English for Academic Purposes* argue: "a sociological imagination or, more precisely, social theory should be a key element of the knowledge-base of EAP practitioners" (Ding & Evans, 2022, p. 1). Academic Literacies, too, distinguishes itself from a more text-oriented approach to EAP, treating reading and writing as social practices that vary with context, culture, and genre (Lea & Street, 2006; Street, 1984)

To address the aversion of explicitly engaging with social theory, many Socio- and Applied Linguists have argued for issues of political economy to be at the forefront of linguistic research in order to understand the structural frames that produce and sustain inequalities (see Block, 2018a; Duchêne & Heller, 2013; Gal, 1989; Holborrow, 2015; Kelly-Holmes & Mautner, 2010; O'Regan, 2021; Park & Wee, 2012). For example, Duchêne (2020) argues that recent sociolinguistic celebrations of multilingualism should "not divert attention away from broader inequalities, especially socioeconomic ones, that multilingualism is unable to address" (2020, p. 91). To Block, a linguistics attuned to the political economy is one that explores "the relationship … between the market and the state" and "understand[s] how social institutions, their activities and capitalism interrelate" (2017, p. 35). This puts neoliberalism, the doctrine that has dominated the world in the past 40 years, at the heart of language analysis (Block, 2018a; Duchêne & Heller, 2013; Holborrow, 2015; Kelly-Holmes & Mautner, 2010; McElhinny, 2015; Park & Wee, 2012). The human geographer David Harvey defines neoliberalism as such:

> Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can be best advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional

framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade (2007, p. 2).

Socio- and Applied Linguists sensitive to neoliberalism and the political economy will study not only the individual agency and creative innovations of minoritized, racialized and otherized language users, but also how the political economy works to constrain and curb this agency.

The agency-structure framework has long been theorised both as an analytic duality (Archer, 2000) – whereby structure and agency are conceptualized separately to give them ontological significance independently of each other – and as being in a mutually constitutive and dynamic relationship. Whether this is captured in Giddens' (1984) idea of structuration, Bourdieu's (1990) ideas of habitus and field, Donati and Archer (2015)'s relational self or Foucault's (2002) Archeology of Knowledge, it is clear that the agency of individuals is both constrained by social structures (whether defined as culture, policies, conventions, ideologies, discourses, norms, or similar) and empowered to change these structures when specific affordances, dispositions, knowledge, abilities and capabilities (Nussbaum, 2011) are available and knowable. In a Foucault-inspired analysis that seeks to bridge agency and structure into a unified analytical framework, Rojo & Del Percio (2019) use the term "neoliberal governmentality" to show how neoliberalism is both exercised by subjects whilst also being at one and the same time structurally reproduced through such agency. Canagarajah, writing specifically about the potential of translingual writing to destabilise existing structures, introduces "scalar theory" in search of bridging the agency-structure duality, arguing that "[m]ore complex perspectives on power might give spaces for multilingual scholars to intervene in strategic ways for changes in academic writing and publishing" (2022a, p. 2-3). About translingual writing, he claims that:

> Such developments also nudge our profession to loosen its insistence on traditional norms of academic writing and attune to new language and rhetorical norms. These creative texts are agentive in initiating changes at the structural level of policies and norms (2022a, p. 19)

Our paper is in fundamental agreement that power structures are changed little by little and that "small small changes make big big differences indeed!" (Canagarajah, 2022a, p. 19). As Brian Street also reminds us, with the metaphor of the 'crack' invoked by Kofi Annan's UN representative in Syria, resistance to the neoliberal practices of universities can be achieved by working on the cracks in the system: "walls have cracks in them and that is what I am going to work on" (Lillis et al., 2015, p. 389). Yet, there is a sense in which such an approach to structural change is insufficient, partly because it relies on the individual happenstance of being in the right place at the right time with the right people to notice and pick away at the cracks - cracks that may even have occurred for reasons other than those we endorse and that motivate us to seek change[2]. And

---

[2] For example, evolutionary changes in the traditional genres of English doctoral dissertation writing, such as practice-based doctorates or PhDs by publication, are,

partly because an individual approach may detract from boldly and collectively creating the structural levers needed to generate the right cracks in the right places for the right people and for the right reasons. As Hultgren (2019) reminds us: "It is only by properly diagnosing the problem that we able are to devise proper solutions. If we misdiagnose, we end up prescribing the wrong medicine".

The next section serves as a reminder of the structural forces we are up against. This paves the way for us to then propose three complementary forms of resistance that can double the force of "chipping away" (Canagarajah, 2022a, p. 20) at current power structures and ingrained inequalities.

4 Language regulation and the limits of translingualism

Any creative innovation of translingual writers faces multiple points of gatekeeping. In contrast to prose and poetry, the gold standard of academic writing remains the double-blind peer-reviewed article in a highly-ranked journal. Writing for this type of outlet is characterized by multiple stages of gatekeeping, both formal and informal. Formally, a journal editor typically makes a decision on whether to send a manuscript out to review, based on an initial screening of its general quality and fit within the scope of the journal. Then, it is sent out to at least one, often two, and sometimes more specialized reviewers who will assess it based on scientific criteria such as originality, rigor and significance as well as established norms of academic writing. This assessment will typically form the basis of a rejection or an acceptance, and, if the latter, some sort of graded classification based on the extent of revisions deemed necessary, after which a final decision on publication is typically made. One is hard pressed to find other genres that undergo as much scrutiny as the genre of academic writing and scientific publishing. These gatekeeping practices, which are the premise of current evaluation regimes and the system of global academic publishing (Hultgren, 2022), work to constrain the agency of academic writers and their scope for engaging in translingual practices.

Contemporary research evaluation regimes are premised on journals being ranked, impact factors being operationalized, and research production being assessed. For this to happen, the system relies on standards, benchmarks and governance structures underpinned by rankable metrics. The academic norms on which such metrices are based are by definition conservative, upheld both by the system itself and by the dominant discourses of a discipline's history. As even Canagarajah and Lee (2013) narrate in their candid revelation of how they came to negotiate and ultimately give up on the publication of Lee's article in *Tesol Quarterly* - of which Canagarajah was the editor - rejection occurred despite the powerful individual agencies involved. Indeed, the editor's own self-declared mission to be "more proactive in accommodating the work of nontraditional researchers" (p. 62) was not enough to ensure Lee's work was published. One of

---

arguably, as much a result of resistance from scholars of research writing and rhetoric as they are of political and economic changes. What this suggests, in the case of the dissertation genre, specifically, is that the traditional 'big book' dissertation format is changing because it has become unfit-for-purpose rather than because of individual resistance. See, *inter alia*, forthcoming work by Paltridge & Starfield (2023).

several explanations for this particular rejection is that, ultimately, the editor had to mitigate risks that might have jeopardized the journal's prestige and rankings, notwithstanding his own agency, namely his scholarly and ethical commitment to encouraging diversity in written academic genres.

Journal prestige is further upheld by one of the most profitable industries in the world, academic publishing, an industry that generates substantial financial turnovers. According to Buranyi (2017), its worldwide sales can reach USD 19 billion, which ranks its profitability in between other lucrative businesses, such as the music and the film industry. In recent years, Elsevier, the world's largest publishing company and the biggest of the "big five" (Elsevier, Black & Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Springer Nature and SAGE), has had a profit margin of 37 percent, which is higher than that of Microsoft, Google and Coca Cola (Buranyi, 2017; Muellerleile, 2020; Ware & Mabe, 2015). The number of journals – still the most coveted of all publication forms – has grown steadily year on year for over two centuries, by about 3% and 3.5% per year respectively, particularly in recent years where the growth has accelerated to 4% per year for articles and over 5% for journals (Johnson, Watkinson, & Mabe, 2018). In the UK, publishers' income from scholarly journals has grown year on year since 2013, with an over £2 billion income in the most recent year for which data is available (2019) (Watson, 2021). The global publishing industry has a vested interest in upholding existing academic norms and standards so as not to devalue their products and compromise profitability.

In recognition of the norms that prevail in academic writing, Solin & Hynninen (2018) introduce the concept of "language regulation" to show how writers, particularly those who don't have English as their first language, have their academic writing practices regulated and intervened in. According to Solin and Hynninen, language in the academic domain is regulated in two important ways: "[l]anguage regulation can target both 'language choice' – which languages can and should be used in which contexts and genres – and 'language quality' – what kind of English language users deem appropriate, acceptable and functional in specific contexts" (2018, p. 2). With regard to "language choice", it is widely recognized that contemporary knowledge production regimes tend to value and encourage writing in English to a greater extent than writing in the author's first language (Canagarajah, 2002; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014). This does not mean that authors are not free to write in languages other than English; simply that there is often pressure to write in English, no matter where in the world a scholar is located. The field of English for Research Publications has amply documented the challenges for non-native writers of English (Politzer-Ahles et al., 2020; Smirnova et al., 2021; Soler, 2021). Smirnova et al. (2021), e.g., show that despite publishing mostly in Russian, Russian scholars in economics, sociology and philosophy are increasingly under pressure to publish their work in English. For Russian scholars, such pressure may have consequences for promotion, bonuses and career progression, as is the case in other contexts. With regard to "language quality", the second component of Solin and Hynninen's "language regulation", it is clear that, as argued above, the most coveted form of academic writing (the double-blind peer-reviewed journal article) undergoes significant scrutiny through the standard peer-review processes. What more precisely "language quality" is, however, is not always clear and may vary considerably (Hynninen & Kuteeva, 2017; McKinley & Rose, 2018), as anyone who

has received contradictory reports from peer reviewers will know. Often the rules are tacit, but nevertheless powerful.

Although diversity and change in academic writing practices are enthusiastically advocated by both writers and their mentors, it is not clear to what extent such diversity is univocally endorsed or sustainable. From South Africa, there have been calls for risk-taking in academic writing as a productive force to subvert a "northern" Anglophone understanding of knowledge and its production and dissemination (Thesen & Cooper, 2013). Writing from the US, Lovejoy (2014), similarly, shows how he encourages his predominantly African American first-year college students enrolled in a writing program in an English department to incorporate their own dialects and voices in their academic writing as a way of making explicit the existence of "a culture of standard language ideology" with the intention that this then be challenged (2014, p. 122). Seloni (2014), also writing from the US, shows how a Colombian art historian's thesis exhibits rhetorical enactments that transcend traditional modalities and languages. While such efforts to diversify the academic register have been demonstrated within the humanities, where the medium of communication makes a particular difference to knowledge construction (Hynninen & Kuteeva, 2020), even in the often assumed-to-be quite standardized genres of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, Negretti & McGrath (2020) show how doctoral students exhibit unconventionalities in their writing, revealing and critiquing their genre awareness and affording them agency in their writing. Adopting a longitudinal perspective, Salö & Hanell (2014) show how Swedish researchers engage with unfamiliar genres by drawing on interdiscursive strategies from previous writing practices, highlighting hybridity across space and time. And Molinari (2021, 2022b), writing in the UK, has proposed a critical realist socio-philosophical framework to explain how and why new genres emerge within established structures. Specifically, she argues that agents – namely writing practitioners and authors – need to become knowledgeable of the affordances (understood as both opportunities and constraints) at the stratified structural levels that allow and prevent ecologies of literacies from emerging. For agents to reach this level of knowledge, structural investment is needed, such as institutional commitments to scholarship and pedagogy (Molinari, 2022b).

However, it might be argued that alternate discourse and writing practices are bound to fail unless dominant publishing policies and norms are changed first. This is because publishing policies are situated in broader geopolitical structures such as colonization and neoliberalism, whereby any attempt at diversification might be resisted or indeed appropriated by such forces for their own profit making and ulterior motivations (Canagarajah, 2022b). Similarly, Heng Hartse & Kubota (2014) have argued that since editing practices are conservative, the efforts of multilingual scholars engaged in diversifying writing are predisposed to fail. Kubota (2016), too, has critiqued any efforts on textual diversity as illusory as they can be appropriated by the dominant ideological and market conditions, leading simply to the selfish gains of diversity proponents rather than resulting in any structural changes that benefit minoritized scholars. Equally, not all proponents of textual diversity are motivated by imperatives that oppose market ideologies. For example, several academic writers simply enjoy exploring different forms of writing and do find suitable and welcoming publishers to showcase their work (e.g. Phillips & Kara, 2021). Other progressive scholars also caution against promoting linguistic and discoursal changes without policy and structural

changes (see also Flores, 2013; Block, 2018b). However, if writers' attempts at overturning unequal power structures are predisposed to fail, what other prospects might there be for a more equitable era of global academic publishing? This is what we explore in the next section.

5 Towards complementary forms of resistance

In this section, we propose three, more structural, resistance strategies that academics might usefully adopt alongside what we broadly refer to as "translingual writing" in this paper. Though they overlap, we discuss them here in turn. We advocate resistance via slow and selective scholarship; by rethinking or bypassing research evaluation regimes; and by shifting the academic emphasis from writing to reading.

5.1 Slow and selective scholarship

One resistance strategy would simply be to be more selective in what and how much one chooses to publish. Inspiration can be sought in the slowness movement, which originated in the food domain in protest against the conveyor-belt nature of fast food consumption. Within the context of academia, Maggie Berg & Barbara K. Seeber (2017), in their book *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy*, draw attention to the corporatization and frantic pace of contemporary academia. Highlighting the psychological strains of the academic culture of speed, the authors' protest focuses on alleviating stress while improving teaching, research, and collegiality, reminding us that an organization can only ever be as healthy as the sum of its parts. It should be a given that quantity does not equal quality; however, the contemporary pressure to publish can lead us to lose sight of this. Contemporary research evaluation regimes are premised on organizational and individual performance enhancement, priming academics to produce more, run faster, and work harder. With levels of psychological distress among academics reportedly higher than those of front-line police and staff in hospital accident units, there are some serious questions to raise about academics' mental well-being in the contemporary pressurized academic environment (Grove, 2018). While some may regard "slow science" as "tenured privilege', a luxury unavailable to those in the start of their career, established academics, having less to lose, might usefully take a lead in role modelling a more "slow science" for their younger colleagues. Of course, this approach could probably not be taken to the extreme as most would agree that academics do have a responsibility to share knowledge with others – their students, wider society and the academic community. However, given how much output is actually produced, and a seeming consensus among academics that it is next to impossible to keep up with the literature, it may not be unreasonable to wish for opening up some serious discussions around the purpose, role, value and meaning of research and knowledge production.

One thing that is worth bearing in mind is that much of what is published is partly written for purposes other than or in addition to sharing knowledge for the good of others. The system of global academic publishing, which incentivizes academics to write, is premised on profit chasing, and sustained and perpetuated by research evaluation regimes and scientometric and bibliometric governance

tools. Hagve (2020) argues that a key reason why publishing companies are able to generate such considerable profit is that they get researchers to work for them for free. Contrasting the academic publishing process with that of a traditional newspaper, whose profits tends to be in the 10-15% range (Buranyi, 2017), Hagve argues that where a "newspaper incurs wage costs for its journalists, editors and graphic artists, as well as expenses for research, fact-checking, printing and distribution", for academic articles "the production of content is paid for by research funds, both the salaries of the researchers and the substantial costs involved in understanding research" (2020, p. np). In other words, where the scholar works within a publicly funded academic institution, tax payers pay the salary for scholarly writers rather than the businesses that profit from the labor. Hagve adds that most editors also work for symbolic pay and that fact-checking and quality control is done through the peer review process, which is also unpaid and voluntary work. Not only do the publishing companies benefit from this free labor, subsequently, they charge research institutions extortionate sums for subscribing to their journals, institutions that have already paid indirectly for the outputs through the salaries of their academic employees. This free-riding off academics' workloads whilst afterwards charging the institutions for accessing the work they themselves have produced has been described as "double appropriating" (Beverungen et al., 2012). As Muellerleile puts it: "First, [the publishers] claim intellectual (copy)rights over knowledge they have played almost no role in producing, and second, they sell this knowledge back to universities at inflated prices" (2020, p. 133). Despite seeking to avoid some of these pitfalls by publishing her monograph Open Access, one of the authors of this paper (Julia) still faced hidden costs and documented her experiences in a blog post (Molinari (2022a). Might there be ways in which slow and selective scholarship could make us more reflective about what we write, for whom we write and with what purpose?

The other author of this paper, Kristina, was asked to write a 4,000-4,500-word encyclopedia entry in her field of expertise for a large publisher. In return, she was offered three months' free online access to the works, after which she would have to pay to access it. Bemused by this offer, she posted it on her Facebook page and asked colleagues and friends to comment on its reasonableness. Comments from some of these individuals, all of whom have chosen not to be anonymous, are reproduced below. One prominent linguist, who she considers to be her lifelong mentor, said:

> no I would not be happy with three months' access. Any situation where you are going to have to pay to see your own published writing (assuming you did not get paid a fee for it in the first place) is unconscionable. Maybe if we all refused to contribute on those terms, the terms would have to change (Deborah Cameron)

Another said:

> I would ask for a fee. They are profiting from your labour!
> (Maria Leedham)

It hadn't occurred to Kristina that she could ask for a fee; she did, nevertheless, ask if, rather than or in addition to having online access, she could have a physical

copy of the book. However, to this day, it remains unclear if the copious nature of the encyclopedic work meant that a physical copy was ever intended:

> depends how it's being published, I guess. I've got a piece in an encyclopaedia with no print edition - just a digital subscription - so there wouldn't have been a 'copy' for them to give me (and, given the number of contributors, if they gave a free subscription to every contributor's employer, there would be very few universities left to sell subscriptions to). ON THE OTHER HAND, they paid their contributors actual money...
> (Daniel Allington)

The same person made a point about "ref-ability", i.e. the extent to which it is possible for an author to claim the item as part of their REF profile, which could then be used for career advancement:

> Yeah. An encyclopaedia entry is not REFable so I think it's reasonable to expect *some* sort of payment, even if it's basically peanuts.
> (Daniel Allington)

One friend offered some hope by posting:

> I have read about increasingly more people backing out of writing commitments that are not fair on the authors. I agree that we should all attempt to resist such unfair terms.
> (Elizabeth Erling)

Bolstered that the feeling of being exploited was not unreasonable, Kristina got back to the publisher asking for lifetime online access. This, too, was rejected and the original terms and conditions restated. After a few weeks' standoff, the publisher eventually got back, offering two years free online access to the work, an offer Kristina turned down. Julia, for her part, engages in similar acts of resistance by favoring publishing book chapters and a monograph to journal articles because of the more collegiate, constructive and direct relationship with editors and publishers. Whilst this ultimately still benefits commercial publishers because of the academic free labor involved, it arguably goes some way towards creating the conditions for establishing that "scalar orientation" towards negotiating norms, argued in both Kuteeva (2022) and Canagarajah (2022a), that can create the conditions for agents to engage in dialogue with publishers, editors and reviewers. In should be recognized, however, that just as translingual writing resistance strategies are not options for everyone, such acts of publishing resistance may not be available to some early-career researchers who are dependent on the gold-standard double-blind peer-reviewed article for appointment and tenure.

The business model in the example of the encyclopedia and most other academic publishing is based on academics producing work at no cost to the publisher, and then counting on them making a case to their institution's librarian to purchase a subscription to the works, unless this is already part of a bundle deal between the publisher and the library. At least we, as authors, get paid through the salary from our institution, but the real losers are arguably the (often public sector) institutions that pay twice – once for our salary as we write the

work and again when they purchase the institutional subscription to the work. The private sector publisher, on the other hand, pays nothing in this model, beyond production and overhead costs. Indeed, publishers also rely on the authors they don't pay to promote their publications via social media, institutional email signatures, book launches paid for and hosted by the authors' academic institutions and at conferences, where the authors work hard to also present, and promote, the research published.

   This shows the workings of the "double appropriating" referred to above (Beverungen et al., 2012; see also Allington et al., 2019) by which institutions are charged twice. Moreover, it also shows how private actors usurp and undermine public sector institutions, in this case higher education institutions. The intensified privatization of higher education and research is a key theme in the higher education literature, reflected in concepts such as the "academic capitalism" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), "marketized university" (Molesworth et al., 2010), and "the triple helix" (Etzkowitz & Zhou, 2017). It is clear that there has been a shift in "research and knowledge from something previously valued according to political, cultural, or disciplinary standards into something that is largely monetary in nature" (Muellerleile, 2020, p. 138).

   In addition to being more selective in what we write, there is also reason to reconsider reviewing practices. Given the exponential increase in journals and articles, reviewers, including ourselves, increasingly find themselves having to turn down requests to review. Hyland notes that:

> Reviewing is done without reward or credit, and so time for it suffers as universities demand more teaching, more admin, more outreach, more research and more everything else. Given these competing pressures, many academics feel that the compensation offered for reviewing, such as journal acknowledgments, positions on editorial boards, free journal access, etc. is just not worth it (2020, p. 54).

Although we both consider reviewing an essential service to the profession, driven, like many other academics, by a "sense of obligation and commitment" (Starfield & Paltridge, 2019, p. 257), we would, unless we turned down review offers, end up reviewing significantly more than what we publish, probably on a ratio of 5 to 1. Both of us are increasingly finding ourselves having to turn down requests to review on the grounds of non-existing time. In the knowledge that reviewing is often a free service to the profit-driving publishing industry, we have both become more scrupulous and unabashed in our declinations to review. We would simply not be able to think, read or support our students and/or junior colleagues if we had to deal with the writing of others all the time. Typically, reviewers spend five hours per review (Johnson, Watkinson, & Mabe, 2018). Judging by our own experiences, it is questionable if this amount of time is sufficient to be able to provide an in-depth review in which the underlying research and the conclusions drawn are properly scrutinized. In order to offer a high-quality review, we find ourselves needing to read a manuscript several times. Bearing in mind that reviewing constitutes a small fraction of the multiple tasks academics are expected to juggle in a highly time-compressed workload of teaching, research and administration, there are also serious questions to be raised

about the extent to which peer review actually serves as a reliable and effective certifier of knowledge:

> An assembly line of papers is not conducive to careful evaluation and serious reflection over the myriad issues that arise from any research project. Stopping to think is something we do less and less, but something either we or our readers (in our stead) need to do more and more, especially with publications coming out faster and often conclusions inviting logical leaps (Anderson, 2014).

While refusing to review may make journal editors' already difficult job finding reviewers even more difficult, we are tempted to advocate collective resistance strategies that could prompt or force journals to overhaul the current system. If reviewers can't be found, then perhaps that might slow down the production line, perturb the system and ultimately alleviate the pressure on academics. This might also prompt some publishers to rethink the current model of free labor in journal reviewing. Reward mechanisms similar to those typically used for reviewing book manuscripts and book proposals as well as paying journal reviewers for their services may foster a culture of slower and more selective scholarship. Such resistance strategies may also go some way towards dismantling the very evaluation regimes that prevent diverse voices from emerging.

5.2 Rethink or bypass research evaluation regimes

How should or could evaluation regimes be resisted or even abolished, with so many stakeholders invested in shaping, upholding and perpetuating them? The publishing industry relies on them for profits, governments for audits, universities for funding, and academics themselves for career progression, despite the harms that they also bring. Although writing and resisting in other contexts and for other reasons, Audre Lorde's (2018) admonishment that 'the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house' forcefully resonates because it serves as a reminder that structural change occurs by rethinking or bypassing the structures themselves: the criticism that evaluation regimes can lead to corner-cutting and manipulation of data while hindering the development of important knowledge that does not get published in mainstream journals (Chavarro et al., 2017) should galvanise our collective resistance to unjust practices.

In keeping with such resistance, several academics are guided more by a mantra of "go public or perish" than by one to "publish or perish" (Leavy, 2019b). Crucially, Leavy (2019a) urges academic writers to think about the way they produce and consume academic knowledge through public scholarship by reminding us of the 'shapes' knowledge both embodies and creates: "The word "shape" speaks to the form of our work but also the way that the form shapes the content and how that content is received by audiences" (p. 702), echoing well-established research in writing studies that writing shapes and is shaped by the knowledge it deals with (Bazerman, 1988, 2015).

Similarly, some prominent Socio- and Applied Linguists are beginning to bypass commercial outlets, disseminating their work through other channels, e.g., blogs, twitter, videos and other forms of digital publishing. Suresh Canagarajah's *Consortium for democratizing academic publishing and knowledge* (Sites at Penn State,

2022), Ingrid Piller and Kimie Takahashi's *Language on the Move* (Language on the Move, 2022) and Jan Blommaert's *Diggit Magazine* (Diggit Magazine, 2022) are all examples of community-driven platforms offering academic news to a global audience without a paywall. The open access Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, edited by Ben Rampton and colleagues, is another excellent online resource offering cutting-edge insights into "linguistic practice, literacies and mediated communication in diverse and stratified settings" (Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, 2022, np) while Deborah Cameron's blog (language: a feminist guide, 2022) and accompanying tweets (https://twitter.com/wordspinster) educate the general public on how sexism is ingrained in everyday language practices. These and many other examples are forms of "knowledge activism" that promote wider knowledge dissemination and education of society. To many less established scholars and early career researchers, however, who are dependent on the system to get a job, secure tenure, attract research grants and advance on the career ladder, a complete bypass of the established and coveted academic publication channels is rarely an option as it could jeopardize their livelihood. Finding alternative outlets to publish remains a privilege afforded to those who have already made it, usually thanks to the very tools they now wish to abolish.

Another resistance strategy is for tenured academics to collectively use their privileged positions to challenge research evaluation regimes. For example, at a recent UK institutional Research Evaluation Framework (REF) event to encourage research staff to publish, Julia asked the facilitator to explain and expand on what academic outputs are recognized in the 7-yearly academic audit cycle that universities in the UK depend on for government funding and what rationales underpin favoring some outputs at the expense of others. She was surprised to hear that any output (or genre) counts, as long as it meets the criteria of 'significance, rigor and originality'. By default and ease of compliance, these criteria have become conflated with the criteria for articles published in high-ranking journals (which, as we have seen, have arrogated their positions in ways that are attributable to financial, not only academic, credentials) yet other outputs can meet these criteria. Academics could exploit this knowledge by not single-mindedly pursuing the most coveted peer-reviewed journals for their writings, but explore alternative outlets as well. These could include research reports, case studies, methodologies, etc., that are made available Open Access on institutional databases or via university presses. It is also worth reminding ourselves that the existence of research evaluation regimes is not written in stone but a relatively recent phenomenon that has emerged out of the governance by numbers and audit culture (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Regimes are situated in particular times and spaces and they include the disproportionate value we place on the written product over and above the process of reading and thinking. The existence of such regimes is not a given that we need to resign ourselves to.

5.3 Shift the academic emphasis from Writing to Reading

We have yet to meet an academic who has not told us of their struggles to keep up with the academic literature in their field. This is because: "[t]he time spent reading and priming one's mind is always as long, if not longer, as the period spent hammering out the words on the keyboard" (Back, 2014, p. 57). Elsewhere, Les Back offers a salutary reminder of the intellectual value of reading each other,

which could be extended to include the intellectual value of peer-review practices (Back, 2016, p. 64):

> More than any other measure, the value of what writers do, even academic ones, is to provide companionship for further thought. Writing here is less an achievement that is measured extrinsically than an invitation to imagine beyond its own terms of reference. Books and essays here befriend and encourage thinking with interlocutors that remain […] anonymous. This value cannot be audited or cheapened through the mechanisms that aim to judge, measure and distribute repute and ultimately money.

While it is difficult to get reliable counts on how much published material is actually read (it depends, among other things, on the level and depth of reading), citations seem to be our common calculable indicator. It has been said that 90% of journal articles never get cited (Meho, 2007) although the figure has been disputed and is highly field-dependent. What seems clear is that there is an ever-increasing gap between the amount of academic material that is produced and that which is consumed. In 2018, there were about 33,100 active scholarly peer-reviewed English-language journals, plus a further 9,400 non-English-language journals, collectively publishing over 3 million articles a year (Johnson et al., 2018). The global scientific output is doubling every nine years and both articles and journals have grown steadily year on year for over two centuries by about 3% and 3.5% per year respectively, particularly in recent years where the growth has accelerated to 4% per year for articles and over 5% for journals (Johnson et al., 2018). New journals arise constantly, with every more niche areas covered, much to the chagrin of researchers who favor big questions and interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge construction and dissemination. As Hyland, who has himself proliferated as a published and widely cited academic writer, notes:

> There is now a bewildering proliferation of journals as publishers step up their search to fill every conceivable disciplinary sub-niche to bursting. At the last count, for instance, there were 61,500 dentistry journals listed in Pubmed (National Library of Medicine, 2019) and over 900 in language and linguistics (SJR, 2021). (Hyland, 2022, p. 3).

Whilst the explosion of scientific knowledge production is driven by a number of factors, including an increase in research and development expenditure, a rise in the number of researchers and a rapid growth in outputs from emerging economies (Johnson et al., 2018), it clearly also testifies to the profitability of the industry as does the emergence of more shady endeavors such as predatory journals and parasite publishers. Perhaps it would not be a disaster if the pace of knowledge production slowed down and if the driving force for publishing was intrinsic – motivated by a sense of having something important to say – rather than extrinsic, such as ever-lurking pressures from research evaluation regimes.

Another suggested way to encourage a shift from writing to reading is to revive and revalue the art and genre of the book review because, as Beer (2021) highlights in a recent blog post,: "The problem we have today is that book reviews have, largely, become a much more marginal and perhaps underappreciated activity. Rather than being at the center of disciplines, they are seen to be something of a luxury: an indulgent misuse of time spent reading, cover to cover, and then

writing something that does not have any measurable value". Yet, book reviews are essential to how we engage with knowledge in our fields and beyond. When done well, they signal deep engagement with the thinking of others and provide insights into how we value each other's contributions to knowledge.

6 Conclusion

Translingualism has been proposed as a way forward for challenging existing power structures and inequalities in global academic publishing, especially those that foment a culture of 'publish or perish'. Certainly, this movement has made tremendous strides in legitimizing, rendering visible and upgrading the regard for alternative language practices, particularly those of minoritized and otherized scholars. While such subversion activities are indispensable for "chipping away" (Canagarajah, 2022a, p. 20) at current power structures, we have indicated three strategies that could serve to double their force. These were to be more selective about what, where and how often we publish, including withdrawing our labor from the review process when this is inadequately recognized; challenging the evaluation regimes that favor the publication of some kinds of knowledge at the expense of others; and valuing the art and craft of reading to off-set the disproportionate value we place on writing to publish.

By foregrounding the profit-chasing nature of the global publishing industry and its mutually constitutive relationship with contemporary research evaluation regimes, we have argued that some existing resistance strategies are potentially insufficient to achieve the changes many of us would like to see. This is because they tend to focus on individual and textual innovations that risk obscuring the deeper systemic and structural imbalances created by the current system of global academic publishing. This system inevitably dictates the mode, content and pace for everyone else, making the system inordinately difficult to disrupt and overturn. Certainly, translingual writing practices may go some way towards challenging such existing power imbalances but they are unlikely to shake the core of the system and its inbuilt inequities, at least for a foreseeable future.

We conclude with a rallying cry for complementing translingual writing resistance strategies and practices with some or all of the three main strategies we have here proposed. Our explicit intention has been to complicate the structure-agency continuum by locating some of the most incisive levers of change. Our resistance strategies are clearly not the only possible structural challenges and we encourage others to suggest more, but they are ones that attempt to dismantle the deeper mechanisms that prevent multilingual writers from publishing their research in ways that matter. By recognizing that it is structural change that is needed, we might begin to locate where, when and how each strategy is likely to be most effective and, in doing so, move further towards a more equitable, sustainable and meaningful way of sharing knowledge.

Disclosure statement

The author declared no conflict of interest.

References

Agha, A. (2005). Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1), 38–59. https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2005.15.1.38

Allington, D., Brewer, D.A., Colclough, S., Echard, S., & Lesser, Z. (2019). *The book in Britain: A historical introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Anderson, K. (2014). Slow and Steady — Taking the Time to Think in the Age of Rapid Publishing Cycles. The Scholarly Kitchen. https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2014/11/13/taking-the-time-to-think-in-the-age-of-rapid-publishing-cycles/

Archer, M. (2000). *Being human: the problem of agency*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511488733

Back, L. (2014). Writing as a movement of imagination, reading as companionship in thought. In C. Smart, J. Hockey, & A. James (Eds.), *The craft of knowledge: Experiences of living with data* (pp. 56–73). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137287342_4

Back, L. (2016). *Academic diary: or why higher education still matters*. Goldsmits Press.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge : the genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C. (2015). Afterword: Social Changes in Science Communication: Rattling the Information Chain. In A. G. Gross and J. Ruehl (Eds.), *Science and the Internet: Communicating Knowledge in a Digital Age (pp.* 267-281). Amityville, United States, Baywood Publishing Company Inc. http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/SCIC13Beer, D. (2021, April 7, 2016). In defence of writing book reviews: Reviewing allows us to put collective knowledge ahead of individualised contributions, says David Beer. *The Times Higher Education*. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/defence-writing-book-reviews

Berg, M. & Seeber, B. (2017). *Slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. University of Toronto Press.

Beverungen, A., Böhm, S., & Land, C. (2012). The poverty of journal publishing. *Organization*, 19(6), 929–938. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508412448858

Block, D. (2017). Political economy in applied linguistics research. *Language Teaching,* 50(1), 32–64. https://doi:10.1017/S0261444816000288

Block, D. (2018a). *Political economy and sociolinguistics: Neoliberalism, inequality and social class*. Bloomsbury.

Block, D. (2018b). The political economy of language education research (or the lack thereof): Nancy Fraser and the case of translanguaging. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 15(4), 237–257, https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2018.1466300

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford University Press.

Buranyi, S. (2017). Is the staggeringly profitable business of scientific publishing bad for science? *The Guardian* 27.6.2017. https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/jun/27/profitable-business-scientific-publishing-bad-for-science Accessed 25.2.2020.

Canagarajah, S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5hjn6c

Canagarajah, S. (2022a). Language diversity in academic writing: toward decolonizing scholarly publishing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2022.2063873

Canagarajah, S. (2022b). Challenges in decolonizing linguistics: the politics of enregisterment and the divergent uptakes of translingualism. *Educational Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1515/eduling-2021-0005

Canagarajah, S., & Lee, E. (2013). Negotiating alternative discourses in academic writing and publishing: Risks with hybridity. In L. Thesen & L. Cooper (Eds.), *Risk in academic writing: postgraduate students, their teachers and the making of knowledge* (pp. 59–99). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783091065-007

Cetina, K. K, Theodore, R. & von Savigny Schatzki, E. (2001). *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203977453

Chavarro, D., Tang, P., & Rafols, I. (2017). *Why researchers publish in non-mainstream journals: Training, knowledge Bridging and Gap-Filling* (Research Policy, Issue. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3014349

Corcoran, J. (2019). Addressing the "Bias Gap": A research-driven argument for critical support of plurilingual scientists' research writing. *Written Communication*, 36(4), 538–577. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088319861648

Demeter, M. (2020). *Academic knowledge production and the Global South: Questioning inequality and under-representation*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Diggit Magazine (2022). https://www.diggitmagazine.com/

Ding, A., & Evans, M. (Eds.). (2022). *Social theory for English for Academic Purposes: Foundations and perspectives* (1st ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Donati, P., & Archer, M. (2015). *The relational subject*. Cambridge University Press. https:// DOI: 10.1080/14767430.2016.1166728

Duchêne, A. (2000). Multilingualism: An insufficient answer to sociolinguistic inequalities. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2020(263), 91-97.

Duchêne, A. & Heller, M. (Eds). (2013). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. Routledge.

Etzkowitz, H. & Zhou, C. (2017). *The triple helix: University–industry–government innovation and entrepreneurship*. Routledge.

Flores, N. (2013). The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: a cautionary tale. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 500–520. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.114

Flowerdew, J. & Habibie, P. (2021). *Introducing English for research publication purposes*. Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2002). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Routledge.

Gal, S. (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 345–367. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2155896

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Polity Press.

Grove, J. (2018). Half of UK academics 'suffer stress-linked mental health problems'. *Times Higher Education Supplement*.

Hagve, M. (2020). The money behind academic publishing. https://tidsskriftet.no/en/2020/08/kronikk/money-behind-academic-publishing#ref4

Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Heng Hartse, J., & Kubota, R. (2014). Pluralizing English? Variation in high-stakes academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 24, 71–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.04.001

Holborrow, M. (2015). *Language and neoliberalism*. Routledge.

Hultgren, A. K. (2019). English as the language for academic publication: On equity, disadvantage and "non-nativeness" as a red herring. *Publications*, 7, 31. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7020031

Hultgren, A. K. (2022). Certifying knowledge under neoliberalism: Global inequality and academic wellbeing. In P. Habibie & A. K. Hultgren (Eds.), *The inner world of gatekeeping in scholarly publication,* (pp. 163–182). Palgrave Macmillan.

Hyland, K. (2022). Preface: Gatekeepers or facilitators? In P. Habibie & A. K. Hultgren (Eds.), *The inner world of gatekeeping in scholarly publication,* (pp. 1–7). Palgrave Macmillan.

Hynninen, N. & Kuteeva, M. (2017). "Good" and "acceptable" English in L2 research writing: Ideals and realities in history and computer science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 30, 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.10.009

Hynninen, N. & Kuteeva, M. (2020). Researchers' language practices concerning knowledge production and dissemination: Discourses of mono- and multilingualism. In M. Kuteeva, K. Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Language perceptions and practices at multilingual universities*, (pp. 323–350). Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, R., Watkinson, A., & Mabe, M. (2018). *The STM report. An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing, fifth edition*. STM: International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers. https://www.stm-assoc.org/2018_10_04_STM_Report_2018.pdf

Kelly-Holmes, H. & Mautner, G. (Eds.) (2010). *Language and the market. Language and globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Kubota, R. (2016). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics,* 37, 474–494. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu045

Kuteeva, M. (2022). Negotiating space for multilingualism in English-medium writing: authors, reviewers, editors. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 17(2), 129–137, https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2022.2092118

Kuteeva, M., & Mauranen, A. (Eds.). (2014). Writing for publication in multilingual contexts: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jeap.2013.11.002

language: a feminist guide (2022). https://debuk.wordpress.com

Language on the Move (2022). https://www.languageonthemove.com

Lea, M. R. & Street, B. V. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications, *Theory Into Practice*, 45:4, 368-377, https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4504_11

Leavy, P. (2019a). A brief statement on the future of public scholarship and the research methods landscape. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Methods for Public Scholarship* (pp. 0). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190274481.013.19

Leavy, P. (Ed.). (2019b). *The Oxford handbook of methods for public scholarship*. Oxford University Press.

Lillis, T. & Curry, M.-J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context*. Routledge.

Lillis, T., Harrington, K., Lea, M. R., & Mitchell, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Working with academic literacies: Case studies towards transformative practices*. The WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor Press. http://wac.colostate.edu/books/lillis/

Lorde, A. (2018). *The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house*. Penguin classics.

Lovejoy K. B. (2014). Code-meshing and culturally relevant pedagogy for college writing instruction. In V. A. Young, R. Barrett, Y. Young-Rivera et al. (Eds.), *Other people's English, code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy*, (pp. 119–152). Teachers College.

Makoni, S., Severo, C. G., Abdelhay, A. and Kaiper-Marquez, A. (Eds.). (2022). *The languaging of higher education in the Global South: De-colonizing the language of scholarship and pedagogy*. Routledge.

Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2006). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Multilingual Matters.

McElhinny, B. (2015). Language and Political Economy. In N. Bonvillain (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Anthropology*. Routledge Handbooks Online.

McKinley, J. & Rose, H. (2018). Conceptualizations of language errors, standards, norms and nativeness in English for research publication purposes: An analysis of journal

submission guidelines. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 42, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.07.003

Meho, L. (2007). The rise and rise of citation analysis. *Physics World,* 20 (1), 32. https://DOI 10.1088/2058-7058/20/1/33

Molesworth, M., Scullion, R. & Nixon, E. (2010). *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203842829

Molinari, J. (2021). Re-imagining doctoral writings as emergent open systems. In C. Badenhorst, B. Amell, & J. Burford (Eds.), *Re-imagining doctoral writing* (pp. 49–69). University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2021.1343.2.02

Molinari, J. (2022a, 15/06/2022). Having your cake and eating it: Towards a just and diverse ecology of academic writings. *Consortium for Democratizing Academic Publishing and Knowledge.* https://sites.psu.edu/publishing/blog/having-your-cake-and-eating-it-towards-a-just-and-diverse-ecology-of-academic-writings/

Molinari, J. (2022b). *What makes writing academic: Rethinking theory for practice*. Bloomsbury. http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350243958

Muellerleile, C. (2020). Open access panacea: Scarcity, abundance, and enclosure in the new economy of academic knowledge production. In Tyfield, D., Lave, R., Randalls, S., & Thorpe, C. (Eds). *The Routledge handbook of the political economy of science* (pp. 132–155). Routledge. oai:cronfa.swan.ac.uk:cronfa28111

Negretti, R & McGrath, L. (2020). English for specific playfulness? How doctoral students in science, technology, engineering and mathematics manipulate genre. *English for Specific Purposes*, 60, 26–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.04.004

Nussbaum, M. C. (2013). *Creating capabilities: the human development approach*. Harvard University Press and Belknap Press

O'Neil, D. (2018). English as the lingua franca of international publishing. *World Englishes*, 37, 146–165 https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12293

O'Regan, J. P. (2021). *Global English and political economy*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749334

Park, J. S.-Y. & Wee, L. (2012). *Markets of English linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203120323

Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (2023). *Change and stability in thesis and dissertation writing: The evolution of an academic genre*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Pennycook, A. (2016). Mobile times, mobile terms: The trans-super-poly-metro movement. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates*, (pp. 201–216). Cambridge University Press. https://doi:10.1017/CBO9781107449787.010

Pennycook, A. & Makoni, S. (2019). *Innovations and challenges in applied linguistics from the Global South*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429489396

Phillips, R. & Kara, H. (Eds.). (2021). *Creative writing for social research: A practical guide.* Policy Press. https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447355991

Politzer-Ahles, S., Girolamo, T., & Ghali, S. (2020). Preliminary evidence of linguistic bias in academic reviewing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 47, 100895. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100895

Rampton, B. (2019). What do we mean by multilingual? Linguistic Reportoires. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 260. https://wpull.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WP260_Rampton_2019_What_do_we_mean_by_mu.pdf

Rojo, L. M. & Del Percio, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Language and neoliberal governmentality*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429286711

Salö, L. (2018). Thinking about language with Bourdieu: Pointers for social theory in the language sciences. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 12(3-4), 523–543. doi: 10.1558/sols.32916

Salö, L. & Hanell, L. (2014). Performance of unprecedented genres. Interdiscursivity in the writing practices of a Swedish researcher. *Language & Communication,* 37, 12–28. https://doi:10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2014.04.001

Seloni L. (2014). "I'm an artist and a scholar who is trying to find a middle point": a textographic analysis of a Colombian art historian's thesis writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 79–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.06.001

Sites at Penn State (2022). *Consortium for democratizing academic publishing and knowledge*. https://sites.psu.edu/publishing/

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smirnova, N., Lillis, T. & Hultgren, A. K. (2021). English and/or Russian medium publications? A case study exploring academic research writing in contemporary Russian academia. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 53, September 2021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101015

Soler, J. (2021). Linguistic injustice in academic publishing in English: Limitations and ways forward in the debate. *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*, 2(2), 160–171. https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.21002.sol

Solin, A. & Hynninen, N. (2018). Regulating the language of research writing: Disciplinary and institutional mechanisms. *Language and Education*, 32(6), 494–510 https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1511727

Starfield, S. & Paltridge, B. (2019). Journal editors: Gatekeepers or custodians? In P. Habibie & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Novice writers and scholarly publication: Authors, mentors, gatekeepers* (pp. 253–270). Palgrave Macmillan http;://doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-95333-5_14

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Stroud, C. & Kerfoot, C. (2020). Decolonising higher education: Multilingualism, linguistic citizenship & epistemic justice. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies,* 265.

Thesen, L. & Cooper, L. (Eds.). (2013). *Risk in academic writing: Postgraduate students, their teachers and the making of knowledge*. Multilingual Matters.

Veronelli, G. A. (2015). The coloniality of language: Race, expressivity, power, and the darker side of modernity. *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies*, 13, 108–134. https://wagadu.org/archive/race-immigration-reform-and-heteropatriarchal-masculinity/

Ware, M. & Mabe, M. (2015). The STM Report An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing, fourth edition. STM: International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers. https://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf

Watson, A. (2021). *Publisher income from learned journals in the United Kingdom (UK) 2013-2019*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/307021/publisher-income-from-learned-journals-by-source-in-the-uk/

Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies (2022). https://wpull.org/