

ther information on trends in specific European and Asian countries, is available at [www.gmac.com/researchreports](http://www.gmac.com/researchreports). ■

## The Dominance of English in Global Scholarly Publishing

MARY JANE CURRY AND THERESA LILLIS

*Mary Jane Curry is assistant professor of education at the Warner Graduate School of Education, University of Rochester. Address: PO Box 270425, Dewey Hall, Rochester, NY 14627, USA. E-mail: [mjcurry@warner.rochester.edu](mailto:mjcurry@warner.rochester.edu). Theresa Lillis is senior lecturer in language and communication in the Centre for Language and Communications at the Open University, UK. For more information on their project see [www.paw.open.ac.uk](http://www.paw.open.ac.uk).*

In an era characterized by globalization, the enterprise of academic research would ideally capitalize on contributions from scholars all over the world. Yet language barriers can present a considerable obstacle to the global circulation of research findings. The dominance of English as the language of scholarly publishing means that scholars around the world are under increasing pressure to publish their research in English. This situation is problematic in two important ways. First, scholars outside of English-dominant contexts face issues of equity in their access to publishing venues, particularly high-status English-medium research journals. While such scholars experience increasing pressure to publish in English (as a major criterion for promotion and research grants), they often have uneven access to the means to do so, including monies for conference travel and research collaboration, library and other resources, and time to write in English. Second, even as multilingual scholars' material conditions may hinder their English publishing, the global research community suffers from not receiving their research findings, insights, and methodologies. The result may be the emergence of what Polish scholar Anna Duszak calls an "academic monoculture."

### THE CHALLENGES OF PUBLISHING IN ENGLISH

Since 2001 we have been conducting a study of some 50 scholars in southern and eastern Europe to understand the effects of the dominance of English on global academic knowledge production. Multilingual scholars attempting to publish in

English face a number of challenges, the least of which may be their technical competence in English. Typically, publishing in English entails more than direct translation of academic writing. Rather, a key to scholars' success in publishing is their interactions with "literacy brokers"—gatekeepers such as journal editors and peer reviewers as well as disciplinary and language specialists who may help at various points in the trajectory of writing and publishing research articles.

Gaining access to literacy brokers can be difficult but may happen through participation in local, regional, and international scholarly research networks, whether formal or informal. The most useful types of "brokers" appear to be disciplinary specialists who are attuned to the key research questions, current discussions, and debates of the field and methodologies preferred by linguistic "center"-based journals. However, the interventions of some brokers may result in pressure on multilingual academics to skew their writing to achieve publication by matching the preferences of center-based journals. Our research provides evidence of the relegation of periphery scholars to roles in which they consume and confirm center-based research but are not allowed access to platforms from which to contribute different perspectives and findings.

### THE GLOBAL POLITICS OF LANGUAGE

The global dominance of English in scholarly publishing has implications for international higher education along two main lines: (1) for gatekeepers of scholarly publication and participation in international academic conferences to understand the challenges that multilingual scholars confront; and (2) for national governmental and institutional policymaking bodies to consider the effects of the premium placed on English-medium journal publishing.

First, in terms of the gatekeeping activities of journals and

*The dominance of English as the language of scholarly publishing means that scholars around the world are under increasing pressure to publish their research in English.*

conferences, it is important for journal reviewers and editors, conference organizers, and proposal reviewers from the English-dominant center to understand the burdens of time, money, and access to research that may hinder multilingual scholars from disseminating their work in English. These constraints may be reflected in submissions that do not reference the most up-to-date literature from English-medium journals, or use nonstandard features of English. The topics and questions that periphery scholars engage with may also not be perceived as "relevant" to current center academic debates because what counts as relevant is often determined by Anglophone center scholars and institutions. Anglophone con-

texts are often more valued as objects and sites of research than research coming from periphery areas. To respond to the growing institutional and governmental pressures to publish in English-medium outlets, multilingual scholars writing from the periphery may need support in the form of bibliographic resources and guidance on shaping manuscripts to meet the conventions of particular journals. Scholars from the periphery may also need support in finding ways to collaborate with scholars in center contexts. At the same time, center gatekeepers should examine the preferences given to particular research contexts, topics, and questions.

Second, English-medium publications increasingly function as criteria for a range of institutional evaluations of individual scholars, their departments, their institutions, and research grant awards. While using English-medium publications as a marker of quality may offer policymakers the sense of creating uniform standards, such policies may not take into account the challenges facing scholars. Such policy innovations are not always accompanied by the resources needed to support scholars in attaining these goals. Discussions of English-language dominance therefore need to be placed on policy agendas for international higher education.

As the academic sphere becomes increasingly globalized,

*Anglophone contexts are often more valued as objects and sites of research than research coming from periphery areas.*

the question of linguistic imperialism and the premium of English in scholarly publishing needs to become a topic of discussion at international and national governmental and institutional levels. These discussions should include raising awareness of how native English speakers or those working in Anglophone contexts are highly advantaged in the global academic marketplace compared with multilingual scholars writing from the periphery. Questions about the effects that privileging English may have on the evolution of local languages, particularly the development of academic registers, and on local research cultures should also be explored further. While the dominance of English as an academic lingua franca is unlikely to shift in the near future, consideration can be given to ways to renegotiate the conditions under which global knowledge is produced and disseminated. Under globalization, the multidirectional circulation of knowledge from academic research has greater potential for benefit than does a unidirectional flow outward from Anglophone countries. ■

## Mobilizing Marginalized Talent: The International Fellowships Program

JÜRGEN ENDERS

*Jürgen Enders is professor at and director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands. Address: CHEPS, University of Twente, POB 217, 7500 AE Enschede, Netherlands. E-mail: j.enders.utwente.nl.*

In November 2000, the Ford Foundation and the International Institute of Education created the International Fellowships Program (IFP) to provide graduate fellowships for individuals from 22 countries in the “Global South.” This 12-year, \$280 million program is the largest initiative in the foundation’s history and has recently been extended by another 2 years and \$75 million in supplementary funds. IFP gives talented students from excluded or marginalized backgrounds the opportunity for advanced study in universities at home and abroad. In 2002, CHEPS was asked to implement an evaluation of the program regarding its implementation and development.

### A DIFFERENT APPROACH

IFP supports mobile scholarships of up to three years of postgraduate study at accredited universities anywhere in the world in a variety of academic fields so that students may choose where and what to study. Fellowships are reserved for talented individuals from the South lacking systematic access to higher education for reasons such as poverty, geographical isolation, ethnicity, race, or gender. The program defines its target group of undergraduates based on their leadership potential, commitment to the development of their countries or communities, as well as academic performance and potential. The fellows, through their further training and scholarly work, are expected to contribute to academic fields relevant to the economy and social justice and to take a leadership role in these areas in their own countries and worldwide.

An innovative and challenging approach has been chosen for IPF: finding and attracting bright students from marginalized backgrounds in the South for international graduate work who want to make a difference in their societies.

### CHEPS FINDINGS

Surveys and interviews by CHEPS show that the IFP has so far been successful in the implementation and development of the program. IFP has received nearly 100,000 applications in the competitions of 2001–2005. In addition to fulfilling unmet demand and potential among excluded communities and groups, IFP attracts and mobilizes interest in regions ranging from the Anambra State in Southeastern Nigeria, to the Mixtec