Academic Publishing in Global Englishes: Standards, Challenges, and Opportunities

Jason Barry

St Anne's College

Dissertation submitted to the Department of Education, University of Oxford, in partial fulfilment for the degree of

Master of Science in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching

Trinity Term 2023

Abstract

Given the increasingly important status of English as a medium for academic publication around the world, applied linguists and researchers in related fields have raised concerns that some English-speaking scholars (e.g., non-native speakers or those living and working outside of the academic center) might be at a disadvantage or face discrimination when pursuing academic publication. In this concurrent mixed methods study, 32 currently publishing academics responded to a 50-item questionnaire which sought to gather information regarding the perceived challenges and effort required to publish academic work in English and about whether and to what extent discrimination in academic publishing exists against those who are non-native English speakers or who live and work outside of the academic center. The quantitative findings from a descriptive statistical analysis of eight independent variable constructs and five dependent variable constructs are reported and discussed, and qualitative data is used to further analyze and interpret the results alongside the literature.

The findings suggest that there are significant differences in the perceptions regarding preparation for success in publishing between native-English speaking academics and non-native English speakers; additionally, scholars with lower English proficiency-levels perceive that they are less prepared to succeed in publishing than those with higher proficiency levels. Respondents also raised concerns about bias against non-native English speakers and maintained that journal editors should be more lenient towards non-native speakers. Additionally, findings suggest that English proficiency had a moderately predictive effect on perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing, and those working outside of North America or Europe reported having higher perceptions of difficulties with the review process than scholars working in North America or Europe. Finally, respondents working at teaching-intensive or technical institutions reported higher perceptions of having difficulties with the review process than those working at research-intensive institutions. After thoroughly discussing the implications of these findings, suggestions for ways that journal gatekeepers, TESOL professionals, and "literacy brokers" might help to create a more

just and equitable publishing environment are offered. After noting important limitations in the study, recommendations for further empirical research on the topic of injustice and discrimination in academic English-language publishing are provided.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Heath Rose, for his detailed feedback on the chapters of this dissertation and for his good advice throughout. A special thanks, as well, to the excellent tutors and administrative staff on the MSc in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching course and to my fellow graduate students in the Department of Education. I am grateful for the rich intellectual discussion and exchange over the last two years, and for the opportunity to think critically with my peers about many of the most pressing theoretical and pedagogical issues in applied linguistics today. Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Dr. Lydia Barry, and my parents Aileen and John Barry, for their love and support.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Appendices

1. Introduction

1.1. Rationale

The spread of English around the world is widely recognized, and the number of English users has increased rapidly over the last few decades (Crystal, 2003; Rose & Galloway, 2019). At present, there are more non-native speakers of English than native speakers (Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2002). As a result of this sociolinguistic development, English is now used as a lingua franca in a range of countries and is spoken in different ways around the world (Rose & Galloway, 2019). In addition to the general increase of English as an international language, English has also been instantiated as the central—and most prestigious—medium of publication in peer-reviewed academic journals and scholarly monographs. Indeed, the majority of the world's most influential academic journals are published in English and the majority of the world's published articles are produced in Western nations, with the United States producing most of the research (Ammon, 2012; Flowerdew, 2015; Hyland, 2016; Paasi, 2005). Additionally, English is increasingly being used as the medium of instruction in higher education intuitions around the world, including in contexts where it has long been a second or foreign language — e.g., in China, Germany, South Korea, and the United Arab Emirates (Galloway & Rose, 2015; Richards & Pun, 2022; Rose & McKinley, 2018). Globalization, and a general marketization of the academy, have further solidified the central role of English in higher education institutions; many of the world's top-ranking universities are English medium instruction (EMI) intuitions and publications in English frequently carry more institutional weight than articles or books published in other languages (Ammon, 2012; Flowerdew, 2015; Lillis & Curry, 2006; and Paasi, 2005). Scholars in most disciplines and in most countries, therefore, have an increasing need to publish their academic work in English (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2008).

Given the rise of English internationally and the important role it plays in both academic instruction and research, scholars in applied linguistics and related fields have raised

concerns that some English users—e.g., non-native speakers and those working on the periphery of the academy—might be at a disadvantage when compared to native English-speaking scholars or those who work in the academic center. Researchers have suggested that academics who use non-standard varieties of English (i.e., varieties other than British or American English) or who conduct research in institutions that are geographically isolated from the academic center may be at a disadvantage (or may face discrimination, injustice, or bias) when writing and submitting their work for publication (Ammon, 2012; Canagarajah, 1996; Flowerdew, 2008; Kourilova, 1996; Li, 2002; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Maniati & Jalilifar, 2018; Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020). Non-native English-speaking scholars, some researchers posit, might take longer than native speakers to write their articles, have less vocabulary to draw on, and might struggle more when articulating and defending their conclusions (Flowerdew, 1999; Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020); additionally, editors might be less likely to accept research that is written in non-standard varieties of English or that contains grammatical or stylistic mistakes (Bocanegra-Valle, 2014; Canagarajah, 1996; Uzuner, 2008). Academics working outside of the academic center might also be unaware of (or unable to access) state-of-the-art research and may face technical or logistical difficulties when submitting their manuscripts for publication; they may also have to work multiple jobs, might not be able to afford submission fees or editorial services, and may have difficulty finding a community of native English-speaking peers who can offer assistance in preparing a manuscript for publication or helping to interpret comments received from gatekeepers (Canagarajah, 1996; Lillis & Curry, 2006; Maniati & Jalilifar, 2018; Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020). Additionally, educators who work at teaching-intensive or technical institutions might face greater challenges publishing their work than their colleagues who have lighter teaching loads at research institutions (Hesli & Lee, 2011; Graves et al., 1982; Griffith & Altinay, 2020). More troubling yet, perhaps, is that academics working in countries deemed to be pariah states (e.g, Iran), may have to work around international sanctions or legal restrictions when submitting their work to journals (Maniati & Jalilifar, 2018; Mozafari, 2016; Riazi, 2009).

Despite these concerns, however, not all researchers agree that disadvantage and discrimination play an important role in academic publishing. Hyland (2016), for example,

has argued that empirical evidence does not support the view that non-native English-speaking scholars face discrimination from journal editors or referees, nor that non-native English speakers face greater hurdles than their native-English speaking counterparts generally. Yet even if Hyland is correct in his assertion, other scholars (e.g., Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016) maintain that researchers should not hastily conclude that injustice does not exist, but rather, should conduct further empirical research investigating the issue. In light of the importance of English internationally and the pivotal role that English-language publishing plays not only for individual academics and their careers, but also for the global exchange of ideas and information, it is important to have a better understanding about whether discrimination exists against those who are non-native English speakers or who live and work outside of the academic center. It is equally vital, I believe, to investigate whether these scholars are at a systematic disadvantage when writing and submitting their work for publication. If it is the case that discrimination and injustice are widespread, I maintain—along with critical researchers such as Ammon (2012), Clouet (2017), Flowerdew (2008), Ramirez-Castaneda (2020), Swales (2004), and others—that more should be done to make the academic publishing landscape in English a more equitable and welcoming space. The rationale for this dissertation, therefore, is to investigate whether and to what extent scholars who are non-native English speakers, or who live and work outside of the academic center, perceive disadvantage, bias, and injustice in academic English-language publishing.

1.2. Research Questions

R1. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the academic mainstream, perceive that they are less prepared for success in academic English-language publishing than their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

R2. Do non-native English-speaking scholars perceive higher levels of linguistic bias in academic publishing than their native English-speaking counterparts?

R3. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the academic mainstream, perceive they are at a systematic disadvantage when trying to publish their

academic work in English when compared to their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

R4. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the academic mainstream, perceive that they face more difficulties with the review process than their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

R5. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the mainstream, perceive that they have access to fewer resources than their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

1.3. Outline

In Chapter 2, I review the literature pertinent to the issue of academic publishing in English and the perceived disadvantages involved for those who are not native speakers of English or who live and work on the periphery of the academy. This chapter investigates the changing sociolinguistic status of English as an international language and the role of English for Research Publication Purposes. Additionally, I discuss the theoretical literature regarding advantage, disadvantage, and injustice in academic English publishing and the empirical literature on scholar perceptions regarding the existence of bias, disadvantage, and injustice in the publishing process; the role that gatekeepers—e.g., editors, reviewers, and publishers—play in determining publishing outcomes is also addressed. Finally, I discuss the motivation for the dissertation and provide reasons why I believe this research may help to ameliorate some important gaps in the literature.

In Chapter 3, I present the research methodology of the study and I discuss and justify the research design that I've employed. Additionally, I describe the data collection instruments that were developed for my research, along with the participants and setting. Finally, I describe the procedure I used to conduct the research and the ethical guidelines that have been followed in this work.

In Chapter 4, I present the findings from the quantitative questionnaire data. The results from a descriptive statistical analysis of eight independent variable constructs (i.e., native speaker status, English proficiency, frequency of English use in the scholar's country, location of academic institution, academic institution type, international ranking of the academic institution, faculty rank, and higher education experience) and five dependent variable constructs (i.e., perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing, perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias, perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage, perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process, and perceptions regarding access to resources) are reported.

In Chapter 5, I discuss the quantitative results of the study and provide a thorough analysis of the findings. I also discuss the qualitative data derived from a mix of close-ended and open-ended items dealing with scholars' perceptions regarding their recent experience(s) with journal article submission, the acceptance and/or rejection of their article(s) for publication, the editorial feedback received from journal editors or referees, and their general attitudes toward submitting and publishing academic work in English. Rather than being used as a data set in its own right, this qualitative data will be used to discuss and interpret the quantitative results and to add further context to the findings; this data, I believe, provides an important indication of where further research should be conducted. After thoroughly discussing the implications of the results, I offer suggestions for ways that journal gatekeepers, TESOL professionals, and "literacy brokers" might help to create a more equitable and just academic publishing environment.

In Chapter 6, I briefly answer the research questions and discuss what I take to be the most important design and methodological limitations of the study. I conclude the dissertation by providing some recommendations for further empirical research on the topic of discrimination and injustice in academic English-language publishing.

2. Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to review the sociolinguistic literature pertinent to the issue of academic publishing in English and the perceived disadvantages involved for those who are not native speakers of English or who live and work outside of the academic mainstream. It's important to declare, at the outset, that this dissertation is rather broad in scope—it deals with the fields of Applied Linguistics, Global Englishes, English for Research Publication Purposes, Knowledge Production and the Sociology of Higher Education, Academic Publishing, and other fields. Nevertheless, this chapter aims to provide a foundation for empirical study and thus proceeds as follows: In Section 1, I will discuss the changing international landscape of English and the rise of English as a Lingua Franca (or ELF); in addition, I will address the role of ELF in Research for Research Publication Purposes (or ERPP). In Section 2, I will discuss the theoretical literature dealing with advantage, disadvantage, and injustice in global publishing in English; furthermore, I will briefly discuss ideas relating to knowledge production and the academic center vs. the academic periphery dichotomy, a concept which I believe is useful when considering perceived inequalities reported by scholars working outside of the geographical and academic mainstream. In Section 3, I will review the current empirical literature on scholar perceptions regarding academic publishing in the "expanding circle." Section 4 will deal with "gatekeeping" in academic book and journal publishing, and it will explore literature dealing with submissions guidelines, editorial services, and peer review. In Section 5, I will discuss the motivation for this dissertation and will address the reasons why I believe this research may help to fill some important gaps in the literature.

2.1. The Changing Landscape of English: English as a Lingua Franca and English for Research Publication Purposes

The spread of English as a global language is widely documented, and the number of English users has increased rapidly over the last few decades (Crystal, 2003; Rose & Galloway, 2019). At the present moment, non-native speakers of English outnumber native speakers

(Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2002). As a result of this development, English is now used as a contact language (or lingua franca) in a multitude of countries and is spoken in different ways around the world (Rose & Galloway, 2019). This new sociolinguistic reality has been a springboard for applied linguistics research in a number of fields, including English Language Testing (Isaacs & Trofimovich, 2012), Second Language Acquisition (Lindemann & Subtirelu, 2013), Critical Pedagogy (Kachru, 1985; Pennycook, 1999; Sung, 2017), and other fields. Ever since Kachru's (1985) seminal discussion about the worldwide spread of English, scholars have regarded the of use of English in countries where it's not an official language—but happens to spoken by a large number of people—as the "Expanding Circle." In contrast, the term "Inner Circle" is used "for regions where English is the native language, and "Outer Circle" where English has an official status as a second language" (Ingvarsdóttir &Arnbjörnsdótt, 2013: 124). As Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2013) argue, "The study of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in the "Expanding Circle" does not have a long history, nevertheless it has been accepted as an independent phenomenon within English language studies and is now a research field" (p. 124). Scholars in applied linguistics dealing with issues relating to scholar perceptions of academic publishing in English, career advancement in the academy, language standardization and examination, the conventions of peer review, and publication strategies have also made use Kachru's framework (Bocanegra-Valle, 2014; Cho, 2009; Flowerdew, 1999; Maniati & Jalilifar, 2018; Olsson & Sheridan, 2012; Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020).

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), according to Firth (1996) is "a 'contact language' between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication" (p. 240). While there is some debate about whether ELF is a bonafide language in its own right (Flowerdew, 2015; Prodromou, 2007), scholars agree that the use of ELF is on the rise around the world (Flowerdew, 2015; Galloway & Rose, 2015). Yet while non-native speakers of English presently outnumber native speakers and English is frequently used as a lingua franca, the type of English being taught and used in academic settings is generally more restrictive. As Jenkins (2011) argues, the conventions of Standard American or British English are frequently the norm in academic contexts:

> While one might expect academia as a whole, and universities, with their substantial international communities, in particular, to be revisiting their English language policies, this seems not to be happening outside a relatively small group of researchers into academic ELF. Instead, it is largely 'business as usual', with the focus remaining on helping students in dedicated pre- and in-sessional classes to improve their English in line with the norms of standard British or American academic English, both spoken and written (p. 927).

Although critical researchers in applied linguistics and English for research publication purposes (ERPP) have sought to challenge the current status quo (Ammon, 2012; Canagarajah, 1996; Curry & Lillis, 2014; Ferguson et al., 2011; Flowerdew, 2015; Ingvarsdóttir &Arnbjörnsdótt, 2013; Jenkins 2011; Pennycook, 1999; Rose & Galloway, 2019), there appears to be a dilemma between the changing sociolinguistic landscape where English is frequently used as an international lingua franca outside of higher education settings and where the norms of British and American academic English predominate within the confines of the academy and academic publishing conventions. Indeed, as McKinley & Rose (2018) maintain:

> Conventions in academic writing are highly standardized and safeguarded by publishers, who are often resistant to change due to a long history of standardization and uniformity in commercial publishing (p. 1).

Despite the divergence between the ways English is used as a medium of communication in informal settings around the world an in academic contexts, there is widespread scholarly agreement about the central role that English plays in and international academic publication and in the academy more generally (Bocanegra-Valle, 2014; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Ferguson et al., 2011). Flowerdew, in his 2008 article on the use of English as an Additional Language and English for Research Publication Purposes, suggests that:

> Fifty years ago scholars did not feel such pressure as they do now to publish in international journals (which are invariably in English). With globalization and the marketisation of the academy, this is no longer the case except in some countries and specific disciplines. Scholars increasingly need to publish in English (p. 77).

This sentiment is echoed by Hyland (2016) and others (e.g., Ammon, 2012; Flowerdew, 2015; Lillis & Curry, 2006; and Paasi, 2005) who argue that scholars around the world depend upon English publication in high profile journals to ensure career opportunities and

job promotion. Publishing in English is often considered to be part-and-parcel of academic talent and expertise, where articles published in English frequently carry more institutional weight than articles published in other languages, and where salary increases and institutional support are tied directly to English publication. Curry and Lillis (2004) conducted a large-scale ethnographic study of the academic writing and publishing practices of sixteen scholars in Slovakia, Spain, and Hungary; drawing on their data analysis of the practices, values, and attitudes of these scholars, the authors conclude that:

> Scholars who are working outside of English-dominant contexts seem to be under increasing pressure to publish in the medium of English, and such pressure is sustained through rewards systems that directly and indirectly place a high premium on English-medium publications. The material rewards for English publications include basic salary and bonuses, opportunities for promotion, and support for future research (p.680-681).

Other researchers, such as Duszak & Lewkowicz (2008), Olsson & Sheridan (2012), and Paasi (2005), have posited that publishing in English is the key to academic success, and that scholars aspire to do so in order to enter the larger, international academic community and to become recognized as legitimate academics. Yet despite the increasing pressure to publish in English, it appears, as Galloway & Rose (2015) argue, that "English holds a near monopoly of published research" which is "a situation unlikely to change in the future" (p. 234).

2.2. Global Publishing in English: Advantage, Disadvantage, and Injustice

Given the ubiquity of English around the world and its predominance as a medium for academic publication and research, scholars have raised concerns that, although the language might help academics around the world to become part of the knowledge economy and increase opportunities for scholarly dialogue, some users of English—in particular non-native speakers or those scholars writing on the outside of the academic center—might be at a disadvantage when compared to their native speaking or more centrally located counterparts (Ammon, 2012). Despite the large number of academic journal submissions from "emerging economies" in recent years, "developed" Western nations are largely responsible for the lion's share of published scientific papers (Ammon, 2012; Hyland, 2016). Drawing on the World Bank's data from 2012, Hyland (2016) notes that:

> The United States remains the biggest spender on research and produces the most research papers, accounting for 29% of the total number of published papers, followed by Japan with 8% and the United Kingdom, Germany, and China with 6% each. This means that these five countries are responsible for 55% of the world's journal articles, while 23 countries accounted for 90%" (p. 59).

It's not only the case that the majority of the world's published journal articles are produced in Western nations, but also that the medium of publication for these articles is typically English (Ammon, 2012; Flowerdew, 2015; Hyland, 2016; Paasi, 2005).

Additionally, scholars have expressed concerns not only about where journals articles are published and which language the author speaks natively, but also about the advantages (or disadvantages) that certain users of English might have when writing or preparing for their work for publication. Drawing on the theoretical work in the field of World Systems (Wallerstein, 1974), Ammon (2012) argues that the current landscape of academic publishing excludes authors working in languages other than English and that those who use languages further away from English linguistically (e.g., Korean, Japanese, and Chinese) are more likely to be at a disadvantage than those who use languages closer to English (e.g., Spanish, French, or German). Similarly, Canagarajah (1996) has argued that scholars working outside of the "academic center"—a concept derived from the theoretical work of Immanuel Wallerstein (1974; 1991)—often face certain disadvantages, such as the cost of sending manuscripts by mail, the challenge of doing academic work while holding-down multiple jobs, the payment of submissions fees, and the prospect of being unaware of cutting edge or state of the art research in their field as a result of being "off network." Canagarajah also suggests that scholars outside of the center are also likely to be consumers of knowledge rather than producers; that is to say, they often read groundbreaking studies but rarely contribute directly to the scholarly discussion by way of publication. While some of Canagarajah's concerns might be mitigated by the advent of the internet—for example, the cost of sending physical manuscripts by mail—other challenges, such as the difficulty of working multiple jobs or having to pay editorial or reading fees, are still extant for many scholars in the developing world (Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020). More troubling yet, some scholars working in countries that are deemed to be pariah states have to contend with

international sanctions and legal restrictions when submitting their work for publication (Maniati & Jalilifar, 2018; Mozafari, 2016; Riazi, 2009).

In addition to logistical concerns with article submission and the challenges that scholars might encounter as a result of being "off network" or working outside of the academic center, some applied linguistics have argued that non-native English speakers might also face linguistic disadvantages when writing and submitting for publication. Curry and Lillis (2004) and Flowerdew (2000) suggest that non-native English-speaking scholars frequently receive harsh editorial comments from reviewers that refer to "poorly written" or "non-native" English. As Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) argue:

> Another way in which linguistic privilege could manifest in academic publishing is through publication bias, with reviewers and editors being less likely to accept for publication a paper with "poor" English than a paper with standard English, all else being equal. Here we are referring mainly to hypothetical situations where the level of English writing biases reviewers or editors to look poorly on the quality of the scientific research (p. 5).

A related view is expressed by McKinley & Rose (2018), who investigated conceptualizations of language norms, standards, and errors in journal submission guidelines and found that journal editorial guidelines are often inflexible in their requirement that authors submit written work in standard American or British English. Similar findings have been reported in recent studies by Clouet (2017), Ramırez-Castaneda (2022), and others.

In his 1999 study, "Problems in Writing for Scholarly Publication in English: The Case of Hong Kong," Flowerdew argues that non-native English-speaking scholars in Hong Kong often encounter several problems when writing for publication that are not faced to the same degree by native-speaker users of the language. Non-native speakers, Flowerdew claims, typically have less facility of expression, take longer to write, have a less rich vocabulary, are less capable of making claims for their research or in defending their conclusions, are less apt at qualitative analysis, and may need to use a simpler writing style than their native-speaking counterparts.

Despite the various concerns that have been raised regarding potential inequalities and disadvantages non-native English-speaking academics might have when writing for

publication, not all scholars agree that linguistic disadvantage and injustice play an important role in publishing outcomes. Hyland (2016), for example, has argued that evidence does not support the view that English as Additional Language authors are discriminated against by journal editors, nor that non-native English speakers face greater hurdles than their native-English speaking counterparts. For Hyland, every scholar setting out to write academic English at a level suitable for publication has to master the conventions of academic rhetoric and discourse, and these conventions are not bounded by native-speaker vs. non-native speaker frameworks. He argues that:

> It seems clear that issues of linguistic disadvantage, or even injustice, become largely irrelevant at these advanced levels of academic writing where authors are seeking publication for their work (p. 67).

Hyland submits that technical knowledge of grammar and English usage are of less importance in academic writing than having an awareness of author voice. By emphasizing the native-speaker vs. non-native speaker dichotomy, Hyland argues, researchers demoralize EAL writers and "marginalize the difficulties experienced by novice L1 English academics" (p. 58). For Hyland, the major challenges involved in writing English prose at a publishable standard have to do with mastering the genre of academic writing—this skill must be learned by everyone, regardless of whether one is a native-English speaker or not. Other scholars express a similar view or maintain that different dichotomies, such as "junior researcher" vs. "experienced researcher" (Ferguson et al., 2011; Swales, 2004) and "proficient academic English user" vs. "General English user" (Romer, 2009) are more relevant to one's success in publishing than the native-speaker vs. non-native speaker polarization.

In their widely-cited response essay, Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) submit that Hyland underestimates the role that linguistic privilege plays in publishing success, and maintain that even if it is that case that all writers must develop skills in academic discourse, it does not follow from this that all writers have the same level of difficulty in doing so. All things being equal, they argue, a native-speaker is likely to expend less effort in writing and preparing work her for publication than her non-native speaking counterpart. While the authors acknowledge that one should not lose track of the challenges that scholars face working outside of prominent institutions or in the academic mainstream, they argue that researchers

should not be too hasty in their dismissal of linguistic injustice and the perceived disadvantages reported by non-native speakers:

> Faced with the dearth of direct evidence for language injustice in academic publishing, we believe the reasonable interim conclusion is not that language injustice does not exist, but that further study is needed (p. 4).

Thus, it is to this body of literature that the current study aims to contribute.

2.3. Academic Publishing in the Expanding Circle: Scholar Perceptions

At least since Canagarajah's (1996) seminal work on academic publishing and the politics of knowledge production, scholars in applied linguistics have taken an interest in the perceptions of researchers outside of the linguistic and institutional mainstream regarding their experiences writing, submitting, and publishing their academic work in English. While some scholars, such as Belcher (2007) and Hyland (2016), have expressed skepticism about the claim that language injustice plays a significant role in publishing outcomes, other researches have set out to conduct empirical studies to further investigate this hypothesis and to explore whether—in addition to indirect evidence—there is direct evidence that some scholars face injustice or unfairness in their pursuit of academic publishing in English. In recent years, there has been a growing body of studies (Bocanegra-Valle, 2014) that set out to investigate the perceptions (or attitudes) of scholars in the "expanding circle" regarding the challenges and difficulties that non-native English-speaking scholars—or those who live and work on the academic periphery—face when writing for publication in international (typically English language) venues. According to Bocanegra-Valle (2014), Canagarajah (1996), and Uzuner (2008), the challenges reported by such scholars typically relate to: (1). Linguistic difficulties, such as lacking the requisite stylistic, grammatical, or lexical skills in English or lacking the ability to produce academic prose in a style suitable for publication; (2) Non-linguistic difficulties, such as problems accessing publishing platforms, affording submissions fees, obtaining resources for conducting research, and living and working in environments that are not conducive to the sustained demands of conducting academic work (e.g., war-torn or deeply impoverished countries).

Regarding the linguistic challenges that scholars might face when writing for publication, Curry and Lillis (2004) examined the perceptions of multilingual scholars living and working outside of Anglophone countries regarding the ways they negotiate the publishing process and the challenges they might face along the way. Drawing on data from an ethnographic study (featuring interviews and documentary data) of scholars in Slovakia, Hungary, and Spain, Curry and Lillis argue that scholars often feel frustrated with the current status quo (i.e., where English is the default medium for publication). Similarly, Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008), in their investigation of the publishing practices of Polish academics, suggest that scholars there face pressure to publish in English not only to increase the exposure to their academic work, but also to gain legitimacy as bonafide academics. Flowerdew (1999; 2002; 2007) argues from the interview data he collected from Hong Kong academics that non-native English-speaking scholars might face challenges in: (1) finding suitable vocabulary to express their views as easily as their native English-speaking counterparts; (2) might have difficulty in composition as a result of the influence of their first language; and (3) might be limited to using a simpler or more rhetorically streamlined style in their writing. Ingvarsdottier and Arnbjornsdottir (2013) investigated the perceptions of Icelandic academics through surveys regarding the use of English in academic publishing and argue that "the writing help required by ELF academics is not "proof reading" but often involves major editing by experts in the field" (p. 140). Similarly, Ramanathan and Kaplan (1996)—in their report on author voice and audience in English compositions—suggest that even after the editing process, linguistic signs of one's background as an ESL or EFL user might persist. According to Clouet's (2017) analysis of the recent research conducted by Martín et al. (2014):

> Publishing in English has widely been reported as representing an additional hurdle by non-English speaking scholars, especially for those who have low proficiency levels in English language skills (Martín, Rey-Rocha, Burgess, & Moreno, 2014, p. 58).

Additionally, the results of attitude studies by researchers such as Kourilova (1996), Li (2002), Li and Flowerdew (2007), Maniati and Jalilifar (2018), McGrath (2014), Olsson and Sheridan (2012), and Ramirez-Castaneda (2020) also suggest that non-native English

speaking academics living and working outside of anglophone countries might encounter various linguistic difficulties—including but not limited by the ones identified in Flowerdew (2008)—when writing for publication in English.

In respect to the non-linguistic, or "non-discursive" (Canagarajah, 1996), challenges that non-native English speaking scholars—or ELF scholars living and working outside of the anglophone center—might face in their pursuit of academic publication, applied linguists such as Ammon (2012), Canagarajah (1996), Curry and Lillis (2004; 2014), Duszak and Lewkowisc (2008), Ferguson et al. (2011), Maniati and Jalilifar (2018), Mweru (2010), and Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) have reported from interview and survey data that scholars often identify factors including: differing conventions of plagiarism and academic honesty, various material, logistical, and financial shortcomings, and a lack of suitable academic networks for research collaboration as those that impinge on both their motivation for writing and their publishing outcomes. Furthermore, in addition to the residue of one's first language appearing in academic English prose and the challenge of writing in a style and voice suitable for publication, researchers also report that it can take non-native English speaking scholars longer to compose their work at a level suitable for publication and that the writing process is often more stress-inducing than it is for native English speakers (Buckingham, 2014; Politzer-Ahles, et al. 2016).

2.4. Gatekeeping: Peer Review, Submissions Guidelines, and Editorial Services

In addition to the linguistic and non-discursive challenges identified above, scholars have also investigated the role that stakeholders or "gatekeepers" might play in publishing outcomes and the perceptions of ELF or non-native English speaking academics regarding unfairness or injustice in the publishing process. In their longitudinal ethnographic study of non-native English speaking psychology scholars in Hungary, Spain, Portugal, and Slovakia, Lillis and Curry (2006) identify a number of "literacy brokers"—including reviewers, editors, academic peers, and English-speaking friends and colleagues—who they submit are pivotal to the publishing process and to a scholar's chances of placing an academic article at an influential, international English-language journal. The involvement of these brokers,

Lillis and Curry argue, "is higher in the production of journal articles than in other text types. Such involvement is also significantly greater in English-medium international than in English-medium national journals" (p.30). Especially important in the publishing process, Lillis and Curry suggest, are academic professionals who influence the production of texts by suggesting or making editorial changes and identifying appropriate journals for scholars to submit their work. Yet, as Canagarajah (1996) argues, not all academics have the same level of access to English speaking peers or to mediators that can serve as advocates for their work. In addition to having access to literacy brokers that can assist non-native English speaking scholars with various aspects of the publishing process, applied linguists have also argued that the attitudes of journal editors and reviewers towards non-Native English-speaking contributors might also play a role in scholars' perceptions of unfairness or injustice. While Flowerdew (2001) found that journal editors try to be fair to both native English-speaking contributors and non-native English-speaking contributors, Clouet (2017), in his paper on the intercultural dimension of ELF English in scientific publishing, argues that:

> We might expect journals publishing articles related to the humanities, generally speaking, and particularly to language and cultural studies, to be more open-minded and interculturally sensitive. Their main consideration, however, is still on formal correctness rather than functional effectiveness, with instructions insisting on native speaking models and giving unfair advantage to English native-speaking academics (p. 325).

Reporting on data derived from interviews, Curry and Lillis (2004) quote a psychologist from Hungary who asserts that: ''if the style or the form of the paper is not native or not current, reviewers think that 'this is a stupid man, this is not acceptable material' "(p. 678). A similar sentiment is offered by Cho (2009), who reports on the perceptions of a professor of Science and Engineering at a graduate school in Korea:

> I have published about 200 papers in English journals, including top-notch ones in my field such as Physical Review Letters and Physical Review B and I'm confident in my English. But I have a strong feeling that the reviewers seemed to have a bias against non-native speakers of English. Some of them sometimes made kind of silly comments on my English (p. 236).

Flowerdew (2008) also maintains that he'd personally heard EAL scholars complain at international conferences about facing discrimination from reviewers and editors. And in an earlier case study (2007), he provides the following quotation from Oliver, an EAL writer and junior academic based in Hong Kong:

> I think Hong Kong scholars to be published in international journals is real hard. I think first of all it's the language problem. I think the journal editors' first impression of your manuscript they discover that it is not written by a native-speaker—no matter how brilliant your idea they will have the tendency to reject. . .What makes me feel bad is I get letters from the reviewer and in the first two sentences it will say this is definitely not written by a native speaker—they shouldn't point this out as part of the main criteria for rejecting the article (p. 16).

Researchers have also examined the way that journal submission guidelines might lead to perceptions of unfairness in the publishing process. McKinley and Rose (2018), for example, argue that "adherence to standards in English for research publication purposes (ERPP) can be a substantial barrier for second language (L2) writers" (p. 1) and that, despite the rise of Global Englishes and the use of English as a Lingua Franca, editors are frequently not receptive to variant uses of English. Similarly, Clouet (2017) points out that gatekeepers often request that submitting authors deliver their manuscripts in "good"—i.e., American or British—English.

Applied linguistics have also reported that, in addition to requesting that contributors adhere to the conventions of "good" or standard varieties English, journal guidelines have requested that non-Native English-speaking scholars seek out the assistance of native English-speaking peers or pay for editorial services before submitting their work (Clouet, 2017; McKinley & Rose, 2018; Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020). The costs for such editorial services can be prohibitively expensive. In the case of scholars living and working in Colombia, for example, the cost of obtaining premium editorial services and translations can be upwards of 50% of the total monthly salary earned by a doctoral student (Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020).

2.5. The Need for Further Research

The challenges along the road to publication for non-Native English-speaking scholars can be immense, and many researchers have argued that the current status quo for such scholars is

not only difficult, but also unjust. Non-native English speaking and ELF scholars may face hurdles related to working "off-network" (or outside of the linguistic and academic center); they may more frequently experience challenges such as problems accessing publishing platforms, obtaining the financial resources required to conduct research, and working in a physical environment that is not conducive to scholarship. Additionally, non-Native English-speaking scholars have reported that they might face linguistic hurdles when preparing their work for publication in English, including but not limited to perceived shortcomings in the command of English grammar, style, rhetoric, and voice that are appropriate or requisite for academic publication. Furthermore, such scholars have also suggested that they might face discrimination or bias from English language editorial boards and reviewers, who require that submissions be written in standard (i.e., American or British) English and who often request—should contributors not be able to produce such work on their own—that they seek out the assistance of native-speaking colleagues or pay for editorial services before submitting their work. Despite these challenges, scholars often have little choice about the language medium used for publication. As Flowerdew (2008) has noted, with the rise of globalization and the marketisation of higher education, scholars increasingly need to publish their academic work in English. In light of the fact that English is now the primary language for international academic publishing and is also spoken by more non-native speakers than native speakers internationally, researchers have sought to address what they take to be inequalities or injustices that not only have the potential to negatively impact the academic publishing outcomes of individual, non-native English speaking or ELF scholars, but which also shape a publishing landscape that tilts unfairly toward native-English speaking users, language standards, journals, and anglophone higher education institutions (Ammon, 2012; Swales, 2004). This situation, according to Flowerdew (2008), is quite serious, as it "results in an unnecessary impoverishment of global knowledge, because contributions from EAL writers may go unrecognized" (p.84).

In light of the concern raised by Flowerdew (2008) that potential contributions from EAL scholars may go unrecognized, it is important to conduct further research that aims to investigate the extent to which discrimination, bias, and systematic disadvantage against non-Native English-speaking academics may play a role in academic publishing. Although much

of the literature seems to suggest that disadvantage and discrimination may play a role in publishing outcomes for non-native English speakers, the claim advanced by Hyland (2016)—i.e., that evidence does not support this view, nor that non-native English speakers face greater hurdles than their native-English speaking peers—should be taken seriously. Nevertheless, I agree with Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) that, when "faced with a dearth of direct evidence for language injustice in academic publishing," the responsible interim position is not therefore to hastily conclude that injustice does not exist, but rather, to conduct further research (p. 4). The research in this dissertation will aim to address not only whether and to what extent bias, discrimination, and systematic disadvantage against non-native English-speaking scholars may be perceived to play a role in academic publishing, but also the extent to which lower-proficiency English speakers—and those who live "off network" or outside of the "academic center"—may perceive bias, systematic disadvantage, and discrimination in the publishing process.

Additionally, while much of the empirical literature has examined perceptions of discrimination, bias, and systematic disadvantage concerning the native-English speaker vs. non-Native English speaker dichotomy, this study will help to fill a gap in the research investigating the possibility of perceived bias and disadvantage against—what Ferguson et al. (2011) and Swales (2004) label—"junior researchers," or those who have little professional experience working in higher education. It will also help to ameliorate a gap in the research investigating whether scholars who work at lower-ranked institutions, or who work in non-tenured positions or at teaching-intensive and technical institutions, may perceive greater levels of disadvantage, bias, and injustice in academic publishing than their peers with more stable positions or those who work at higher ranked, research-intensive institutions. This dissertation, therefore, aims to expand the literature exploring whether and to what extent non-native English speakers, less-proficient English users, contingent or inexperienced academics, scholars who work outside of the United States and Europe, and those who work in technical or less prestigious, teaching-insensitive institutions perceive discrimination, bias, and systematic disadvantage in academic English-language publishing.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Approach

This study utilized a mixed methods research design. In recent years, educators and applied linguists concerned with evidence-based practice have opted to use a range of methodologies in their classroom-based and experimental research (Ivankova & Greer, 2016). Mixed methods—or research using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies—has been used by researchers since the 1960s and it offers a number of potential advantages over a singular method when conducting empirical studies in the social sciences. According to Green, Caracelli, and Graham (1989), there are five key reasons why mixed methods might be used by social science researchers: (1) mixed methods allow for triangulation—i.e., to corroborate or verify results from one method using another; (2), mixed methods can be used to clarify ambiguous or uncertain results from one method with the results from another; (3) mixed methods may facilitate new or unexpected discoveries that might not have been evident in findings derived from a single methodological approach; (4), mixed methods can be used to better inform or developing the findings in another method; (5) mixed methods can help to expand the scope of an empirical investigation and may allow for a more flexible approach in the design and articulation of research questions. In respect to the field of applied linguistics, researchers have employed mixed methods as a means of "gaining comprehensive answers to research questions" that might not be available with a single methodology (Ivankova & Greer, 2016, p. 65). Mixed methods have also been found to dovetail with the sort of research approaches that are common in the field—e.g., studies that utilize pre-post tests, questionnaires, surveys, interviews, case-studies, and translations (Danzak, 2011; Ivankova & Greer, 2016).

In this study, a concurrent mixed methods design was used, whereby a questionnaire was administered to participants that included a series of both quantitative and qualitative items. According to Ivankova & Greer (2016), a concurrent quantitative + qualitative design is used when it is necessary to compare qualitative and qualitative results and where the researcher believes that multiple methodologies—or methodological triangulation—might shed light on

research questions or constructs. Additionally, as Ivankova & Greer maintain, a concurrent mixed methods design has the advantage that data can be collected and analyzed over a brief period of time, thus "helping to save time and the associated cost of conducting the study" (p. 71). Further arguments for the advantages of concurrent mixed methods designs for researchers in applied linguistics and second language acquisition have been advanced by Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), Morse and Neihaus (2009), Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009), and others. As the research in this dissertation aimed to interrogate a range of constructs concerned with researchers' attitudes regarding the perceived challenges and effort required to publish academic work in English—as well as scholars' perceptions and attitudes regarding editorial or geographical biases that may be extant in the academic publishing industry at large—a concurrent mixed methods design was utilized.

3.2. Data Collection Instruments

A questionnaire of 50 qualitative and quantitative items was developed as the primary instrument in this study. The questionnaire aimed to interrogate a range of constructs in connection with the research questions identified in Chapter 1. In particular, the questionnaire sought to gather information regarding the participants' perceived proficiency in English, their experience working in higher education settings, their academic rank and qualifications, their perceptions regarding the amount of effort required to publish academic work in English for native and non-native English speakers, their ability to pay for or otherwise acquire editorial support for their academic writing, the importance of the prestige and geographical location of their university, and their perceptions regarding the potential biases or stereotypes that might exist in the English-language academic publishing industry. The majority of the items (n = 28) were quantitative, in that they utilized a Likert scale of five possible options: 1 = 'strongly agree,' 2 = 'somewhat agree,' 3 = 'neither agree nor disagree,' 4 = 'somewhat disagree,' 5 = 'strongly disagree.' A Likert scale was used in this study, as evidence suggests that, with Likert-based questionnaires, "a number of items can be used to try and assess the same construct" (Wagner, 2016, p. 89); additionally, a relatively large number of questionnaire items were presented, as evidence indicates that having a large number of items can help to generate more accurate and reliable data (Wagner, 2016).

Additionally, 15 items were designed to elicit data regarding the sociolinguistic background of the participants (e.g., how many languages they spoke to a functional level in addition to English, what their academic field was, which type of educational institution they were employed at, etc.). The remaining 7 items were a mix of close-ended and open-ended qualitative questions written to allow the participants space to reflect on their recent experience(s) with journal article submission, the acceptance and/or rejection of their article(s) for publication, the editorial feedback received they had received from journal editors or referees, and their general attitudes toward submitting and publishing academic work in English.

Several of the questionnaire items were adapted from a study conducted by Duszak and Lewkowicz (2008) which investigated the perceptions that Polish scholars had regarding their experiences publishing academic writing in journals. Sousa et al. (2017) indicate that "due to time and cost constraints of developing new questionnaires, researchers often adapt existing questionnaires to better fit the purpose of their study" (p. 1289) while Mohler et al. (2016) note that:

> adaptation may be made to the content, format, response scales, or visual presentation of any part of a question, questionnaire, or instrument. The purpose of adaptation is to better fit the needs of a new population, location, language, or mode, or any combination thereof" (p.1).

Given the thematic and methodological overlap between Duszak and Lewkowitz's study and the present dissertation, the researcher believed they were justified to adapt these items for use in this work. Additionally, similar mixed methods questionnaires exploring constructs related to perceptions of bias, discrimination, and systematic disadvantage in academic publishing have been utilized by Ferguson et al. (2011), Ingvarsdóttir and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2013), and Ramirez-Castaneda (2020) and have offered informal "models" for empirical research in this area. The full questionnaire is included in the appendix section of the dissertation.

3.3. Participants and Setting

An email contact list of 770 individual, currently publishing scholars was compiled for this study, and academics who had published an article or essay in the latest issue of a mid-ranked (i.e., 25th percentile-75th percentile) English-language academic journal listed on Scopus were considered eligible for inclusion. Mid-ranked journals were selected with the aim of eliciting data from scholars who might better reflect the typical professional profile of an academic currently publishing in English than one who might publish their work in either the top quartile or the bottom quartile of their respective field.

To select journals for inclusion, the study employed stratified random sampling, whereby subgroups were selected "from within a particular population, with samples generated for each of the subgroups" (Wagner, 2016, p. 85). According to Wagner (2016), this technique can be used effectively in applied linguistics research to cover a broad range of needs, resources, and populations and may be helpful in supporting the generalizability of survey research. Thus, for each of the subject areas defined by Scopus as 'Science,' 'Arts and Humanities,' 'Social Science,' 'Medicine,' 'Mathematics,' and 'Engineering,' a total of 9 mid-ranked scholarly journals were selected; three journals ranked between the 75th and 70th percentile, three journals ranked between the 55th and 50th percentile, and three journals ranked between the 35th and 30th percentile were chosen at random to create a list of nine total academic journals for each of the six subject areas.[1] After the lists had been compiled for each subject area, email contacts of the authors listed on Scopus (n = 770 scholars) were recorded on a master spreadsheet. None of the individuals included in the email list were known by the researcher.

[1] For each band ranking (i.e., 75th-70th percentile, 55th-50th percentile, and 35th-30th percentile) in the six subject areas, the journal title lists available on Scopus were exported and compiled into a large Excel spreadsheet; each journal title was then assigned a unique number based on its corresponding row number in the spreadsheet. After this, free randomization software available online was used to generate three random numbers from the larger set, and journal titles with numbers that matched those picked by the generator were selected for inclusion in the study. After the journal lists had been compiled for each subject area, email addresses from the list of contributors in the most recent issue of each journal were recorded on a separate spreadsheet, and duplicate email addresses were deleted before the questionnaire was sent to the contributors.

3.4. Research Procedure

Prior to administering the questionnaire to the email list, the questionnaire was piloted with a small group of currently publishing, native-English speaking and non-native English-speaking scholars—i.e., those with a similar educational, occupational, and sociolinguistic profile as the target population—who were known to the researcher and who were colleagues of his at a technical university in the Middle East. According to Wagner (2016), it is important that questionnaires be piloted before being administered to the target population as they can be effective in identifying underlining problems in the questionnaire items or format. No problems or ambiguities were identified by the participants in the pilot sample. After piloting was completed, a Qualtrics email with a link to the questionnaire was sent to the email list of 770 scholars during the 2023 Trinity Term at Oxford University inviting them to participate in the study. After a reminder email was sent approximately one week later, a total of 32 individual scholars completed the questionnaire (which meets the minimum threshold of participants for quantitative studies suggested by Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991) and 40 emails bounced or were rejected by the system. The completion rate in this study, therefore, was approximately 4.2%, and this low return rate, despite multiple efforts to encourage participation, is a noted limitation of the final sample obtained.

3.5. Ethical Considerations

Research for this dissertation has been conducted according to the guidelines and regulations of the Central University Research Ethics Committee (CUREC) and the Education Departmental Research Ethics Committee at the University of Oxford. All personal data obtained in this dissertation has been managed in accordance with the University's legal requirements and guidelines.

4. Results

4.1. Research Constructs and Variables

It was the original intention of data analysis to conduct a Principle Component Analysis (PCA) on the questionnaire data to reveal underlying constructs that underpinned the Likert scale items. This would have allowed the study to reduce the data into a smaller number of manageable multi-item variables for further statistical analysis. However, the small sample size made this plan impossible. As an alternative, the researcher and their supervisor engaged in theoretically-driven grouping of items through collaborative in-depth discussions about which items could justifiably be argued to measure a known concept in the literature.

Drawing on data compiled from the questionnaire, Likert-scale items were grouped by the researchers into 5 dependent variable constructs to help shed light on the research questions identified in the introductory chapter and were analyzed for internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha. Potential constructs and questionnaire items that did not meet the reliability threshold were discarded in the analysis, leaving the following items and constructs for review:[2]

Construct 1: Perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publication (Cronbach's Alpha: .630)

> Q16. I am prepared to write academic papers at a publishable level in English.
> Q17. I often need editorial advice or assistance from my peers/colleagues to write at a publishable level in English.
> Q33. It is easy for me to submit my academic work online to journals.

Construct 1 aimed to measure whether there were differences in perception between groups regarding preparation for success in academic publishing, as identified in studies by Curry and Lillis (2004), Duszak and Lewkowitz (2008), and Ramirez-Castaneda (2020).

[2] Construct 5, "Perceptions regarding access to resources" was weakly correlated, with a Cronbach's Alpha of .527. Given the relatively low internal consistency, findings derived from this construct should be interpreted with a high degree of caution.

Construct 2: Perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias (Cronbach's Alpha: .661)

> Q22. Editors, referees, and publishers might reject my submission because of the variety of English I use in my writing.
> Q30. My native language negatively impacts my publishing opportunities in English.

Construct 2 sought to measure potential biases in the publishing process, as identified in studies by Curry and Lillis (2004) and Flowerdew (1999; 2002; 2007; 2008).

Construct 3: Perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage (Cronbach's Alpha: .855)

> Q35. I believe that I am at a disadvantage when submitting my academic work for publication.
> Q37. I have found my language proficiency to be an obstacle when trying to publish my academic work.
> Q38. I have found my writing style to be an obstacle when trying to publishing my academic work.

Construct 3 aimed to measure potential systematic disadvantage in the publishing process, as identified in studies conducted by Ammon (2012), Canagarajah (1996), Curry and Lillis (2004), Maniati and Jalilifar (2018), and Martín et al. (2014).

Construct 4: Perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process (Cronbach's Alpha: .784)

> Q41. I have faced difficulties when communicating with editors, reviewers, and publishers.
> Q42. I have faced difficulties when interpreting comments and suggestions made by referees and editors.
> Q43. I have encountered technical problems and obstacles when trying to publish my academic work in English.

Construct 4 aimed to measure perceptions of having difficulties with the review process in academic publishing, as identified in studies by Duszak and Lewkowitz (2008), Maniati and Jalilifar (2018), and Ramirez-Castaneda (2020).

Construct 5: Perceptions regarding access to resources (Cronbach's Alpha: .526)

> Q29. I can easily obtain advice from my peers/colleagues about how to improve my academic writing in English.
> Q32. My university provides services/resources to faculty to improve their academic writing in English.
> Q39. A lack of financial or university resources has been an obstacle when trying to publish my academic work.
> Q40. A lack of access to the latest research in my field has been an obstacle when trying to publish my academic work.

Construct 5 sought to measure perceptions regarding having access to material and social resources that could help to facilitate academic research, writing, and publishing in English, as identified in studies by Belcher (2007), Buckingham (2014), Canagarajah (1996), Curry and Lillis (2014), and Mweru (2010).

To determine if there were statistically significant differences between participant groups in the study, an Independent-Samples t-test was performed using the sum composite scores of each dependent variable construct when a normal distribution pattern was present across the two dependent variables;[3] when a normal distribution was not present, a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was performed. For tests involving items regarding experience working in higher education and self-perceived English-language proficiency, a simple linear regression was utilized. Drawing on biographical data derived from the questionnaire responses, the following eight independent variables were analyzed with the five dependent variable constructs listed above: Native speaker status (native English speaker vs. non-native English speaker); English proficiency (proficient English speaker vs. non-proficient speaker); Frequency of English use in the scholar's country (English is the most common language vs. English is not the most common language); Location of academic institution (North America or Europe vs. outside of North America or Europe); Type of academic institution (research-intensive university or college vs. teaching or technical university or college); International ranking of academic institution (ranked in top 500 vs. ranked in top 1000); Faculty rank

[3] According to George and Mallery (2010), the values for skewness and kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered to be appropriate thresholds for proving normal distribution. Histograms of the distribution curve for both dependent variables were compared for similarity; when the two curves were markedly dissimilar, a Mann-Whitney U test was performed.

(tenure or tenure-track faculty vs. non-tenure or contract-based faculty); and Experience working in higher education. Although more fine-grained sociolinguistic background information was collected in the above categories, it was not possible to divide the sample into more than two categories for analysis as it would violate the assumptions of the statistical tests and increase the likelihood of Type II error due to a lack of statistical power.

The data presented in this chapter have not had a Bonferroni Correction applied to the p-values when testing for significance. According to Armstrong's (2014) review of the use of Bonferroni correction in scientific research, the method is often used "uncritically with no rationale or discussion" (p. 502), especially when applied to multiple t-tests. He suggests that it "should not be used routinely" (p. 502), especially not in cases where all tests are needed to reject the null hypothesis. If readers prefer to interpret the results more conservatively, please note that a corrected p-value of < 0.01 for significance would need to be applied to account for the five multiple contrasts underpinning each analysis in 4.2.

In addition to the attitudinal and biographical items included in the constructs, qualitative data regarding scholars' perceptions of their recent experience(s) with journal article submission, the acceptance and/or rejection of their article(s) for publication, the editorial feedback received from journal editors or referees, and their general attitudes toward submitting and publishing academic work in English has also been analyzed. Rather than being used as a data set in its own right, the qualitative data will be used to discuss and interpret the quantitative results alongside the literature in Chapter 5.

4.2. Research Findings

4.2.1. Native Speaker Status

As scholars including Ammon (2012), Curry and Lillis (2004), Flowerdew (1999), Paasi (2005), and others have raised concerns that non-Native English speakers may be at a disadvantage compared to native English speakers when writing and submitting their academic work for publication, it was important to consider whether a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the two groups would be found across the constructs.

7 respondents reported English to be their native language, while 25 reported a language other than English as their native language.[4] A histogram and descriptive statistics of the composite scores for each construct were analyzed.

Perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing between native English-speaking academics and scholars who were nonnative English-speakers. A significant effect ($U = 138$; $p = .020$) was identified for the two conditions, and native English-speaking scholars reported higher perceptions ($m = 9.29$) of preparation for success than scholars who were nonnative English speakers ($m = 18.77$).[5]

Perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to compare the perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias in academic publishing between scholars who were native English-speakers and scholars who were nonnative English-speakers. There was a significant effect ($U = 150$; $p = .003$) for the two conditions, and native English-speaking scholars reported higher perceptions ($m = 7.57$) of native English-speaker bias in academic publishing than scholars who were nonnative English speakers ($m = 19.00$).

Perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing between scholars who were native English-speakers and scholars who were nonnative English-speakers.

[4] Although the sample size meets the minimum requirement for descriptive statistics suggested by Hatch and Lazaraton (1991), the results for this variable should be interpreted with a high degree of caution, as the unequal sample size between native English speakers ($n = 7$) and non-native speakers ($n = 25$) may strongly affect statistical power and increase the risk of Type 1 errors (Rusticus & Lovato, 2019).

[5] This study utilized a Likert scale with the following categories: 1 = 'strongly agree,' 2 = 'somewhat agree,' 3 = 'neither agree nor disagree,' 4 = 'somewhat disagree,' 5 = 'strongly disagree.' A lower composite score is thus interpreted as a reflection of more agreement about a construct than a higher composite score.

There was a significant effect (U = 131; p = .026) for the two conditions, and native English-speaking scholars reported higher perceptions (m = 9.29) of systematic disadvantage in academic publishing than their nonnative English-speaking counterparts (m = 17.96).

Perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process in academic publishing between scholars who were native English-speakers and scholars who were nonnative English-speakers. There was not a significant effect (U = 107; p = .395) observed for the two conditions, though native English-speaking scholars reported higher perceptions (m = 13.71) of difficulty with the review process than their nonnative English-speaking counterparts (m = 17.28).

Perceptions regarding access to resources

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to compare the perceptions regarding having access to resources between scholars who were native English-speakers and scholars who were nonnative English-speakers. While a significant effect was not observed for the two conditions (U = 101; p = .562), native English-speaking scholars reported higher perceptions (m = 14.57) of having access to resources than scholars who were nonnative English speakers (m = 17.04).

4.2.2. English Proficiency

Researchers including Clouet (2017), Curry and Lillis (2004), Flowerdew (1999), Martín et al. (2014), Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016), and others have suggested that academics with lower levels of English proficiency may have greater difficulties publishing their work than scholars with higher proficiency levels. To test this hypothesis, 32 scholars were asked to assess their level of proficiency in English according to the scale established for the Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (Marian, Blumenfeld, and Kaushanskaya, 2007). The following table (Table 1) reflects the distribution of self-assessments.

Table 1. Please select your level of proficiency in English

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
Slightly less than adequate	2	6.3	6.3	9.4
Adequate	4	12.5	12.5	21.9
Slightly more than adequate	1	3.1	3.1	25.0
Good	9	28.1	28.1	53.1
Very good	4	12.5	12.5	65.6
Excellent	9	28.1	28.1	93.8
Perfect	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

To determine whether there was an association between the English proficiency levels reported by the respondents above and the five dependent variable constructs of the study, a simple linear regression was conducted.

Perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing

A simple linear regression was used to examine whether self-reported English proficiency levels significantly predicted preparation for success in academic publishing. The results indicated that self-reported English proficiency levels explained 55.9% of the variation in perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing ($F(1, 30) = 13.61$, $p = < .001$). These significant results reflect a moderate association, meaning proficiency had a predictive effect on perceived success in academic publishing.

Perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias

A simple linear regression was used to examine whether self-reported proficiency levels significantly predicted perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias. The results indicated that self-reported English proficiency levels explained 33.6% of the variation in perceptions regarding native English speaker bias ($F(1, 30) = 3.80$, $p = .060$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage

A simple linear regression was used to examine whether self-reported English proficiency levels significantly predicted perceptions regarding having experienced a systematic disadvantage in academic publishing. The results indicated that self-reported English proficiency levels explained 40.2% of the variation in perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage ($F(1, 29) = 5.89$, $p = .025$). These significant results reflect a moderate association, meaning proficiency had a predictive effect on perceived systematic disadvantage in academic publishing.

Perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process

A simple linear regression was used to examine whether self-reported English proficiency levels significantly predicted perceptions regarding having difficulties with the review process. The results indicated that self-reported English proficiency levels explained 18.9% of the variation in perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage ($F(1, 29) = 1.14$, $p = .30$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Perceptions regarding access to resources

A simple linear regression was used to examine whether self-reported English proficiency levels significantly predicted perceptions regarding having access to resources. The results indicated that self-reported English proficiency levels

explained 5.6% of the variation in perceptions regarding access to resources ($F(1, 30) = .094$, $p = .76$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

4.2.3. Frequency of English Use in the Scholar's Country

Researchers including Ammon (2012), Canagarajah (1996), Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) and others have suggested that scholars working in languages other than English—or who live countries where English is not the primary language of communication—may be at a disadvantage when compared to those who more frequently use or work in English.
9 respondents reported that English was the most common language where they lived and worked, while 22 reported that a language other than English was the most common. A histogram and descriptive statistics of the composite scores for each construct were analyzed, and t-tests or non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests were applied based on these results. Please note that when interpreting the results, the unequal group sizes may have increased the potentiality of Type II error.

Perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing

An Independent Samples t-test was conducted to compare the perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing between scholars who live countries where English is the most common language and those who live in countries where it is not the most common language. There was not a significant effect for the two conditions, $t(29)=-1.924$, $p = .064$, though scholars who lived in countries where English was the most common language ($m = 4.88$, $SD = 2.08$)) reported higher levels of preparedness for publishing success than scholars who lived in countries where another language was more common ($M = 7.00$, $SD = 2.99$).

Perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias in academic publishing between scholars who live countries where English is the most common language and those who live in countries where it is not the most common language. There was a significant effect

(U = 160; p = .007) for the two conditions, and scholars who lived in countries where English was the most common language reported higher perceptions of native English-speaker bias (m = 9.22) than those who lived in countries where another language was more common (m = 18.77).

Perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the perceptions of systematic bias in academic publishing between scholars who live countries where English is the most common language and those who live in countries where it is not the most common language. There was not a significant effect (U = 134; p = .077) for the two conditions, though scholars who lived in countries where English was the most common language reported higher perceptions of native systematic disadvantage (m = 11.11) than scholars who lived in countries where another language was more common (m = 17.38).

Perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process

An Independent Samples t-test was conducted to compare the perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process between scholars who live countries where English is the most common language and those who live in countries where it is not the most common language. There was not a significant effect for the two conditions, t(29)= .367, p = .741, though scholars who lived in countries where English was not the most common language (m = 10.63, SD = 3.07)) reported higher levels of difficulty with the review process than scholars who lived in countries where English was the most common language (M = 11.11, SD = 3.72).

Perceptions regarding access to resources

An Independent Samples t-test was used to compare the perceptions regarding access to resources between scholars who live countries where English is the most common language and those who live in countries where it is not the most common language.

Although there was not a significant effect for the two conditions, t(29)= -2.01 p = .054, scholars who lived in countries where English was the most common language (m = 10.88, SD = 4.34)) reported perceptions of having higher levels of access to resources than those who lived in countries where English was not the most common language (M = 13.68, SD = 3.13).

4.2.4. Location of Academic Institution

Researchers including Ammon (2012), Canagarajah (1996), Maniati & Jalilifar (2018), Mozafari, (2016), Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016), Ramirez-Castaneda (2020), and Riazi (2009) have argued that scholars working outside of the "academic center" may face disadvantages or discrimination when publishing their academic work in English.[6] 15 respondents reported working at an institution located in North America or Europe while 17 respondents reported working at an institution located elsewhere. A histogram of the composite scores for each construct were analyzed, and an Independent Samples t-test was was conducted for each of the five multiple contrasts.

Perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing

A t-test was performed to compare the perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing between scholars who work at an institution located in North America or Europe and those who work at an institution located elsewhere. Although there was not a significant effect for the two conditions, t(30)= -.19 p = .985, scholars who worked in North America or Europe (m = 6.33, SD = 2.94) reported perceptions of having slightly higher levels of preparedness than scholars who worked elsewhere (M = 6.35, SD = 2.87).

[6] According to the Times Higher Education *University Rankings 2023,* 74 of the world's top 100 ranking universities are located in North America or Europe, 18 in East Asia, 1 in the Middle East, and 7 in Australia.

Perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias

A t-test was used to compare the perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias in academic publishing between scholars who work at an institution located in North America or Europe and those who work at an institution located elsewhere. While there was not a significant effect for the two conditions, $t(30) = -.344$ $p = .733$, participants who worked in North America or Europe ($m = 5.60$, $SD = 2.16$) reported having higher perceptions of native English-speaker bias than their counterparts who worked elsewhere ($M = 5.88$, $SD = 2.44$).

Perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage

A t-test comparing the perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing between scholars who work at an institution located in North America or Europe and those who work at an institution located elsewhere was conducted. While there was not a significant effect for the two conditions, $t(29) = -.854$ $p = .400$, scholars who worked in North America or Europe ($m = 8.14$, $SD = 3.13$) reported having higher perceptions of systematic disadvantage than those who worked elsewhere ($M = 9.17$, $SD = 3.52$).

Perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process

A t-test was conducted to compare the perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process between scholars who work at an institution located in North America or Europe and those who work at an institution located elsewhere. There was a significant effect for the two conditions, $t(30) = 2.798$ $p = .009$, and academics who worked outside of North America or Europe ($m = 9.24$, $SD = 3.31$) reported higher perceptions of having difficulties with the review process than their counterparts who worked in North America or Europe ($M = 12.20$, $SD = 2.42$).

Perceptions regarding access to resources

A-test was used to compare the perceptions regarding access to resources between academics who work at an institution located in North America or Europe and those who work at an institution located elsewhere. There was not a significant effect for the two conditions, t(30)= .122 p = .904, but respondents who worked outside of North America or Europe (m = 12.70, SD = 3.40) reported having slightly higher perceptions of access to resources than those who worked in North America or Europe (M = 12.86, SD = 4.05).

4.2.5 Type of Academic Institution

In addition to the location of the academic institution, scholars such as Hesli and Lee (2011), Graves, Marchand, and Thompson (1982), and Griffith and Altinay (2020) have posited that academics who work at teaching-intensive or technical universities may face more challenges publishing their work than those employed at research-intensive institutions. One challenge that scholars at teaching-intensive universities frequently encounter is the high course-load per semester. According to Griffith and Altinay, "teaching 12 credits or more per semester does not allow sufficient time for preparation, planning, and implementation of high-quality research" and "without institutional guidelines that are based on data and objective models, the divide between research and teaching institutions in terms of faculty productivity will widen" (p. 697). 16 respondents reported working at research-intensive universities, while 16 reported working at an institution that emphasized teaching or technical training. A histogram and descriptive statistics of the composite scores for each construct were analyzed.

Perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing

An Independent Samples t-test was performed to compare the perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing between scholars who work at a research-intensive institution and those who work at a technical or teaching-oriented institution. There was not a significant effect for the two conditions, t(30)= -.550 p = .586, but scholars who worked at a research-intensive institution (m = 6.06, SD =

2.35) reported having slightly higher perceptions of preparedness than scholars who worked at a teaching or technical institution (M = 6.62, SD = 3.34).

Perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias

An Independent Samples t-test was conducted to compare the perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias in academic publishing between scholars who work at a research-intensive institution and those who work at a technical or teaching-oriented institution. Although there was not a significant effect for the two conditions, t(30)= .612 p = .545, scholars who worked at a teaching or technical institution (m = 5.50, SD = 1.71) reported having higher perceptions of native English-speaker bias than those who worked at research-intensive institutions (M = 6.00, SD = 2.78).

Perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage

To compare the perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing between academics who work at a research-intensive institution and those who work at a technical or teaching-oriented institution, an Independent Samples t-test was performed. There was not a significant effect for the two conditions, t(29)= .174 p = .863, but academics who worked at a teaching or technical institution (m = 8.60, SD = 2.52) reported having higher perceptions of systematic disadvantage than their counterparts at research-intensive institutions (M = 8.81, SD = 4.03).

Perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process

A non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to compare the perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process between scholars who work at a research-intensive institution and those who work at a technical or teaching-oriented institution. There was a significant effect (U = 49; p = .002) for the two conditions, and scholars who worked at teaching or technical institutions (m = 11.56) reported higher perceptions of having difficulties with the review process than those who worked at research-intensive institutions (m = 21.44).

Perceptions regarding access to resources

An Independent Samples t-test was used to compare the perceptions regarding access to resources between scholars who work at a research-intensive institution and those who work at a technical or teaching-oriented institution. A significant effect was not found for the two conditions, $t(30) = .143$ $p = .888$, but participants working at a teaching or technical institution ($m = 12.68$, $SD = 3.55$) reported having higher perceptions of access to resources than participants who worked at research-intensive institutions ($M = 12.87$, $SD = 3.87$).

4.2.6. International Ranking of Academic Institution

Some researchers, such as Canagarajah (1996), have argued that academics who work at institutions outside of the "academic center" may be more likely to be "consumers of knowledge" rather than producers of knowledge; they may also have difficulties accessing state of the art research, affording journal submissions fees, or face other disadvantages when compared to their counterparts who work at more prominent institutions (Maniati & Jalilifar, 2018). 15 respondents reported working at an institution ranked internationally in the top-500, while 17 respondents reported working at an institution ranked internationally in the top-1000 or 'other.' A histogram and descriptive statistics of the composite scores for each construct were analyzed. To determine whether there was an association between the international ranking of an academic institution and the five dependent variable constructs of the study, an Independent Samples t-test was performed. A table of the t-test results for the five multiple contrasts is included below (Table 2).

Table 2. Independent Samples T-Test - International Ranking of Academic Institution

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
						Significance	
		F	Sig.	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
Preparation for Success	Equal variances assumed	.000	.992	.141	30	.444	.889
	Equal variances not assumed			.142	29.906	.444	.888
Native Speaker Bias	Equal variances assumed	5.223	.030	1.128	30	.134	.268
	Equal variances not assumed			1.166	26.072	.127	.254
Systematic Disadvantage	Equal variances assumed	15.723	<.001	.420	29	.339	.678
	Equal variances not assumed			.443	25.635	.331	.662
Difficulties with the Review Process	Equal variances assumed	.008	.928	1.670	30	.053	.105
	Equal variances not assumed			1.659	28.545	.054	.108
Access to Resources	Equal variances assumed	.213	.648	.451	30	.328	.655
	Equal variances not assumed			.453	29.904	.327	.654

A significant effect (p-value of < 0.05) was not found for any of the five dependent variable constructs analyzed with respect to the international ranking of the academic institution. While the results were not significant, regarding perceptions of preparation for success in academic publishing, scholars who worked at an institution ranked in the top-1000 or 'other' ($m = 6.26$, $SD = 2.78$) reported having higher perceptions of preparedness than those who worked at an institution ranked in top-500 ($m = 6.41$, $SD = 3.00$). Results also indicate that those who worked at an institution ranked in the top-1000 or 'other' ($m = 5.26$, $SD = 1.57$) reported having higher perceptions of native English-speaker bias than those who worked at an institution ranked in top-500 ($m = 6.17$, $SD = 2.74$), and scholars who worked at an institution ranked in the top-1000 or 'other' ($m = 8.42$, $SD = 2.24$) reported having higher perceptions of systematic disadvantage than those who worked at an institution ranked in top-500 ($m = 8.94$, $SD = 4.08$). Additionally, participants who worked at an institution ranked in the top-1000 or 'other' ($m = 9.66$, $SD = 3.30$) reported having higher perceptions of difficulties with the review process than those who worked at an institution ranked in top-500 ($m = 11.52$, $SD = 3.00$), while those who worked at an institution in the top-1000 or 'other' ($m = 12.46$, $SD = 3.56$) reported having higher perceptions of access to resources than those an institution ranked in the top-500 ($m = 13.05$, $SD = 3.83$).

4.2.7. Faculty Rank

Scholars such as Ferguson et al. (2011) and Swales (2004) have posited that the dichotomy between "junior researcher" and "experienced researcher" may be more relevant to publishing outcomes than the native-speaker vs. non-native speaker polarization. To test this hypothesis, 'faculty rank'—i.e., tenure-track or tenured faculty vs non-tenure or tenure-track faculty—was considered, along with the years of experience the scholar had working in higher education. 16 respondents (Table 3) reported their academic position as 'Assistant Professor (tenure-track),' 'Associate Professor with tenure,' 'Professor with tenure,' or 'Professor Emeritus,' while 16 respondents reported their position as 'Adjunct or part-time Lecturer or Instructor,' 'Adjunct or part-time Professor,' 'Visiting Lecturer or Instructor,' 'Visiting Professor (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor),' 'Full-time,

Contract-based Lecturer or Instructor,' 'Academic Administration,' or 'Other.' A histogram and descriptive statistics of the composite scores for each construct were analyzed.

Table 3. Which of the following best describes your academic position?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Adjunct or part-time Lecturer or Instructor	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
Visiting Lecturer or Instructor	1	3.1	3.1	9.4
Visiting Professor (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor)	1	3.1	3.1	12.5
Full-time, contract-based Lecturer or Instructor	5	15.6	15.6	28.1
Assistant Professor (tenure-track)	4	12.5	12.5	40.6
Associate Professor with tenure	8	25.0	25.0	65.6
Professor with tenure	2	6.3	6.3	71.9
Professor Emeritus	2	6.3	6.3	78.1
Academic Administration	2	6.3	6.3	84.4
Other	5	15.6	15.6	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

To determine whether there was a significant association between faculty rank and the five dependent variable constructs investigated of the study, an Independent Samples t-test was performed. A table of the t-test results for the five multiple contrasts in the study is included below (Table 4).

Table 4. Independent Samples T-Test - Faculty Rank

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
						Significance	
		F	Sig.	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
Preparation for Success	Equal variances assumed	1.159	.290	1.583	30	.062	.124
	Equal variances not assumed			1.583	29.979	.062	.124
Native Speaker Bias	Equal variances assumed	1.680	.205	1.248	30	.111	.222
	Equal variances not assumed			1.248	28.758	.111	.222
Systematic Disadvantage	Equal variances assumed	.022	.884	1.233	29	.114	.228
	Equal variances not assumed			1.236	28.999	.113	.226
Difficulties with the Review Process	Equal variances assumed	.082	.777	-1.038	30	.154	.307
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.038	29.825	.154	.307
Access to Resources	Equal variances assumed	.152	.700	-.333	30	.371	.741
	Equal variances not assumed			-.333	28.970	.371	.741

A significant effect (p-value of < 0.05) was not found for any of the five dependent variable constructs analyzed with respect to faculty rank. While the t-test results were insignificant, for perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing, scholars who identified as Adjunct, Visiting, or Full-time (contract-based) faculty reported perceptions of having higher levels of preparedness ($M = 5.56$, $SD = 2.82$) than those who identified as tenured, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty ($M = 7.12$, $SD = 2.75$). Results also indicate that participants who identified as Adjunct, Visiting, or Full-time (contract-based) faculty reported higher perceptions of native English-speaker bias ($M = 5.25$, $SD = 2.48$) than participants who identified as tenured, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty ($M = 6.25$, $SD = 2.01$). Additionally, participants who identified as Adjunct, Visiting, or Full-time (contract-based) faculty reported higher perceptions ($M = 8.00$, $SD = 3.42$) of systematic disadvantage than participants who identified as tenured, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty ($M = 9.46$, $SD = 3.18$), while those who identified as tenured, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty ($M = 10.06$, $SD = 3.10$) reported higher perceptions of having difficulties with the review process than Adjunct, Visiting, or Full-time (contract-based) faculty ($M = 11.25$, $SD = 3.35$). Finally, respondents who identified as tenured, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty ($M = 12.56$, $SD = 3.34$) reported higher perceptions of having access to resources than their Adjunct, Visiting, or Full-time (contract-based) faculty counterparts ($M = 13.00$, $SD = 4.04$).

4.2.8. Experience Working in Higher Education

To further test the proposition by Ferguson et al. (2011) and Swales (2004) that the dichotomy between "junior researcher" and "experienced researcher" may be more relevant to one's publishing outcomes than the native-English speaker vs. non-native English speaker polarization, it is also important to consider the experience an academic has had working in a higher education institution. 32 respondents provided the number of years they have worked in higher education (Table 5).

Table 5. How many years have you worked in higher education?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-5 years	7	21.9	21.9	21.9
6-10 years	5	15.6	15.6	37.5
11-15 years	4	12.5	12.5	50.0
16-20 years	4	12.5	12.5	62.5
21-25 years	3	9.4	9.4	71.9
More than 25 years	9	28.1	28.1	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

To determine whether the number of years a scholar reported having worked in higher education significantly predicated potential variation in the dependent variable constructs, a simple linear regression was conducted.

Perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing

A simple linear regression was used to test if the number of years a scholar had worked in higher education significantly predicted perceptions of preparation for success in academic publishing. The results indicated that the number of years working in higher education explained 1.80% of the variation in perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing ($F(1, 30) = .010$, $p = .921$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias

A simple linear regression was used to test if the number of years a scholar had worked in higher education significantly predicted perceptions of native English-speaker bias. The results indicated that the number of years in education explained 13.3% of the variation in perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias in academic publishing ($F(1, 30) = .538$, $p = .469$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage

A simple linear regression was used to test if the number of years a scholar had worked in higher education significantly predicted perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing. The results indicated that the number of years in education explained 14.2% of the variation in perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing ($F(1, 30) = .595$, $p = .447$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process

A simple linear regression was used to test if the number of years a scholar had worked in higher education significantly predicted perceptions regarding having difficulties with the review process. The results indicated that the number of years in education explained 10.0% of the variation in perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing ($F(1, 30) = .305$, $p = .585$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Perceptions regarding access to resources

A simple linear regression was used to test if the number of years a scholar had worked in higher education significantly predicted perceptions regarding having access to resources. The results indicated that the number of years in education explained 26.9% of the variation in perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing ($F(1, 30) = 2.34$, $p = .136$). These results were not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

5. Discussion

5.1. Analysis of the Findings

This study investigated the impact of eight independent variable constructs (i.e., native English-speaker status, English proficiency, the frequency of English use in the scholar's country, the location of the academic institution, the type of academic institution, the international ranking of the academic institution, faculty rank, and experience working in higher education) on five dependent variable constructs (i.e., perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publication, perceptions regarding native English-speaker bias, perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage, perceptions regarding difficulties with the review process, and perceptions regarding access to resources). As was indicated in the literature review and the results chapter, these constructs were based on concerns identified in the scholarly literature and are thus grounded in both the theoretical and empirical research. In this chapter, I will analyze and discuss the quantitative findings from the study. Additionally, I will discuss the qualitative findings concerned with scholars' perceptions regarding their recent experience(s) with journal article submission, the acceptance and/or rejection of their article(s) for publication, the editorial feedback received from journal editors or referees, and their general attitudes toward submitting and publishing academic work in English; these findings, I submit, provide additional context for interpreting the quantitative data and may also illuminate areas for further investigation. I will conclude by discussing the implications of the results and offering suggestions for ways that journal gatekeepers, TESOL professionals, and "literacy brokers" might help to create a more equitable and just academic publishing environment.

5.1.1. Native Speaker Status

The quantitative results regarding the hypothesis that non-native English speakers may be at a disadvantage compared to native English speakers when writing and submitting their academic work for publication are mixed. While native English speakers report higher

perceptions of being prepared for publishing success than non-native speakers, they also report higher perceptions of native-English speaker bias and systematic disadvantage in academic publishing than non-Native English speakers. The first finding—i.e., that native English speakers report higher perceptions of being prepared for success in publishing than non-native speakers—is consistent with the arguments presented by Ammon (2012), Canagarajah (1996), Curry and Lillis (2004), Flowerdew (1999), Paasi (2005), and others. The quantitative data, however, does not appear to support the contention that non-Native English speakers perceive higher levels of native English speaker bias and disadvantage than their counterparts and, indeed, may perceive less bias or structural disadvantage. While this result is surprising and appears to stand in contrast with much of the critical literature, it's important to review the qualitative reflections derived from a mix of close-ended and open-ended questions to further contextualize these results. One non-native English-speaking participant in this study claimed that "some editors are biased and set up higher standard for Taiwanese researchers," while another indicated that a recent submission was likely rejected for publication because "the English writing was not suitable" for publication. A third non-native English-speaking participant argued that "academic journals should be more lenient towards non-native speakers" while a fourth reported facing particular challenges with composing articles in fluent English and suggested that they might lack resources which could help to facilitate publishing success:

> Having insufficient knowledge to write fluently in English, I turned to translators each time. The big problem was that not all translators were native speakers, i.e. they did not have a sufficient terminological background. I had to intervene in the translations.

The qualitative data supports the views offered by Ammon (2012), Bocanegra-Valle (2014), Canagarajah (1996), Curry and Lillis (2004), Flowerdew (1999; 2002; 2007), Paasi (2005), Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) and other critical researchers in applied linguistics who argue that there may be a systematic disadvantage or bias against non-native English speakers in academic publishing. The qualitative data, I believe, complicates the findings derived from the statistical analysis. While the mixed quantitative and qualitative results for this construct may lend some support to Hyland's (2016) contention that the empirical evidence does not justify the view that English as a second or foreign language authors are discriminated

against by journal editors or face greater hurdles than their native-English speaking counterparts, I agree with Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) that the responsible interim conclusion is not, therefore, that "language injustice does not exist," but that "further study is needed" (p.4). Further investigation on the construct of perceived injustice for non-native English speakers is especially important given the relatively few respondents in the study (n = 32) and their unequal distribution (i.e., 7 respondents reported English to be their native language, while 25 reported a language other than English as their native language). Furthermore, as I maintained in the previous chapter, the results for this variable should be interpreted with a high degree of caution, as the unequal sample size may strongly affect statistical power and increase the risk of Type 1 errors (Rusticus & Lovato, 2019).

5.1.2. English Proficiency

Researchers have suggested that academics with lower levels of English proficiency may have greater difficulties publishing their work than scholars with higher proficiency levels. The quantitative data in this study appears to support this contention, as proficiency had a moderately predictive effect on perceptions regarding both preparation for success and perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing. These findings are consistent with those presented by Clouet (2017), Curry and Lillis (2004), Flowerdew (1999), and Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016), and they appear to support the view offered by Martín et al (2014) that:

> Publishing in English has widely been reported as representing an additional hurdle by non-English speaking scholars, especially for those who have low proficiency levels in English language skills (p. 58).

The qualitative data further supports these findings, as one participant—who reported their English proficiency skills as being 'slightly less than adequate'—indicated that the recent editorial feedback they'd received on a rejected submission included comments that the article "has grammar and language related issues." Additionally, the short-response considered above by a scholar who (in addition to being a non-Native English speaker) also reported their English proficiency skills as being 'slightly less than adequate' indicates that

those with "insufficient knowledge to write fluently in English" may have to rely on the assistance of native English-speaking translators—or "literacy brokers" as Lillis and Curry (2006) call them—to help improve their work. Further evidence that non-native English speakers may face additional hurdles in publishing is reflected in the response from a native Chinese-speaking participant with 'slightly less than adequate' English proficiency, who reported that they received editorial feedback indicating that "my English need to be improved" before their article could be accepted for publication.

Scholars who report having higher levels of English proficiency, however, provided written comments quite different in spirit from those of academics with lower English proficiency. One native Arabic speaking participant, for example, who reported their English proficiency as 'very good' indicated that English proficiency is not a perceived barrier in publishing: "It's [English] almost my native language and I live in the US therefore I don't have any issues with the language." Similarly, a native-English speaking scholar with 'excellent' English proficiency indicated that "I have had a lot of difficulty publishing my work in English, but maybe some of the reasons have to do with the quality of my submission." These responses seem to indicate that language proficiency was not a perceived obstacle to publication for more advanced English users. The qualitative findings, I maintain, provide further evidence that those with lower proficiency in English might perceive that they are less prepared, or more at a disadvantage, when compared to proficient English speakers when pursuing academic publication.

5.1.3. Frequency of English Use in the Scholar's Country

Researchers including Ammon (2012), Canagarajah (1996), Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) and others have posited that academics working in languages other than English, or who live countries where English is not the primary medium of communication, may be at a disadvantage or face negative bias when compared to those who more frequently use or work in English. The quantitative data does not appear to support this view, however, as the only statistically significant construct found was that regarding perceptions of native English-speaker bias, and for this construct, scholars who lived in countries where English was the

most common language unexpectedly reported higher perceptions of native English-speaker bias than scholars who lived in countries where another language was more common.

5.1.4. Location of Academic Institution

Critical researchers such as Ammon (2012), Bocanegra-Valle (2014), Canagarajah (1996), Maniati & Jalilifar (2018), Mozafari, (2016), Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016), Ramirez-Castaneda (2020), Riazi (2009), Uzuner (2008), and others have submitted that scholars working outside of the "academic center" may face disadvantages or discrimination when publishing their academic work in English. The quantitative data appears to offer some evidence in support of this view. Although investigations of several constructs did not indicate significant differences between respondent groups, participants who worked outside of North America or Europe reported having higher perceptions of difficulties with the review process than those who worked in North America or Europe. One explanation for this outcome might be that which is offered by Lillis and Curry (2006) in their longitudinal study of non-native English-speaking academics in Hungary, Spain, Portugal, and Slovakia. Lillis and Curry argue that "literacy brokers"—such as reviewers, editors, academic peers, and English-speaking friends and colleagues—are pivotal to the publishing process and to a scholar's chances of placing an article at an influential, international English-language journal. It may be the case that in this study, participants who were outside of the academic center had more difficulty consulting with English-speaking peers, editors, or colleagues to help interpret ambiguities offered by journal readers or editors in the review process. Additionally, although the quantitative data does not indicate a significant difference between perceptions regarding having access to resources and perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage between those who work inside the "academic center" and those who are situated outside of it, one respondent located in Africa reported facing "financial challenges due to high exchange rate," while another scholar, located in Taiwan, submitted that "some editors are biased and set up higher standard for Taiwanese researchers." Finally, a different scholar based in Africa articulated that:

> You can be asked to revise your work severely but at last it will still be rejected, this kills the morals in academic writings in Africa. The Journal's scope, aims and style of

> writing, proficiency in English, research methodology and non acceptance of African's ideas on theories have been the research obstacles in Africa.

This comment reflects concerns that are presented by Ammon (2012), Canagarajah (1996), Maniati & Jalilifar (2018), Mozafari, (2016), and others, and points to potential discrimination, disadvantage, or bias against scholars working outside of the academic center. Particularly troubling, however, is the sense of despair in the passage, and the notion that—despite the ability to revise an article according to the requirements of a journal editor or reviewer—there might still be a reluctance for gatekeepers to accept scholarly contributions from African researchers. This view, it seems, is in line with the concern raised by Canagarajah (1996) that scholars outside of the center are likely to be consumers of knowledge rather than producers of knowledge, and are more likely to read groundbreaking research than to directly contribute to the intellectual discussion.

5.1.5. Type of Academic Institution

Scholars such as Hesli and Lee (2011), Graves, Marchand, and Thompson (1982), and Griffith and Altinay (2020) have argued that academics who work at teaching-intensive or technical universities may face more challenges publishing their work than those employed at research-intensive institutions. The quantitative findings seem to provide some evidence for this view. Although it did not appear that significant differences existed between respondent groups for several of the analyzed constructs, participants who work at teaching or technical institutions reported higher perceptions of having difficulties with the review process than those who work at research-intensive institutions. One possible explanation for this outcome might have to do with Lillis and Curry's (2006) notion of "literacy brokers" —that is, it may be the case that scholars working in teaching intuitions have less contact than those at research institutions with reviewers, editors, academic peers, and English-speaking friends and colleagues who could help them to interpret the feedback received from gatekeepers. Another explanation might have to do with the distinction raised by Ferguson et al. (2011) and Swales (2004) which posits that "experienced researchers" might have more publishing success than "junior researchers," all else being equal. Given that scholars at research-intensive institutions typically have more time for publishing than those at teaching or

technical institutions, it would not be surprising if these scholars also had more experience publishing their academic work. As Griffith and Altinay point out, "teaching 12 credits or more per semester does not allow sufficient time for preparation, planning, and implementation of high-quality research" (p. 697).

5.1.6. International Ranking of Academic Institution, Faculty Rank, and Experience Working in Higher Education

Despite concerns raised in the literature by Canagarajah (1996), Ferguson et al. (2011), and Swales (2004) that the international ranking of one's academic institution, one's faculty rank, or one's experience working in higher education might play a significant role in determining a scholar's perceptions regarding preparation for success in publishing, native English-speaker bias, systematic disadvantage, difficulties with the review process, and access to institutional and social resources, the quantitative results from the study do not appear to support this view. Indeed, Independent Samples t-tests for International Ranking of Academic Institution and Faculty Rank, along with a simple linear regression for Experience Working in Higher Education, suggest that there are no statistically significant differences across the dependent variable constructs. This result is surprising, as one might assume *prima facie* that scholars who have just entered the profession—or who work at relatively low-ranked universities or in more precarious positions—would report higher levels of perceived disadvantage or difficulty in publishing than their higher-ranking peers or those work at more prestigious institutions. One explanation for this outcome could be that researchers in more precarious or junior positions might exert greater effort in publishing because their future careers depend on it (Pickett & Savala, 2022; van Dalen, 2021; Warren, 2019) and they may find success in their endeavors due to the pressure they are under to publish. A different explanation might be the one which is offered by Hyland (2016). Hyland argues that the key challenges involved in writing English at a publishable level have to do with mastering the genre of academic writing, and this skill must be learned by everyone, regardless of the institution they work at or their respective position within that institution. If this is the best explanation, however, then it would appear that one would need to learn these critical writing skills before entering the profession (for example, in undergraduate or graduate school), as

the data does not seem to indicate that the years of experience one has working in higher education plays a significant role on the dependent variables.

5.2 Implications

The findings suggest that there are significant differences in the perceptions regarding preparation for success in academic publishing between native-English speaking scholars and non-native English speakers; additionally, those who report having lower levels of English proficiency perceive that they are less prepared to succeed in publishing than those with higher proficiency levels. Respondents also raised concerns in qualitative reflections about bias against non-native English speakers and maintained that journal editors should be more lenient towards non-native speakers. Furthermore, English proficiency itself had a moderately predictive effect on perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in academic publishing, and those who worked outside of North America or Europe reported having higher perceptions of difficulties with the review process than scholars who worked in North America or Europe. Finally, respondents who work at teaching or technical institutions reported higher perceptions of having difficulties with the review process than those working at research-intensive institutions.

How should we respond to these findings? In addition to offering instruction that could help to improve a scholar's English proficiency and general confidence in their academic writing abilities, one suggestion that has been offered in the literature is to expand the criterion of "acceptable" academic English from a current status quo that enforces conformity to standard (typically British or American) varieties to one that allows for language variation and prioritizes intelligibility. Flowerdew (2008) argues that intelligibility, rather than a rigid conformity to standard varieties of English, should be established as a primary measure for linguistic norms in academic publishing, at least for disciplinary communities that are composed primarily of English as a Lingua Franca users. As Flowerdew notes:

> In the long run, therefore, just as spoken corpora may help to characterise ELF in verbal communication . . . large corpora for the various disciplines written by EAL writers might help to identify what is acceptable in terms of intelligibility in written academic English and what is not. Editors would then be able to accept writing

> according to standards which truly belong to the international academic community rather than just to NESs [Native English Speakers] (p. 84).

Similar views have been advanced by Ammon (2012), Clouet (2017), Ingvarsdottier & Arnbjornsdottier (2013), Jenkins (2000; 2006), Kachru (2005), Rose and Galloway (2019), Seidlhofer (2011), and others. While a non-native English-speaking participant in the study commented that "I don't believe I have a right for my work to be accepted by anyone. They journals reserve the right to accept or reject work according to their own standards," expanding the criterion of acceptable academic English might be a way of addressing the concern raised by a different participant that "some editors are biased and set up higher standard for Taiwanese researchers." Another participant commented that "I feel that academic journals should be more lenient towards non-native speakers," suggesting that more could be done by editors or gatekeepers to level the playing field.

Additionally, expanding the category of "acceptable" English might help to increase the perception of preparedness a non-native English-speaking scholar—or a less proficient English user—has when developing their work for submission and may help to mitigate concerns raised by participants in this study who indicated that the major challenges they've faced on the road to publication are "improving my English writing," "language structure and writing style," "language habits," "editing my work to the required standard," and having a "lack of time to revise the paper more times." Non-native English speaking participants and less proficient English-speaking participants also indicated that the main comments journal reviewers provided about why their submissions were rejected had to do with deficiencies in English writing and grammar; one participant, for example, received a response that their English writing "was not suitable" for publication while another was told that their submission was rejected because it had "grammar and other language related issues." Curry and Lillis (2004) and Flowerdew (2000) have argued that non-native English-speaking academics frequently receive harsh editorial comments from reviewers, and Politzer-Ahles et al. (2016) submit that:

> Another way in which linguistic privilege could manifest in academic publishing is through publication bias, with reviewers and editors being less likely to accept for publication a paper with "poor" English than a paper with standard English, all else being equal. (p. 5)

Broadening the category of what's linguistically "acceptable" in academic writing could be a way of increasing published contributions from a wide range of non-native English-speaking scholars, ELF users, and lower-proficiency English speakers; it might also help these scholars to feel more confident in both their English writing abilities and their publishing prospects.

In addition to expanding the range of "acceptable" academic English, researchers have argued that TESOL professionals should provide practical help to academics working toward publishing in English (Curry & Lillis, 2004) and should provide guidance and instruction in both English for Publication Purposes and publishing strategies to faculty members and graduate students who are preparing their work for submission (Buckingham, 2014; Cho, 2009; Ferguson, 2011; Li & Flowerdew, 2007). These measures would aim to position TESOL instructors as mediating agents fulfilling a role similar to what Curry and Lillis label "literacy brokers" (2006); that is, they could offer non-native English-speaking academics—as well as less-proficient English writers and ELF users—their expertise with various aspects of the publishing process. A related view has been articulated by Swales (1990) and Flowerdew (2002), who suggest that those working in TESOL might be able to provide assistance to scholars who otherwise might lack "discourse communities" or supportive academic networks that could help provide a foundation for intellectual exchange, collaboration, and peer review. Closely connected to this point, a participant in this study indicated that "sometimes I do not know the conventions of the journal or how to format my work exactly." Having a network of TESOL professionals with experience in academic publishing conventions might help to mitigate this type of concern.

Furthermore, researchers also suggest that it often takes non-native English-speaking academics longer to compose their work at a professional level and that the writing process is typically more stress-inducing than it is for native English speakers (Buckingham, 2014; Politzer-Ahles, et al. 2016). Increasing the access that non-Native English-speaking academics and lower-level English proficiency writers have to TESOL professionals and other "literacy brokers" might help to reduce not only the amount of time it takes to compose academic work in English, but also the amount of stress experienced during the writing, planning, and submission process.

Closely connected to this, recall that a participant in this study reported facing particular challenges with composing academic articles in English and indicated that they might lack the social resources which could aid in their success. Positioning TESOL instructors and other "literacy brokers" in positions of influence could help to address this concern. Lastly, increasing the access scholars have to "literacy brokers" might also have a positive impact on publishing outcomes for academics who work primarily at teaching or technical universities, where instructors typically have little time to dedicate to research and have reported perceiving difficulties with the review process.

Regarding the publishing landscape for scholars outside of the linguistic and academic center, researchers have indicated that there is a growing desire from journal editors to solicit more article contributions from ELF scholars or those working outside of the mainstream (Belcher, 2007; Hewings, 2006). Soliciting more contributions from academics working outside of the linguistic or academic center may help to address the concerns raised by a participant that scholars in Africa might perceive that their ideas are not accepted by those who are working in the mainstream. Ammon (2012) has argued that the current landscape of academic publishing often excludes authors working in languages other than English, and that those who use languages further away from English linguistically (e.g., Korean, Japanese, and Chinese) are more likely to be at a disadvantage than those who use languages closer to English (e.g., Spanish, French, or German). Similarly, Canagarajah (1996) maintains that academics outside of the center are likely to be consumers rather than producers of knowledge, and are more likely to read groundbreaking research than to contribute directly to the academic conversation.

Finally, researchers have argued for the need to reduce the expenditure for article submissions and for editorial services that are offered to scholars who are unable to submit their work according to established journal guidelines and requirements (Ramirez-Castaneda, 2020). Reducing the cost for journal submission might help to mitigate the concerns raised by a participant in this study, who was living outside of North America and Europe, that "financial challenges due to high exchange rate" for international submissions have been a barrier to publication and that "in most cases publication in international journals is

expensive." Additionally, reducing the costs for editorial services might address the concern raised by a different participant about having a lack of access to native-English speaking translators.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Reviewing the Research Questions

Given the rapid spread of English around the world and the important role that English-language publishing plays both in the development of a scholar's academic career and in the global exchange of ideas, this study set out to investigate whether some English users—e.g., non-native speakers and those writing outside of the academic mainstream—might be at a disadvantage or face bias or other difficulties when compared to native English-speaking scholars or those who live and work in the academic center. In light of the findings and discussion, I shall now attempt to briefly answer the research questions set out in the introduction.

R1. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the academic mainstream, perceive that they are less prepared for success in academic English-language publishing than their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

The findings suggest that non-native English-speaking scholars perceive that they are less prepared for success in academic publishing than their native-English speaking counterparts. Additionally, it appears that scholars who report having lower levels of English proficiency perceive that they are less prepared for success than more proficient English speakers. The data does not suggest, however, that those who work outside of the academic mainstream perceive they are less prepared for success than their more centrally located counterparts.

R2. Do non-native English-speaking scholars perceive higher levels of linguistic bias in academic publishing than their native English-speaking counterparts?

While the quantitative findings suggest that non-native English-speaking scholars do not perceive higher levels of linguistic bias in academic publishing than their native English-speaking counterparts, the data is complicated by findings derived from the qualitative

reports. Respondents raised concerns about bias against non-native English speakers and maintained that journals should be more lenient towards non-native speakers. They also indicated that the most important editorial comments they'd received on submitted work had to do with English grammar and punctuation. The results for this variable are therefore inconclusive and further research is needed to investigate the research question.

R3. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the academic mainstream, perceive they are at a systematic disadvantage when trying to publish their academic work in English when compared to their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

While the quantitative findings suggest that non-native English-speaking scholars do not perceive higher levels of systematic disadvantage in academic publishing than their native English-speaking counterparts, English proficiency did have a moderately predictive effect on perceptions regarding systematic disadvantage in publishing. The quantitative data is complicated by findings from the qualitative reports. Non-native English-speaking scholars raised concerns that they might lack resources (e.g., access to native English-speaking translators) which could help to facilitate their publishing success. Furthermore, scholars outside of the academic mainstream raised concerns that financial challenges might be a barrier to publication. Additionally, one respondent noted that, despite having the ability to revise an article according to editorial requirements, there might still be a reluctance from gatekeepers to accept contributions from researchers working outside of the academic center. The results, therefore, appear to be inconclusive and further research is needed.

R4. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the academic mainstream, perceive that they face more difficulties with the review process than their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

While there does not appear to be a significant perceptual difference between native English-speaking scholars and non-native English-speaking scholars, those who worked outside of North America or Europe reported having higher perceptions of difficulties with the review

process than scholars who worked in North America or Europe. Additionally, scholars who work at teaching or technical institutions reported higher perceptions of having difficulties with the review process than scholars who work at research-intensive institutions.

R5. Do non-native English-speaking scholars, or scholars who work outside of the academic mainstream, perceive that they have access to fewer resources than their native English-speaking or centrally located counterparts?

While the quantitative findings suggest that non-native English-speaking scholars and those who work outside of the academic mainstream do not perceive that they have access to fewer resources than their counterparts, participants raised concerns in the qualitative responses that they might lack translation resources which could help to facilitate publishing success. Additionally, respondents noted that financial challenges due to high exchange rates and high international journal fees might present a barrier to publishing. Given these mixed results, further research is needed.

6.2. Limitations and Further Research

The most significant limitation is the small sample size of the participants (n = 32). As indicated in the methodology chapter, despite multiple attempts to encourage participation in the study, the return rate was approximately 4.2%. Although the sample size meets the minimum requirement for descriptive statistics indicated by Hatch and Lazaraton (1991), the results should be interpreted cautiously; in particular, the results drawn from the independent variable construct analyzing the difference between native-English speakers and non-native English speakers should be interpreted with a great deal of caution, as the unequal sample size between native English speakers (n = 7) and non-native speakers (n = 25) may strongly affect statistical power and increase the risk of Type 1 errors (Rusticus & Lovato, 2019). In light of this, it would be beneficial to conduct a follow-up study that includes a greater number of participants and that includes a roughly equal distribution between native-English speakers and non-Native English speakers.

Related to this, it was the original aim in the data analysis to conduct a Principle Component Analysis (PCA) on the questionnaire data to reveal underlying constructs that underpinned the Likert scale items, as to reduce the data into manageable multi-item variables. The small sample size made this impossible, however. Consequently, the researcher and their supervisor engaged in theoretically-driven grouping of items through collaborative discussions about which items could justifiably be argued to measure a concept identified in the literature, which were inspected for internal reliability. Further research on this topic with a sufficiently large sample size would allow for conditions where a Principle Component Analysis could be conducted.

An additional limitation regards the independent variables that were investigated in the study. This research did not analyze the impact of race, ethnicity, gender, age, or sexual orientation on the dependent variables; these constructs may have offered useful data regarding whether and to what extent perceptions of bias, discrimination, and systematic disadvantage in academic publishing extend beyond the constructs explored in the study. According to le Roux (2016), recent scholarship suggests that women and ethnic minorities may perceive high levels of discrimination in academic publishing, and further research should investigate the perceptions of these groups in detail. Additionally, there may be an opportunity to explore the impact of intersectionality in publishing. In a recent interview, the critical scholar and legal professor Kimberlé Crenshaw argued that **"**various forms of inequality often operate together and exacerbate each other" (Steinmetz, 2020); further research could investigate the degree to which other inequalities may play a role in scholars' perceptions regarding possible bias and disadvantage—as well as the prospects for success—in academic writing and publishing.

There are also methodological limitations. While this study was based on data derived from a mixed methods approach (i.e., it included a mix of Likert-scale items, socio-biographical items, and close-ended and open-ended questions), there are opportunities to engage in further mixed methods research based on a combination of quantitative items, close-ended and open-ended questions, and oral accounts (such as interviews or oral narratives). Flowerdew (1999) provides an example of the way in-depth interviews can be used to good

effect in research exploring scholars' perceptions of disadvantage and bias in academic publishing. In-depth interviews may be especially useful in cases where the qualitative and quantitative data appear to be inconclusive or to point in opposite directions, as was the case with the second, third, and fifth research question explored in this study, as interviews "provide an opportunity to explain or clarify questions or answers, thereby helping to increase the accuracy of the collected data" (Alamri, 2019, p. 66). Related to this, it's important to point out that, although self-report instruments such as questionnaires are commonly used in applied linguistics research and are a flexible way of collecting data, they can also inhibit what respondents say or lead them to provide what they believe are the expected answers (Borg, 2016).

There are also limitations with open-ended questionnaire items. Borg (2016) points out that they often require more effort and time for a respondent to complete, and should be used sparingly when possible. Given the limitations of the chosen instruments in this study, there may be grounds to also include interviews or oral account instruments to ensure additional triangulation in further empirical research.

A final limitation concerns the sampling of participants. In this study, mid-ranked journals were selected with the aim of eliciting data from academics who might better reflect the typical professional profile of an academic currently publishing in English than one who might publish in either the top quartile or the bottom quartile of their respective field. In light of this choice, it's important to note that the findings may have left out information about the perceptions of bias, discrimination, or systematic disadvantage for scholars currently publishing in the top or bottom quartile of their fields, or who may not be publishing at all. Further research should be conducted, therefore, to investigate the perceptions of academics endeavoring to publish in journals across their fields of study.

References

Alamri, W. (2019). Effectiveness of Qualitative Research Methods: Interviews and Diaries. *International Journal of English and Cultural Studies, 2*(1), 65-70.

Ammon, U. (2012). Linguistic inequality and its effects on participation in scientific discourse and on global knowledge accumulation – with a closer look at the problems of the second-rate language communities. *Applied Linguistics Review, 3*(2), 333-355.

Armstrong, R. A. (2014). When to use the Bonferroni correction. *Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics*, *34*(5), 502-508.

Belcher, D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 1–22.

Bocanegra-Valle, A. (2014). 'English is my default academic language': Voices from LSP scholars publishing in a multilingual journal. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 13*, 65-77.

Borg, S. (2016). Researching Teachers' Beliefs. In. B. Paltridge and A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 487-504). Bloomsbury.

Buckingham, L. (2014). Building a Career in English: English as an Additional Language in Academia in the Arabian Gulf. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(1), 6-33.

Canagarajah, S. (1996). "Nondiscursive" Requirements in Academic Publishing, Material Resources of Periphery Scholars, and the Politics of Knowledge Production. *Written Communication, 13*(4), 435-472.

Cho, D. (2009). Science journal paper writing in an EFL context: The case of Korea. *English for Specific Purposes, 29*, 230-239.

Clouet, R. (2017). The intercultural dimension of English as an Academic Lingua Franca (EALF) in scientific publication. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Especificios*, *23*(2), 313-333.

Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and Conducing Mixed Methods Research, 2nd Edition*. Sage.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language, 2nd Edition*. Cambridge University Press.

Curry, M., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 663-688.

Curry, M., and Lillis, T. (2014). Strategies and tactics in academic knowledge production by multilingual scholars. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 22*(32), 1-24.

Danzak, R. (2011). The interface of language proficiency and identity: A profile analysis of bilingual adolescents and their writing. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 42*(4), 506-519.

Duszak, A., & Lewkowicz, J. (2008). Publishing academic texts in English: A Polish perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 108-120.

Ferguson, G., Perez-Llantada, C., and Plo, R. (2011). English as an international language of scientific publication: a study of attitudes. *World Englishes, 30*(1), 41-59.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality. On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 26, 237–259.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8,* 243–264.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly, 35,* 121-150.

Flowerdew, J. (2007). The non-Anglophone scholar on the periphery of scholarly publication. *AILA Review, 20*, 14–27.

Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an Additional Language: What can Goffman's "Stigma" tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 77-86.

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse Community, Legitimate Peripheral Participation, and the Nonnative-English-Speaking Scholar. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(1), 127-150.

Flowerdew, J. (2015). Some thoughts on English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) and related issues. *Lang. Teach., 48*(2), 250-262.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing Global Englishes*. Routledge.

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*, 17.0 update (10a ed.). Pearson.

Graves, P., Marchand, R., & Thompson, R. (1982). Economics Department Rankings: Research Incentives, Constraints and Efficiency. *American Economic Review 72*(5),131–41.

Green, J., Caracelli, V., & Graham, W. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*(3), 255-274.

Griffith, S., & Altinay, Z. (2020). A Framework to Assess Higher Education Faculty Workload in U.S. Universities. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 57(6), 691-700.

Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The Research Manual: Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Heinle and Heinle.

Hesli, V., & Lee, J. (2011). Faculty Research Productivity: Why Do Some of Our Colleagues Publish More than Others? *PS: Political Science & Politics, 44*(2), 393-408.

Hewings, M. (2006). English language standards in academic articles: attitudes of peer reviewers. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 53*, 47-62.

Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 31*, 58-69.

Ingvarsdóttir, H., &Arnbjörnsdótt, B. (2013). ELF and academic writing: a perspective from the Expanding Circle. *JELF, 2*(1), 123-145.

Isaacs, T., & Trofimovich, P. (2012). Deconstructing Comprehensibility: Identifying the Linguistic Influences on Listeners' L2 Comprehensibility Ratings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 34*, 475-505.

Ivankova, N., & Greer, J. (2016). Mixed Methods Research and Analysis. In. B. Paltridge and A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 63-81). Bloomsbury.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2002). *World Englishes. A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16*(2), 137–162.

Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(4), 926–936.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (p.11-36). Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. (2005). *Whose English is it? Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon*. Hong Kong University Press.

Kourilova, M. (1996). Interactive function of language in peer reviews of medical papers written by NN users of English. *UNESCO-ALSED LSP Newsletter*, *19*(1), 4–21.

Le Roux, E. (2015). Discrimination in scholarly publishing, *Critical Arts*, *29*(6), 703-704.

Li, Y. (2002). Writing for international publication: The perception of Chinese doctoral researchers. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 12,* 179–193.

Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2007). Shaping Chinese novice scientists' manuscripts for publication. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 28*(3), 100-117.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication, 23*(1), 3-35

Lindemann, S., & Subtirelu, N. (2013). Reliably Biased: The Role of Listener Expectation In the Perception of Second Language Speech. *Language Learning, 63*(3), 567-594.

Maniati, M., & Jalilifar, A. (2018). Strategies for publishing in English journals: A study of perceptions of Iranian scholars. *Learned Publishing, 31*, 355-365.

Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). The language experience and proficiency questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing language profiles in bilinguals and multilinguals. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 50*(4), 940–967

Martín, P., Rey-Rocha, J., Burgess, S. & Moreno, A. (2014). Publishing research in English-language journals: Attitudes, strategies and difficulties of multilingual scholars of medicine. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *16*, 57-67.

McGrath, L. (2014). Parallel language use in academic and outreach publication: A case study of policy and practice. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 13*, 5–16.

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.

Mohler, P., Dorer, B., Jong, J., & Hu, M. (2016). *Cross-Cultural Survey Guidelines*. https://ccsg.isr.umich.edu/chapters/adaptation/ (website last accessed June 10, 2023).

Morse, J., & Niehaus, L. (2009). *Mixed Method Design: Principles and Procedures*. Left Coast Press.

Mozafari, M. (2016). Iran and science publishing in the post-sanctions era. *The Lancet, 387*, 1721–1722.

Mweru, M. (2010). Why Kenyan academics do not publish in international refereed journals. *World social science report: Knowledge divides*. 110-111.

Olsson, A., & Sheridan, V. (2012). A Case Study of Swedish Scholars' Experiences With and Perceptions of the Use of English in Academic Publishing. *Written Communication, 29*(1), 33-54.

Paasi, A. (2005). Globalization, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning, 37,* 769-789.

Pennycook, A. (1999). Critical Approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 329-348.

Pickett, J., & Savala, P. (2022). Rate of Publication Hastens, but number of publications slows academic promotion. *PLoS One 17*(10), 1-20.

Politzer-Ahles, S., Holliday, J., Girolamo, T., Spychalska, M., & Berken, K. (2016). Is linguistic injustice a myth? A response to Hyland (2016). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 34*, 3-8.

Prodromou, L. (2007). Is ELF a variety of English? A critical discussion of 'English as a Lingua franca' (ELF) as both a novel phenomenon and in relation to ELT methodology. *English Today, 23*(2), 47–53.

Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. (1996). Audience and voice in current L1 composition texts: some implications for ESL student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(1), 21-34.

Ramirez-Castaneda, V. (2020). Disadvantages in preparing and publishing scientific papers caused by the dominance of the English language in science: The case of Colombian researchers in biological sciences. *PLoS ONE, 15*(9): e0238372.

Riazi, A. M. (2009). Producing scholarly texts: Writing in English in a politically stigmatized country. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueiredo (Eds.), *Genre in changing world*. (pp. 449–466). The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.

Richards, J., & Pun, J. (2022). *Teaching and Learning in English Medium Instruction: An Introduction*. Routledge.

Romer, U. (2009). English in academia: Does nativeness matter? *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies, 20,* 89–100.

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Rose, H., & McKinley, J. (2018). Japan's English-medium instruction initiatives and the globalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 75*(1), 111-129.

Rusticus, S., & Lovato, C. (2014) Impact of Sample Size and Variability on the Power and Type I Error Rates of Equivalence Tests: A Simulation Study. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation 19*(11), 1-10.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.

Sousa, V., Matson, J., & Lopez, K. (2017). Questionnaire Adapting: Little Changes Mean a Lot. *Western Journal of Nursing Research 39*(9), 1289-1300.

Steinmetz, K. (2020). She Coined the Term 'Intersectionality' Over 30 Years Ago. Here's What It Means to Her Today. *TIME*. https://time.com/5786710/kimberle-crenshaw-intersectionality/ (website accessed July 9, 2023).

Sung, C.C. M. (2017). Out-of-class communication and awareness of English as a Lingua Franca. *ELT Journal, 72*(1), 15-25.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres*. Cambridge University Press.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Sage.

Times Higher Education. *World University Rankings 2023*. Website last accessed June 20, 2023: https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-ranking/2023/world-ranking.

Uzuner, S. (2008). Multilingual scholars' participation in core/global academic communities: a literature review. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(4), 250–263.

van Dalen, H. (2021). How the publish-or-perish principle divides a science: the case of economists. *Scientometrics, 126*, 1675-1694.

Wagner, E. (2016). Survey Research. In. B. Paltridge and A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 83-99). Bloomsbury.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System, I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I. (1991). *Geopolitics and geoculture*. Cambridge University Press.

Warren, J. (2019). How Much Do You Have to Publish to Get a Job in a Top Sociology Department? Or to Get Tenure? Trends over a Generation. *Sociological Science, 6*(7), 2330-6696.

Appendix 1: CUREC Approval Form

Research ethics approval

Research title:

Academic Publishing in Global Englishes: Standards, Challenges, and Opportunities

Research ethics reference:

EDUC_C1A_23_053

The above application has been considered on behalf of the Education Departmental Research Ethics Committee (DREC) in accordance with the University's procedures for ethical approval of all research involving human participants.

I am pleased to confirm that, on the basis of the information provided to the DREC, ethics approval has now been granted for this study.

Please note the following:

Personal data: It is the responsibility of the PI to ensure that all personal data collected during the project is managed in accordance with the University's guidance and legal requirements.

In-person activities: Any data collection involving in-person interactions with participants must have an up-to-date fieldwork risk assessment in place; further guidance is available from the Safety Office's website.

Amendments: Please notify the committee if you intend to make any amendments to the information in your ethics application as submitted at date of this approval, as all changes must receive ethical approval prior to implementation. The amendment form is available on the SSH IDREC webpage.

We welcome feedback on your experience of the ethical review process and suggestions for improvement. Please email any comments to:

staff.curec@education.ox.ac.uk / student.curec@education.ox.ac.uk or ethics@socsci.ox.ac.uk.

Yours sincerely

Liam Francis Gearon

DREC Chair

Liam Francis Gearon, PhD, FHEA, FRSA, Docent

Senior Research Fellow, Harris Manchester College, University of Oxford

Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Oxford

Conjoint Full Professor, Newcastle University, Australia

Docent, University of Helsinki, Finland

Extraordinary Professor, North-West University, South Africa

Visiting Professor, Irish Institute for Catholic Studies, MIC, Limerick, Ireland

Honorary Senior Research Fellow, School of Education, University of Birmingham

Appendix 2: Research Questionnaire

Academic Publishing in Global Englishes: Standards, Challenges, and Opportunities

Questionnaire for MSc in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching
University of Oxford, Department of Education
Researcher: Jason Barry
Supervisor: Dr. Heath Rose

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. If you prefer not to answer any of the following questions, feel free to skip the question and move on to the next.

1. Which of the following describes how you think of yourself? Please select one option

Male
Female
In another way

2. Please select your level of proficiency in English

0 – none
1 – very low
2- low
3 – fair
4 – slightly less than adequate
5 –adequate
6 – slightly more than adequate
7 – good
8 – very good
9 – excellent
10 – perfect

3. How many languages do you speak to a functional level in addition to English?

0
1-3
4-6
5-7
Other

4. What is your native (first) language? (if more than one first language, list your most proficient language) _____

5. What is the highest degree you have obtained?

Associates Degree
Bachelor's Degree
Master's Degree
PhD or other doctorate degree
Other

6. What is your academic field?

Social sciences
Arts and Humanities
Sciences
Medicine
Mathematics
Engineering
Other

7. Please indicate your area of academic specialization _____

8. Which of the following best describes your academic institution?

Technical university
Research-intensive university or college
Teaching-intensive university or college
Other

9. Which of the following best describes the international ranking of your academic institution?

Top 10
Top 50
Top 100
Top 500
Top 1000
Other

10. Which of the following best describes your academic position?

Adjunct or part-time Lecturer or Instructor
Adjunct or part-time Professor
Visiting Lecturer or Instructor
Visiting Professor (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor)

Full-time, contract-based Lecturer or Instructor
Assistant Professor (tenure-track)
Associate Professor with tenure
Professor with tenure
Professor Emeritus
Academic Administration
Other

11. How many years have you worked in higher education?

Less than one year
1-5 years
6-10 years
11-15 years
16-20 years
21-25 years
More than 25 years

12. How many years has it been since you obtained your highest degree?

Less than one year
1-5 years
6-10 years
11-15 years
16-20 years
21-25 years
More than 25 years

13. In which continent is your academic institution located?

North America
South America
Asia
Africa
Europe
Oceania

14. To what degree is English spoken or used in your country?

Very often
Often
Somewhat often
Not often

15. What is the most common language spoken or used in your country?

_____

16. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I am prepared to write academic papers at a publishable level in English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I often need editorial advice or assistance from my peers/colleagues to write at a publishable level in English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

18. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I am able and willing to pay for professional editing services to help improve my writing.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

19. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: When journal editors/referees make a decision about whether to publish or reject my academic writing, my submission will be evaluated fairly.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

20. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The ranking of my university and academic department have a negative impact on my publishing opportunities.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

21. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The geographical location of my university/college has a negative impact on my publishing opportunities.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

22. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Editors, referees, and publishers might reject my submission because of the variety of English I use in my writing.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

23. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Editors, referees, and publishers might reject a submission if it is not in American or British English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

24. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The ideas presented in my writing are more important to publishers, editors, and referees than the accuracy and style of my English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

25. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The amount of effort I need to write at a publishable level in English is equal to that of my peers/colleagues.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

26. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The amount of effort needed to write at a publishable level for non-native English speakers is equal to that of native English speakers.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

27. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I spend more time preparing, writing, and editing my academic essays than my peers/colleagues do.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

28. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I can always afford to pay submissions fees when sending my work to journals.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

29. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I can easily obtain advice from my peers/colleagues about how to improve my academic writing in English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

30. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: My native language negatively impacts my publishing opportunities in English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

31. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The location and prestige of one's university have an impact on their publishing outcomes.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

32. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: My university provides services/resources to faculty to improve their academic writing in English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

33. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is easy for me to submit my academic work online to journals.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

34. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Publishing academic work in English is important for advancing my career.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

35. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I believe that I am at a disadvantage when submitting my academic work for publication.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

36. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Journal editors and publishers should be more lenient towards submissions from non-native English speakers.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

37. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I have found my language proficiency to be an obstacle when trying to publish my academic work.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

38. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I have found my writing style to be an obstacle when trying to publish my academic work.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

39. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: A lack of financial or university resources has been an obstacle when trying to publish my academic work.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

40. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: A lack of access to the latest research in my field has been an obstacle when trying to publish my academic work.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

41. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I have faced difficulties when communicating with editors, reviewers, and publishers.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

42. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I have faced difficulties when interpreting comments and suggestions made by referees and editors.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

43. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I have encountered technical problems and obstacles when trying to publish my academic work in English.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

44. What other challenges do you encounter when trying to publish your academic writing in English?

_____
_____
_____

45. In the last five years, have you published any academic writing in English (e.g, journal articles, book chapters, or academic books)?

Yes_____No_____

46. If you answered 'yes' to question 45, briefly describe the number and type of publication(s)

_____
_____
_____

47. In the last 5 years, have you had a submission rejected by an English-language journal?

Yes _____ No _____

48. If you answered 'yes' to question 47, why do you think your submission was rejected (select all that apply)?

1. The content was not suitable for the journal _____
2. The article did not meet the journal's specifications or guidelines _____
3. There were language problems with the submission _____

49. If you answered 'yes' to question 47, what were the main comments you received from the referees/editors? Did you agree with their comments?

_____
_____
_____

50. Please add any further comments you have about your experiences publishing academic work in English

_____

_____

_____