Journal of English for Academic Purposes 36 (2018) 26–36

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of English for Academic Purposes

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jeap

English language policies in scientific journals: Signs of change in the field of economics

Ann C. Henshall*

Lisbon School of Economics & Management (ISEG), University of Lisbon, University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies (ULICES), School of Arts and Humanities, University of Lisbon, Portugal

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 25 June 2017
Received in revised form 25 May 2018
Accepted 8 August 2018
Available online 9 August 2018

Keywords:
English language policy
Scholarly publication
Hegemony
English as a lingua franca
Web of science

ABSTRACT

This article aims to shed light on the socio-politics of English in the academic context of scientific publishing. It aims to bring to light the assumptions underlying the English language policies of journals indexed in the Economics category of the Social Science Citation Index of the Web of Science. Using information on journal territory, publisher and publication language from the Journal of Citation Reports and the instructions for authors on the journals' websites, the policies are classified with regard to English language variety, attitudes towards grammatical correctness, and readership constraints. The results indicate that English language policy can contribute to journal identity and is shaped by assumptions about readership, recognition of linguistic diversity among the contributing author base, and the publisher. The findings also suggest that journal English language policies are evolving in response to increased internationalisation in the contributor base.

1. Introduction

In the dissemination of scientific research English retains a special status as 'the global academic language' (Graddol, 2007, p. 74). Indeed, in a survey of 16,056 academics from 109 countries, Buela-Casal and Zych (2012) found that publication in English is considered to be the first, most important component of internationality. The result may be induced by the importance accorded to publishing in peer-reviewed journals that are indexed on large databases like Scopus or the Web of Science (WoS), in both of which the vast majority of journals are English-medium. Despite criticism that English-medium journals are over-represented in these databases (Meadows, Dietz, & Vandermotten, 2016; Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016; de Moya-Anegón et al., 2007), over the last 15 years Testa (2003; 2006; 2008; 2009) has justified the use of English in journal selection criteria for the WoS on several occasions, repeatedly arguing that 'English is the universal language of science [… and] the journals most important to the international research community are publishing full text in English' (Testa, 2016). The perceived importance of English for international exposure has led some journal editors in non-Anglophone countries to publish local or national journals in English (Gonzalez-Alcaide, Valderrama-Zurian, & Aleixandre-Benavent, 2012; Lillis, 2012; Muresan & Nicolae, 2015), and some multilingual journals to drop their multilingual policy in favour of English (Petrić, 2014; Short, Boniche, Kim, & Li, 2001) or to question whether the journal should continue it (Bocanegra-Valle, 2014).

The international contributor base for WoS and Scopus indexed journals is extremely heterogeneous, and the impact of linguistic, economic and political factors on scientific productivity varies across countries and scientific fields (Gantman,

* Rua do Quelhas, 6, 1200-781, Lisbon, Portugal.
E-mail address: ahenshall@iseg.ulisboa.pt.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.08.001
1475-1585/

2012). Debate on inequity has been framed in terms of distinctions between native speakers of English (NS) and non-native speakers of English (NNS) (e.g. Barbin, 2008; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000); distinctions between wealthier countries with high levels of funding for education and research and development such as the U.S. and Germany, termed 'centre' or 'core' countries, and countries with lower levels of funding, deemed 'peripheral' (Ferguson, 2007; Salager-Meyer, 2008) or 'semi-peripheral' (Bennett, 2014; Lillis, 2012); and finally distinctions between novice and experienced writers (Hyland, 2016).

Irrespective of the explanation for differing scientific productivity, the literature on scholars' struggles to publish in English has highlighted how literacy brokers intervene to mould the finished article. Insightful case studies have described how, along the process, content, form and language are negotiated (e.g. Curry & Lillis, 2004; Dueñas, 2012; Englander, 2009; Flowerdew, 2000; 2001; Lillis & Curry, 2006; 2010). Yet, notably absent from the discussion is one of the mechanisms through which the scientific article is regulated: journal language policy. It is a sensitive issue in view of the heterogeneity of the entities involved (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014), but the pertinence of the topic is revealed through its emergence during a UK-based writing for publication mentoring programme whose goal was to support scholars in the writing of research articles for submission to the journal *Compare: a journal of comparative and international education* (Lillis, Magyar, & Robinson-Pant, 2010). During the programme the assumptions underlying the 'the kind of English(es) in which articles can/should be written' (Lillis et al., 2010, p. 796) emerged as an issue. An understanding of the assumptions underlying journal language policy is important for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) because instructional materials are often valued and chosen on the basis that they have been published in peer-reviewed journals (Tribble, 2015). However, to date a thorough examination of these assumptions is lacking, and even less is documented about how they might change over time, even though with globalisation, policies might be expected to change in response to institutional pressures for scholars to publish in internationally recognised peer-reviewed journals. The purpose of this article is to examine more closely what is meant by 'English' in Thomson Reuters Web of Science through an analysis of the English language policies in journals indexed in the category of Economics on the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) database and to compare the results, where possible, with those of prior studies to determine if and how the policies have changed. The study seeks to contribute to a greater understanding of the nature and role of English for research publication purposes (ERPP) and the forces that shape it.

2. Submission guidelines, the academic publishing sector and practice

The language policies of a journal can be studied through the submission guidelines for authors. Such information is important for it enables prospective authors to tailor the article to meet the specifications of the journal. While policies may not reflect actual practice (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014), they do present the institutional face of the journal. They have been broached as part of the backdrop to discussions on what constitutes acceptable English and EAP in pre-submission phases (Kirkman, 2001, cited in; Burrough-Boenisch, 2006) and post-submission feedback phases (Burrough-Boenisch, 2006; Shashok, 2008), as well as in the context of hegemonic and pluralist models of English(es) (Henshall, 2012; Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014).

The studies, which span the fields of medicine (Burrough-Boenisch, 2006; Shashok, 2008), science (Kirkman, 2001), economics (Henshall, 2012) and applied linguistics (Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014), overwhelmingly illustrate that journal language policies rest on hegemonic assumptions that native speaker standard American or British English constitutes the norm of acceptability, with journals stipulating that authors should write "'good English", or "idiomatic English", or "standard English, or "grammatical English", or English "in accordance with acceptable standards of usage" or even "letter-perfect English"' (Burrough-Boenisch, 2006, p. 34. Such specifications are underscored by recommendations that NNS authors have their manuscripts checked by NSs prior to submission (Burrough-Boenisch, 2006; Shashok, 2008; Henshall, 2012). Only Heng Hartse and Kubota (2014) report an instance in which a journal language policy is explicitly inclusive: the *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca.* Published by the commercial publisher de Gruyter, the journal openly accepts non-native usages of English and explicitly rejects the need for NNS manuscripts to be checked by a NS before submission. Heng Hartse and Kubota, however, claim that this inclusive position is limited to journals in applied linguistics and teaching, whose orientations are sensitive to matters of language, and "few academic publishers are prepared to take up the challenge of applying these approaches in publishing" (Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014, p. 76).

Although these studies suggest a longstanding reliance on NS English as the linguistic standard of acceptability for manuscripts, they are not without their limitations. First, because language policies are not the main data sources in Burrough-Boenisch (2006) and Shashok (2008), the sample sizes for journals and/or publishers tend to be small and limited. Shashok's (2008) conclusions, for example, are based on general observation and the analysis of only five commercial publishers in the field of medicine, and it is not clear how many and what journals constituted her data. Moreover, other long-established commercial publishers, university publishers and academic associations operating in the field were excluded. Second, the classification procedure in Henshall (2012) was rather crude. The language policies of the 239 WoS-indexed English-medium journals in the field of economics were classified as requirements for English variety (American or British English or a non-specified variety), or requirements for grammatically correct language (normative), or constraints due to readership, or no information, but each journal was tagged with one feature only. As a result, the study underrepresents the number of journals with NS standards of linguistic acceptability and readership constraints.

The responsibility for setting journal language policy can lie with the journal itself or with the publisher, or it can be shared between them (Henshall, 2012). While Shashok (2008) reports that Elsevier, Wiley, Blackwell and Biomed Central applied a

common policy across all their journals, Henshall (2012) finds that only Elsevier did so, and the Wiley-Blackwell journals combined a general policy of recommending pre-submission NS copy-editing with individual journals setting the parameters for English variety (British or American) or providing no other information. Springer journals, by contrast, were reported to operate no uniform policy (Shashok, 2008), and nor did individual journals tend to stipulate specific policies (Henshall, 2012). In light of the potential for major publishers to influence the English language of their journals by implementing a common policy across them, their role in ERPP should not be ignored.

Owen (2002) argues that due to digitalisation and technology the role of publishers in scholarly communication is becoming more profit oriented. About 60% of publishers are for-profit concerns (Ware & Mabe, 2015), and the large commercial publishing houses – in particular Elsevier, Springer, Taylor and Francis, and Wiley-Blackwell – have consolidated their position in the market through the acquisition of smaller ones (Larivière, 2015; Paasi, 2005; Smart, 2014) as well as by taking over English-medium journals published by university institutions in non-Anglophone countries (Lillis, 2012) or attempting to do so (Petrić, 2014). As a result, the journals published by these major commercial publishers cover a wide range of disciplinary fields (Migheli & Ramello, 2018). These commercial publishers are also entrepreneurial. Not only do they publish and disseminate scientific research, but technological advances in analytics have enabled them to track trends, thereby identifying niche markets and creating new journals to fill them (Ware & Mabe, 2015).

The sector has shown continued growth, with the average number of research articles increasing yearly by about 3% accompanied by a concomitant increase in the number of researchers (Smart, 2014; Ware & Mabe, 2015). Much of this growth has come from the emerging economies. In particular the relative share of Chinese and South Korean authors has risen (Ferguson, 2007; Ware & Mabe, 2015), and between 2000 and 2011 the number of non-Anglophone researchers successfully publishing in the top five journals ranked with the highest impact factor in the sciences and social sciences grew significantly (Hyland, 2016). The increased international diversity of contributing authors in scientific publishing is a matter of pride for Thomson Reuters, for it validates their scientific journal selection criterion that a journal's contributing authors should be internationally diverse and reinforces their claim that the database, which is constantly updated and extended, covers the core journals that are important for international researchers (Testa, 2009; 2016). The growth in both authors and journals also represents increased competition among publishers for authors, and publishers have responded to it by expanding their author support services (Ware & Mabe, 2015).

Despite the dominance of a handful of major commercial publishers, there is evidence that some English-medium journals not published by the major firms have been able to fill niche markets unavailable to the journals that are. The English medium can, for instance, enable a journal to act as an intermediary for dissemination of country-specific knowledge that authors would find difficult to publish in journals edited by the major publishers (Lillis, 2012; Mišak, Marušić, & Marušić, 2005; Petrić, 2014). In some cases these journals actively play a role in supporting language development for contributing authors (e.g. see Mišak et al., 2005; Petrić, 2014). Editors in journals published by the commercial publishing houses may also instigate policies and strategies to support language development. Examples of such journals have been reported in the fields of education (Lillis et al., 2010), language policy and planning (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005), biology (Burgman, Jarred, & Main, 2015), and geography (Paasi, 2005).

Viewed from the perspective of practice rather than policy, there is evidence that linguistic norms of English acceptability in manuscripts vary across disciplinary cultures (see Kuteeva and Mauranen's (2014) introduction to the special issue of *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* on writing for publication in multilingual contexts). In history, for example, NS norms prevail and pre-submission NS copy-editing of manuscripts is common among NNS authors (Gnutzmann & Rabe, 2014 for Germany; Hynninen & Kuteeva, 2017 for Sweden and Finland). By contrast, in disciplines such as biology or mechanical engineering, English seems to have been appropriated by the NNS authors with the result that traces of NNS English are accepted in the text (Gnutzmann & Rabe, 2014 for Germany). Gnutzmann and Rabe (2014) posit that the inclusive practices in the latter disciplines stem from the high proportion of NNS editors and reviewers in these fields and the standardisation of their empirical research article structure and use of formulaic language.

Language choice in scholarly publishing is an ideologically sensitive issue (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014). For multilingual scholars it is not only affected by disciplinary knowledge-making practices, but also by professional needs, with institutional policies valuing highly publications in English-medium journals that are indexed on internationally recognised databases (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014). Thus, the stakeholders in scholarly publishing are diverse; in addition to a growing international and multilingual contributor base of authors, reviewers and readers, journal editors, small and large commercial and university publishers and associations all have a vested interest in the language policies of journals. The evolution of policy in some journals in applied linguistics and the apparent mismatch between policy and practice in fields such as biology and mechanical engineering suggest that there is potential for wider change. It therefore seems timely to undertake a fine-grained analysis of the language policies in WoS indexed journals to bring to light the assumptions underlying them. This study of the journals in the economics category seeks to shed more light on the dynamics underpinning English for research publication purposes.

3. Data and method

The data for analysis consist of information reported by the Journal of Citation Reports (JCR), 2015, for the journals in the economics category, augmented by content on language policy from each journal's website, accessed through the information available for authors on submission guidelines. The JCR lists 345 journals, of which four have double listings due to name

changes. As a result, the old journal title was dropped, leaving 341 journals. Because the sample population is the same as Henshall (2012), i.e. all the journals listed in the economics category, it is possible to compare the results for variety of English of the two studies. The 2015 sample has 94 journals more than that of Henshall (2012), the result of new journals being added to the index and some being dropped. 242 journals are common to both analyses.

The journals were classified according to journal country/territory, publisher, publication language, and English language policy. When differences regarding publisher or publication language were encountered between the JCR website and the journal website, I used the information from the journal website. Two of the journals, which make up less than one per cent of the total number of journals listed, do not publish in English, so they were also dropped from the analysis. The final sample covers journals from 34 countries and comprises 319 English-medium journals and 20 multilingual journals, which publish in English and one or more other languages.

3.1. English language policy parameters

The broad categories for English language policy were based on (Henshall, 2012). However, unlike that study, the categories were non-mutually exclusive, and new specifications emerging from the current analysis were added. The parameters were: variety of English; attitudes towards grammatical correctness; and readership constraints. Each parameter included an option of no information for when there was no mention in the guidelines of anything to do with that parameter.

3.1.1. Variety of English

English varieties included specifications for American English, British English, Canadian English, Australian English, English ('any consistent variety' or no variety specified), and no language specification. The requirement could be explicitly formulated, for example, 'Please use British "ize" spelling consistently' (*Applied Economics*), 'Canadian Spelling (*Canadian Oxford*)' (*Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue Canadienne d'Economique*) or 'British or American spelling and terminology may be used' (*Review of Industrial Organization*), or implied through references to grammars or dictionaries, for example, 'Articles must conform to EJW style, which is based on the Chicago Manual of Style (14th edition)' (*Economic Journal Watch*). When references to general style, i.e. not the formatting of bibliographic references, specified the *Chicago Manual of Style* and *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, the journal was classified American English. Journals whose reference text was the *Oxford English Dictionary* were classified British English. When the guidelines specified the use of English but did not request a particular variety, for example 'Manuscripts are accepted in English. Any consistent spelling and punctuation styles may be used' (*Journal of Economic Policy Reform*), they were classified English.

3.1.2. Grammatical correctness

The policies for grammatical correctness seek to determine the journal's underlying attitude towards infelicities in the grammar of the manuscript or traces of NNS usage of English. Thus, they reflect the extent to which the journal facilitates participation by NNS authors. They included:

- explicit normative specifications (e.g. requests for 'standard English' (*Journal of World Trade*) or 'grammatically correct' English (*Journal of Korean Trade*));
- implicit normative specifications in which there are no overt requests for 'standard' or 'correct' English but non-native English speakers are singled out as potentially needing to correct the English (e.g. 'Authors for whom English is a second language may choose to have their manuscript professionally edited before submission to improve the English' (*Developing Economies*));
- specifications explicitly stating tolerance towards grammatical mistakes (e.g. 'Make sure the text is written in clear, grammatically-acceptable English. The grammar does not have to be perfect, but it cannot be so poor that it causes the reader to pause at frequent intervals' (*Review of Financial Studies*));
- conflicting norms, where there were both explicit normative and explicit tolerant specifications;
- implicit tolerant specifications in which there were no explicit specifications about tolerance to grammatical infelicities or NNS usage, but editorial or publisher policy implied tolerance (e.g. 'The *Southern Economic Journal* follows the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th Edition, in copy-editing manuscripts for publication. It is not necessary for authors to familiarize themselves with these details for initial submissions of manuscripts' (*Southern Economic Journal*)); and
- no information regarding grammatical correctness.

3.1.3. Readership constraints

Readership constraint specifications draw attention to manuscript readability for the journal's audience. They included requests for 'clear and concise' writing (*Review of Network Economics*) or 'plain' language rather than 'jargon' (*Journal of Australian Political Economy*). They also included more general requests such as 'Articles should be written in a way that makes them accessible to economists working in different fields and those working in the government, policy and corporate sectors. This consideration should apply to the level of complexity of the article, its use of specialist terminology, its assumptions

about prior knowledge of the field, and its use of mathematical notation (which is covered separately below)' (*Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*). Again, a no-specification option was included.

4. Results and discussion

The results of the analysis of English language policies show that 41 journals (12.09%) apparently have no language policy; that is, there is no information concerning English language variety, grammatical correctness or readership constraints, which suggests that these journals take language as given. This result represents an almost threefold decrease in comparison with the results reported in Henshall (2012). Notwithstanding this seemingly positive evolution, more than three quarters of these journals are based in English-speaking countries: 21 journals are published in the United States of America, 11 are from England, and one is from Ireland. Some of these journals have been in existence for a long time or are from well-established and prestigious institutions, often universities, which may explain the lack of information. For instance, the *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, published by Oxford University Press, was established in 1939, and, although the *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* began publication in 1970, the Brookings Institute in the U.S., its publisher, is more than 100 years old, having celebrated its centenary in 2016. Other journals are publications from an institution that has a recognised language policy. This is the case of the *World Bank Economic Review*, which began publication in 1986 and is reportedly the world's most widely read economic journal (Research Gate, n.d.). Yet longevity does not necessarily explain the presence of some journals whose policy is based on the assumption that authors will write in an appropriate English. *Quantitative Economics,* an e-journal which began publication in 2009 and is published by Wiley-Blackwell, is an example.

4.1. Results and discussion on English language variety

Analysis of the journal policies on language variety shows that fewer than half the journals (44.72%) specify that authors should use a particular variety of English (Table 1). This represents a slight increase with regard to Henshall (2012), which reported 38.9%. When journals from North America and the United Kingdom and Ireland specify a variety, it tends to be American English and British English, respectively. Australia, which leans towards British English, and Canada also claim the right to use their national varieties of English in a WoS indexed journal with one Australian journal, *Australian Economic Papers*, and one multilingual Canadian journal, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, challenging the hegemony of British and American Englishes. By contrast, Continental Europe privileges the American and British varieties, as does Asia, but, unlike Asia, offers authors a choice between them.

Contrasting these results with those of Henshall (2012) shows that there has been a rise in the relative share of North American journals that request American English, from 25.8% to 35.96%, and of UK and Irish journals that request British English, from 17.9% to 23.86%. In addition, the requests for Australian and Canadian English are new. With regard to Continental Europe, although the total share of journals that specify a particular English variety has declined slightly, there has been a rise in the share of British English-medium journals and a decrease in the share of journals that accept submissions in both British and American English.

Journal policies that require manuscripts to be written in a particular variety of English suggest that language variety contributes to the identity of the journal, in keeping with the arguments that people use a local variety or dialect of English to express identity (Svartvik & Leech, 2006) and orthographic conventions function to underpin the communal standard of an institution (Widdowson, 1994). In the global market for academic publishing, as portrayed through the WoS SSCI database, just as British economic journals are competing with U.S. economic journals, British English is competing with American English, and now, it would seem, there are new entrants in the market: Australian and Canadian Englishes. Indeed, the increase in journals from English-speaking countries that specify their national varieties suggests that these journals are increasingly using English language variety to help establish their brand.

Nevertheless, over a third of the journals require authors to write in English but do not specify a particular variety. The distribution of these journals across regions is not uniform (Table 1). The results show that the relative share of journals with

Table 1
English language variety by region.

	Units								% of region							% of all regions
	AmE	BrE	AmE/BrE	AusE	CanE	Eng.	No info.	Total	AmE	BrE	AmE/BrE	AusE	CanE	Eng.	No info.	Total
North America	41	1	15	0	1	29	27	114	35.96	0.88	13.16	0	0.87	25.43	23.68	33.63
UK & Ireland	2	21	15	0	0	25	25	88	2.27	23.86	17.04	0	0	28.40	28.40	25.96
Continental Europe	3	5	37	0	0	53	6	104	2.88	4.81	35.58	0	0	50.96	5.76	30.68
Asia	2	2	1	0	0	5	4	14	14.28	14.28	7.14	0	0	35.71	28.57	4.13
Australia & NZ	0	4	1	1	0	2	3	11	0	36.36	9.09	9.09	0	18.18	27.27	3.24
Latin America	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	83.33	16.67	1.77
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	0.59
All regions	48	33	69	1	1	120	67	339	14.16	9.73	20.35	0.29	0.29	35.39	19.76	100

AmE = American English; BrE = British English; AmE/BrE = American English/British English; AusE = Australian English; CanE = Canadian English; Eng = English.

this policy tends to be lower than average in English-speaking regions and higher than average in non-Anglophone regions. This result might be explained by a tendency for non-native speakers not to think of English immediately in terms of varieties, thus focussing on the function of communication rather than identity. The relative share of journals specifying English, but no particular variety, has more than doubled since Henshall (2012), and this has more than offset the decrease in the number of journals that provided no information on language policy.

Finally, almost a fifth of the journals do not mention anything to do with English language variety. With the exception of Asia, in which only one journal (*Singapore Economic Review*) is from an Anglophone country, Singapore, the proportion of journals with no policy on language or language variety is higher in Anglophone regions than in non-Anglophone regions.

When submission guidelines neither specify a variety of English nor give any information about language, it leaves authors to glean what is expected from the spelling conventions or regional terms used on the website or in the journal itself. This opaque practice is high across all regions, and has in fact, risen from 51% reported in Henshall (2012) to 55.15% in this study. Basing a language policy on the assumption that none is needed may indicate a hegemonic function of English on the part of Anglophone countries, as implied by their higher-than-average share in journals that provide no information on language. While such a policy may or may not covertly contribute to screening participation in the journal, it does not facilitate the author's task of writing the manuscript. On the other hand assuming that it suffices to specify English suggests that English is being used as an 'umbrella label' (Jenkins, 2006), as indicated by the higher than average share of journals in non-Anglophone regions that specify English, but no particular variety. In this case use of the term 'English' might be considered shorthand for English as a Lingua Franca, defined by Seidlhofer (2011, p. 7) as 'any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option', thus focussing on its function of international communication.

When the policies on English variety are looked at not from the perspective of region but from that of the publisher, a slightly different picture emerges. Table 2 shows the breakdown of these policies by publisher.

The most striking result is the high concentration, in each case over 85%, of a particular policy in journals published by Elsevier, Springer and other universities (i.e. non-U.S. and non-British). While most publishers seem to have left the choice of language variety to the individual journal, Elsevier and Springer have implemented a general policy for all of their journals, with few exceptions. Elsevier offers authors a mutually exclusive choice of writing their texts in American or British English: 'American or British usage is accepted, but not a mixture of these' (e.g. *Energy Economics*). These Elsevier journals account for 85% of the journals that accept manuscripts in American or British Englishes and are distributed across different regions. Springer, by contrast, merely specifies English and their wording suggests that they are using English as an 'umbrella label': 'For editors and reviewers to accurately assess the work presented in your manuscript you need to ensure the English language is of sufficient quality to be understood' (e.g. *Small Business Economics*). I shall discuss this Springer specification in more depth in the results on policies on grammatical correctness.

The universities outside the U.S. and Britain also tend not to request a particular variety of English. This group of publishers is made up of universities from 12 different countries; two journals are from Asia, four from Latin America, one from South Africa, and the rest from Europe. Seven of the 15 journals requesting English are multilingual. Again the multilingual context of publishing for these countries suggests that it is the communicative function of English that is privileged by the term.

The distribution of policies on English variety among the other major publishers reflects the trends noted in the distribution among regions. British university publishers of journals tend not to specify an English language variety but when they do, it is the variety of the country in which the journal is based. Similarly, U.S. university publishers opt for American English. Routledge, Taylor and Francis show a greater tendency to request British English. This trend can be explained by the fact that more than half of their journals are based in England. Their journals based in the U.S. tend to specify American English. Wiley-Blackwell, by contrast, shows a high proportion of journals that provide no information on English variety or even language.

Comparison with the results of Henshall (2012) for the four major publishers – Wiley-Blackwell, Elsevier, Springer and Routledge, Taylor and Francis – shows that the trends remain unchanged except for Springer. Before, very few Springer journals - 92.9% - had a policy on language variety. Today, Springer journals are overwhelmingly covered by a policy that

Table 2
English language variety by publisher.

	Units								% of publisher							% of all publishers
	AmE	BrE	AmE/BrE	AusE	CanE	Eng.	No info.	Total	AmE	BrE	AmE/BrE	AusE	CanE	Eng.	No info.	Total
Wiley-Blackwell	9	9	3	1	1	17	29	69	13.04	13.04	4.35	1.45	1.45	24.64	42.03	20.35
Elsevier	0	0	59	0	0	4	2	65	0	0	90.77	0	0	6.15	3.08	19.17
Springer	1	0	2	0	0	41	3	47	2.17	0	4.35	0	0	89.13	6.52	13.86
Routledge, Taylor & Francis	8	18	2	0	0	6	1	35	22.86	51.43	5.71	0	0	17.14	2.86	10.32
UK universities	7	2	2	0	0	11	15	37	18.92	5.41	5.40	0	0	29.73	40.54	10.91
US universities	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	36.36	0	0	0	0	36.36	27.27	3.24
Other universities	0	1	0	0	0	15	1	17	0	5.88	0	0	0	88.24	5.88	5.01
Other	19	3	1	0	0	22	13	58	32.20	5.08	5.88	0	0	37.28	22.03	17.11
All publishers	48	33	69	1	1	120	67	339	14.16	9.73	20.35	0.29	0.29	35.40	19.76	100.00

AmE = American English; BrE = British English; AmE/BrE = American English/British English; AusE = Australian English; CanE = Canadian English; Eng = English.

requests that manuscripts be written in English. This change indicates a conscious strategy on the part of the publisher, and it will be discussed in more depth in the results on attitudes towards grammatical correctness.

4.2. Results and discussion on grammatical correctness

The results for grammatical correctness show that more than half the journals in the sample provide information about the issue, but Continental Europe is the only region that has clearly addressed it. The distribution of policies on grammatical correctness is clearly related to the role of the publisher (Table 3). The two publishers that have implemented general policies for their journals in the author instructions – Elsevier and Springer – have included explicit specifications on the importance of grammatical correctness in manuscripts. It is to be noted that these two publishers are based in Europe and not in Anglophone countries, and together, they publish almost a third of the journals in the sample.

Elsevier, a Dutch commercial publisher who publishes almost a fifth of the journals and allows authors to choose between writing in British or American English, takes an explicit normative approach towards grammar, requesting that authors write in 'good English' without mixing the British and American varieties. They further specify that the 'manuscript must be "spell checked" and "grammar checked"', and recommend professional copy-editing 'to eliminate possible grammatical or spelling errors and to conform to correct scientific English' (e.g. *Economic Modelling*). By contrast, almost half the journals from Oxford University Press apply an implicit normative policy. In the absence of any open specification, the importance of grammatical correctness is implied by suggestions such as 'Particularly if English is not your first language, before submitting your manuscript you may wish to have it edited for language' (e.g. *Journal of Economic Geography, Cambridge Journal of Regions Economy and Society*). This advice is clearly directed to NNS of English, but there is no requirement that the editing should be carried out by a native speaker. The assumption is that the editing will bring the manuscript into conformity with the journal's linguistic standards. A few journals explicitly advise authors that poor English will result in rejection. The U.S. journal *Economics of Energy and Environment Policy* states, 'Submissions in poor English will be declined' while the Dutch *Journal of Economic Psychology*, which is published by Elsevier, recognises that English language quality is a key component in the initial screening: 'In today's competitive environment the quality of the English language used in your paper is essential. Your research may be critical, but poor English is a common cause of delays and initial rejections.' Still others, which are published by both commercial publishers and university institutions, advise NNS authors to have their manuscript proof-read by a native speaker of English before submission (e.g. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, published by Routledge, *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, published by Vilnius Gediminas Technical University).

The wording of the normative specifications tends to create a division within international research communities of scholars working in economics between native-speakers of English and non-native speakers. NNS authors, who are variously referred to as 'non-native speakers' (*Economics and Philosophy*), 'authors for whom English is a second language' (*Developing Economics*), 'authors whose native language is not English' (*Ecological Economics*), and 'authors whose first language is not English' (*Journal of Institutional Economics*), are singled out as potentially needing to improve the English of the manuscript. Thus, the native speaker remains the ideal against which authors are compared. Such wording reinforces what Hyland (2016) calls 'the myth of linguistic injustice' and may contribute to the perception that there is a linguistic bias against NNS scholars, as reported in many studies (see Lillis & Curry, 2010; Moreno, Rey-Rocha, Burgess, Lóppez-Navarro, & Sachdev, 2012). It may also help explain Hynninen and Kuteeva's (2017: 58–59) finding that, in the field of history, researchers in Sweden and Finland hold the elegance of native English speaker writing as an ideal but aim for 'a basic expository text' that is 'faultless', attributing considerable importance to copy-editing to ensure that the manuscript is grammatically correct.

Hynninen and Kuteeva (2017) report that for both the historians and computer scientists in their study grammatically correct English is seen as a means to avoid alienating the reader or reviewer for it contributes to the clarity of the content. In this study, the motivations behind the policies requesting grammatical correctness are not clear. Elsevier's policy, for example,

Table 3
Journal policy on grammatical correctness by publisher.

	Units							% of publisher						% of all publishers
	Ex Norm	Imp Norm	ExTol	Imp Tol	Conf.	No info.	Total	Ex Norm	Imp Norm	ExTol	Imp Tol	Conf.	No info.	Total
Wiley-Blackwell	11	12	4	1	1	40	69	15.94	17.39	5.80	1.45	1.45	57.97	20.35
Elsevier	61	0	0	0	0	4	65	93.85	0	0	0	0	6.15	19.17
Springer	0	0	40	1	3	3	47	0	0	86.96	2.17	6.52	6.52	13.86
Routledge, Taylor & Francis	3	1	0	0	1	30	35	8.57	2.86	0	0	2.86	85.71	10.32
UK universities	5	14	1	0	0	17	37	13.51	37.84	2.70	0	0	45.95	10.91
US universities	1	0	0	0	0	10	11	9.09	0	0	0	0	90.91	3.24
Other universities	1	0	0	0	1	15	17	5.88	0	0	0	5.88	88.24	5.01
Other	20	8	1	0	0	29	58	33.90	13.56	1.69	0	0	49.15	17.11
All publishers	102	35	46	2	6	148	339	30.09	10.32	13.57	0.59	1.77	43.66	100

ExNorm = Explicit normative; ImpNorm = Implicit normative; ExTol = Explicit Tolerant; ImpTol = Implicit Tolerant; Conf. = Conflicting.

was reported by Shashok (2008) and Henshall (2012), and it has remained unchanged. It may be that these commercial publishers are unwilling to take on the responsibility for copy-editing, unless as a paid service. As a result, publishing in these journals can be difficult for some scholars who would like to but are unable to have their manuscripts copy-edited prior to submission due to financial constraints (Barros, 2014; Dueñas, 2012). It may also be the case that language policies do not reflect practice (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014). According to Hyland (2016) there is no evidence in the literature that editors and reviewers specifically penalise NNS authors for grammar-related issues.

Normative specifications for grammatical correctness can create dilemmas for all authors when no other language policies are given. For example the South Korean journal *Journal of Korea Trade* stipulates that 'The author must ensure that it [the manuscript] is complete, grammatically correct and without spelling or typographical errors' but provides no information on which variety of English should constitute the reference norm. The author is left to determine the reference variety by consulting the articles already published, or possibly use the variety of the country if the journal is based in an Anglophone country.

While just over 40% of the journals apply normative policies, less than 15% apply explicit or implicit tolerant policies towards linguistic correctness. Springer, who publishes almost 14% of the journals, clearly acknowledges a potential burden for NNS scholars writing in English. They apply a common policy of intelligibility: the author 'need[s] to ensure that the English language is of sufficient quality to be understood' (e.g. *European Journal of Health Economics*, *Open Economies Review*). The stipulation appears under a section in the instructions for authors entitled English language editing. The policy suggests that Springer recognises that research communities are linguistically diverse and that an imperfect command of EAP should not constitute a barrier to participation. Their support for authors includes suggestions for language support, an on-line English language tutorial, and professionally editing accepted manuscripts for 'spelling and formal style before publication'. Moreover, most of their journal websites provide abridged author guidelines in Chinese, Japanese and Korean (e.g. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, *Review of Economics of the Household*), suggesting recognition of the value of authors' contributions from these countries.

These policies for Springer were not in practice in the earlier study (Henshall, 2012), which found that the great majority of Springer journal websites had no language policy of any kind in the instructions for authors, i.e. there was no information on language variety, grammatical correctness or readership constraints, although on a separate webpage the publisher indicated that they usually copy-edit accepted manuscripts. The new explicit policy illustrates the evolving context of academic publishing and the entrepreneurship of the publisher in exploiting new opportunities. It is likely that it was implemented after 2011, when Springer was taking a proactive approach to the opportunities provided by digitalisation (electronic publishing and open access systems) and an increase in journal publications. Their strategy between 2011 and 2016 sought to reach out to the growing numbers of new researchers, and it included "the forward-thinking promotion of new authors and fields of research, and accessing new research locations, such as China" (Springer, n.d.). The abridged guidelines in Japanese, Chinese and Korean suggest recognition of the importance of research from these countries.

Springer is not the only institution to have introduced policies of tolerance towards traces of NNS English. Six journal editors from 4 different publishers have also done so. Four of the journals are published by Wiley-Blackwell (*Pacific Economic Review* and *China and World Economy*, both from China, *Econometrics Journal* from England, and *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* from Australia). One is published by Oxford University Press (*Review of Financial Studies* from the U.S.), and the other by Edward Elgar Publishers (*Review of Keynesian Economics* from England). In four cases, these policies couple with a request for a particular language variety. For example, *China and World Economy* requests the use of American English. To implement a policy of tolerance towards grammar in these journals represents a conscious decision on the part of the editor and editorial board, who clearly recognise and value the heterogeneity of the global researcher base. While it is only possible to speculate on the motivations that led to their implementation, these policies, which must have been introduced at some point between 2010 and 2016, provide a response to calls for editorial tolerance (Flowerdew, 2008; Muresan & Nicolae, 2015; Salager-Meyer, 2008; Tonkin, 2011), contrasting with the previously reported hegemonic policies of NS standard English (Burrough-Boenisch, 2006; Kirkman, 2001; Henshall, 2012; Shashok, 2008). They also strike a chord with research that shows that NNS value clarity and intelligibility (Gnutzmann & Rabe, 2014; Hynninen & Kuteeva, 2017).

There are six instances in which the submission guidelines include both explicit normative and explicit tolerant specifications. With one exception, they are all from commercial publishers. In three of the cases, the journal is published by Springer (*Environmental & Resource Economics*, *Journal of Economic Inequality* and *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*), and an editorial guideline conflicts with the general policy of tolerance. For example the *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* stipulates in the information under the topic 'Text' that 'Works by non-native speakers must have been checked by a native speaker,' and directs interested contributors to a language editing service, but the same webpage carries the topic 'English language editing', which states Springer's general policy. In the case of the *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, which is published by the Economics Department of the University of Pretoria, the guidelines initially seem normative but later suggest that the journal undertakes the role of copy-editing: 'The entire manuscript must be neatly prepared, spell-checked, and adhere to the structure and style requirements …. Upon acceptance of a manuscript for publication by the Editor-in-Chief, the editorial staff will work towards preparing the manuscript for online publication. The first stage involves language editing, after which the manuscript is returned to the corresponding author for review.' The other two journals are *Developing Economies*, published by Wiley-Blackwell and *New Political Economy*, published by Routledge.

4.3. Results on readership constraints and discussion

Few journals include readership constraint specifications. By drawing attention to the various professions and knowledge base of the readers, these journal policies seek to ensure accessibility for the readership and place the onus for complying with them on the author. Interestingly, journals with readership constraints are overwhelmingly based in Anglophone regions (Table 4).

Over half of the readership constraints were made up of requests for clarity and/or conciseness, but others revealed a deeper awareness of relations among readership diversity, motivations for reading and the research article genre. For example the Australian journal *Economic Record* specifies that 'The introduction, conclusion and abstract should be written for the non-specialist', which suggests that readers outside academia are less interested in the methodology and results of the study than in how it relates to other research and what its conclusions are. Specific requests to avoid jargon were usually coupled with descriptions of a broad or non-specialist readership. For instance, the *Journal of Common Market Studies* specifies, 'Authors should keep their technical writing to a minimum and consider that the journal has a wide readership.' Indeed, a sense of frustration can be sensed in the English journal *Economic Policy*'s specification that 'Jargon cannot be avoided entirely but you should try to cut down on it as much as possible (and you should try hard to make the introduction absolutely jargon-free). Even words like "exogenous" and "endogenous" often have simple translations in their context. If essential, you should explain jargon terms in plain English when they are first introduced, remembering that some EP readers are non-specialists.'

This editor's frustration draws attention to the different stakeholders involved in scientific knowledge production and reception, echoing studies that identify jargon as a hindrance to the flow of knowledge from academics to practitioners in management-related fields (Booker, Bontis, & Serenko, 2008; Hughes, Bence, Grisoni, O'Regan, & Wornham, 2011). The small number of journals that cater to non-specialists suggests that this is, in fact, a niche market, so a language policy that ensures readability is a high priority for these journals. These readership specifications also draw attention to the importance of competence in both English for general purposes and English for academic purposes (EAP) in scholarly writing, in contrast with studies that highlight the importance of EAP over English for general purposes (e.g. Moreno et al., 2012).

The high concentration of journals with readership constraints in Anglophone countries is open to different interpretations. It might suggest that the market for practitioner-oriented journals in economics for non-Anglophone countries is filled by journals published in the country's native language, in line the results reported by McGrath (2014) on the publication language practices of Swedish academics. Such a finding could allay fears expressed in other domains that the shift to English-medium journals excludes NNS practitioners from making use of the published knowledge (e.g. see Amano, González-Varo, and Sutherland (2016) for biologists in Spain and Brazil).

5. Conclusions

The analysis of the English language policies of the economics journals indexed on SSCI sought to shed light on the assumptions underlying the nature of English in WoS in the context of an evolving global market for academic journal publishing, with greater participation by NNS authors. The analysis indicates that the language 'English', as used in the WoS, is not a single, homogeneous construct and various forces contribute to shaping it, including journal identity, journal readership, recognition of linguistic diversity in the contributor base, and the publisher.

The analysis finds that 'English' may refer to a particular variety of English, with the U.S. and British varieties remaining dominant, or it may be used as an umbrella label, suggesting English as a Lingua Franca. The rise in the number of journals which use a particular English variety and the specific requests for Australian English and Canadian English rather than the British and U.S. varieties suggest that specifications for a particular language variety contribute to branding the journal identity.

The findings also suggest that underlying assumptions of the need for grammatical correctness in manuscripts are changing as a result of growing awareness among publishers and journals of the linguistic diversity of the participants in the WoS economics scientific communities. Some journals (e.g. *Econometrics Journal, Economic Theory*) and publishers (e.g. Springer) have embraced the linguistic diversity by openly not using English language competence as a gatekeeper for manuscript submission. Others apply explicit normative grammar policies, which do not create a level playing field for all

Table 4
Journal policy on readership constraints by region.

	Units			% of region		% of all regions
	Reader-ship constraints	No info.	Total	Reader-ship constraints	No info.	Total
North America	20	94	114	17.54	82.46	33.63
UK & Ireland	14	74	88	15.91	84.09	25.96
Continental Europe	1	103	104	0.96	99.04	30.68
Asia	3	11	14	21.43	78.57	4.13
Australia & NZ	6	5	11	54.55	45.45	3.24
Latin America	0	6	6	0	100	1.77
South Africa	0	2	2	0	100	0.59
All regions	44	295	339	12.98	87.02	100

contributors but do make the rules of the game clear (e.g. *Astin Bulletin* published by Oxford University Press, *Ecological Economics* by Elsevier). The normative policies, which were clearly in evidence in Kirkman (2001), perpetuate the ideal of the 'native speaker' through a tendency to classify authors in the contributing base as native vs non-native speakers of English.

Another conclusion is that in some journals language policy is influenced by the readership of the journal. In particular, some sections of the research article need to be written in non-specialist language in order to reach the target audience. In such cases, writing competence in English for general purposes becomes equally important as English for Academic Purposes.

Finally, the analysis shows that language policies in the WoS-indexed journals are entwined with the role played by publishers. While in most cases the language policy is set by each journal's editor or editorial board, two major publishers have chosen to apply a general policy across their journals. Elsevier's hegemonic policy of American and British NS standard English seems to have been in practice for at least 20 years. In the case of Springer, the decision to implement a contrasting, more inclusive policy is recent, and it seems to be a strategic response to the increased internationalisation of contributing authors. Such changes in language policy ultimately have an impact on EAP practice as the published articles become available to be used as resources in EAP classes.

The study highlights the importance of clear language polices in the submissions guidelines for authors. It draws attention to the responsibility that editors and publishers have in promoting transparent practices for the submission of manuscripts by a global contributor base. The results for economics journals challenge the claim that inclusive policies rarely extend beyond the field of applied linguistics and language (Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014), but it remains to be seen if they have made inroads into scientific fields like biology, where practice and policy seem to diverge.

Conflicts of interest

None.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

References

Amano, T., González-Varo, J. P., & Sutherland, W. J. (2016). Languages are still a major barrier to global science. *PLoS Biology, 14*(12), e2000933. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2000933.

Barbin, B. J. (2008). Scholarly marketing publication: The American advantage? *European Business Review, 20*(5), 370–383.

Barros, R. (2014). Portuguese academics' attitudes to English as the academic Lingua Franca: A case study. In K. Bennett (Ed.), *The semi-periphery of academic writing: Discourses, communities and practices* (pp. 105–120). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bennett, K. (2014). Introduction: The political and economic infrastructure of academic practice: The 'semiperiphery' as a category for social and linguistic analysis. In K. Bennett (Ed.), *The semi-periphery of academic writing: Discourses, communities and practices* (pp. 1–9). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2013.10.010.

Booker, L. D., Bontis, N., & Serenko, A. (2008). The relevance of knowledge management and intellectual capital research. *Knowledge and Process Management, 15*(4), 235–246. https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.315.

Buela-Casal, G., & Zych, I. (2012). How to measure the internationality of scientific publications. *Psicothema, 24*(3), 435–441. http://www.psicothema.com/pdf/4036.pdf.

Burgman, M., Jarred, F., & Main, E. (2015). Decreasing geographic bias in conservation biology. *Conservation Biology, 29*(5), 1255–1256. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12589.

Burrough-Boenisch, J. (2006). Negotiable acceptability: Reflections on the interactions between language professionals in Europe and NNS 1 scientists wishing to publish in English. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 7*(1), 31–43. https://doi.org/10.2167/cilp086.0.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands and rewards. *Tesol Quarterly, 38*(4), 663–688. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588284.

Dueñas, M. P. (2012). Getting research published internationally in English: An ethnographic account of a team of Finance Spanish scholars' struggles. *Iberica: Revista de la Asociación Europeu de Lenguas para Fines Èspecíficos, 24*, 139–156. http://www.redalyc.org/html/2870/287024476012/. (Accessed 17 March 2015).

Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English-speaking scientists as a consequence of the social construction of revision. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 8*(1), 35–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450802611997.

Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: Questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Iberica, 13*, 7–38.

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *Tesol Quarterly, 34*(1), 127–150. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588099.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *Tesol Quarterly, 35*(1), 121–150. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587862.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.002.

Gantman, E. R. (2012). Economic, linguistic, and political factors in the scientific productivity of countries. *Scientometrics, 93*, 967–985. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192.012.0736-3.

Gnutzmann, C., & Rabe, F. (2014). 'Theoretical subtleties' or 'text modules'? German researchers' language demands and attitudes across disciplinary cultures. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 13*, 31–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2013.10.003.

Gonzalez-Alcaide, G., Valderrama-Zurian, J. C., & Aleixandre-Benavent, R. (2012). The impact factor in non-English-speaking countries. *Scientometrics, 92*(2), 297–311. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0692-y.

Graddol, D. (2007). English next. *British Council*, 1–132. http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-research-english-next.pdf. (Accessed 17 April 2011).
Heng Hartse, J., & Kubota, R. (2014). Pluralizing English? Variation in high-stakes academic texts and challenges of copyediting. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 24*, 71–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.04.001.
Henshall, A. C. (2012). English as an international language and language policies in economics journals. *Anglo Saxonica III, III*(4), 131–164. http://hdl.handle.net/10451/7974.
Hughes, T., Bence, D., Grisoni, L., O'Regan, N., & Wornham, D. (2011). Scholarship that matters: Academic-practitioner engagement in business and management. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education, 10*(1), 40–57.
Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 31*, 58–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005.
Hynninen, N., & Kuteeva, M. (2017). "Good" and "acceptable" English in L2 research writing: Ideals and realities in history and computer science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 30*, 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.10.009.
Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *Tesol Quarterly, 40*(1), 157–181. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264515.
Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2005). Editing contributed scholarly articles from a language management perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 47–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.01.001.
Kirkman, J. (2001). Third person, past tense, passive voice for scientific writing. Who says? *European Science Editing, 27*(1), 4–5.
Kuteeva, M., & Mauranen, A. (2014). Writing for international publication in multilingual contexts: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 13*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.11.002.
Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The oligopoly of academic publishers in the digital era. *PLoS One*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502.
Lillis, T. (2012). Economies of signs in writing for academic publication: The case of English medium "national" journals. *Journal of Advanced composition, 32*(3/4), 695–722.
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English medium texts. *Written Communication, 23*(1), 3–35, 10.1177/0741088305283754 http://wcx.sagepub.com.
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
Lillis, T., Magyar, A., & Robinson-Pant, A. (2010). An international journal's attempts to address inequalities in academic publishing: Developing a writing for publication programme. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 40*(6), 781–800.
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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2013.10.008.
Meadows, M., Dietz, T., & Vandermotten, C. (2016). A perspective on problems and prospects for academic publishing in Geography. *Geography and Environment, 3*(1), e00016. https://doi.org/10.1002/geo2.16.
Migheli, M., & Ramello, G. R. (2018). The market of academic attention. *Scientometrics, 114*, 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2564-y.
Mišak, A., Marušić, M., & Marušić, A. (2005). Manuscript editing as a way of teaching academic writing: Experience from a small scientific journal. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 122–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.001.
Mongeon, P., & Paul-Hus, A. (2016). The journal coverage of Web of science and Scopus: A comparative analysis. *Scientometrics, 106*(1), 213–228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1765-5.
Moreno, A. I., Rey-Rocha, J., Burgess, S., Lóppez-Navarro, I., & Sachdev, I. (2012). Spanish researchers' perceived difficulty writing research articles for English-medium journals: The impact of proficiency in English vs publication experience. *Iberica, 24*, 157–184.
de Moya-Anegón, F., Chinchilla-Rodríguez, Z., Vargas-Quesada, B., Corera-Álvarez, E., Muñoz-Fernández, F. J., González-Molina, A., et al. (2007). Coverage analysis of SCOPUS: A metric approach. *Scientometrics, 73*(1), 57–58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-007-1681-4.
Muresan, L. M., & Nicolae, M. (2015). Addressing the challenge of publishing internationally: Romania - a case in point. In Ramón Plo Alastrué, & Carmen Pérez Llantada (Eds.), *English as a scientific and research language: Debates and discourses, English in Europe* (Vol. 2, pp. 281–310). Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
Owen, J. M. (2002). The new dissemination of knowledge: Digital libraries and institutional roles in scholarly publishing. *Journal of Economic Methodology, 9*(3), 275–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350178022000015113.
Paasi, A. (2005). Globalisation, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning, A37*, 769–789. https://doi.org/10.1068/a3769.
Petrić, B. (2014). English-medium journal in Serbia: Editors' perspectives. In K. Bennett (Ed.), *The semiperiphery of academic writing: Discourses, communities and practices* (pp. 189–209). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Research Gate (n.d.) The World Bank Economic Review. http://www.researchgate.net/journal/1564-698X_The_World_Bank_Economic_Review Accessed 06/05/2017.
Salager-Meyer, F. (2008). Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 121–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2008.03.009.
Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding ELF*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Shashok, K. (2008). Content and communication: How can peer review provide helpful feedback about the writing? *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8*, 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-3. . (Accessed 14 April 2017).
Short, J. R., Boniche, A., Kim, Y., & Li, P. L. (2001). Cultural globalization, global English, and geography journals. *The Professional Geographer, 53*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-0124.00265.
Smart, P. (2014). The big picture: Scholarly publishing trends 2014. *Science Editing, 1*(2), 52–57. https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.2014.1.52. . (Accessed 1 April 2016).
Springer (n.d.) Content for a knowledge-based society - editorial for the 21st century (2011-2016) http://www.springer.com/gp/about-springer/history Accessed 21/01/2018.
Svartvik, J., & Leech, G. (2006). *English: One tongue, many voices*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Testa, J. (2003). The Thomson ISI journal selection process. *Serials Review, 29*(3), 210–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-7913(03)00063-7.
Testa, J. (2006). The Thomson Scientific journal selection process. *International Microbiology, 9*, 135–138.
Testa, J. (2008). The Thomson Scientific journal selection process. *Contributions In Science, 4*(1), 69–73. https://doi.org/10.2436/20.7010.01.37.
Testa, J. (2009). The Thomson Reuters journal selection process. *Transnational Corporations Review, 1*(4), 59–66.
Testa, J. (2016). The Thomson Reuters journal selection process. http://wokinfo.com/essays/journal-selection-process/. (Accessed 11 March 2017).
Tonkin, H. (2011). Language and the ingenuity gap in science. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 8*(1), 105–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2011.545759.
Tribble, C. (2015). Writing academic English further along the road. What is happening now in EAP writing instruction? *English Language Teaching Journal, 69*(4), 442–462. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv044.
Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2015). *The STM report: An overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing. 4th edition International Association of Scientific*. Technical and Medical Publishers. http://www.stm-assoc.org/2015_02_20_STM_Report_2015.pdf.
Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *Tesol Quarterly, 28*(2), 377–389. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587438.

Ann Henshall teaches English at the Lisbon School of Economics and Management, University of Lisbon. She has a PhD in Linguistics and her research interests include EAP, Systemic Functional Linguistics and Multimodality.