# Review of Linguistic Inequality and Injustice in Academic Writing

**Siavash Zokaieh** *             **Amir Marzban** **

**Mehrshad Ahmadian**

## Abstract

This review article examines the underpinning of the little-researched, influential elements that create linguistic injustice in the specific contexts of linguistic imperialism through standardization. To this end, with a review of critical views that includes argumentation and discussion of theoretical and empirical studies, we further aim to highlight linguistic injustice in writing for publishing. The domination of the English language as a lingua academia has not happened neutrally and can create unjust and unequal situations. In knowledge construction, the prosperity of researchers and academics is tied to international publication, and this action supports globalization, individualism, and standardization in favor of native English users. The domination of the English language in academic settings may be a hegemonic practice of native Anglophones to maintain power. In this review, we underline the possibilities for privileged communities to pinpoint linguistic inequality and injustice. The nature of academia should be liberal and liberating; however, in reality, academic settings are politically partisan and at the service of the powerful and wealthy. Still, there is slim hope that the system can change, and one of such profound changes may happen with equal access to resources and mentors for marginalized communities. In this case, the minorities' voices may also be heard and respected globally.

*Keywords*: Injustice, Imperialism, Standardization, Criticality, Academic Writing

* Instructor, Department of English, Qaemshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran, szokaieh@gmail.com, Corresponding Author
** Assoicte Professor, Department of English, Qaemshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran, amir_marzban@yahoo.com
*** Assistant Professor, Department of English, Qaemshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran, mehrshad.ahmadian@qaemiau.ac.ir

© Shiraz University

Research, findings, and reporting (writing) are three intertwined factors in knowledge construction and create the infrastructure of academic settings. Academicians, however, do not usually use aberrant frameworks and do not majorly deviate from academic norms mainly rooted in dominant schools of thought such as positivism. The dominant research paradigm leads to standardization in academic settings and creates a discourse that is considered legitimate and that academicians are required to follow. As a result, based on policymakers' intentions, academic communities create and legitimize certain frameworks but not others. This is intertwined with standardization across disciplines that adhere to academic communities' norms.

One aspect of injustice in knowledge construction that suppresses minorities is the gatekeeping feature based on norms and standards in a discourse community. When applied to writing skill, this feature creates an unjust atmosphere for the non-native user of English. Accordingly, two major areas for filtering academic articles and texts are related to "language brokers" and "academic brokers" (Flowerdew & Ho Wang, 2016; Raitskaya & Tikhonova, 2020), which can create unequal settings for English users in academic writing. The former is concerned with language forms (linguistics structures), and the latter focuses on English content (methodology, novelty, etc.) for publishing purposes.

It is quite evident that the ideology of the dominant school of thought influences methodological approaches in research. For instance, during the positivistic era in applied linguistics, most scholars and practitioners viewed all language-related matters from the behaviorist's viewpoint. However, Kuhn's (1962) paradigm shift and Foucault's (1972) epistemic break (cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2012) attempt to disrupt the domination by a single school of thought in knowledge construction. Conceptually, the paradigm shift is more globally oriented, whereas the epistemic break is contextually derived (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). As a revolutionary process, the paradigm shift (before and after Kuhn's work) has described the way for the applicability of new theories, methods, and approaches in science. But this revolutionary approach has been influenced by the neoliberal agenda and governmental manipulations (Holliday & Macdonald, 2020).

Through the marketization of universities, the intentions of governments can be achieved, and researchers become servants of the system via their so-called academic achievements. This achievement may encourage only certain discourses, methodology and standards approved by the majority (power) and invites academicians into competition for publications of their findings (Holliday & Macdonald, 2020). However,

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **175** Siavash Zokaieh |
| --- | --- |

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

other voices can be sought out through the democratic intentions in the paradigm shift. For instance, Freire (1970) divulged the true nature of education from liberal perspectives in critical pedagogy. He introduced the problem-posing education model as an alternative to the dominant (banking model) education system. This new model provided opportunities for contribution by minorities, voiceless learners, and the oppressed both during their educational life span and in their societies.

In academic writing, the paradigm shift should be investigated through liberation in using research methods and liberation in writing and reporting. In general, open-minded writing as a literacy skill is not a desperate plight and can engage learners in the problem-posing model to resist hegemony in the educational system. Applying the tenets of critical pedagogy in academic writing and researching can enhance equality among researchers who want to publish internationally. According to Mignolo (2005), western knowledge has perceivable and hidden sides. The perceivable side is what academic communities follow in their studies and make their results public to others. In social sciences, researchers may use quantitative, qualitative and/or mixed-methods designs or other approved varieties in their studies. These studies create a visible atmosphere in knowledge construction. On the other hand, the invisible side underlines the domination of western knowledge that resists other possibilities which do not follow the standards (Mignolo, 2005). Liberation in using research methods can be achieved when researchers freely adopt the locally appropriate research method for the locally identified gap. In fact, researchers can concentrate on their local settings instead of merely thinking about the standards of international publications.

The duplication of the same old routines for publishing may suppress authors' creativity in writing academic articles, effectively squandering it. This perspective supports modeling in academic writing and presupposes standardized forms which most authors must follow. This standardization often encourages only certain language forms (generally standard American or British English). In this regard, Raitskaya and Tikhonova (2020) rightly underline the existence of native-like written articles in high-quality English language journals that non-native writers must make their work sound as native-like as possible. This pinpoint supports the contention that there are more opportunities for Anglophones in academic publishing. Furthermore, the standards for academic writing are bewildering, and there is no clear definition of Standard English or of what good or bad writing is (McKinley & Rose, 2018). Standardization in academic settings, moreover, is often backgrounded by economic and political motivations. Bruce

and Hamp-Lyons (2015) underline the importance of standard language, which has been entered into Hong Kong's universities for political and economic intentions. In this case, followers of the western globalized educational policies are benefiting politically and economically compared to those communities that resist. With regard to economic interests, Phillipson (2008) claims that "the English language teaching sector directly earned nearly £ 1.3 billion for the UK in invisible exports and our other education-related exports earn up to £10 billion a year" (p. 260). Linguistic injustice is not limited to domination over forms (grammar and vocabulary); more daunting forces such as hegemony, segregation, and manipulation are involved.

Nevertheless, in the literature, linguistic injustice is mainly referred to in terms of language barriers, while the contexts in which it occurs are not emphasized per se. Currently, English as a lingua franca exercises global domination over writing for publication purposes. This context of language imperialism is not highlighted and is only faintly touched in the arguments of current studies. To underline one example of inequality stemming from several possible circumstances, Raitskaya and Tikhonova (2020) mention that "national research published in international English-language journals is often inaccessible for national scholars at large" (p.4). In this case, academic authors (especially from marginalized communities) do not have equal access to their own national studies. In this regard, we review some pertinent studies discussing areas such as linguicism and standardization in academic settings to unveil linguistic injustice. This review aims at underpinning other influential elements, such as hegemonic aspects of publications that embrace the myth of neutrality of English as the dominant language. In addition, scrutinizing the hidden layers of standardization may shed some light on the true nature of publications.

## Revisiting Linguicism vis-à-vis Academic Writing

In general, academic context should create an atmosphere for democratic debates, exchanging true knowledge, and freely expressing ideas. However, colonial intentions in academia restrict the process of decolonization per se (Philip & Helen, 2005). One of the key elements needed to sustain the status quo is the colonizer's imposition of their own language as the dominant language. English has been established as the dominant language for academic exchange, particularly for publication purposes. As a resistor construct, the influential, provocative, and controversial notion of linguistic imperialism has keenly questioned the importance of the English language as compared to others.

According to Phillipson (1997), language imperialism is a subcategory of linguicism which underlines the domination of one language or dialect with the label of standard over the other languages in a context.

Although the present study is focused on injustice in academic writing, Phillipson's concepts of speakers and dialect can be generalized and used to describe standards for academic writing. That is, the standards and particular models of academic writing (American or British English) represent linguistic imperialism and are utilized upfront to support the existence of linguistic injustice.

At the heart of this linguistic injustice is the globalization of education and domination by the English language in its role as lingua franca. Phillipson (1998) underlines seven key considerations for globalizing education, namely, "learning how to learn; the world-language; the mother-tongue (if different from world-language); numeracy; cultural literacy; social skills; and religious ethics and values" (p. 103). He explains that these criteria create unjust atmospheres for monolingual and bilingual users of English. Sources of power convince the majority of the neutrality of English as the lingua franca, while there are other manipulative intentions behind this domination. For instance, a number of foreign universities claim internationalization of their policies, while in reality, they promote national intentions and treat non-native students as empty vessels (Rose & McKinley, 2018).

Among several terms coined by Phillipson (2008), "lingua academia" is of paramount importance to this study. In fact, domination of the English language in academic settings is a hegemonic practice of native Anglophones to maintain power. In this regard, Ferguson, Perez-Llantada and Plo (2011) pinpoint several pieces of evidence that demonstrate linguistic barriers for non-native users of English, such as poor vocabulary, improper way of expressing ideas, and the attitudes of non-Anglophone researchers. They found that,

> (83%) feel that a single international language of science is necessary, with a similarly high proportion (96%) accepting that English, the currently dominant lingua franca, advantages native speakers over non-native. On the other hand, a majority (62%) report that they feel personally more advantaged than disadvantaged by the dominance of English in science, while about half, mainly those of higher proficiency, reject the idea that the dominance of English is an unfair advantage to native-speaking academics (Ferguson, Perez-Llantada & Plo, 2011, p. 54).

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **178** Siavash Zokaeieh |
| --- | --- |

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

It is evident that a great majority considered lingua academia advantageous for native users, and we can be skeptical of those who perceive lingua academia as advantageous and fair for everyone. They might have the required abilities (determined by sources of power) that result in their positive attitude.

Two important distinctions from several possible problems can be argued to demystify linguistic imperialism in publishing settings. In many countries, the visibility and recognition of scholars, practitioners, and graduate students are intertwined with publishing in prestigious international journals. Initially, this raises two hegemonic aspects: reducing the opportunities for local journals and reducing opportunities for scholars unfamiliar with publishing standards. In terms of the first issue, O'Neil (2017) found an increase in the publishing rate of outer and expanded circles in Scimago's index of Elsevier's database and uttered a word of caution based on the "disrupted traditional publishing practices" in Korea (p. 16). Furthermore, this monolithic structure indicates the importance and dominance of English as the language of science, which marginalizes publishing in local languages (Raitskaya & Tikhonova, 2020).

The second concern remains with the issue of scholars' and practitioners' inclusion in well-accredited journals. This directly relates to the hegemony of the dominant language, culture, economy and politics. In fact, researchers are required to follow sets of predetermined agendas (linguistic and methodological) to become part of the network of globally known scholars. O'Neil (2017) remarked that editors and editorial boards could control the disciplines through their power. They define truth in academic writing, and as Foucault (1980) states, the truth is at the service of power, and we reproduce it. This indicates the hegemony in knowledge construction in international publications. Expert researchers, scholars, and practitioners are expected to follow frameworks with limited attention to "why" questions. In the Iranian academic setting, the limited attention to philosophical questions is underlined in the study of Shahini and Khosravian (2022), which can diminish the true nature of education. Linguistic imperialism is the mere domination of language and research methodology and political and economic domination in academic settings. With regard to neoliberal policies, Kubota (2015) observed that "the current accountability-based and ranking-driven neoliberal system of higher education increasingly require university intellectuals to produce as many publications as possible in prestigious journals in order to maintain and advance their academic career" (p.34). Due to materialistic intentions, there is a possibility for well-accredited journals to disregard the pressures of publishing placed on academic

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **179** **Siavash Zokaeieh** |
| --- | --- |

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

communities. In fact, sources of power view education as an enterprise in which the more they develop knowledge, the more they maneuver in the world (economic and political). In what follows, we highlight some points about standardization in writing for publishing purposes.

## Standardization in Writing for Academic Purposes

In general, the role of language's social aspects is crucial in social constructivism and possibly in thinking about writing skill. Previous approaches to this skill overemphasized structural variety, organization of ideas, and word choices along with developmental stages in the process of writing. On the contrary, scholars and practitioners of contextually-oriented writing view the prosperity of writers vis-à-vis "personal, social, cultural, linguistic, educational and political contexts" (Leki, 2010, p. 107). Therefore, the power relationship between university professors and students or experts and novices becomes an important factor for the emancipation of learners/writers. From another angle, the attention given to filling academic authors with predetermined strategies in academic writing can be replaced by scaffolding in problem-posing education (this is further discussed in the concluding remarks). Writing in this approach is not merely the combination of words and grammar at the sentence level. Writing is identified at "Discourse" and above "Discourse" levels, where context plays a profound role. Gee (2015) distinguished between "discourse" (lower-case d) and "Discourse" (upper-case D). Early studies of discourse and discourse analysis were focused on elements above sentence level. The linguistic investigation above sentence level could be referred to as discourse (d) studies. However, Discourse/Discourses embrace broader social aspects of language, which create an identity and are accepted (as a standard) by specific groups (Gee, 2015). Academic writing is not limited to following the standards for developing texts; therefore, other elements, such as the author's identity, play an important role (Rezvani & Mansouri, 2013). Moreover, these standards favor the dominant groups in academic societies.

The promotion of the English language has been announced overtly by sources of power and is part of their policies (Phillipson, 2007) which canvass for the standardization of the English language. Standardization is the process of setting certain constructive elements which create a phenomenon. In general, the standards are set by natives (or powerful groups) and promote language ownership. This ownership undermines the unorthodox structures that non-native authors can bring from their first language into their

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **180** **Siavash Zokaeieh** |
| --- | --- |

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

texts (Canagarajah, 2015). In translingualism, the linguistic system (form and meaning) is changeable according to the availability of language resources (Otheguy, Garcia, & Reid, 2019). These resources in academic writing embrace a wide range of areas, such as access to up-to-date textbooks and articles, mentors, labs, and facilities. By considering the mentioned resources, decision-makers in publications should take into account the possible unequal access of authors in marginalized communities. Hyland (2016) also underlines the importance of resources and professional mentoring for academic authors (which possibly creates injustice in academic writing).

Furthermore, we cannot set a hundred percent standard in humanities and social sciences. The nature of human beings is dynamic and subjective, while standardization is an objective and measurable approach. Regarding publishing purposes, judgments in areas such as the article's format, language, and research methodology come under the influence of the standards approved by the academic discourse community. McKinley and Rose (2018) rightly question the interpretive and subjective views in defining standards, possibly creating injustice in academic writing. We should bear in mind that there is a sense of subjectivity in our objective judgments (Bachman, 1990). The standards objectively seek for native-like or close to the native-like performance of the English language while threatening the democratic acceptance of other varieties of the English language (Tupas & Rubdy, 2015). In this respect, it is important to realize what high-quality journals expect from non-native authors in terms of their language. Farley (2018) identifies several points on how to recognize non-native authors, such as misuse of similar-sounding words, improper use of articles, and omission of third-person singular 's' and such. These standards are important, but they may also create unjust conditions for non-native authors that result in fear of rejection based on their language use rather than the quality of their research. Non-native authors, from the lens of translingualism, should be aware of the ideological manipulation of the standard language in academic writing (Canagarajah, 2015). The domination of standard language in academic writing is not a neutral entity and may provide unfair circumstances for non-native scholars. The ideological consideration of standard language underlines inequality and marginalization of minorities in academic writing (Kubota, 2014).

## The Truth of Linguistic Injustice

Hyland (2016) did not consider writing barriers to be linguistic injustice or to be stumbling blocks to non-native researchers and L2 authors. Accordingly, Hyland (2016)

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **181** **Siavash Zokaeieh** |
|---|---|

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

considers academic writing a "specialized competence" or a skill that non-native and native scholars/practitioners should learn through several years of schooling. This approach can be a source of inequality. The schooling of natives is in their first language, whereas non-natives should struggle to grasp the specialized competence in L2 classrooms. Undoubtedly, both groups should learn the infrastructure of academic writing. However, we can underline inequality when non-native authors should develop their texts in the dominant language (English) in the end. Furthermore, Hyland (2016) equalizes the anxiety of native authors with non-natives for academic writing. In this regard, we can mention that the anxiety of native authors may be for the academic brokers rather than the language brokers. In an unfair setting, non-native authors may have extra concerns with regard to their language barriers. Hanauer, Sheridan, and Englander (2019) empirically investigate linguistic injustice by comparing Mexican writers (148 survey responses) and Taiwanese writers (236 responses) in their attitudes toward academic writings both in their first and second language. Their results reveal that all the respondents have equal attitudes towards three variables (difficulty, dissatisfaction, and anxiety) for second language writing. Their results further indicate statistically significant differences between participants' perceptions regarding barriers to writing in their first languages and in their second languages. Furthermore, in pinpointing barriers to publishing, they found difficulty and anxiety as the main hindrances to writing for publication purposes. The anxiety of non-native authors is a rightful concern with respect to linguistic injustice. Regarding reviewers' approach to the language of academic articles in the peer review process, Lillis and Curry (2015) provide 14 comments from reviewers, which are mostly concerned with non-native patterns of language in the academic articles; this is in contrast to Hyland's contentions that no barriers exist (2016).

In another study, McKinley and Rose (2018) find unjust circumstances for L2 authors' standards and norms for writing scholarly articles in high-quality journals. Their findings reveal that most well-established journals are intolerant of deviation from standard and native-like English. This reminds us of the stigmatization faced by those who deviate from the standards of the community that judges the language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2015). However, McKinley and Rose's study was criticized by Stapleton (2019) regarding the importance of using standard language for publication purposes. Stapleton (2019) provides an interesting example of the use of the verb "prove" in students' academic writing, which had to be changed and moderated to meet the hedging strategy. This example indicates the possibility of an unequal and unjust atmosphere in academic

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **182** **Siavash Zokaeieh** |
| --- | --- |

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

writing where only certain groups should follow norms and standards. That is, the discourse community possibly accepts the word "prove" in the academic text of a mastermind or a famous scholar but not in the texts of students. However, the problem is that linguistic injustice is not limited to grammar, punctuation, and word choice in academic writing but also embraces sociopolitical context in texts' development (Upper-case D-Discourse). For instance, Stapleton (2019) states that

> similar to the standardization of the English spelling system, which our ancestors took pains to develop despite the challenges, scholars wishing to publish their works over the ages have also developed a uniform means of communication for advancing knowledge, which in the case of academic writing happens to use an arcane form of the English language (p. 112).

This statement has several elements that demonstrate the role of context in unjust and unequal academic writing. First, the possessive determiner "our ancestors" separates native speakers of English from non-natives and underlines the importance of the standardized forms established by (their) ancestors. The hidden colonial logic insists on progression and globalization as the influential factors for development (Mignolo, 2005). However, the developments in science through the highest standards do not guarantee humanity, equality, or justice. Scholars should not close their eyes to the mentioned conundrums for their benefit. Mignolo (2005) underlines that colonialism, with the motto of progression and a better world, neglects that the majority (90%) of the world's population does not meet living standards. When this notion comes to academic writing, we cannot equally judge the scholars of developing and developed countries on the same scale. Many factors (social, cultural, economic, and political) are involved in the research and academic writings that publications usually do not consider. Publications may judge the studies based on the finalized versions.

With regard to colonialism, Schneider (2007) underlines the influence of colonizers on language and believes that "the structural effects of language contact depend to a strong extent on social conditions" (p. 22). In global academic settings, mostly the English language (British, American or other approved varieties) determines scholars' social conditions (academic life span). Also, the process of colonization is visible in the "uniform means of communication" in academic writing, which Stapleton emphasizes. This can also be related to the notion of linguicisim in that legitimation of a language is due to the backgrounds such as logic and richness (advancement and improvement) in

| | Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)<br>(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)<br>41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **183**<br>**Siavash Zokaeieh** |
| --- | --- | --- |

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

sciences which result in domination (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2015). Put differently, scholars who developed knowledge have set the standards (which indicate the richness of science); these standards are legitimate, according to Stapleton (2019).In this undemocratic approach, scholars are required to follow norms and standards for their future and their prosperity, which is under the control of power. This notion is crystal clear in the statement of Stapleton (2019) that "English happens to be a source of power that the academic community has attached itself to, and a particular form of that language called academic English, has become the standard that scholars must adhere to when submitting their work to journals" (p.112). As a result, English as the lingua of academia has not apolitically happened to be the dominant international language of academic debates. Providing some extended recommendations and sharing some visions of a more just publishing climate may be helpful.

## Concluding Remarks

In this article, we considered the broader context of linguistic imperialism along with some empirical and theoretical studies that support linguistic injustice and inequality in writing for publishing purposes. In knowledge construction, the prosperity of researchers and academicians is tied to international publication, and this action supports globalization, individualism, and privatization. More than any ideology, this argument has roots in neoliberalism and neoliberal intentions in academic settings. Neoliberalism creates political hegemony in western nations and leads to competition among individuals (Olssen & Peters, 2005). This is quite transparent in literature based on topics such as "publish or perish" or "pressures of publishing" and the like. Regarding neoliberalism, Cannizzo (2018) mentions various intentions of scholars for publishing, including "improving their job security or employment opportunities"; this indicates the materialistic approach to knowledge construction and the fracture between native users of English (developed countries) and non-native authors. Universities' policies (in their MA and Ph.D. programs) are not separate from this dehumanizing struggle. Some universities create unjust platforms where the graduation of students can be encumbered by failure to publish in high-quality journals. Multiple educational, economic, and political intentions lie behind this filtering, all of which truncate the true nature of education (inviting learners to thinking, equality, justice, peace, kindness, help, support, etc.) in the service of the enterprise. In this regard, Collins (2018) underlines that "a primary focus of the university is self-promotion and branding" that have been sold by

| TESL Quarterly | Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188 | **184** **Siavash Zokaeieh** |

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

the labels, such as future job opportunities, globalization or internationalization (p.627). The brands of universities, their scientific contributions, and their goals put an emphasis upon the marathon of publishing where the stronger gets first place.

This is against democracy in academia, and the fracture between the treatment of non-native and native authors promotes inequality in such a context. Furthermore, as Vuong (2019) notes, aspects such as

> the dominance of the English language journals over the past decade, difficult access to tertiary-level science and quality research training, poor collaboration among researchers, policymakers and industry players and the lack of skilled human recourses possibly due to the migration of trained professionals from less-developed to more-developed settings. ( p.314).

Indicate inequality between developed and developing nations. We strongly suggest that these areas be further studied to bring equality and justice into writing for publishing purposes. For example, due to political conflicts between some countries, access to credible editing services is not available to all communities. Furthermore, these editing services are costly for marginalized communities. Despite the economic advantages, not all non-native academic authors have a simple equal right to use editing services, let alone other beneficiaries. The nature of academia should be neutral to become liberal and liberating; however, academic settings are politically partisan and at the service of sources of power. We can highlight some possibilities in publishing settings for the sake of egalitarianism and praxis, which encourage bringing critical thoughts into action**.**

Initially, it is possible to change the gatekeeping characteristics of editors, reviewers, and evaluators to a facilitating role. Hyland (2016) believes that the division of native and non-native authors may be "offensive to the many reviewers, editors, and mentors who seek to support non-Anglophone authors in getting published" (p. 66). We admire the editors' and reviewers' support for publishing, and we believe that their positive attitude will be helpful for non-Anglophone researchers. However, the help of editors and reviewers in transforming the unequal and unjust circumstances in academic publishing can be a "true generosity" (see Freire, 1970). For instance, publication ethics encourage editors to treat all authors equally when the papers are submitted for peer review and publishing processes. This action may violate structural features of fairness in the gatekeeping characteristics of journals. Scholars and practitioners from marginalized

communities may lack appropriate resources that are not the concern of the privileged communities.

In this case, editors may face two macro issues in the submitted articles: the language barriers and the content (e.g., the structure of the study and methodology). The former issue can be compensated by providing free of charge and available to all editing services in well-accredited journals. Neoliberal agendas invite organizations into privatization; however, governments must provide economical support for such journals to change the status quo for language barriers in publishing. With regard to the second concern, editors who are deliberately involved in knowledge construction can supervise academic authors who suffer from proper mentoring. Through pre-submission inquiries, marginalized academic authors can achieve valuable information from the wise suggestions of editors.

Moreover, the type of interaction between editors, reviewers, and authors is highly important. One common approach between critical pedagogy and translingualism is dialogic interaction which can be adopted in publishing processes. In other words, the distance between reviewers (who are usually experts in the field) and novice authors can be shortened through dialogic interactions. Also, the dialogue (from the lens of critical pedagogy) can be helpful for the development /improvement of the articles and thinking critically (criticality). Dialogue and equal communication are important elements of a true educational system (Barjesteh, 2019). According to Mignolo (2005), scientists "either unconsciously support the dominant system or knowingly remain silent regarding the growing injustice, exploitation, colonialism, etc., that the products of science are being used for" (pp. 119-120). Thereby, a gradual transformation can create justice and equality in academic settings.

Other possibilities, encouraging open access publications, can also create more democratic settings. The academic authors of marginalized communities can have equal access to the materials, scholars' support and guidance. It is hoped that by increasing the support of experts in privileged communities and access to the resources, academic authors from marginalized communities and minorities' voices can also be heard and respected globally.

## Limitations of the Discussions

It is worthwhile to mention that the discussions of inequality, injustice, imperialism, and such lofty heights of oppressive power are difficult to show in a review article or even an empirical study. Our study aimed to highlight and underline some important issues

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188

**186**

**Siavash Zokaeieh**

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

raised in the literature, such as language imperialism and linguistic injustice. It is based on the pieces of evidence available in the literature. Additional studies are needed to identify the layers of our discussions. Moreover, there are no personal biases in the exemplification of some of the studies. We respect all the proponent and opponent views and studies which we reviewed in the present article. Many critical language studies are theoretically oriented and opinion based. However, the possibilities for praxis may glamorize liberation. For instance, Freire's (1970) notion of dialogic interaction is a significant approach that can be utilized between editors, reviewers and authors. However, this open-minded notion by Freire may be hard to achieve due to political and economical interests in publishing.

## References

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford University Press.

Barjesteh, H. (2019). Dynamicity of transformative L2 materials preparation model in EFL classroom: Place of critical language pedagogy in teacher education. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 38*(2), 47-79.

Bruce, E., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2015). Opposing tensions of local and international standards for EAP writing programs: Who are we assessing for? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 18*, 64-77.

Canagarajah, S. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between translingual practice and L2 writing: Addressing learner identities. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(4), 415-440.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188

**187**

**Siavash Zokaeieh**

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

Cannizzo, F. (2018). Tactical evaluations: Everyday neoliberalism in academia. *Journal of Sociology, 54*(1), 77-91.

Collins, H. (2018). Interculturality from above and below: Navigating uneven discourses in a neoliberal university system. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 18*(2), 167-183.

Farley, A. F. (2018). NNES RAs: How EFL RAs inform literacy brokers and English for research publication instructors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 33*, 69-81.

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

Flowerdew, J., & Ho Wang, S. (2016). Author's editor revisions to manuscripts published in international journals. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 32*, 39-52.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language.* Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977.* (C. Gordon, Ed.) Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* London: Continuum Books.

Gee, J. P. (2015). Discourse, small d, big D. In K. Tracy (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction* (pp. 1-5). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hanauer, D. I., Sheridan, C. L., & Englander, K. (2019). Linguistic injustice in the writing of research articles in English as a second language: Data from Taiwanese and Mexican researchers. *Written communication, 36*(1), 136-154.

Holliday, A., & Macdonald, M. N. (2020). Researching the intercultural: Intersubjectivity and the problem with postpositivism. *Applied Linguistics, 41*(5), 621-639.

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

Kubota, R. (2014). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 37*(4), 474-494.

Kubota, R. (2015). Inequalities of Englishes, English speakers, and languages: A critical perspective on pluralist approaches to English. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes* (pp. 21-41). Palgrave Macmillan.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* The University of Chicago Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). Individual identity, cultural globalization, and teaching English as an international language: The case for an epistemic break. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 9-27). Routledge.

Leki, I. (2010). Second language writing in English. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 100-109). Oxford University Press.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2015). The politics of English, language and uptake: The case of international academic journal article reviews. *AILA Review, 28*(1), 127-150.

McKinley, J., & Rose, H. (2018). Conceptualization 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.

Mignolo, W. D. (2005). Prophets facing sidewise: The geopolitics of knowledge and the colonial difference. *Social Epistemology, 19*(1), 111-127.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(4), Fall 2022, pp. 173-188

**188**

**Siavash Zokaeieh**

REVIEW OF LINGUISTIC INEQUALITY AND INJUSTICE

Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(3), 313-345.

O'Neil, D. (2017). English as the lingua franca of international publishing. *World Englishes, 37*(2), 1-20.

Otheguy, R., Garcia, O., & Reid, W. (2019). A translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review, 10*(4), 625-651.

Philip, H. K. F., & Helen, P. L. M. (2005). Higher education, imperialism and colonial transition. In M. Bray, & R. Koo (Eds.), *Education and society in Hong Kong and Macao. CERC studies in comparative education* (Vol. 7). Springer.

Phillipson, R. (1997). Realities and myths of linguistic imperialism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 18*(3), 238-248.

Phillipson, R. (1998). Globalization English: Are linguistic human rights an alternative to linguistic imperialism? *Language Science, 20*(1), 101-112.

Phillipson, R. (2007). Linguistic imperialism: A conspiracy, or a conspiracy of silence? *Language policy, 6*, 377-383.

Phillipson, R. (2008). Lingua franca or lingua frankensteinia? English in European integration and globalization. *World Englishes, 27*(2), 250-267.

Raitskaya, L., & Tikhonova, E. (2020). Pressure to publish internationally: Scholarly writing coming to the fore. *Journal of Language and Education, 6*(1), 4-7.

Rezvani, R., & Mansouri, T. (2013). Stripped of authorship or projected identity? Iranian scholars' presence in research articles. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 5*(1), 91-110.

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

Schneider, E. W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world.* Cambridge University Press.

Shahini, G., & Khosravian, E. (2022). Thinking ability and its impacting factors among graduate Iranian EFL learners through generating types of questions. *Teaching English as a Second Language, 41*(3), 117-153.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2015). Linguicism. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics.* Blackwell.

Stapleton, P. (2019). Standards of English in academic writing: A response to McKinley and Rose. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 44*, 110-113.

Tupas, R., & Rubdy, R. (2015). Introduction: From world Englishes to unequal Englishes. In R. Tupas, & R. Rubdy (Eds.), *Unequal Englishes* (pp. 1-21). Palgrave Macmillan.

Vuong, Q. H. (2019). The harsh world of publishing in emerging regions and implications for editors and publishers: The case of Vietnam. *Learned Publishing, 32*(4), 314-324.