

2

Coloniality of Knowledge as Co-creation

Federico Navarro
UNIVERSIDAD DE O'HIGGINS

Abstract / Resumen

Researchers from the Global South frequently face manuscript rejections labeled as “somewhat narrow and country-specific,” despite efforts to write in English for a global audience. At the core of these experiences lies the fact that coloniality is not solely a phenomenon of territorial conquest but rather a symbolic and epistemological coloniality of knowledge that influences beliefs, ways of communication, and roles in global scientific research. In this chapter, I analyzed some of the world’s most prominent scientific journals in my discipline; publishing in these types of top-tier journals is often obligatory for obtaining tenure and promotion for many scholars worldwide in all areas of knowledge. Results show that, in the case of literacy research, they exclusively publish articles in English and nearly seven out of every ten authors and over eight out of every ten editors hail from Global North English-speaking countries, despite their claim to represent international knowledge production. This coloniality of knowledge is also often entrenched in the Global South. In the case of literacy research in Latin America, an analysis of citation distribution reveals that two out of three references originate from non-Latin American authors, two out of three correspond to publications in languages other than Portuguese and Spanish, and, perhaps most importantly, non-Latin American authors are predominantly cited to draw from their theoretical frameworks. Finally, I contend that it is imperative to denaturalize this co-construction of colonial practices—from North to South but also from South to North—and to promote affirmative and critical policies in both the Global North and South in order to creatively diversify languages and roles in scientific research worldwide.

Los investigadores del Sur Global suelen enfrentar rechazos de manuscritos bajo el argumento de que son «algo restringidos y específicos de un país,» aun cuando escriben en inglés para un público internacional. En la raíz de estas experiencias

está el hecho de que la colonialidad no es solo una cuestión de conquista territorial, sino una colonialidad simbólica y epistemológica del conocimiento que influye en creencias, formas de comunicación y roles en la investigación científica global. En este capítulo, analizo algunas de las revistas científicas más destacadas, a menudo indispensables para la contratación y promoción de académicos en múltiples disciplinas. Los resultados indican que, en investigación sobre literacidad, estas revistas publican exclusivamente en inglés, y casi siete de cada diez autores y más de ocho de cada diez editores provienen de países angloparlantes del Norte Global, pese a su pretensión de representar el conocimiento internacional. Esta colonialidad del conocimiento también está presente en el Sur Global. En el caso de la investigación sobre literacidad en América Latina, dos de cada tres citas provienen de autores no latinoamericanos, dos de cada tres corresponden a publicaciones en idiomas distintos del portugués o español, y, más importante aún, los autores no latinoamericanos son citados principalmente para establecer los marcos teóricos. Finalmente, sostengo que es fundamental desnaturalizar esta co-construcción de prácticas coloniales—del Norte al Sur pero también del Sur al Norte—y promover políticas afirmativas y críticas en el Norte y Sur Global para diversificar creativamente los idiomas y roles en la investigación científica global.

What Is Coloniality of Knowledge?

It is a common occurrence for researchers from the Global South to encounter manuscript rejections on the grounds of being “somewhat narrow and country specific”, despite their attempts to write in English for an international audience. At the core of these experiences lies the fact that coloniality is not solely a phenomenon of territorial conquest but more about a nuanced and widespread epistemological and symbolic effort. This effort is characterized by a Eurocentric and US-centric, rational-modern, racially biased, English-dominated, center-periphery (or North-South)¹ paradigm of knowledge creation, beliefs, symbols, and modes of communication. In essence, it represents a “coloniality of knowledge” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007), where the geopolitical context of scholars, texts, and languages influences the politics and opportunities of academic knowledge production (Lillis & Curry, 2010).

1 According to Wallerstein, there is also a zone deemed the ‘semi-periphery’ which comprises a relatively small intermediate group of countries that enjoy a moderate degree of wealth (Aguirre Rojas, 2015); see also Bennett (2014).

According to Segato (2012), the North-South divide assigns biopolitical roles to scholars that transcend biological attributes or locally ascribed identities: scholars from the South are racially categorized as non-white, non-English speaking, non-European, and non-American by Northern centers of knowledge production, irrespective of their actual skin color or citizenship. Consequently, their scholarly contributions and theories are geopolitically labeled and assessed by the North. Academic prestige and symbolic capital are distributed based on the imaginary and power structures of the modern colonial world (Mignolo, 2011), which stem from the history of colonization (Quijano, 2000).

As a result, there is a colonial allocation of intellectual and scientific labor, characterized by a Western geopolitics of knowledge (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). Researchers from the Global North generate and disseminate theoretical frameworks and knowledge about the world, which researchers from the Global South then adopt and implement, even when these theories and assertions may not be fully applicable to their specific contexts. This knowledge production is situated in a purportedly zero-point of observation (Castro-Gómez, 2007) or “unmarked locality” (Lillis & Curry, 2010), which claims universal validity. In contrast, scholarship from the periphery is often viewed as underdeveloped, immature, dubious, anecdotal, and subjective, perceived as lacking the sophistication and expertise required to produce credible knowledge (Canagarajah, 2002).

Peripheral localities are also frequently validated through a process of “exoticization,” whereby findings from the center are replicated in the periphery for confirmation or adjustment (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Once again, the value of peripheral knowledge production is contingent upon its marked locality and its relationship to the center. Consequently, Southern scholars are often regarded as desirable consumers of knowledge. Indeed, the global expansion of higher education has also meant an increase in the number of readers, conferences, grants, and citations, which are fundamental to the establishment of scientific authority (Bourdieu, 2003).

Moreover, when a scholar from Western Europe or the United States takes an interest in a Southern topic, that topic gains value both locally and internationally: “It is as if the finding is real only when the West gets to know about it. It is at that point that the discovery is recognized as a ‘fact’ and constitutes legitimate knowledge” (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 2). Thus, the Northern, developed world provides validation for the Southern, developing regions, effectively setting the research agendas for the South. As Muchiri and colleagues already observed some thirty years ago, “there is a widespread assumption that validation of knowledge comes from distant and powerful research centers.” (1995, p. 184).

Simultaneously, developing countries frequently supply data—such as Indigenous languages, at-risk educational systems, tribal cosmologies, and alternative writing-teaching programs—often collected using tools and protocols developed in the Global North (e.g., CLASS@, Stallings). This data is then processed, or at best, co-processed, in the (symbolic) laboratories of the developed North (Mignolo, 2010). As Canagarajah observes: “just as raw material is taken from the periphery to be manufactured into synthetic products by Western entrepreneurs and sold back to the periphery for a profit, data from the periphery is used by Western scholars to produce academic papers and knowledge.” (2002, p. 246). Indeed, subaltern Southern regions, countries, and ethnicities are relegated to the production of culture, with their contributions limited to local topics. Consequently, the developed world is seen as possessing universal scientific knowledge, while the developing world is confined to local culture (Mignolo, 2010). This constitutes the epistemic privilege of the Northern world: an export-oriented perspective and one-way flow of experience, education, and knowledge from central countries to supposedly deficient, younger peripheral regions—a phenomenon that has intensified with globalization (Donahue, 2009). As Rigg puts it, “rarely does the flow of knowledge run counter to this stream and even more rarely is it seriously considered that the South might have something to teach the North” (2007, p. 2).

In fact, alternative knowledge beyond borders is actively construed as non-existent (Santos, 2018), as evidenced by geolinguistic analyses of citations (Lillis et al., 2010). This symbolic erasure implies that the most prestigious international journals do not require scholars based in central Anglophone countries to consider theoretical frameworks and empirical findings developed beyond academic literature in English, at least in certain disciplines and knowledge areas. This is not usually the case for scholars conducting research in non-central or non-Anglophone regions. Additionally, scholars in central Anglophone countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom, are afforded centrality and validation in their own writing: articles by these scholars indexed in the Web of Science (WoS) exhibit double the percentage of self-citations compared to authors from non-English-speaking countries publishing in the same journals (Lillis et al., 2010). This disparity is also reflected in the linguistic distribution of publications: 92.6% of documents indexed in Scopus and 95.4% of documents indexed in WoS are written in English, with a stark contrast to the second most common language: 2.8% (Chinese) in Scopus and 1.3% (Spanish) in WoS (Vera-Baceta et al., 2019).

But the colonial distribution of intellectual labor is not solely a unilateral process from the center to the periphery. Although less evident

and intuitive, it is also reinforced within and from the periphery through a colonial cross-fertilization dynamic, as suggested by the notion that “colonialism is a co-creation” (Santos, 2018, p. 14). According to Quijano (1992), epistemological coloniality is embedded within the ideology of the oppressed, thus functioning effectively as a means of social and cultural (self-)control. The “epistemologies of the North” (Santos, 2018) often take root in the South through local groups that serve as agents of these epistemologies, participating in their own domination. Whether as an individual survival strategy or as an active institutional or national policy, scholars who adopt Northern languages, venues, traditions, and co-authors are more likely to gain recognition and promotion in their local contexts (Lillis et al., 2010), even if they genuinely aim to resist and critique Northern dynamics or remain in a peripheral role. Moreover, the same Southern scholar who is perceived and classified as racially non-white and therefore not validated from the perspective of the North might occupy privileged positions in the periphery, thereby reinstating internal segregation and inequity (Segato, 2012). Unsurprisingly, Eurocentric and US-centric knowledge is disseminated in the South, accessible only to the privileged, associated with the pursuit of power and success, and thus desired by the oppressed (Quijano, 1992). In essence, the periphery encourages and rewards those who engage in colonial practices, perpetuating racial and social segregation and inequity in intellectual labor.

In a recent chapter (Navarro, 2022), I shared my personal experiences as a peripheral multilingual researcher born in Argentina and based in Chile, who regularly participates in networks, editorial boards, conferences, and publications in both the Global North and the Global South, primarily in English, Spanish, or a mix of both, and in venues that range from open-access and university-based to more restrictive transnational journals and publishers. In this chapter, I aim to explore the complementary nature of the two poles—the Global North and the Global South—in the colonial distribution of intellectual labor, with a focus on elite journals and citation patterns. Additionally, I strive to work within a multilingual, multilateral framework, with nearly two-thirds of the references in this chapter led by authors born or based in peripheral or semi-peripheral nations, to enhance our understanding of colonial dynamics in science.

On the one hand, I will analyze the geographic and linguistic locations of authors and editors in leading scientific journals from the Global North, which claim to make universal contributions to global research. On the other hand, I will examine the citation patterns of articles published in the Global South, particularly in terms of the recognition they offer to scientific

production from the center and the periphery. To anchor the discussion in a specific scientific field, the analysis focuses on venues and scholarship related to the research of literacy, especially in tertiary education.

Case 1: Literacy-Related Journals in the Global North

Elite journals (Salager-Meyer, 2015) claim to include diverse research sites and achieve a global scope by requiring submissions to adopt an interdisciplinary approach and address an international audience. This approach transcends local, limited interests to construct knowledge that is intended to be universally relevant and valid. However, as Canagarajah noted two decades ago, this implicit or explicit universalistic mission and scope is contradicted by the underrepresentation of scholars from non-Western regions (Canagarajah, 2002).

The following analysis examines ten journals indexed in WoS that regularly publish research related to literacy, especially in tertiary education, and are ranked in the upper quartiles within their fields. These include journals focused on higher education studies, applied linguistics, and reading and writing studies. The analysis highlights the declared scope, language of publication, and the percentage of authors and editorial board members based in central Anglophone countries (CAC). Central Anglophone countries are defined as English-speaking countries located in the Global North with significant scientific production: the US (#1), UK (#3), Canada (#9), Australia (#10), Hong Kong² (#32), New Zealand (#39), and Ireland (#41); the numbers indicate positions in the Scimago Country Rank (Scimago, 2024).

Declared scopes and editorial board affiliation were consulted on the journal websites on October 5, 2019. Authors' institutional affiliation by country was consulted in WoS on October 5, 2019, covering 2016 to 2018, and provided by Clarivate Analytics, except for *College Composition and Communication*, a journal only indexed in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (information on the institutional affiliation of the authors of the research articles and review essays was manually retrieved from the journals' websites). *Higher education*, *Studies in Science Education* and *Modern Language Journal* were included as they are the best ranked journals in Education and Educational Research category pertaining to higher education, science education and linguistics, respectively.

2 Although Hong Kong includes Chinese as another official language and is currently part of China, it is still differentiated from "China mainland" in databases and has a long tradition of English-speaking scholars and research institutions.

Table 2.1. Scope, Language, and Percentage of Authors and Editorial Board Members based in Central Anglophone Countries in 10 Literacy-related Research WoS-indexed Journals (2016-2019)*

Journal (Publisher)	Declared scope (selection)	Language	CAC Authors	CAC Board
<i>Written Communication</i> (SAGE)	“An international multidisciplinary journal that publishes theory and research in writing”	English (implicit)	73.2	90.5
<i>Journal of Business and Technical Communication</i> (SAGE)	“A forum for research and scholarly discussion of business communication, technical communication, and scientific communication”	English (implicit)	80.6	85.0
<i>Reading and Writing</i> (Springer)	“Pertaining to the processes, acquisition, and loss of reading and writing skills”.	English (implicit)	48.8	76.7
<i>Reading and Writing Quarterly</i> (Taylor & Francis)	“For educating preschool through grade twelve students for literacy”	English (implicit)	76.8	98.1
<i>Higher Education</i> (Springer)	“The leading international journal on higher education studies”	English (explicit)	37.2	65.2
<i>Studies in Science Education</i> (Taylor & Francis)	“Analytical syntheses of research into key topics and issues in science education”	English (implicit)	57.1	59.1
<i>Modern Language Journal</i> (Wiley)	“Particularly committed to publishing high quality work in non-English languages”	English (explicit)	68.4	82.6
<i>Journal of Second Language Writing</i> (Elsevier)	“A significant contribution to current understandings of central issues in second and foreign language writing and writing instruction”	English (explicit)	70.4	80.5
<i>Assessing Writing</i> (Elsevier)	“ <i>Assessing Writing</i> embraces internationalism and will attempt to reflect the concerns of teachers, researchers and writing assessment specialists around the world, whatever their linguistic background.”	English (explicit)	63.7	80.8

Journal (Publisher)	Declared scope (selection)	Language	CAC Authors	CAC Board
<i>College Composition and Communication</i> (NCTE)	“Research and scholarship in rhetoric and composition studies”	English (implicit)	100	100
Mean			67.6	81.9

* US, UK, Canada, Australia, Hong Kong, New Zealand, and Ireland

As shown in Table 2.1, highly influential international journals related to literacy research, especially in tertiary education, tend to publish authors based in central English-speaking countries (mean = 67.6%). This trend is especially pronounced in six out of the ten journals, which have more than two-thirds of their lead authors located in central English-speaking countries despite the lack of locality in their stated scope: *Modern Language Journal* (68.4%), *Journal of Second Language Writing* (70.4%), *Written Communication* (73.2%), *Reading and Writing Quarterly* (76.8%), *JBTC* (80.6%), and *College Composition and Communication* (100%). Moreover, scholars based in central English-speaking countries are predominant on editorial boards, which account for their symbolic capital within the field: from 59.1% to 100% of total scholars (median = 81.9%). As for the remaining settings in editorial boards, they mostly include Western European countries (France, Germany, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Greece), Israel, and China—which can broadly be labeled as “non-Anglophone center scholars” (Lillis et al., 2010) or, in some cases, semiperipheral scholars (Bennett, 2014).

Submission language is always—and only—English, although most journals take this for granted, since they do not always explicitly point it out. However, some journals do emphasize that works cited and published in languages other than English must include a title translation, while others suggest professional editing for authors whose primary language is not English³. English language editing is often a paid service offered by journals’

3 As can be noticed in the following quotations, “English” is conceptualized as a simple matter of mechanics (elimination of grammatical and spelling errors), style (language polishing and refining), and clarity (a text ready to be understood). In contrast, key issues in intellectual labor such as knowledge construction, research agendas, modes of communication and literature traditions are not mentioned or problematized: “Authors who would like to refine the use of English in their manuscripts might consider using the services of a professional English-language editing company” (retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/author-instructions/JBT> on January 11, 2020); “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” (retrieved from <https://www.springer.com/journal/10734/updates/17235736> on January 11, 2020); “For editing support, including translation and language polishing, explore our Editing Services website” (retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/action/au>

affiliates, thereby reinforcing the anomaly—and the role of consumers—of non-Anglophone authors.

Unsurprisingly, the more explicitly international journal in its scope—*Higher Education*—is also the one that includes more authors from non-central English-speaking countries (six out of ten), although its editorial board consists mostly of scholars from central English-speaking countries (65.2%). In contrast, the *Modern Language Journal* states an explicit commitment to international research on multiple languages, together with a specific commitment to “publishing high-quality work in non-English languages.” However, it mostly publishes authors and invites editors from central English-speaking countries. Finally, the editorial board of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* includes only 19.5% of scholars who do not work in central English-speaking countries, despite the fact that its scope pertains to all second/foreign language writing.

Overall, a review of some of the most prominent indexed journals where international literacy researchers may publish their work reveals a materialization of the center-periphery (or North-South) paradigm of knowledge creation mentioned above. The United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, Hong Kong, New Zealand, and Ireland comprise on average almost seven out of ten authors and around eight out of ten editorial board members. This suggests a pattern of underrepresentation of non-Anglo-Western scholars, aligning with findings from previous studies (Canagarajah, 2002; Goyanes & Demeter, 2020), alongside the central role of English in international research gatekeeping (Navarro et al., 2022). This configuration becomes especially problematic when peripheral, developing countries foster institutional and governmental policies to assess knowledge production—and even scholars’ promotion—based on publication in WoS-indexed journals (Curry & Lillis, 2017). These policies have had a direct impact on the publication venues favored in Latin America, as this region has experienced the second-highest increase in participation in journals indexed in the main citation indices of the WoS over the past 25 years (Adams et al., 2021). In the case of Chile, the number of Chilean articles in the WoS has nearly tripled over the last 15 years, while participation in local Scielo-indexed journals has remained stable⁴.

thorSubmission?show=instructions&journalCode=rsse20 on January 11, 2020); “Authors who feel their English language manuscript may require editing to eliminate possible grammatical or spelling errors and to conform to correct scientific English may wish to use the English Language Editing service” (retrieved from <https://www.elsevier.com> on January 11, 2020).

4 Retrieved from <https://dataciencia.anid.cl/articles> on August 8, 2024.

Case 2: Literacy-Related Articles in the Global South

Although there is extensive research on how peripheral or semiperipheral scholars adapt their research practices, language, and citations to be accepted in elite journals and venues (e.g., Lillis et al., 2010), evidence on how they embody and reproduce central dynamics in the periphery is still scarce. The following analysis examines articles written by Latin American authors in Spanish and Portuguese, published over a decade (2006–2016) in five special issues related to literacy in tertiary education from the central contributing countries to the field in Latin America (Navarro et al., 2016): Argentina (*Signo & Señal*, 2006), Brazil (*Ilha do Desterro*, 2016), Chile (*Signos*, 2016), Colombia (*Grafía*, 2016), and Mexico (*Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 2013). Out of a total of 28 articles, 15 were selected, three from each special issue, in order to obtain a balanced and sufficiently representative sample. The selection within each special issue was random, that is, three archives were manually chosen without considering their metadata, order, or any other variables.

Using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (QSR Nvivo Pro 12) for coding purposes, citations in the introductory and theoretical sections of articles, totaling 37,373 words, were classified. Two contextual categories were coded: 1) *location*, identifying whether the first authors' institutional location was Latin American or non-Latin American, which was researched in the quoted reference; and 2) *language*, determining if the same language of the article (Spanish or Portuguese) was used, if other languages were translated into the language of the article, or if a different language was used, typically French or English. These contextual categories were employed to explain two textual categories: 1) *function*, which either offered a *state-of-the-art* overview of work done on a particular subject or contributed to the theoretical *framework* of the article; and 2) *citation type*, distinguishing between *integral* citations, which place authors and sources in the sentence, and *non-integral* citations, which confine them to brackets. Self-quotations were not considered. Table 2.2 shows the resulting distribution.

Data show that approximately two out of three references are from non-Latin American authors. This tendency resembles the language preferences: two out of three references were published in English, French, Russian or Italian (or rather translated into Spanish or Portuguese from those languages). So, although there is a regional accumulation of literature from which to draw (Navarro et al., 2016), this is vastly overcome by international sources.

When comparing the function of references in terms of location and language of the source, a clear picture emerges: scholars located in Latin

Table 2.2. Institutional Location, Language, Function and Citation Type of Quoted References in Introductory and Theoretical Sections of 15 Literacy-related Research Articles Published in Spanish and Portuguese by Latin-America Affiliated Scholars in Argentinian, Brazilian, Chilean, Colombian, and Mexican Journal Special Issues (2006-2016)

	Location			Language			Total						
	Latin American	Non-Latin American	Spanish or Portuguese	Translated into Spa/Port	Non-Spa/Port								
Function	State-of-the-art	72	47.1%	53	14.1%	76	42.9%	3	6.0%	46	15.3%	125	23.7%
	Framework	81	52.9%	322	85.9%	101	57.1%	47	94.0%	255	84.7%	403	76.3%
Citation	Integral	50	32.7%	152	40.5%	57	32.2%	25	50.0%	120	39.9%	202	38.3%
	Non-integral	103	67.3%	223	59.5%	120	67.8%	25	50.0%	181	60.1%	326	61.7%

America are quoted both to demonstrate that there is a field researching literacy (47.1%) or to draw theoretical concepts (52.9%), but scholars outside Latin America are mostly quoted to refer to theory (85.9%). Moreover, the location contrast per function illustrates a marked difference: 79.9% quotations (322 out of 403) drawn for theory building are from outside Latin America, while 57.6% quotations (72 out of 125) drawn for literature review are from Latin America. That is, Latin Americans are identified as researchers, while non-Latin Americans are recognized as theorists, whose theoretical frameworks are essential for the research and interpretation of findings to be possible.

Languages mirror this tendency: sources written in languages other than Portuguese or Spanish are more likely to be used for theory (original = 84.7%; translated = 94%) than sources written in the same language of the article (57.1%). Language contrast per function strengthens this tendency: 74.9% quotations (302 out of 403) drawn for theory building were originally written in English, French, Russian or Italian, while 60.8% quotations (76 out of 125) drawn for literature review were written in Portuguese or Spanish.

Finally, although there is an overall preference for non-integral citations, international authors are more frequently foregrounded (40.4%) by means of integral citations compared to Latin American authors (32.7%), while sources in English, French, Russian or Italian are more commonly foregrounded (original = 39.9%; translations = 50%) than sources in Spanish or Portuguese (32.2%).

In sum, there appears to be a common quotation pattern that may reinforce colonial dynamics; setting aside self-quotations, peripheral literature often tends to appear in the Literature Review, whereas central literature is more frequently found in the Theoretical Framework section. As noted by Ávila Reyes (2018), Latin American scholars need to make the point that there is scholarly work in the region, not only to create a research niche but also because, in a relatively small scientific community as literacy research, colleagues often become gatekeepers of funding and publishing. So it is a strategic choice to acknowledge them. Conversely, when it comes to theory building, quotations tend to rely on foreign, central, Anglophone authors (French is also frequent).

These results provide empirical evidence to support the concept of colonialism as co-creation; the roles assigned to citations from the South and to citations from the North reproduce the inequitable hierarchy in the production of scientific knowledge. This appears to be a consensual—though more or less invisible—practice that reinforces and cross-fertilizes the coloniality of knowledge.

Some examples might illustrate these rhetorical and epistemic patterns. In an article written by two Argentina-based scholars, the introductory section

claims that there is a relationship between writing and learning:

Some authors highlight student writing as a cognitive activity especially involved in the promotion of science learning processes (Applebee, 1984; Keys, 1999) (ID01AR, p. 49; own translation).

This theoretical claim is supported by two international, seminal references, which are later elaborated into the writing across the curriculum and the reading to write movements. Afterward, the authors move their attention to other, peripheral countries:

In the 1990s this general conception of the cognitive implications of writing academic texts began to take effect outside the Anglo-Saxon sphere (Muñoz Chápuli, 1995; Aguirre, 1998; Bono & De la Barrera, 1998; Vázquez, Matteoda, Jakob and Rosales, 1997) (ID01AR, p. 50; own translation).

In this case, the authors provide four examples of an “Anglo-Saxon” theoretical position becoming gradually accepted in peripheral countries (quoted authors are located in Spain, Argentina, and Venezuela), that is, non-English speaking scholars play a reproductive role as they spread what they have learned from the North. Similar examples are frequent in other articles included in the corpus and coded using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software

Latin America-affiliated authors are also quoted to draw from their theoretical claims and frameworks, either as regional developments for the most renowned authors (Carlino, Marsusch, Motta-Roth, Moyano, Oteiza, Parodi, etc.) or as “information brokers” (Lunsford, 2012) that introduce, translate or recast authors and sources difficult to find or read in their original publication:

The intertext is the knot where one meaning is grouped with another (Noval Pedraza, 2010). It is characterized by being the confluence of the meaning of a previous text with the present text. It is the network of cultural relationships that enable the meaningful construction of a piece of writing (Kristeva, quoted by Noval Pedraza, 2010) (ID07ME; own translation).

In the previous extract, written by two Mexico-based scholars, a Colombia-affiliated author is quoted both as the source of a theoretical claim and a facilitator of French tradition scholars Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes.

Finally, Latin America-based scholars are generously quoted to demonstrate the relevance of a topic, to classify the topics and niches in the field, and to acknowledge works from colleagues (Ávila Reyes, 2018), as in the following opening paragraph of a research article written by another pair of Mexico-based scholars. Interestingly, since the findings or claims are not explicitly detailed, the citations solely aim to build a local scientific field in which the authors can position themselves:

In recent years, there has been a remarkable growing interest in studying researchers training in Latin America. Most studies have focused on describing this training process to make disciplinary-specific trajectories more visible. For example, there is significant research that describes research centers and graduate program recruitment processes, as well as scientific mobility (Tovar, 2005; Vessuri, 2007; Aguilar, Magaña & Guzmán, 2013). There is also extensive work on reward interchange and distribution among researchers and authority building and management in academic and scientific settings (Rodríguez, Bertone & García, 2009; Moreno, 2011; Gómez, Jiménez & Morales, 2014). From a sociological perspective, there is interest in academic cultures and scientific habitus and epistemic communities building, along with ethical and learning topics (Agudelo, 2004; Pérez & Guzmán, 2013; Cammarosano, Almada Santos & Rojas, 2014). The subject of tutoring as scientific training mediation has also begun to foster relevant research (Moreno, 1997; León, 2006; Iguarán, 2009; Quevedo & Buela, 2013) (ID14CH, p. 31; own translation).

These examples suggest that the center/periphery dynamic is reflected by peripheral authors throughout their research articles, often perpetuating it, yet also, to some extent, resisting and negotiating it. Quoting international authors to support theoretical claims and regional authors to acknowledge work being done on a certain topic is not necessarily an ideological stance or a naïve view on international research. It seems more of an implicit survival tactic: it provides legitimization to a peripheral scholar's piece of research.

Towards Decolonial Dynamics in Knowledge Production

Colonial dynamics rely on cross-border support—both from the North and the South—to persist. This chapter has provided empirical evidence that helps illustrate the functioning of the colonial distribution of intellectual labor as

co-creation. First, in the overrepresentation of authors and editors based in central English-speaking countries in leading scientific journals that claim to promote universal and global knowledge. Second, in the overrepresentation of Global North authors cited in peripheral articles to construct interpretative theoretical frameworks.

To address this co-constructed dynamic, there is a need for scholars in non-central, non-Anglophone countries to promote illegitimate peripheral participation (Navarro, 2022), epistemic disobedience (Mignolo, 2015), and the sociolinguistic right to choose one's language of publication (Navarro et al., 2022, 2023). This involves altering the ways of belonging to a transnational community of practice. Authors from the Global South should develop and cite their own theories while addressing local needs to formulate global claims and engage in transnational conversations. This is challenging, as it requires confronting or integrating Northern epistemic practices and knowledge while dealing with urgent material limitations and the consequences of resisting or criticizing center-based dynamics and criteria.

In addition, since “decolonizing entails decolonizing the knowledge of the colonized as much as the knowledge of the colonizer” (Santos, 2018, p. 14), central journals should also consider non-English-speaking literature and traditions to foster North/South research collaborations. Moreover, elite journals should strive to democratize participation and critically examine the limitations of mainstream knowledge, particularly given their stated international, universalistic reach (Canagarajah, 2002). This may involve implementing affirmative action strategies, publication quotas, and internationalization metrics for authors, editors, scientific boards, and peer reviewers. Journals could include articles in languages other than English, accompanied by English translations; Southern scholars might be invited to peer review northern works and to join editorial boards; articles authored by scholars not affiliated with central Anglophone countries could become more prevalent; and citations of non-English traditions could be encouraged and valued (Navarro et al., 2022). It should be noted that in recent years, some journals and publishing companies related to language and literacy have started to acknowledge this need for widening and diversifying roles, traditions, languages, and conversations (cf. e.g., Dryer et al., 2023; Duchêne et al., 2021; Palmquist et al., 2020; Slomp, 2019).

Decolonization, as Maldonado-Torres (2007) asserts, is an invitation to engage in dialogue and exchange while rejecting a totalitarian approach to knowledge (García & Baca, 2019). This invitation does not draw from a positivist paradigm that seeks “the common good” or “science progress” that neglects inequities and power hierarchies among scholars and research systems, thus

reifying nation-state borders and/or monolingual ideologies. This invitation, just like this chapter, is a political call for social justice in global research that actively contests historically unequal configurations, totalizing claims and epistemic violence (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), and promotes liminality between nations, languages, and identities (Canagarajah, 2018).

Palabras finales

La génesis de un texto académico elaborado desde la periferia o la semi-periferia suele tener capas y etapas que tienden hacia la hibridez y la fluidez, los cambios y las traducciones entre lenguas y estilos. Es probable que un borrador escrito en Santiago o Belo Horizonte—y también Madrid o Budapest—tenga algunos fragmentos en una lengua, otros en otra, otros más en una tercera, y que haya operaciones de traducción del autor, de un revisor o de software asistido por inteligencia artificial que vaya transformando unos y otros. Sin dudas, una de esas lenguas será el inglés.

Además, esta fluidez y este cambio también influyen en modificaciones respecto de audiencias, canales editoriales y lenguas, que con frecuencia se modifican a lo largo del proceso de escritura y revisión por pares. Un artículo originalmente escrito en inglés puede haber sido rechazado en cierta revista internacional y luego traducido al español o portugués para enviar a una revista continental, o, en sentido inverso, un capítulo que originalmente aparecería como prólogo más personal en un libro de una comunidad local que no llegó a publicarse se transforme a un texto más impersonal y normado para participar en la revisión por pares internacional y su segregación implícita por origen y lengua.

Las transformaciones y capas de lenguas también operan en las trayectorias de lectura. Seguramente muchos investigadores de la periferia no recuerden bien en qué lengua estaba escrito ese artículo que leyeron hace unos meses atrás. Por supuesto, esta participación multilingüada e híbrida no puede idealizarse, porque está plagada de esfuerzos y barreras extra para quienes quieren participar en ella. En un artículo publicado recientemente en Brasil intentamos conservar estas capas multilingües en las que normalmente habitamos los autores de la periferia (Macedo et al., 2021).

Toda esta complejidad y esfuerzo extra suelen perderse en el producto final, mucho más pulido, determinado, simple, y hasta aburrido. Pero el camino, si se logra transitar con éxito, resulta extremadamente enriquecedor. Es frecuente, por ejemplo, que el cambio de código de una lengua a otra, o de una audiencia a otra, opere epistémicamente y colabore en la elaboración y ajuste de conceptos y entramados teóricos, además de mejorar y complejizar formulaciones y postulados.

Quizás sea una buena idea explorar de forma regular la posicionalidad no solo de los autores de las investigaciones, sino también de los textos que escriben, para recuperar algo de esa riqueza, de esos obstáculos y de esa agencia autorral. Lo intentaré a continuación.

Este capítulo nació hace tiempo como borrador para un libro en inglés que se publicó en Estados Unidos, pero las restricciones de extensión dejaron fuera la investigación empírica que sustentaba la propuesta teórica. Originalmente, fue escrito en parte en inglés y en parte en español, revisado colaborativamente con una traductora, hasta llegar a su versión final en inglés para una audiencia internacional. Posteriormente, fue presentado en sociedad como parte de una conferencia plenaria en la *V PRISEAL Conference*, en una performance que combinaba y alternaba el inglés y el español en modo escrito (subtítulos) y multimodal (diapositivas y voz).

Ahora, he decidido darle una forma final en inglés, a pesar de aparecer en un volumen bilingüe, para intentar alcanzar una audiencia lo más amplia posible. Mi motivación fue que las evidencias sobre la segregación y discriminación en la producción y comunicación científica permeen las políticas editoriales y las prácticas científicas en general. Al mismo tiempo, la lengua de publicación no determinó las fuentes citadas, que son en su mayoría de autores de la periferia, por lo que el inglés servirá como puente entre ciertos lectores y ciertas tradiciones teóricas. Finalmente, quise rescatar la prosa en inglés que elaboré originalmente y que implicó importantes esfuerzos de tiempo y recursos, y en la que también puedo expresar mi voz. En este sentido, una postura decolonial y equitativa en la construcción de conocimiento científico también implica el derecho de elegir nuestra lengua de publicación de acuerdo con las posibilidades que habilita, incluyendo las audiencias a las que queremos llegar o el mensaje que queremos comunicar.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by ANID/Support 2024 AFB240004 and FONDECYT 1251238, National Agency of Research and Development, Chile.

References

- Adams, J., Pendlebury, D., Potter, R., & Szomszor, M. (2021). *Global research report Latin America: South and Central America, Mexico and the Caribbean*. Institute for Scientific Information.
- Aguirre Rojas, C. A. (2015). Introduction: Immanuel Wallerstein and the critical “world-systems analysis” perspective. In I. Wallerstein, C. A. Aguirre Rojas, & C. Lemert (Eds.), *Uncertain worlds: World-systems analysis in changing times* (pp. vii-xxxv). Routledge.

- Ávila Reyes, N. (2018). Locales, regionales y cosmopolitas: análisis intertextual de artículos sobre escritura universitaria en América Latina Hispánica [Locals, regionals and cosmopolitans: intertextual analysis of articles on university writing in Hispanic Latin America]. In R. Celi Mendes Pereira (Ed.), *Escrita na universidade. Panoramas e desafios na América Latina* (pp. 45-82). Editora da UFPB.
- 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 semiperiphery of academic writing: Discourses, communities and practices* (pp. 1-9). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). El campo científico [the scientific field]. In *Los usos sociales de la ciencia* (pp. 9-57). Nueva Visión. (1976)
- Canagarajah, S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburg Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Transnationalism and translanguaging: How they are connected. In X. You (Ed.), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 41-60). Routledge.
- Castro-Gómez, S. (2007). Decolonizar la universidad: La hybris del punto cero y el diálogo de saberes [Decolonize the university. The hybris of the zero point and the dialog of knowledge]. In S. Castro-Gómez & R. Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 79-91). Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2017). Problematizing English as the privileged language of global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies. In M. J. Curry & T. Lillis (Eds.), *Global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies* (pp. 1-20). Multilingual Matters.
- Donahue, C. (2009). “Internationalization” and Composition Studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 212-243. <https://doi.org/10.58680/cc20099470>
- Dryer, D. B., Poe, M., & Graphenreed, T. (2023). Editors’ Note. *Written Communication*, 40(3), 787-791. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883231179517>
- Duchêne, A., Ellece, S. E., Tupas, R., Sabaté-Dalmau, M., Unamuno, V., & Urla, J. (2021). Welcome on board! Prefiguring knowledge production in the sociology of language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2021(267-268), 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2021-2121>
- García, R., & Baca, D. (2019). Hopes and visions: The possibility of decolonial options. In R. García & D. Baca (Eds.), *Rhetorics elsewhere and otherwise: Contested modernities, decolonial visions* (pp. 1-48). CCCC & NCTE.
- Goyanes, M., & Demeter, M. (2020). How the geographic diversity of editorial boards affects what is published in JCR-Ranked communication journals. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 97(4), 1123-1148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699020904169>
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Routledge.

- Lillis, T., Hewings, A., Vladimirov, D., & Curry, M. J. (2010). The geolinguistics of English as an academic lingua franca: Citation practices across English-medium national and English-medium international journals. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 111-135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00233.x>
- Lunsford, K. (2012). Conducting writing research internationally. In L. Nickoson & M. P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Writing studies research in practice: Methods and methodologies* (pp. 220-230). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Macedo, C., Navarro, F., Vian Jr., O., & Ferreira, M. M. (2021). Estudos de la escritura na educação superior: a multilingual presentation. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Linguística Teórica e Aplicada*, 37(3), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-460X202155572>
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 240-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162548>
- Mignolo, W. (2010). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7-8), 159-181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275>
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). Geopolitics of sensing and knowing: On (de)coloniality, border thinking and epistemic disobedience. *Postcolonial Studies*, 14(3), 273-283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2011.613105>
- Mignolo, W. (2015). Yes, we can. In H. Dabashi (Ed.), *Can non-Europeans think?* (pp. 10-38). Zed Books.
- Mignolo, W., & Walsh, C. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.
- Muchiri, M. N., Mulamba, N. G., Myers, G., & Ndoloi, D. B. (1995). Importing composition: Teaching and researching academic writing beyond North America. *College Composition & Communication*, 46(2), 175-198. <https://doi.org/10.58680/cc19958742>
- Navarro, F. (2022). The unequal distribution of research roles in transnational composition: Towards illegitimate peripheral participation. In C. Donahue & B. Horner (Eds.), *Teaching and studying transnational composition* (pp. 17-33). Modern Language Association.
- Navarro, F., Ávila Reyes, N., Tapia Ladino, M., Cristovão, V. L. L., Moritz, M. E. W., Narváez Cardona, E., & Bazerman, C. (2016). Panorama histórico y contrastivo de los estudios sobre lectura y escritura en educación superior publicados en América Latina [Historical and contrastive panorama of higher education reading and writing studies published in Latin America]. *Signos*, 49(S1), 100-126. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342016000400006>
- Navarro, F., Lillis, T., Donahue, T., Curry, M. J., Ávila Reyes, N., Gustafsson, M., Zavala, V., Lauría, D., Lukin, A., McKinney, C., Feng, H., & Motta-Roth, D. (2022). Rethinking English as a lingua franca in scientific-academic contexts. A position statement. *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*, 3(1), 143-153. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.21012.nav>
- Navarro, F., Lillis, T., Donahue, T., Curry, M. J., Ávila Reyes, N., Gustafsson, M., Zavala, V., Lauría, D., Lukin, A., McKinney, C., Feng, H., & Motta-Roth, D. (2023). Manifiesto. Reconsideración del inglés como lengua franca

- en contextos científico-académicos [Rethinking English as a lingua franca in scientific-academic contexts: A position statement]. *Revista Argentina de Investigación Educativa*, 3(5), 261-270.
- Palmquist, M., Childers, P., Maimon, E. P., Mullin, J., Rice, R., Russell, A., & Russell, D. (2020). Fifty years of WAC: Where have we been? Where are we going? *Across the Disciplines*, 17(3/4), 5-45. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.3.01>
- Quijano, A. (1992). Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad [Coloniality and modernity/rationality]. *Perú Indígena*, 13(29), 11-20.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina [Coloniality of power, eurocentrism and Latin America]. In E. Lander (Ed.), *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas* (pp. 201-246). CLACSO.
- Rigg, J. (2007). *An everyday geography of the Global South*. Routledge.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (2015). Peripheral scholarly journals: From locality to globality. *Ibérica*, 30, 15-36. <https://www.revistaiberica.org/index.php/iberica/article/view/726>
- Santos, B. d. S. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the South*. Duke University Press.
- Scimago. (2024). *Scimago country rank 1996-2023*.
- Segato, R. (2012). Brechas descoloniales para una universidad nuestroamericana [Decolonial gaps for an our-American university]. *Revista Casa de las Américas*, 266, 43-60.
- Slopp, D. H. (2019). Complexity, consequence, and frames: A quarter century of research in *Assessing Writing*. *Assessing Writing*, 42, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.100424>
- Vera-Baceta, M.-A., Thelwall, M., & Kousha, K. (2019). Web of Science and Scopus language coverage. *Scientometrics*, 121(3), 1803-1813. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03264-z>