16 From the Editor's Desk of a Bilingual Journal in Mexico

Sarah Frances Gordon and Bernardo Turnbull
Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Abstract / Resumen

English is currently the dominant language of scholarly publishing, with most scientific journals published in English. The ramifications of this development are covered in this chapter, with special attention given to researchers who speak English as an additional language (EAL) in Latin America. This piece discusses the effects of increasing English dominance in scientific communication, the potential benefits and drawbacks of producing scientific information in one language instead of multiple languages, and the discriminatory language practices in academic publishing. Possible ways journals can combat these exclusionary language practices, as well as the firsthand accounts of two editors at a bilingual journal in Mexico, and their various challenges, are discussed.

El inglés es actualmente el idioma dominante en la publicación académica, con la mayoría de las revistas científicas publicando en inglés. Las ramificaciones de este desarrollo se abordan en este capítulo, prestando especial atención a los investigadores que hablan inglés como segundo idioma (ISI) en América Latina. Los autores analizan los efectos de la prevalencia del inglés en la comunicación científica, los beneficios y desventajas de producir información científica en un solo idioma en lugar de en varios idiomas, y las prácticas lingüísticas discriminatorias en la publicación académica. Se consideran posibles formas en que las revistas pueden combatir estas prácticas lingüísticas excluyentes, así como las experiencias de primera mano de dos editores de una revista bilingüe en México y los diversos desafíos que enfrentan.

Keywords / Palabras clave: journal editing; journal metrics; Mexico; national and institutional policies; language choice / edición de revistas; métricas de revistas; México; políticas nacionales e institucionales; elección de idioma

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2026.2821.2.16

Despite over 7,100 languages worldwide, English is the dominant language of the scientific world. Most scientific articles are published in English, and publishing in a high-impact journal typically requires fluency in this language (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Hernández Bonilla, 2021; Olmos-Lopez et al., 2022; Salatino, 2022). Therefore, a researcher's career advancement often hinges on their ability to write effectively in English. Academic institutions and funding agencies frequently mandate that for research to achieve significant visibility, it must be published in prominent journals, which are predominantly English-medium (Curry & Lillis, 2018; Gea-Valor et al., 2014; Gordon & Gutiérrez, 2022; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Ordorika, 2018). This requirement applies regardless of a scholar's native language or the geographical origin of their research, placing a premium on publishing in English within the global academic community.

According to the Cervantes Institute Report, there are more than 500 million native Spanish speakers worldwide, making Spanish the second most spoken language by native speakers after English (Instituto Cervantes, 2023). However, the hypercentrality of English in Latin America and other Ibero-American countries remains prevalent (Badillo, 2021; Beigel, 2022). Research from the Organization of Ibero-American States and the Elcano Royal Institute shows that 95.7% of scientific articles in journals indexed in the Web of Science (WOS) in 2020 were published in English, with only 1.7% of these articles being published in Spanish (Badillo, 2021). Native Spanish-speaking researchers typically publish extensively in English and engage in various forms of scientific communication in Spanish, Portuguese, Basque, Catalan, and/or, much more infrequently, Indigenous languages spoken in Ibero-American countries. They also contribute robustly to Spanish-language publications in regional journals (Linder & De Sterck, 2016).

In Latin America, academic journals typically publish research articles in English, Spanish, or Portuguese. Brazil leads the way in scholarly publishing in Latin America, followed by Mexico, Colombia, Chile, and Argentina (Beigel et al., 2024; Orozco, 2018). These countries are the primary contributors to the region's scholarly output. Recently, there has been a notable trend in Brazil, where journals increasingly opt to publish in English instead of Portuguese. Packer (2016) documented this shift among journals in Brazil, driven by the mandates of major indexing databases like SciELO that require a certain percentage of articles to be published in English. In contrast, countries such as Cuba, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, and Mexico have more unevenly adopted this change, with journals in these regions predominantly continuing to publish in Spanish (Salatino, 2020). Overall, the supremacy of English and the underrepresentation of languages such as Spanish and Portuguese in scholarly

publishing in Latin America remain (Salatino, 2022). For example, only 12% of researchers in Mexico publish scientific articles in Spanish (Badillo, 2021).

Many research projects in Latin America have been conducted in Spanish, Portuguese, or other Indigenous languages endemic to that region and subsequently published in English. Does this benefit the participants, who are the rightful owners of the data? Is it right for the English language to be the gatekeeper of all knowledge, including Indigenous knowledge? As the editors of a scholarly journal in Mexico that publishes articles in Spanish and English, these are essential questions for us to consider. This chapter will discuss the challenges that researchers in Latin America face in this "publish or perish (but only in English)" environment, which has become characterized by impact factors and exclusionary language practices associated with neoliberal values. It also explores what journals can do to promote language diversity and research dissemination for broader societal benefit.

Debating the "English-only" Language Trend in Scholarly Publishing

The overrepresentation of journals that only publish articles in English and their inclusion in prestigious indexes is a phenomenon that is well-documented in the literature (Céspedes, 2021; Curry & Lillis, 2024; Englander, 2014; Henshall, 2018; Salatino, 2022). Céspedes (2021) found in their analysis of journals indexed in international scientific databases that of the 25,185 active journals indexed in SCOPUS, 78.9% only publish in English. This trend was similar for the WoS, where of the 21,226 active journals indexed, 62% only publish in English (Céspedes, 2021). These statistics show how English-medium journals are dominating the scholarly landscape.

There are obvious benefits to having a global language of communication in the scholarly world, but this does not mean that linguistic privilege and disadvantages do not exist (Hanauer et al., 2018; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016). On the one hand, a universal language helps promote greater access and understanding of academic works across different countries and cultures. A policy of monolingualism in scholarly publishing also facilitates global collaborations, reduces the need for translation, and potentially makes it easier for researchers to share their work with others worldwide (Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016). This may lead to faster progress in research as new scientific discoveries can be shared quickly. Conversely, publishing scientific articles in different languages may lead to certain studies being overlooked (Fane & Wastl, 2023). For example, in 2004, scientists published in Chinese-medium journals about the infection of pigs with avian influenza viruses in China. They warned about the possibility of

a future influenza pandemic (Haiyan et al., 2004). However, this information mainly went unnoticed by the international community, probably because it was published in Chinese. Still, the benefits of monolingualism come at a cost for English-as-an-additional-language (EAL) speakers, who are expected to learn English to participate in this global scholarly community and may not receive the same societal benefits as a first-language speaker of English (Amano et al., 2023; Beigel, 2022; Corcoran, 2019; Hanauer et al., 2018; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016). First-language English speakers have a particular invisible privilege that allows them to exist more easily in the global scholarly community than EAL speakers (Vandrick, 2015).

We must ask ourselves, "What are the advantages and disadvantages of monolingual vs. multilingual scientific knowledge production?" Monolingualism and its underlying ideologies and epistemologies ultimately elevates English as the gatekeeper to academic discourse in scholarly publishing, potentially reinforcing existing inequalities (Amano et al., 2023; Márquez & Porras, 2020). This categorization places scholars into two groups: "native vs. non-native speakers of English" (Henshall, 2018, p. 35). The trend of monolingualism further perpetuates the myth of English language superiority. This practice hinders the development of Spanish as an academic language in the scientific world, relegating its use to popular discourse and placing it in an inferior position to English (Molin & De Sterck, 2016).

Moreover, there are also fewer opportunities for scholars to publish in their native language, which may hinder the dissemination of research among local communities and policymakers (Curry & Lillis, 2018, 2024). It may create barriers for those who need to be proficient in English, particularly for scholars from developing countries, who need more access to discursive and non-discursive resources (Flowerdew & Habibie, 2021; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016). Further, the need for EAL speakers to publish in English may alienate them from the research context, the place where the research problem exists. Researchers worldwide constantly need to see their research findings adequately applied in local or regional contexts (Curry & Lillis, 2004). As these EAL researchers have to participate in a system that values publication first, they may have to compromise the potential practical value of their work and prioritize their visibility, readership, and chances of obtaining research funding. The obligatory exportation of research findings to foreign spaces (journals, institutions, and land) potentially leads to their research being separated from its local context.

The trend of "English-only" in scholarly publishing also reproduces the dominance of Anglophone researchers and the broader dissemination of their work over others. English sources published in the global north are

more commonly referenced than others, and essential work from developing countries is often overlooked (Di Bitetti & Ferreras, 2017; Tardy, 2004). Over the past few decades, research has commonly interpreted non-Western data through Western epistemological perspectives and disseminated it predominantly in English, raising concerns about linguistic exclusion (Schäfer, 2010). This heavy reliance on English sources from the global north is troubling because it exposes a power dynamic in the scholarly publishing community, which is exclusionary as it privileges one group over another (Haelewaters et al., 2021). Researchers with higher citation counts often appear to publish more quickly, a pattern that may contribute to a dynamic in which English-language publications cite one another more frequently. In this way, English cites English, and this tendency reinforces the visibility of established English-speaking scholars, reproducing monolingual norms and the perceived dominance of English in academia (Di Bitetti & Ferreras, 2017). Furthermore, not considering the global collection of scientific knowledge published in different languages and only relying on research published in English may slow down and skew scientific advancement and is considered by many to be an increasingly common, dangerous practice in science (Amano et al., 2021; Haelewaters et al., 2021).

Exclusionary Language Practices in Scholarly Publishing

The truth is that the gatekeepers of scholarly knowledge are, for the most part, Anglophone scholars and publishers, who, inadvertently or otherwise, often facilitate and engage in these exclusionary language practices. Scholars not considered "sufficiently" Anglophone are often excluded from participating in the inner circles of scholarly communities (Tardy, 2004; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016). As a result, they face more challenges publishing their research and are at a considerable disadvantage when competing with Anglophone scholars (Hanauer et al., 2018; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2020). Fewer et al. (1997) even go so far as to label this as "academic imperialism."

How Academic Imperialism Works

Like an informal game of football (or soccer for some readers) in which the team that scores first receives the whistle from the referee's hands and gets to call the shots for the rest of the game, we all write and implement rules to guarantee our success in life. Here, "The more you have, the more you can get" rings true. Research is no exception. The system of academic imperialism is also compounded by the myriad incentives that academics compete for

(Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Ordorika, 2018). In Ibero-American countries like Mexico, the research system (e.g., Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología – CONAHCYT) rewards and thus incentivizes publishing in high-impact factor, international, often English-medium journals (Corcoran, 2019; Hernández Bonilla, 2021; Olmos-Lopez et al., 2022). Ugarte Pineda and Parra Huerta (2021) highlighted the importance of CONAHCYT for researchers in Mexico. Their study of articles published in WoS-indexed journals by researchers affiliated with Mexican institutions revealed that 46% of these articles acknowledged CONAHCYT for funding their research.

Publishing in English-language journals presents significant linguistic and logistical challenges, particularly for researchers who must translate their work. Even in cases where the researcher can afford to pay for translation services or even a bilingual assistant, the researcher will face the ordeal of paying for many translations, from the first draft, the revisions after the peer review stage, to the final version. Writing up research is not a simple linear process but a series of iterations, variations, and repetitions that tend to slow down the process. Although all academics have to go through the same process when writing research papers, the process is even more time-intensive when different translations are involved. For example, Amano et al. (2023) found in their study of 908 researchers, who all had one of the following eight nationalities— Bangladeshi, Bolivian, British, Japanese, Nepali, Nigerian, Spanish, and Ukrainian—that EAL English speakers need more time to write a paper in English than their first language English speaking peers, and spend considerably more effort on research activities.

Furthermore, high English proficiency for EAL speakers is usually correlated with a higher socio-economic status because of the economic resources needed to learn a language (Amano et al., 2023). Therefore, academics from higher socio-economic backgrounds in non-English-speaking countries are again privileged, making it more difficult for first-generation academics and/or those from lower socio-economic backgrounds to excel in these spaces. This should come as no surprise, as academia has long been known as the insular domain of the elite (Van Dam, 2022).

How Can Journals Combat Exclusionary Language Practices?

EAL speakers often report that journals focus on reviewing the quality of English in a manuscript and ignore the research; however, the peer-review process should be based on the quality of the science and content, not the lexicogrammatical accuracy of the text (Amano et al., 2021, 2023; Corcoran,

2019; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2022; Lillis & Curry, 2015; Márquez & Porras, 2020; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016, 2020; Strauss, 2019). Whether Anglophone or not, reviewers tend to hold ideologies regarding what they deem *good English* and potentially display linguistic bias when reviewing texts written by EAL speakers. Considering the current state of monolingualism in scholarly publishing, the goal of the scientific community should be to ensure that language is not a barrier to advancing and disseminating academic knowledge. There are various measures that peer-reviewed journals can implement to combat exclusionary language practices while promoting the dissemination of scholarly knowledge. This section outlines some such measures.

First, reviewers in academic journals should be instructed by the editor to look at the quality of the research instead of grammatical errors when evaluating a text (Gordon & Gutiérrez, 2022). A reviewer who sets out to correct the manuscript's grammar, spelling, and style may end up distracted from the scientific substance of the text, leading to a negative perception of the author by the reviewer and thus biasing the review from the start. In our journal, *Psicología Iberoamericana*, a bilingual publication in the field of psychology in Mexico, when we receive submissions in English, we strive to forward them to bilingual researchers. This is because these researchers are more likely to be familiar with submitting manuscripts in a language other than their own. They understand that prioritizing quality over language issues is paramount.

Second, research articles and abstracts should be translated into different languages to help combat the poor visibility of non-English research (Amano et al., 2021; Márquez & Porras, 2020). This will also help engage a wider audience and increase the accessibility of research. However, journals often only publish in one language. In Scopus, only 8.2% of their indexed journals publish in more than one language, while in WoS, only 3.4% publish in more than one language (Céspedes, 2021). Indexations focusing on Ibero-American countries insist that journals provide abstracts in English and the language of publication, such as Spanish or Portuguese. Our journal, *Psicología Iberoamericana*, always provides abstracts in Spanish and English. Although our journal accepts manuscripts in Spanish and English, the content of our journal is primarily published in Spanish. It is common for researchers in Mexico to publish one article based on their research in Spanish in a regional journal, such as ours—because it is more accessible to grassroots organizations, policymakers, local researchers, and other scholars in Ibero-American countries—and then later publish an article in English in an international, high-impact-factor journal so that they can appeal to our neighbors in the north (the United States and Canada) and benefit from the rewards systems

set up by the government and their institutions. This is a delicate balancing act that researchers in Ibero-American countries are constantly navigating to ensure that their research has sufficient exposure both abroad and at home.

Third, editors and reviewers should encourage authors to consult non-English literature when applicable and not limit their focus to Anglophone research. For example, we were recently reading a journal article about the migrant crisis at the border between the United States and Mexico. We were irritated when we discovered that none of the sources cited were from researchers affiliated with Mexican institutions. Furthermore, none of the sources cited were published in Spanish. Although the article was published in a high-impact journal, it made us question the quality of the research and the perspectives communicated by the author because of the apparent ethnocentrism permeating the text. Is it even possible to accurately represent the migrant crisis on the U.S.-Mexico border without consulting any Mexican-based literature? This example is, unfortunately, more common than we as researchers would like to admit, and we need to start critically assessing the impact of monolingualism on scholarly work and how it contributes to Western-focused ethnocentrism in research. Unfortunately, the dominance of global English in the academic community has ramifications, and some of them are not good. For example, we once got an article rejected by an international journal, and one of the comments from the reviewers was that we had referenced too many studies published in Spanish. Since the paper focused on health issues in Mexico, we thought this was appropriate, but apparently not.

Fourth, the scientific community should support EAL speakers and help them with language issues in scholarly publishing (Amano et al., 2021). Although many journals suggest that authors employ an editing service, very few offer editing support (see Mišak et al., 2005; Lillis et al., 2010). What support is on offer is often only in the form of unaffordable paid services to many scholars who would most benefit from them. Our journal provides free English language support if an author wishes to publish in English; however, this service is rarely utilized, and most authors still opt to publish in Spanish.

Finally, journals should encourage diversity among editorial board members, editors, and reviewers. When selecting new members for the editorial board or peer reviewers, it is essential to consider the diversity of the individual in terms of their sexuality, race, ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status, geographical location, career stage, and language background. Including more EAL speakers in journals is crucial because it will expose the scholarly publishing community to a more diverse set of voices and perspectives. Although there will always be gatekeepers who will resist change, these steps are necessary for real change in scholarly publishing.

Ideally, what is needed is an environment where research can be taught in multiple languages (Amano et al., 2021). Is it too much to expect scholars to be able to read academic texts in two or more languages? In the early 1900s, this was common practice for scholars. Within the current landscape of publishing, where English is hyper-dominant, EAL speakers are expected to "master" English if they want to work in academia; conversely, few expect researchers in Anglophone countries, such as the United States or the United Kingdom, to learn languages other than English if they wish to excel in their field. We need to examine our double standards regarding language in the scientific community. Similarly, institutions should encourage language learning among scholars and collaborations with other institutions. This will help promote more multilingualism in the world of scholarly publishing and help foster a better understanding between researchers of different backgrounds and contexts.

Our Experience as an Open-Access Journal in Mexico: Challenges and Barriers

Psicología Iberoamericana, the journal we manage, was established at the Universidad Iberoamericana in 1987. The first journal established in Mexico was in 1974 (Beigel et al., 2024); therefore, our journal is one of the earliest psychology journals in Mexico. Most journals in Mexico are based at universities and are open-access and non-commercial (Salatino, 2022). *Psicología Iberoamericana* is also funded by the university where we are based and is open-access and non-commercial. This policy reflects our desire to be included in national indexes, such as CONAHCYT, Redalyc, Latindex, BIBLAT, and Scielo Mexico. There is no fee to publish in our journal. This section outlines some challenges we have encountered as editors over the past years.

First, as a peer-reviewed and open-access journal in Mexico, we are constantly pressured to be included in major indexes, such as WoS, Scopus, and PubMed. However, the application process for such indexes can be complex, and journals are only allowed a limited number of attempts. While the requirements may seem simple to journals in developed countries that are used to big budgets and more staff, they can be challenging for smaller, open-access journals with fewer resources. For example, obtaining an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) can be challenging in some countries in Latin America. There are delays at the Instituto Nacional del Derecho de Autor (INDAUTOR) in Mexico, which can make the process take years. Website functionality can also be challenging for journals needing more funding for dedicated technical support.

Another criterion for entering a major index is having high citation scores associated with authors and editorial boards. For example, a journal must publish articles by authors with a strong publication history in WoS. Since most journals indexed in WoS only publish articles in English, this translates into the criterion that a journal must publish authors who have published in English. The same applies to editorial board members. A journal must have editorial board members with a strong WoS publication history and, therefore, have published articles in English in WoS-indexed journals. This last criterion of author and editorial board citation scores is particularly biased because it favors Anglophone scholars over scholars from other parts of the world. It also perpetuates a cycle of rewarding exclusionary language policies and repeatedly privileging the same voices of mainstream Anglophone scholars and those working in the global north.

One interesting pushback to the systemic issues that privilege English in global knowledge production is that Latin America has many competing indexes published in Spanish and Portuguese. Many new journals in Latin America thus try first to be indexed in regional indexes (e.g., Redalyc, Latindex, BIBLAT, SciELO) before they even attempt to apply to indexes such as WoS, Scopus, PubMed, DOAJ, etc. Latindex, SciELO, BIBLAT, and Redalyc are considered scholarly-led regional, collaborative, and non-commercial initiatives that support open-access publishing (Babaini, 2019; Beigel, 2022; Vasen & Vilchis, 2017). They help elevate the quality of journals in Latin America by having strict inclusion criteria and reviewing journal membership regularly. Open-access scholarly publishing is currently the prevailing policy for journals in Latin America, as universities and research institutions in this region tend to have a public mission of knowledge sharing (Babaini, 2019; Beigel, 2022). For example, Latindex currently has 27,359 journals indexed directly in print or online, constituting a network of 24 institutions across Latin America (Latindex, 2024). However, despite these indexes being regional efforts, they still contain criteria that include a certain percentage of English articles. Therefore, this system's journals can still not avoid the anglophone dominance in scholarly publishing.

Next, it is also tricky for journals in Mexico to attract high-quality articles, especially when that journal is trying to compete with high-impact-factor journals that only publish in English and are already indexed in WoS, Scopus, PubMed, etc. The reward system for researchers in Mexico is the nationally rated research system called the Sistema Nacional de Investigadores (SNI), a national registry of researchers making a significant contribution to scientific research. Depending on your ranking in the system, you receive a monthly stipend, and being in the system is critical to your career advancement as

a researcher. The system operates under the umbrella of CONAHCYT in Mexico. It often disincentivizes academics from publishing in regional open-access journals because it generally values articles published in English in high-impact-factor journals more. Not that local researchers cannot produce high-quality, citable, and applicable research, but when they have a promising manuscript, they cannot "afford to waste it" in a local journal because they are under economic and work pressure to get published by more prominent journals. We, in Latin America, are in the habit of stealing our work from our own journals and thus perpetuating the same cycles of academic imperialism that we are trapped in.

Another barrier for a smaller journal hoping to be indexed by major indexing services (e.g., WoS, PubMed, Scopus) is that many of these companies require journals to provide eXtensible Markup Language (XML) copies of each article and upload these documents to their servers. However, this means that a journal must outsource this service to another company or employ and train someone to code all the documents in XML. Both options are costly, and often, regional open-access journals need help finding the funding to pay for this service.

Finally, smaller journals often need more infrastructure and funding to hire a team of full-time staff to run the journal, making it increasingly challenging to meet this criterion despite the best intentions of the editors. Most journals in Mexico are funded and managed by institutions such as universities, government research institutions, or professional associations, and therefore, journals in the country have ongoing bureaucratic and budget issues. Additionally, a journal requires staff to manage the submissions, peer review process, editorial and proofreading stages, and production phase. The list of work activities journal staff must undertake to publish one article is lengthy, often underestimated, and underappreciated. The time, staff, space, money, equipment, and even expertise required to run this process put underfunded journals at a disadvantage compared to international journals. In the case of our journal, only one full-time employee works there and is responsible for all these activities.

Considering these factors, it is no surprise that the WoS has a historically low representation of journals from Latin America, and this lack of representation in significant indexes negatively affects the recognition of regional scientific production (Céspedes, 2021; Sánchez-Pereyra, 2010). There are only 833 journals (3.3%) from Latin America in SCOPOS and 1,048 (4.9%) in WoS (Céspedes, 2021). This creates an illusion of superiority for many journals. To illustrate how this works, imagine a school child visiting a museum with her class and looking at a map showing all the dig sites where dinosaur

bones had been found. She looks at the map slowly and asks her teacher if the abundance of digging sites means more dinosaurs lived in the United States than elsewhere. The teacher explains to the child that the United States has more money to dig holes than other countries. More science does not always come from where there is more knowledge, rigor, or talent, but often from where there is more money.

Our Current System of Scholarly Publishing: Reflections on the Way Forward

The current landscape of scholarly publishing is rife with exclusionary language practices, which reflect the culture of intellectual imperialism and endogamy governing academic and research institutions worldwide. This culture is propped up by the various reward systems for academics, which incentivize publishing in English in international, high-impact-factor journals. Scholars are torn between publishing in their local languages in regional journals or publishing in English in a handful of international, high-impact-factor journals (Alatas, 2022). National research foundations, universities, and research institutions demand that scholars prove the instrumentality of their research as a prerequisite for funding and career advancement (Muñoz-García, 2019). In Mexico, the situation is compounded by political considerations and the affiliation of researchers with public or private universities. Those from public institutions are favored, while their counterparts from private institutions are excluded from funding and the national research rating system. Cruz (2023) argues that the new regulations in Mexico regarding researchers from public and private institutions in the new Ley General de Ciencia are causing fragmentation in the scientific community.

Consequently, scholars' careers are being influenced by a neoliberal regulation of knowledge, prioritizing the market value of their publications and alignment with the current political system over critical, reflexive research and academic freedom (Curry & Lillis, 2018; Muñoz-García, 2019). Institutions are becoming more concerned about their reputation in the global competitive market. As a result, they pressure academics to publish in English in these high-impact international journals and do not encourage publications in local languages. This creates a disconnection between these institutions and society, as communities are separated from research (often funded through taxpayer money) conducted in their contexts.

This system of academic imperialism utilizes exclusionary language practices to reproduce the academic dependency of many scholars and institutions that may not be as resource-rich as others (Amano et al., 2023). However,

despite this seemingly insurmountable problem, there are some solutions. Alatas (2022) argues that we must create more awareness of these systems of academic imperialism, dependency, and endogamy linked to the exclusionary language practices embedded in scholarly publishing. This awareness could translate into writing and teaching about this issue at our institutions and will help highlight how the system is slowly excluding non-Anglophone voices from the scientific community (Céspedes, 2021; Politzer-Ahles et al., 2016). Curry and Lillis (2014) suggest that Anglophone scholars working in gatekeeper roles—as journal reviewers, editors, or policymakers, for instance—must include non-Anglophone scholars in global knowledge production. Still, we do not think we can solely rely on the kindness of Anglophone scholars. Real change will depend on whether we can overhaul the reward systems in our institutions that incentivize English publications. We need wide-scale structural change to how research outputs are measured at our institutions. This will help tackle linguistic privilege and potentially eliminate academic endogamic practices. Furthermore, as stated before, we need to publish academic knowledge in different languages and not limit ourselves to English, even if this goes against the accepted practices in our profession.

The irony that this chapter is written in English is not lost on us. However, the way forward for greater democratization of science includes embracing multilingualism in scholarly publishing and encouraging different language versions of scientific articles. We need to incentivize researchers to publish in regional publications (e.g., *Psicología Iberoamericana*) in Mexico and other Iberoamerican countries.

References

Alatas, S. F. (2022). Political economies of knowledge production: On and around academic dependency. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, *35*(1), 14-23. https://doi.org/10.1111/JOHS.12362

Amano, T., Ramírez-Castañeda, V., Berdejo-Espinola, V., Borokini, I., Chowdhury, S., Golivets, M., González-Trujillo, J. D., Montaño-Centellas, F., Paudel, K., White, R. L., & Veríssimo, D. (2023). The manifold costs of being a non-native English speaker in science. *PLoS Biology, 21*(7), e3002184. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002184

Amano, T., Rios Rojas, C., Boum, Y., Calvo, M., & Misra, B. B. (2021). Ten tips for overcoming language barriers in science. *Nature Human Behaviour, 5(9)*, 1119-1122. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01137-1

Babaini, D. (2019). Scientific communication in Latin America is open, collaborative, and non-commercial. Challenges for journals. *Palabra Clave (La Plata), 8*(2), e065. https://doi.org/10.24215/18539912e065

Badillo, A. (2021). *El portugués y el español en la ciencia: Apuntes para un conocimiento diverso y accesible.* Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (OEI) y Real Instituto Elcano.

Beigel, F. (2022). Multilingüismo y bibliodiversidad en América Latina. *Anuario de Glotopolítica, 5*, 119-132. https://glotopolitica.com/aglo5/beigel/

Beigel, F., Packer, A. L., Gallardo, O., & Salatino, M. (2024). OLIVA: La producción científica indexada en América Latina. Diversidad disciplinar, colaboración institucional y multilingüismo en SciELO y Redalyc (1995-2018). *Dados, 67*(1), e20210174. https://doi.org/10.1590/dados.2024.67.1.307

Céspedes, L. (2021). Latin American journals and hegemonic languages for academic publishing in Scopus and Web of Science. *Trabalhos Em Linguística Aplicada*, *60*(1), 141-154. https://doi.org/10.1590/010318138901311520201214

Corcoran, J. N. (2019). Addressing the "bias gap": A research-driven argument for critically supporting plurilingual scientists' research writing. *Written Communication, 36*(4), 538-577. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088319861648

Cruz, A. (2023, March 5). Discriminar a investigadores de instituciones privadas fragmenta el ecosistema de ciencia: Susana Lizano. *Cronica.* https://www.cronica.com.mx/academia/discriminar-investigadores-privadas-fragmenta-ecosistema-ciencia-susana-lizano.html

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

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2014). Estrategias y tácticas en la producción de conocimiento académico por investigadores multilingües. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *22*. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n32.2014

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2018, March 12). The dangers of English as lingua franca of journals. *Inside Higher Ed*, https://tinyurl.com/ywrxys2u

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2024). Multilingualism in academic writing for publication: Putting English in its place. *Language Teaching, 57*(1), 87-100. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000040

Di Bitetti, M. S., & Ferreras, J. A. (2017). Publish (in English) or perish: The effect on citation rate of using languages other than English in scientific publications. *Ambio, 46*(1), 121-127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0820-7

Englander, K. (2014). *Writing and publishing science research papers in English: A global perspective.* Springer.

Fane, B., & Wastl, J. (2023, December 4). In the spotlight: English as the lingua franca in science. *Digital Science.* https://www.digital-science.com/blog/2023/12/in-the-spotlight-english-as-the-lingua-franca-in-science/

Fewer, G., Kantha, S. S., Umakantha, N., & Carter-Sigglow, J. (1997). Beyond the language barrier. *Nature, 385*(6619), 764-764. https://doi.org/10.1038/385764a0

Flowerdew, J. (2022). Models of English for research publication purposes. *World Englishes, 41*(4), 571-583. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12606

Flowerdew, J., & Habibie, P. (2021). *Introducing English for research publication purposes.* Routledge.

Gea-Valor, M. L., Rey-Rocha, J., & Moreno, A. I. (2014). Publishing research in the international context: An analysis of Spanish scholars' academic writing needs in the social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes, 36*, 47-59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.05.001

Gordon, S. F., & Gutierrez Fierros, E. (2022). Combatting exclusionary language practices in science publishing: A DEI concern. *Science Editor, 45*(3), 84-85. https://doi.org/10.36591/SE-D-4503-84

Haelewaters, D., Hofmann, T. A., & Romero-Olivares, A. L. (2021). Ten simple rules for global north researchers to stop perpetuating helicopter research in the global south. *PLoS Computational Biology, 17*(8), e1009277. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009277

Hanauer, D. I., Sheridan, C. L., & Englander, K. (2018). 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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088318804821

Haiyan, L. I., Kangzhen, Y., Huanliang, Y., Xiaoguang, X., Junyan, C., Pu, Z., Yinzuo, B., & Hualan, C. (2004). Isolation and characterization of H5N1 and H9N2 influenza viruses from pigs in China. *Chinese Journal of Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 26*(1), 1-6.

Henshall, A. C. (2018). English language policies in scientific journals: Signs of change in the field of economics. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 36*, 26-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.08.001

Hernández Bonilla, J. M. (2021, July 30). How to end the hegemony of English in scientific research. *El País*. https://english.elpais.com/usa/2021-07-30/how-to-end-the-hegemony-of-english-in-scientific-research.html

Instituto Cervantes. (2023). *El español en el mundo 2023.* Instituto Cervantes; McGraw Hill.

Latindex. (2024). *Latindex: Sistema regional de información en línea para revistas científicas de América Latina, el Caribe, España y Portugal.* Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM). https://www.latindex.org/latindex/

Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in global context.* Routledge.

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. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.28.06lil

Lillis, T., Magyar, A., & Robinson-Pant, A. (2010). An international journal's attempts to address inequalities in academic publishing: Developing a writing for publication programme. *Compare, 40*(6), 781-800. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2010.523250

Linder, D., & Sterck, G. D. (2016). Non-native scientists, research dissemination and English neologisms: What happens in the early stages of reception and reproduction? *Ibérica, 32*, 35-58.

Márquez, M. C., & Porras, A. M. (2020). Science communication in multiple languages is critical to its effectiveness. *Frontiers in Communication*, *5*, 31. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2020.00031

Mišak, A., Marušić, M., & Marušić, A. (2005). Manuscript editing as a way of teaching academic writing: Experience from a small scientific journal. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(2), 122-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.001

Molin, D. P. L., & De Sterck, G. (2016). Non-native scientists, research dissemination and English neologisms: What happens in the early stages of reception and re-production? *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos, 32*, 35-58.

Muñoz-García, A. L. (2019). Intellectual endogamy in the university: The neoliberal regulation of academic work. *Learning and Teaching*, *12*(2), 24-43. https://doi.org/10.3167/LATISS.2019.120203

Olmos-Lopez, P., Prudencio, F. E., & Novelo, A. (2022). Mexican economics professors' publication: Three case studies. *English for Specific Purposes, 66*, 131-143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2022.01.002

Ordorika, I. (2018). Las trampas de las publicaciones académicas. *Revista Española de Pedagogía, 76*(271), 463-480. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26547097

Orozco, C. E. (2018). Diez años de investigación de la comunicación pública de la ciencia en y desde América Latina. Un estudio en tres revistas académicas (2008-2017). *Journal of Science Communication-América Latina, 1*(1), A02.

Packer, A. L. (2016, May 10). The adoption of English among SciELO Brazil journals has been increasing. *Scielo in Perspective.* https://blog.scielo.org/en/2016/05/10/the-adoption-of-english-among-scielo-brazil-journals-has-been-increasing/

Politzer-Ahles, S., Holliday, J. J., Girolamo, T., Spychalska, M., & Berkson, K. H. (2016). Is linguistic injustice a myth? A response to Hyland (2016). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 34*, 3-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.09.003

Politzer-Ahles, S., Girolamo, T., & Ghali, S. (2020). Preliminary evidence of linguistic bias in academic reviewing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 47*, 100895. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100895

Salatino, M. (2020). Open access in dispute in Latin America: Toward the construction of counter-hegemonic structures of knowledge. In C. Martens, C. Venegas, & E. F. S. Sharupi Tapuy (Eds.), *Digital activism, community media, and sustainable communication in Latin America* (pp. 125-148). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45394-7_6

Salatino, M. (2022). Los circuitos lingüísticos de la publicación científica latinoamericana. *Tempo Social, 34*(03), 253-273.

Sánchez-Pereyra, A. (2010). Latin American scientific journals: From "lost science" to open access. *Encuentro de Mexicanistas.* https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13669.29929

Schäfer, M. S. (2010). Taking stock: A meta-analysis of studies on the media's coverage of science. *Public Understanding of Science, 21*(6), 650-663. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662510387559

Strauss, P. (2019). Shakespeare and the English poets: The influence of native speaking English reviewers on the acceptance of journal articles. *Publications, 7*(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7010020

Tardy, C. (2004). The role of English in scientific communication: Lingua franca or Tyrannosaurus rex? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *3*(3), 247-269. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEAP.2003.10.001

Ugarte Pineda, E., & Parra Huerta, G. (2021). La importancia del financiamiento sobre la producción científica en México. *Investigación Bibliotecológica, 35*(87), 187-202. https://doi.org/10.22201/iibi.24488321xe.2021.87.58330

Vandrick, S. (2015). No "knapsack of invisible privilege" for ESL university students. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 14*(1), 54-59. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2015.988574

Van Dam, A. (2022, July 8). People from elite backgrounds increasingly dominate academia in the U.S. *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2022/07/08/dept-of-data-academia-elite/

Vasen, F., & Lujano Vilchis, I. (2017). Sistemas nacionales de clasificación de revistas científicas en América Latina: Tendencias recientes e implicaciones para la evaluación académica en ciencias sociales. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales, 62*(231), 199-228. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0185-1918(17)30043-0