ENGLISH AS THE LANGUAGE OF SCIENCE: THE ROLE OF ENGLISH IN THE ACADEMIC WORLD

Batuhan SELVİ[*]

Abstract

English has been used as the primary language of academic publications and international research. Many academic institutions worldwide have founded their hiring, promotion, reward and graduation systems on publishing in international indexed journals. In this sense, academic members and graduate students have no choice but to publish in international arena which is tremendously dominated by English. The aim of this paper is to investigate the role English played in the academic world. As a part of this paper, first the position of English will be examined from a historical perspective and then the current position of English in the academic world will be described. Further, a brief literature analysis with regard to the international scholars' problems in writing for academic publication process and the strategies they use to deal with these problems will be provided. Finally, the role English play in Turkish academia will be discussed. It is concluded in this paper that although international scholars have a number of difficulties, they also have a number of strategies to overcome the problems in writing for scholarly publication.

Keywords: *English, Writing for Publication, Academic World, Academic Writing, International Scholars.*

BİLİM DİLİ OLARAK İNGİLİZCE: AKADEMİK DÜNYADA İNGİLİZCE'NİN ROLÜ

Öz

Akademik yayınlarda ve uluslararası araştırmalarda İngilizce birincil dili olarak kullanılmaktadır. Dünya çapında birçok akademik kurum, işe alma, terfi, ödül ve mezuniyet sistemlerini uluslararası indeksli dergilerde yayın yapma üzerine kurmuştur. Bu açıdan incelendiğince, akademik personelin ve lisansüstü öğrencilerin, İngilizce'nin büyük ölçüde hakim olduğu uluslararası arenada yayın yapmaktan başka seçenekleri bulunmadığı görülmektedir. Bu makalenin amacı, İngilizcenin akademik dünyadaki rolünü incelemektir. Bu kapsamda öncelikle İngilizcenin konumu tarihsel bir perspektiften ele alıncak ardından da İngilizce'nin akademik dünyadaki mevcut durumu incelenecektir. Ayrıca, uluslararası

---

[*] Dr., Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü, batuhanselvi@outlook.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4755-3361.

akademisyenlerin akademik yayın sürecinde yaşadıkları sorunlara ve bu sorunlarla başa çıkmak için kullandıkları stratejilere ilişkin kısa bir literatür analizi sunulacaktır. Son olarak, İngilizcenin Türkiye'de akadamik camiadaki rolü tartışılacaktır. Çalışma kapsamında uluslararası akademisyenlerin bir takım zorluklar yaşamasına rağmen, bilimsel yayın yapma sürecinde sorunların üstesinden gelmek için bir takım stratejiler geliştirdiği sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İngilizce, Bilimsel Yayın Yapma, Akademik Dünya, Akademik Yazma, Uluslararası Akademisyenler.*

Introduction

The information revolution, which took place in the second half of the 20th century, has gradually given rise to a change in the fundamental human resources from land to scientific knowledge (Dhia, 2006), turning information into a basic product that is considered as a sign of development, and prosperity of countries (Carneiro, 2016). Consequently, academia has gained critical importance since academic institutions have been regarded as the places where scientific knowledge is shaped and distributed. Therefore, governments all over the world made a great amount of investments in higher education institutions and enhanced research programs in order to ensure that their universities would gain a global status and appeal to international students (Jiang, Borg & Borg, 2017). This reputation race among the universities paved the way for the introduction of ranking systems to measure the success of universities. This ranking system, which depends mostly on the number of international publications and citations, has required universities to publish research especially in the eminent international journals (Gonzales, Martinez & Ordu, 2014). Accordingly, numerous universities worldwide have based their institutional hiring, promotion, reward, and even graduation systems on publishing in eminent international journals (Canagarajah, 1996; Englander & Uzuner-Smith, 2013; Lillis & Curry, 2010). However, a great majority of the journals having high impact factor and indexed in reputable databases are published in English, and thus publishing in English has become a must for scholars around the world (Bocanegra-Valle, 2014). Therefore, English has become the primary language of the academic world and international research encompassing more than 5.5 million scholars and 2,000 publishers all over the world (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Currently, scholars around the world need to publish in English in order to survive in the academic world, disseminate their works and pursue their academic careers (Flowerdew, 1999). In this context, the aim of this paper is to discuss the dominant position of English in the academia on the basis of the problems international scholars experience in scholarly writing. To do that, first the dominant position of English will be investigated from a historical perspective and then the current position of English in the academia will be described. Further, the problems international scholars experience in writing for publication process

and the strategies they employ to overcome these problems will be revealed. Finally, the role English play in Turkish academia will be discussed

1. THE DOMINANCE OF ENGLISH: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

There is a consensus on the fact that English is the lingua franca of the global world. However, this was not the case a century ago. It was not until the end of World War II (WWII) that English emerged as a global language. After WWII, English has achieved such a tremendous growth that currently the number of people speaking English as a second or foreign language has exceeded those speaking it as a first language (Crystal, 1999). There are two opposing views trying to explain underlying reasons how English has become the dominant language in the world. One the one hand, a group of researchers states that English became the leading language of the world by accident as a result of a series of accidents began at the beginning of the 20th century (Ammon, 1992; Kaplan, 1996). On the other hand, others consider the dominance of English as a kind of linguistic imperialism and relate it to the colonial and imperialist activities of English speaking countries (Philippson, 2001). Both of the views will be briefly mentioned in this section.

Those suggesting that English became dominant by accident propose that at the end of the WWII, the only chief Western country whose scientific and educational organization stayed unharmed was the USA (Kaplan, 2001). As the only scientific and educational institutions were in the USA, researchers and students needed to study and work in there. As a result, the USA led the scientific and technological development in the world. The more scientific output was produced in the USA, the more students and researchers were attracted. As a result, a great number of researchers and students were educated in English, and massive amounts of information were produced, kept, and disseminated in English. Besides, the invention of the first computer occurred during this period. The advent of the computer allowed storage of great information and data retrieval which in turn facilitated science and technology. As computers were needed to carry out scientific activities, most of the scientific and technological output was produced in English during the 1950s and 1960s. The first computers also contributed to the development of English dominance in that their early software were based on English-like languages and thus using them effectively required learning English. Therefore, people trying to keep up with scientific and technological development all around the world learnt English. Finally, coinciding with these developments, the United Nations was established during this period. The USA played an active role in the establishment of the United Nations and English became one of the official languages of this organization. In total, these advancements, that took place coincidentally at the same time, paved the way for the flourishment of English and made it a dominant language in the world.

On the other side of the debate, researchers relate the dominance of English to the imperialism (Philipson, 2003). Proponents of this view state that in 19th century England did not follow an expansionist policy, instead English was used to form a privileged group within the colonial countries and taught to this privileged group (Pennycook, 2007). This language policy positioned the English language in an extremely privileged position in terms of power and status in these countries (Mufwene, 2010). However, after the decolonization process in the 1950s, English started to be dominant language of the world (Canagarajah, 2005). The replacement of Britain by the USA, which regarded English as an important part of its globalization policy, as the superpower of the world strengthened the dominant position of English (Berghahn, 2010; Ricento, 2012). In the same period, Britain was looking for ways to maintain its political and economic influence on its former colonies and used English language teaching as a means of solution (Phillipson, 2009, Tollefson, 2010). Furthermore, the concept of expert opinion, put forward and promoted by Anglo-American institutions under the leadership of England and USA, was introduced during this period (Bhatt, 2005). In this context, Western-style institutions, expert groups, international associations, and journals were established all around the world by Anglo-Americans (Phillipson, 1992). This required researchers to learn English and publish in English in order to be included in these English-based specialist groups run by Anglo-Americans. Thus, English became the dominant language, and the production, dissemination and control of knowledge began to be provided through English.

The brief overview above shows that although they conflict in terms of underlying reasons, both views agree on the fact that English owes its dominant position to its widespread use in all kinds of scientific activity. Therefore, the position of English in the academia should also be examined.

2. THE POSITION OF ENGLISH IN THE ACADEMIA

There has always been a common language used in science since it is considered that using a common language facilitates scientific production, dissemination and communication. For example, Latin served as the language of science from the Middle Ages to the dawn of the modern age. However, there has never been such a requirement for publication as it is now. This pressure to publish, especially in high-ranked journals, is related to globalization and the marketization of the academia (Flowerdew, 2008). Science and technology are two important indicators of the countries' development levels in today's modern world in which information is considered as power. Therefore, governments have supported and made investments to academic institutions in order to contribute to the development and competitiveness of their countries (Min, 2014). Therefore, academic institutions have been involved in a reputation race (Hazelkorn, 2011) the aim of which is to obtain a respectable status in the world (Jiang, Borg & Borg, 2017). In this context, a number of ranking systems such as

Times Higher Education and QS World University Rankings have appeared to measure the success and competitiveness of the academic institutions. Typically, publication and citation rates play a significant role in these ranking systems (Gonzales, Martinez & Ordu, 2014). Therefore, both in order to increase the visibility of their institutions and to rank in the upper places in these ranking systems, increasingly more universities around the world are basing their hiring, promotion and reward systems on the number and quality of publications, which requires academicians to publish in high-ranked international journals (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Furthermore, numerous universities have required their graduate students to publish in international journals as a part of graduation criteria (Ho, 2017). A great majority of the journals indexed in prestigious databases such as the International Scientific Indexing (ISI) and Scopus are published in English and the number of the journals switching to English-only policy is increasing everyday (Curry & Lillis, 2018; Hyland, 2015). Therefore, the pressure to publish, especially in English, has become a critical part of academic life for academicians (Lillis & Curry, 2010). In this sense, the number of academicians and graduate students trying to publish in the international arena, which is entirely dominated by English, is increasing.

Now, it is agreed on the fact that the publication is one of the most absolute necessities in today's academic world. Even though publication includes a wide range of types, over the years, researchers and academics have gained a considerable experience regarding the ways and means of academic publication. In this sense, academic publication, the aim of which is to distribute scientific knowledge and research, deals with a limited number of types such as books, book chapters and conference proceedings. Among them, research articles have been the most preferred and prestigious type of publication. The first research articles were published in 1665 and since then researchers have enthusiastically been trying to publish research articles in order to promote scientific knowledge. Even though the first research articles were written in the form of letters, they became the main means of disseminating scientific knowledge in the 19th and 20th century, and they rapidly grew in number after the invention of the Internet (Flowerdew, 2008; Meadows, 1979; Price, 1986). The majority of the research journals were published by scientific societies until WWII, after which the proportion of commercial publishing houses started to increase. However, the situation has dramatically changed since then. Today, more than half of the scientific journals are published by five commercial publishers (Larivière, Haustein, & Mongeon, 2015). Suffice it to say that a great majority of the scientific journals are operated in English. Studies in the literature has revealed that over 90% of the scientific journals indexed in the International Scientific Indexing (ISI), 87% of journals in Science Citation Index-Expanded, 88% of journals included in Social Science Citation Index, and 65% of journals in Arts and Humanities Citation Index are published in English (Curry & Lillis, 2018; Hyland, 2015).

A brief review above clearly suggests that English is the dominant language of science in the modern world. However, this domination has also raised a number of questions regarding the principles of academic English writing and the challenges experienced by academics in writing for publication process as the case of English is somewhat different to that of Latin in that English is the first language of a large number people and countries (Kaplan, 2001; Truchot, 1990) and thus requires using a set of rhetorical features and strategies and adopting a certain kind of understanding and argumentation (Bennett, 2010; Lillis & Curry, 2006; Swales, 2004). In this context, two conflicting perspectives have appeared. On the one hand, some researchers argue that the dominance of English in the academia put non-native speakers of English in an unfavorable position, which paves the way for them to have a number of difficulties and challenges in the writing for publication process (Flowerdew, 2008). On the other hand, others put forward that the problems experienced during the publication process are not specific to non-native speakers of English and all of the novice writers experience such problems due to socialization and communication process in the academic discourse community (Hyland, 2018).

The supporters of the first view state that English is not the first language of greater number of international scholars and thus they have difficulty in conforming to native written English norms, which then leads to a number of problems in writing manuscripts that are satisfactory for international journal editors and reviewers (Ammon, 2001; Canagarajah, 2002; Flowerdew, 2008). In this sense, international scholars have "the triple disadvantage of having to read, do research and write in another language" (Van Dijk, 1994, p. 276). In other words, international scholars need to learn English to read what was done in the field, review the related literature to carry out their studies and finally write their manuscripts in English. This situation probably worsens their problems with writing satisfactory manuscripts in English, which is reflected on the reviewer comments indicating that international scholars are biased against in writing for publication (Li & Flowerdew, 2007). As a result, this discrimination may pave the way for stigmatization of international scholars in academic publishing (Flowerdew, 2008). The second view, on the contrary, rejects such a native vs non-native writer division and puts forward that the problems international scholars have in writing for publication are also experienced by native scholars (Hyland, 2018). It also argues that although there is a wealth of studies on the problems and difficulties international scholars experience in scholarly writing, there are few studies investigating the challenges native speakers have in this process, which makes comparison of the issue quite difficult. In addition, it attaches that the challenges and difficulties as a result of English do not necessarily mean that international scholars cannot publish in English. In sum, this perspective regards scholarly writing as a particular skill that needs to be developed by both international

and native scholars (Hyland, 2018). Irrespective of the result of the debate, it is clear that international scholars suffer from specific issues and challenges in writing for publication. Therefore, this challenges and difficulties should also be mentioned.

3. THE PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARS

The challenges experienced by international scholars in writing for scholarly publication have long been a topic of discussion. As mentioned above, even though there is a debate on the issue, it is evident in the literature that international scholars have some particular issues and challenges in the process scholarly publication.

One of these challenges is narrow-mindedness, that is, an inadequate point of view focused on the local scope. Such a problem is experienced if international scholars become unsuccessful in connecting their local research into the global research context. A scientific study should make sense and contribute to the international research community. Otherwise, the chances of publication in high-ranked journals indexed in international databases would be quite slight as research based solely on local context may fail to fulfil the anticipations of the center-based scientific communities (Flowerdew, 2001). In this sense, a journal editor in Flowerdew's study (2001) stated that international scholars' contributions are likely to be overly localized; and thus, they are unable to show the significance and contributions of their research. Consequently, this problem may lead to the rejection of the paper.

Rhetorical problems also pose challenges to international scholars. Although each culture has its characteristic writing style and rhetorical convention (Connor, 1996), there are severe preventive practices for academic English scientific writing. It is known that editors and reviewers are not willing to tolerate any deviation from English academic writing standards. Consequently, international scholars are required conform to Anglophone rhetorical norms (Bennett, 2011) and produce research papers on the basis of this norm (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995). It has been stated in the literature that the technical dissimilarities between rhetorical practices of international scholars and those of Anglophone based research communities often result in rhetorically erroneous or weak manuscripts (Flowerdew, 1999; Li, 2007; Shaw, 1991; St. John, 1987). In this regard, conforming to English academic rhetoric is a significant challenge and handicap for international scholars. A lack of knowledge with regard to English academic writing rhetoric lead to an adverse influence on the skill to write acceptable manuscripts and as a result reduce the publication rates in the academic world (Bazerman, 1985; Swales, 1990).

A wealth of studies has highlighted the annoying and troublesome characteristic of scholarly writing and have stressed the extra burdens international scholars need to deal with in this process (Casanave, 1998; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000). Producing a scientific paper in

English is a demanding and laborious task for international scholars, which paves the way to postponements in publications due to endless reviews and corrections. In addition, this time-consuming feature of writing in English also prevent international scholars from involved in new scientific projects and as a result decrease their motivation and academic productivity (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 1999).

Another difficulty international scholars have is lack of connections with core academic communities in the center. Such a problem may hinder their international publication in reputable scientific journals. Studies examining whether having connection with scientific communities enables publishing in international journals show that limited or no networks with the center academic communities are limiting factor and tend to decrease the probability of publication (Belcher, 2007; Casaneve, 1998; Curris & Lillis, 2004; Flowerdew, 2000). As a result of this isolation and limited connections, international scholars face a number of bias in writing for publication process. The studies in the literature have concentrated on particularly reviewer and editorial biases. Although there are conflicting results on this issue, there are a number of studies which revealed bias against international scholars in writing for publication (Belcher, 2007; Flowerdew, 2001; Li, 2006). It was stated in these studies that journal editors and reviewers treat manuscripts of international scholars in a prejudiced manner and even label international scholars as unintelligent or even stupid because of their poorly written texts (Ammon, 2000; Curry & Lillis, 2004). Although there are studies reporting that editors and reviewers deal with each manuscript without bias, most of the time, international scholars are asked to have their papers checked by a native speaker who is beyond the reach of many international scholars (Li & Flowerdew, 2007).

Lack of enough funds to carry out research constitutes another difficulty for international scholars. It was stated in the literature that countries that dedicate a greater amount of funds to scientific research had a dominance in international publication (Man, Weinkaif, Tsang & Sin, 2004). It seems that developing countries is less supported with regard to funds for carrying out scientific research Such a situation results in the decrease in the opportunity of conducting cutting-edge research and publishing in reputable international journals (Swales, 1997).

Last but not least, insufficient English proficiency is a remarkable and distinctive challenge for international scholars. The studies in the literature has revealed that lack of success in language requirement of journal editors and reviewers possibly lead to rejection of the manuscript (Bordage, 2001; Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Li, 2005). It was also found that international scholars received more negative comments with regard to language-related problems such as clarity, grammar and word choice (Hewings, 2006). In addition, international scholar expressed that they had trouble with language-related problems in writing for publication process (Cho, 2009; Ferguson, Perez-Llantada & Plo, 2011; Huang, 2010). In sum, the literature

substantiate argument that international scholars are at a disadvantageous position and need to overcome a number of challenges and difficulties in writing for publication.

4. STRATEGIES INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARS EMPLOY TO OVERCOME THESE PROBLEMS

As they have a great number of obstacles to overcome, international scholars have adopted several strategies to publish in high ranked international journals. Some of the strategies adopted by multilingual scholars will be discussed below.

The first strategy is to ask for support of literacy brokers. The term literacy brokers simply refer to those who aid other people in reading and writing. Therefore, everyone assisting the revision or edit of the papers can be considered as literacy brokers. In that sense, experts in the academic community, language professionals, proofreading services, editors of the journals and reviewers all play a role as brokers. However, Lillis and Curry (2010) revealed that the functions each group fulfill differs. For example, while experts in the academic community are likely to address discursive and technical issues, language specialists focus on surface errors such as spelling, punctuation, and grammar. A number of studies showed that international scholars, especially novice ones, ask for the support of brokers before submitting their articles (Flowerdew, 2000; Li, 2006; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Gurel, 2010). Nevertheless, there are some limitations to this strategy as well. For example, there may be communicative problems resulting in an unwillingness to make suggested revisions (Belcher, 1994); the proofreading service or language experts may not be acquainted with the research topic or genre (Mišak, Marušić & Marušićet, 2005) and the researchers may not be able to find sufficient funds for proofreading services (Li & Flowerdew, 2007).

Another strategy employed by international scholars is to use their first language to overcome the problems regarding English deficiency. They usually rely on outlines written in their native language (Li, 2007). Thus, they are able to express their thoughts and statements more clearly. Similarly, Gosden (1996) found that Japanese scholars wrote the first drafts of their articles in their native language and translated or got them translated to English. Attention here should be directed to the translation process, which will undoubtedly influence the quality of the paper.

International scholars sometimes use technical language excessively to keep away from explaining concepts or terms in English. For example, Sionis (1995) revealed that a number of novice French academics preferred to use more mathematical language to compensate for their lack of proficiency in English and overcome their linguistic deficiencies. Nevertheless, this resulted in the rejection of their papers due to a lack of incoherence since the excessive use of technical language prevented them from explaining their points and conveying the meanings they planned.

Therefore, it can be said that international scholars should be careful while using the technical language and should try to make optimal use of it.

The international scholars, especially novice ones, also use the published texts as models. A typical example of this strategy is to imitate Swales' rhetorical moves (1990, 2004) in published articles (Li, 2005). They may also model the complete structure of the articles (Li, 2006) or copy common expressions from the articles in the journals (Englander, 2009). However, overuse of borrowed expressions may lead to plagiarism, and thus scholars should be cautious and careful about textual borrowing.

Another strategy is finding mentors. Different from the concept of literacy brokers, mentorship covers a wide range of relationships between the expert, usually a supervisor or faculty member, and novice scholars, often a doctoral candidate. This relationship includes different features and challenges of writing for publication such as joint authorship, finding a suitable journal, and reviewing the manuscripts (Lee & Norton, 2003). The literature draws particular attention to joint authorship since it provides useful expert guidance, opportunities for learning how to negotiate with the journal editors and reviewers and politics of writing for publication, and visibility (Lei & Chuang, 2009). Therefore, another strategy for international scholars is to find mentors who support them in every step of writing for the publication process.

The last strategy mentioned in this paper is getting institutional support. Attempts to develop the writing skills of scholars to improve the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge (Keen, 2007). Therefore, institutional support can play a pivotal role in aiding international scholars in writing for the publication process. In that sense, higher education institutes are recommended to provide systematic and continuous support for the scholars to increase their scholarly writing (McGrail, Rickard & Jones, 2006). As a result of the significance of academic productivity for ranking, promotion, and funding, numerous academic institutions have started providing support for writing for publication (Hyland, 2015). One means of this support, if not the best, is academic writing centers. Academic writing centers advise scholars throughout the writing for publication process, trying to advance their scholarly writing skills by fostering awareness of their writing progression. The aim of this support is to prepare international scholars for writing for publication and "shortcut the painful and lengthy processes of learning by experience" (Hyland, 2015, p. 186). However, not every institution can offer support for its members, and thus this strategy is available for a limited number of international scholars.

5. SITUATION IN TURKEY

Turkey has a population of over 80 million and covers an area of 780,580 square kilometers. It is an intercontinental country lying on both sides of Southeastern Europe and Western Asia and thus Turkey has always been get involved a quarrel between the West and East (Durgun, 2010).

However, it has always prioritized Europe instead of Asia (Kırkgoz 2005; Uysal, 2012). This situation has also reflected in its policies in that the country has been going through a Western-oriented modernization since its foundation in 1923 (Yücel, 2020). Currently, Turkey is a member of several Western institutions such as United Nations, NATO, the IMF, the OECD, and the Council of Europe. As a result of these attempts to adopt center-based policies, Turkey can be defined as a semi-periphery country (Uysal, 2012). Although the inclusion of English in state school curriculum dates back to 1908, English became the primary foreign language in state schools in the 1950s as a result of improved Turkey - American relations (Dogançay-Aktuna, 1998). Subsequently, it has secured its position as the primary foreign language and besides the number of schools and institutes delivering English-medium instruction has increased (Selvi, 2011).

English has a significant role in Turkish tertiary education system both for students and academic members. For students, the instruction is delivered through English in approximately 20% of the higher education programs in Turkey (Arik & Arik, 2014). In addition, additional points are given to those having a score in a second language, which is most of the time English, in application to master's programs. Furthermore, candidates have to obtain a minimum score in a second language and even publish a paper in an international journal to apply for a doctoral program. Besides, graduate students need to publish a conference proceeding, a research article or both as a part of graduation criteria. Currently, 297,100 masters' and 101,242 Ph.D. students are registered in the Turkish higher education system (YÖK, 2021). Considering that these students have to publish in order to graduate, almost 400,000 graduate students will publish in a relatively short period.

On the other hand, English play a more significant role for scholars. Currently, 179,154 academic members are working in 129 state and 78 private universities in Turkey. The role of English is directly related to hiring, promotion and reward policies. To be hired, researchers have to obtain at least a score of 60 in national foreign language exam and publish a number of research articles in high-ranked journals, books, book chapters or conference proceedings in order to put in an application to a position in a university. In addition, assistant professors are required to meet a set of publication criteria for contract renewal, which depends on the university. For promotion, academic members have to secure publication in reputable journals in order to apply for the associate professorship examination. The applicants obtain 8 points for a research article indexed in national databases whereas 20 points for a research article indexed in Web of Science database. Similarly, they get 20 points for a book published by an international publisher though they obtain 15 points for a book published by a national publisher. In terms of reward, the latest Academic Incentive Payments Regulation puts emphasis on the role of international activities and high-ranked journals. For example, national conferences are no longer a part of reward system and a clear definition of international conference is provided.

In this sense, a conference is regarded as an international activity if more than half of the participants are international. The regulation also describes an international publisher in a clear way. A publisher is required to publish no less than 20 books of different researchers in the same discipline in a foreign language to be classified as international. A similar situation exists for research articles. For research articles in international journals, academic members obtain twice to four times as many points as national journals according to the journal's impact factor. As stated in previous sections, the language of these international activities is obviously English.

It is seen that the state policies and regulations requires academics to carry out international activities and publish in English. Although this situation resulted in an increase in the number of international publications, this quantitative increase was not transformed into a qualitative one. In 2019, Turkish academics published 49,930 research articles, indicating an almost 8% increase compared to 2018 and a nearly 11% increase compared to 2017 (SCImago, 2020). However, the number of citations Turkish scholars decreased significantly from 439,997 in 2010 to 108,848 in 2018 and 29,044 in 2019 (SCImago, 2020). Similarly, University Ranking by Academic Performance (URAP) revealed that only 9 Turkish universities ranked among the top 1000 universities in 2020 (URAP, 2021). It should also be stressed that none of these universities were in in the top 100 or 500 university list. On the other hand, 9 Turkish universities ranked in the top 500 list, and 20 Turkish universities were in the top 1000 list in 2011. This shows that Turkish scholars failed to publish ground-breaking and high-quality papers in recent years and were likely to publish in journals with low impact factor. It was stated in a report issued by URAP in 2019 that 78.02% of the research articles were published in journals with low impact factor between 2014-2018 (URAP, 2019). Furthermore, Turkey fell beyond the world average with regard to impact factor in which Turkish scholars get 0.77 whereas the world average was 1.00. These data and statistics prove that Turkish scholars have focused on the quantitative aspect of academic publication instead of qualitative aspect and have showed a tendency to publish in low quality journals, which prevent them from getting citations. Such a conclusion is in consistence with the literature. It has been revealed that scholars from developing countries tend to publish more in low impact and predatory journals (Lukic, Blesic, Basarin, Ivanovic, Milosevic & Sakulski, 2014; Simon, 2016). Similarly, Turkey was found to be among the top three countries having the highest number of predatory journals and publication in these journals (Demir, 2018). The Turkish scholars publishing in predatory journals justified their decisions by stating that they were in a desperate need of publishing a research article in an indexed journal in order to meet the promotion, hiring, reward or graduation criteria as soon as possible as their manuscripts were rejected after a very long wait time.

In sum, state policies and regulations have prioritized and promoted international activities and publishing in English in Turkey. However, the

brief overview above demonstrates that although Turkish scholars have increased the number of research article, they have failed to produce scientific output of high quality. In that sense, it can be argued that the policies and regulations have fallen behind the expectations in that their primary aim in issuing these policies and regulations was to improve the quality of higher education as well as the amount of academic output. However, it seems that scholars in Turkey concentrated on the latter and tried only to meet the requirements set by their universities, ignoring producing high-quality research papers. Therefore, as stated above, both the number of Turkish universities in global rankings and the number of citations Turkish scholars have obtained have decreased significantly.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to investigate the role of English in the academic world. In this context, the historical position of English, its current role in the academic world, the problems international scholars experience in academic publication process, and the strategies they employ to deal with these problems was briefly discussed. Finally, the role English play in Turkish academia was dealt with. A brief overview above shows that although there are conflicting views regarding to its sources and outcomes, English has long been the language of science. However, its use as the common language of science has also led to a number of problems for international scholars. In turn, international scholars have come up with a number of solutions and strategies in order to publish in eminent journals and meet the requirements set by academic institutions. However, it seems that Turkish scholars have failed to use these solutions and strategies since the number of Turkish universities in global ranking systems and the number of citations Turkish scholars get have decreased though the number of academic output have increased. This shows that they have failed to carry out cutting edge research and produce research papers of high-quality. Therefore, the quality of papers Turkish scholars produce should be improved. To do that, first a comprehensive needs analysis should be carried out to identify their problems in scholarly writing process and the most suitable solutions and strategies should be offered. In addition, state policies and regulations should be revised in order to prioritize producing high-quality research papers.

References

Ammon, U. (1992). The Federal Republic of Germany′s policy of spreading German. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *1992*(95), 33-50.

Ammon, U. (2000). Towards more fairness in international English: Linguistic rights of non-native speakers? In R. Philipson (Ed.), *Rights*

to language: Equity, power and education (pp. 111-116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ammon, U. (2001). English as a Future Language of Teaching at German Universities? In U. Ammon (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a language of science. Effects on other languages and language communities* (pp. 343-361.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Arik, B. T. & Arik, E. (2014). The role and status of English in Turkish higher education. *English Today, 30*(4), 5-10. doi:10.1017/S0266078414000339

Bazerman, C. (1985). Physicists reading physics: Schema-laden purposes and purpose-laden schema. *Written communication*, *2*(1), 3-23.

Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for specific purposes, 13*(1), 23-34.

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

Bennett, K. (2010). Academic discourse in Portugal: A whole different ballgame? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(1), 21-32.

Bennett, K. (2011). *Academic writing in Portugal: I-discourses in conflict*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra.

Berghahn, V. R. (2010). The debate on 'Americanization'among economic and cultural historians. *Cold War History*, *10*(1), 107-130.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bhatt, R. M. (2005). Expert discourses, local practices, and hybridity: The case of Indian Englishes. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practic*e (pp. 25-54). New Jersey: Lawrence Erbaum Associates, Publishers.

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

Bordage, G. (2001). Reasons reviewers reject and accept manuscripts: the strengths and weaknesses in medical education reports. *Academic Medicine, 76*(9), 889-896.

Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, S. A. (1996). "Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *WrittenCommunication, 13*(4),435–472.

Carneiro, I. A. (2016). *The Information Age*. Clube de Autores.

Casanave, C. P. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(2), 175-203.

Cho, D. W. (2009). Science journal paper writing in an EFL context: The case of Korea. *English for Specific Purposes*, *28*(4), 230-239.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. New York: Cambridge University.

Crystal, D. (1999). The future of Englishes. *English Today*, *15*(2), 10-20.

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.

Demir, S. B. (2018). Predatory journals: Who publishes in them and why?. *Journal of Informetrics, 12*(4), 1296-1311.

Dhia, A. (2006). *The information age and diplomacy: an emerging strategic vision in world affairs*. Florida: Universal.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural Development, 19*(1), 24-39.

Durgun, Ş. (2010). *Modernleşme ve Siyaset*. Ankara: A Kitap Yayınları.

Duszak, A., & Lewkowicz, J. (2008). Publishing academic texts in English: A Polish perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(2), 108-120.

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

Englander, K., & Uzuner-Smith, S. (2013). The role of policy in constructing the peripheral scientist in the era of globalization. *Language Policy, 12*(3), 231-250.

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

Flowerdew, J. (1999a). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 243-264.

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

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of Journal Editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 121-150.

Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an Additional Language: What can Goffman's "Stigma" tell us?. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(2), 77-86.

Gonzales, L. D., Martinez, E., & Ordu, C. (2014). Exploring faculty experiences in a striving university through the lens of academic capitalism. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(7), 1097-1115.

Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese novices' research writing practices in English. *Journal of second language writing, 5*(2), 109-128.

Gurel, N. (2010). An examination of linguistic and sociocultural variables in writing a dissertation among Turkish doctoral students. State University of New York at Buffalo.

Hazelkorn, E. (2011). *Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education: The Battle for World- Class Excellence*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Ho, M. C. (2017). Navigating scholarly writing and international publishing: Individual agency of Taiwanese EAL doctoral students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *27*, 1-13.

Huang, J. C. (2010). Publishing and learning writing for publication in English: Perspectives of NNES PhD students in science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(1), 33-44.

Hyland, K. (2015a). Corpora and written academic English. In D. Biber & R. Reppen (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 292-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139764377.017

Hyland, K. (2018). Participation in publishing: The demoralizing discourse of disadvantage. In P. Habibie & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Novice writers and scholarly publication* (pp. 13-33). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Jiang, X., Borg, E., & Borg, M. (2017). Challenges and coping strategies for international publication: perceptions of young scholars in China. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(3), 428-444.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, *16*(1-2), 1-20.

Kaplan, R. B. (2001). English–the accidental language of science? In U. Ammon (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a language of science: Effects on other languages and language communities* (pp. 3-26.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Keen, A. (2007). Writing for publication: pressures, barriers and support strategies. *Nurse education today*, *27*(5), 382-388.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). English language teaching in Turkey: Challenges for the 21st Century. In G. Braine (Ed), *Teaching English to the world: History, curriculum and practice* (pp. 159-175). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The oligopoly of academic publishers in the digital era. *PloS one*, *10*(6), e0127502.

Lee, E., & Norton, B. (2003). Demystifying publishing: A collaborative exchange between graduate student and supervisor. In C. P. Casaneve & S. Vandrick (Eds), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 37-64). New York: Routledge.

Lei, S. A., & Chuang, N. K. (2009). Undergraduate research assistantship: a comparison of benefits and costs from faculty and students' perspectives. *Education*, *130*(2), 232-241.

Li, Y. (2005). Multidimensional enculturation: the case of an EFL Chinese doctoral student. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 15*(1), 153-170.

Li, Y. (2006). Negotiating knowledge contribution to multiple discourse communities: A doctoral student of computer science writing for publication. *Journal of second language writing*, *15*(3), 159-178.

Li, Y. (2007). Apprentice scholarly writing in a community of practice: an interview of an NNES graduate student writing a research article. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(1), 55-79.

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

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

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

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2018). Trajectories of knowledge and desire: Multilingual women scholars researching and writing in academia. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *32*, 53-66.

Lukic, T., Blesic, I., Basarin, B., Ivanovic, B. L., Milosevic, D., & Sakulski, D. (2014). Predatory and fake scientific journals/publishers: A global outbreak withrising trend: A review. *Geographica Pannonica*, *18*(3), 69–81. http://dx.doi.org/10.5937/geopan1403069lManca

Man, J. P., Weinkauf, J. G., Tsang, M., & Sin, J. H. D. D. (2004). Why do some countries publish more than others? An international comparison of research funding, English proficiency and publication output in highly ranked general medical journals. *European journal of epidemiology, 19*(8), 811-817.

McGrail, M. R., Rickard, C. M., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *25*(1), 19-35.

Meadows, A. J. (Ed.). (1979). *The scientific journal* (Vol. 2). London: Aslib.

Min, H. T. (2014). Participating in international academic publishing: A Taiwan perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(1), 188-200.

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.

Pennycook, A. D. (2007). Language, localization, and the real: Hip-hop and the global spread of authenticity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *6*(2),101-116

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2001). English for Globalisation or for the World's People?. *International review of education*, *47*(3), 185-200.

Phillipson, R. (2003). *English-only Europe? Challenging language policy*. London: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. London: Routledge.

Price, D. J. (1986). *Little science, big science... and beyond* (Vol. 480). New York: Columbia University Press.

Ricento, T. (2012). Political economy and English as a 'global'language. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, *1*(1), 31-56.

SCImago. (2020). *SJR — SCImago Journal & Country Rank*. Retrieved from http://www.scimagojr.com/countryrank.php

Selvi, A. F. (2011). World Englishes in the Turkish sociolinguistic context. *World Englishes, 30*(2), 182-199.

Shaw, P. (1991). Science research students' composing processes. *English for Specific Purposes, 10*(3), 189-206

Simón, A. (2016). Pitfalls of predatory journals: A personal account. *Comprehensive Psychology*, *5*, 1–5. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2165222816631691

Sionis, C. (1995). Communication strategies in the writing of scientific research articles by non-native users of English. *English for Specific Purposes*, *14*, 99–113.

St. John, M. J. (1987). Writing processes of Spanish scientists publishing in English. *English for Specific Purposes, 6*(2), 113-120.

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

Swales, J. M. (1997). English as Tyrannosaurus rex. *World Englishes, 16*(3), 373-382.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Tollefson, J. W. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. K. Hall & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 7–21). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.,

Truchot, C. (1990). *L'anglais dans le monde contemporain*. Paris: Le Robert.

University Ranking by Academic Performance. (2019). *World Ranking.* Retrieved from https://www.urapcenter.org/Rankings/2019-2020/World_Ranking_2019-2020

University Ranking by Academic Performance. (2021). *World Ranking.* Retrieved from https://www.urapcenter.org/Rankings/2020-2021/World_Ranking_2020-2021

Uysal, H. H. (2014). Turkish academic culture in transition: Centre-based state policies and semiperipheral practices of research, publishing and promotion. In K. Bennett (Ed.), *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing* (pp. 165-188). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

van Dijk, T. A. (1994). Academic Nationalism. *Discourse & Society*, *5*(3), 275–276.

Yücel, G. (2020). *Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e Ana Akım Siyasi Partiler (1889-193*0). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2021). *Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi*. Retrieved from https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/