

Disciplinary responses to the rise of English in metrics-driven social sciences and humanities

Stanisław Krawczyk

Institute of Sociology, University of Wrocław, Poland

*Scholarly Communication Research Group, Adam Mickiewicz University in
Poznań, Poland*

Uniwersytet Wrocławski

Instytut Socjologii

ul. Koszarowa 3

51-149 Wrocław

stanislaw.krawczyk@uwr.edu.pl

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in the journal
Globalisation, Societies and Education on 15 December 2023, available at:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2023.2294130>

Disciplinary responses to the rise of English in metrics-driven social sciences and humanities

This paper draws upon 123 interviews with Polish scholars, analysing their disciplinary-based views on the rise of English as a publishing medium in an increasingly metrics-driven set of social sciences and humanities disciplines. Those included in the paper are history, philosophy, economics, and law. The paper argues that the participants can be divided into three classes (internationalists, multilinguals, localists), depending on their responses to research evaluation reforms that encouraged publishing in prestigious English-language venues. Disciplinary differences are also explored. The results are discussed in the context of three academic discourses (internationalisation, Englishisation, multilingualism) on the rise of English in scholarly publishing, and in the context of the neo-nationalist movement's current influence on global academia. A key finding is that the traditions of the social sciences and humanities may work as heterogenising forces against evaluative and linguistic homogeneity.

Keywords: Englishisation; higher education; internationalisation; multilingualism; research evaluation; scholarly communication

1. Introduction

Not many scholars in the world can ignore the performative power of the English language. English has become highly important in scholarly communication, both in the natural sciences (Gordin 2015) and in the social sciences and humanities (W. Liu 2017). By the mid-to-late 20th century English has become a shared language worldwide, broadly related to the leading position of the United States and the United Kingdom in global academia. Now the status of these two powers is being contested, particularly by China (Marginson and Xu 2021). However, for the moment the US and the UK continue to be powerful magnets for international students and dominate academic knowledge production.

Scholarly communication encompasses all kinds of conversations through which academics develop knowledge, with its formalised subset: scholarly publishing (Guédon et al. 2019). That said, the rise of the English language in scholarly publishing has been discussed in academic literature for decades. For instance, between the late 1980s and the early 2000s, some applied linguists and natural scientists represented English as a beneficial common language, a *lingua franca*, whilst others described it as a threat to academic diversity (Tardy 2004).

In more recent literature that is itself written in English, we may distinguish three main scholarly discourses: a dominant discourse of internationalisation, and two less influential discourses; that of Englishisation and that of multilingualism. By internationalisation I mean the expansion of knowledge creation, circulation, and consumption beyond national boundaries. In relation to the latter pair, ‘Englishisation’ is a critical term referring to how the use of English diminishes the use of other languages, whilst ‘multilingualism’ is an affirmative term referring to the continued presence of these languages in various domains of academic life. Although many works on international academia interweave scholarly publishing and higher education, usually focusing on the latter (as in Kosmützky and Putty 2016), the three discourses are reconstructed below on the basis of works and topics related to publishing. This reconstruction forms the background for the overarching question of this paper: *How do scholars from different disciplines respond to reforms emphasising the role of English in scholarly publishing?* The disciplines included represent the social sciences and humanities, as in these two fields the role of English is debated much more than in it is in STEM.

Internationalisation is often studied together with globalisation (Lee and Stensaker 2021). The adherents of the internationalisation discourse have presented various rationales for making research more international, and they have inspected various factors that affect this process (Woldegiyorgis, Proctor, and de Wit 2018). This body of work examines subjects such as international publishing patterns (Kwiek 2021) or their relationship with research productivity (Kwiek 2015). Over time some internationalisation scholars have also begun to engage more with concepts like power and inequality (Mittelmeier and Yang 2022), at times employing the label of critical internationalisation studies to register the distinct nature of their concerns (Stein and McCartney 2021). It has also been suggested that adequate internationalisation should be supported by modified research evaluation systems, more congruent with traditional disciplinary publishing patterns in the social sciences and humanities (Sivertsen 2016).

Other critical scholars have developed the discourse of Englishisation, utilising this term in literary studies (Tam 2019), management studies (Boussebaa and Tienari 2021), or linguistics (Phillipson 2009). As noted above, the term draws attention to the negative consequences of the rise of English, though it is important to note that other authors have also made similar criticisms in works that do not use the word “Englishisation”. For example, some Latin American scholars have observed that many English-language journals burden scholars from poorer countries with the costs of translation, editing, or proofreading, thus creating unfair barriers to the global dissemination of research (Rodriguez Medina 2019; Suzina 2021). Others have argued that the importance of English has been overestimated by the dominant citation indexes, journal directories, and evaluation metrics (Curry and Lillis 2022).

The issues mentioned in the discourses of Englishisation and multilingualism are intertwined, though the latter concept focuses more on possible solutions. Advocates of multilingualism have noted that the social sciences and humanities are already multilingual (Balula and Leão 2021), and that this fact should be acknowledged in research evaluation – for instance, in the reforms that are now being prepared in the European Union (Pölönen et al. 2021). Indeed, the European Commission and other organisations have drafted a document which repeatedly mentions the role of language diversity in evaluating research (‘Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment’ 2022). It has also been proposed that multilingual scholarship be bolstered through machine translation (Steigerwald et al. 2022).

The rise of English in academia continues to be an object of scholarly debate. However, this debate has yielded little qualitative research that compares different disciplines. At the same time, scientometric studies have uncovered differences in disciplinary publishing patterns within the social sciences and humanities (Kulczycki et al. 2018, 2020). In this context, the current paper presents a qualitative study of 123 interviews with Polish historians, philosophers, economists, and legal scholars. The study examines the connection between their own publishing patterns and their responses to the evident rise in the role of English. These responses are inspected through the lens of the participants’ perceptions of the recent research evaluation reforms, which emphasised publishing in English with a view to strengthening the presence of Polish social scientists and humanities scholars in prestigious international venues.

The next section outlines different types of responses to research evaluation reforms. Following this, the Polish reforms are described and the results of the interviews are analysed on a discipline-by-discipline basis. The disciplines are then compared and final conclusions are drawn.

2. Responses to the Emphasis on English in Research Evaluation Reforms

In the last decades, governments of many countries in which English is not a majority language have placed new emphasis on its use through research evaluation reforms. This has evoked substantial controversies in the social sciences and humanities. Various national languages are traditionally employed in these fields more than in STEM (Archambault et al. 2006), and the proponents of multilingualism make a good case that the internationalisation-oriented reforms of research evaluation have been at odds with this tradition. Numerous scholars critical of the role of English are thus also opposed to these reforms, as well as to the discourse of internationalisation in public policy.

A disapproving attitude toward the reforms is often grounded in the traditions of particular disciplines, as in the case of the members of the expert panel involved in the creation of the Polish journal ranking in the area of history (Krzieski, Szadkowski, Kulczycki 2022). It can also be grounded in a belief that the reforms are tied to the development of the neoliberal university, which is at odds with the traditional values of academic autonomy and belonging to a community (Nordbäck, Hakonen, and Tienari 2022), on the one hand, or in the broader political movement of neo-nationalism (Douglass 2021), on the other. Disciplinary allegiance is not the only factor that counts, however, it does play an important role.

Some social scientists and humanities scholars agree that English should be emphasised in research evaluation. Again, disciplines are not the only factor but they do matter, which we will see in the results section (there appears to be very little qualitative research available on the responses to the rise of English in this group of scholars). Overall, it is likely that disciplines characterised by higher shares of English-language publications gather more scholars who favour the recent research evaluation reforms.

The distinction between those scholars unfavourable toward, and those favourable to, the reforms is a necessarily simplified one. Such is also the distinction between scholars publishing in particular national languages and scholars publishing in English – quantitative cross-national research demonstrates that many scholars publish their works in more than one language (Kulczycki et al. 2020). Further complications arise from the fact that national or local agents are not simply receivers of global norms; rather, they have a degree of agency (Marginson 2022), and this agency is exercised in acceptance as well as in resistance, or even antipathy. Whilst the present paper cannot explore the implications of all these complexities, it reports on an interview-based study of yet another complexity: that of disciplinary differences.

3. The Research Evaluation Reforms in Poland in the 2010s

Around the year 2010 “internationalisation” became a key term in the Polish reform of research evaluation. In the early 2010s major changes were introduced to the Polish journal ranking which evaluates journals by assigning them a given number of points. Scholars were now strongly encouraged to publish their works in highly ranked English-language venues (Kulczycki, Rozkosz, and Drabek 2019). The modified ranking worked in connection with other components of the performance-based research funding system in Poland (Kulczycki 2017), whilst the reform sparked a lively

debate both in academia and in national media (Ostrowicka, Spsychalska-Stasiak, and Stankiewicz 2020).

There were further government reforms in 2018, and a restructured Polish journal ranking was published in 2019. The altered journal scores continued the trend of the high valorisation of many journals published in English. A two-tier list of academic book publishers was also announced in 2019, with a different number of points assigned to each of the tiers; the top tier consisted solely of foreign publishers, based mostly in the US or the UK.

In general, a crucial medium through which the reforms of the 2010s were enacted was research evaluation metrics. The Polish points continue to be the most debated metric related to scholarly publishing, although other metrics – including international ones, such as the impact factor – are also used and discussed.

These reforms influenced all layers of Polish academia. For example, university faculties commonly adopted the point scores from the Polish journal ranking in evaluating their academic staff (Kulczycki et al. 2021), and senior academic officials had the reforms in mind when constructing their discursive models of top researchers (S. Krawczyk, Szadkowski, and Kulczycki 2023). The reforms also set a new national norm for individual scholars to follow. The scholars accepted this norm, or resisted it, in various ways. The following analysis of 123 interviews will answer the question: How did Polish historians, philosophers, economists, and legal scholars respond to these reforms, especially to the emphasis on publishing in the English language?

4. Materials and Methods

This paper originates from a larger grant project *Evaluation Game in Academia* (for more on the evaluation game, see Kulczycki, 2023). The project was launched

in 2018, and one of its major parts was 169 individual in-depth interviews with Polish academics. I arrived at the project in late 2020 and my main task was the analysis of all interviews, in consultation with other team members. This paper is based on 123 interviews with those scholars who did not hold senior management positions. The central topic of these interviews was the scholars' responses to the ongoing reforms of the national academic system, particularly its metricisation – that is, the widespread use of metrics in research evaluation. The interviews had a semi-structured form. All participants were asked similar questions in a similar order, but some deviations were allowed – for instance, to explore new topics emerging during the interview.

The participants came from eight universities and four institutes in the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAS). University faculties and PAS institutes had been selected based on the results of the Comprehensive Evaluation of Scientific Units conducted by the state in 2017. The selection criteria had ensured a balance between higher- and lower-ranked units, smaller and larger units, and units from the humanities and from the social sciences. In total, the universities and institutes are located in eight cities.

The participants represent four disciplines: history (30), philosophy (32), economics (30), and law (31). The first two are formally classified in Poland as humanities, and the other two are classified as social sciences. The entire group comprises 63 men and 60 women. At the time of the interview, there were 67 scholars with a habilitation degree (including 20 full professors) and 56 scholars with a PhD degree but no habilitation.

All interviews were conducted in Polish; an average interview took about 46 minutes. The interviews were transcribed and processed using *MaxQDA 12* and the initial coding frame – mostly data-driven – was devised by my colleagues in September 2021. I then revised that frame slightly and coded the material between October 2021

and February 2022 in keeping with the general guidelines of qualitative content analysis (Schreier 2012). In addition, I compiled a conceptual note – about 1,000 words on average – for each of the interviews.

For this paper, I have analysed interview fragments coded under two categories: first, the criteria for selecting publication venues, both in a more distant past and during the recent internationalisation-oriented reforms; second, the relation between evaluation metrics and the participants' own definitions of scholarly value. The following section examines the relationship between the participants' own publishing patterns (internationalist, localist, or multilingual) and their responses to the reformed Polish research evaluation system, including in particular its emphasis on publishing in English.

5. Results

Most participants can be divided into three classes. The internationalists described publishing in highly ranked English-language venues but did not mention publications in other foreign languages. The multilinguals described publishing in two or more languages, at least one of which was neither English nor Polish (in some cases, this involved translating the work of other scholars from French or German). The localists only described publishing in Polish.

This classification depends mostly on declared publication languages, but the internationalists are also distinguished basing on another criterion: publishing in highly ranked venues (venue ranks were generally made explicit in the interviews). That sets them apart from the participants who also published in English – though not in other foreign languages – but did not achieve high evaluation scores. I will return to these participants in the discussion.

5.1. History

A quarter of the historians – the localists – mentioned no publications in English (although some planned to publish in English soon). They also tended to distance themselves from metrics, sometimes strongly. One participant used phrases like ‘crazy pointosis’ [obsession with accumulating points for publications]; another said that once scholars ‘satisfy the demands of the system’, they should ‘think more about the way things were done before the point-based evaluation’; still another argued that scholars with a habilitation degree should not be evaluated at all because ‘they have already proven themselves and verified that scholarship is what they want to do, that it is their passion’.

A negative approach to metrics was prevalent in the whole group: almost all 30 participants were critical of at least some elements of the evaluation, and criticism was expressed more often than acceptance. However, numerous historians implied that the ministry could rectify the system of Polish points by assigning adequate scores to journals. The group as a whole was thus less willing to reject the entire point system than the subgroup of localists.

Most historians said that they published in English. Their practices varied from submitting papers to unspecified journals where the participant had ‘already had . . . an initial approval’ and had known ‘that the paper was expected’ to ‘publishing frequently in the leading [English-language] journals in my subdiscipline’. Yet publishing in leading journals abroad was highly unusual in this group, and the internationalists were few.

About half the historians – the multilinguals – had experience with publishing both in English and in another foreign language. They usually mentioned more than one of the following: multiple relevant publications, formal collaboration or informal

communication with foreign scholars, and visiting conferences or universities abroad. They all mentioned writing in Polish as well, which means they had published their work in at least three languages.

To illustrate the complexity of multilingualism, let us look at one participant midway through her academic career. She referred to publications in English, Polish, and German, and she considered herself a part of an international scholarly network spanning countries from Central Europe to the core Anglosphere. She wrote mostly for English- and German-language journals, and she wanted to publish in more influential ones. At the same time, she wished to be read by Polish historians, which required publishing in Polish. She also presented a complex response to the evaluation system. On the one hand, she wanted Polish historiography to become more international, and she suggested that this could be driven by even higher point scores for the leading journals abroad. On the other hand, she did not use Polish points as a criterion in her own publishing choices, and she was critical of the point system. She also saw weaknesses in international bibliometric indicators (though, unlike most historians, she believed these indicators to be useful).

This participant was also one of those who argued that journals or – less often – publishing houses from non-Anglophone countries had not received enough Polish points in the ministerial evaluation. Across all 30 interviews, the countries named directly in this context include Belarus, Croatia, Finland, Lithuania, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Slovenia (in one interview each), as well as Czechia, France, Germany, and Ukraine (in two interviews each). In the case of Slavic journals, a few participants argued that their underappreciation contrasted with their quality, their role for Polish scholars, or the strategic considerations regarding Poland's collaboration with its neighbours:

The new list of journals has discouraged us entirely from publishing abroad in the East . . . I have to refuse with regret, or publish there from time to time, but knowing that this is only to maintain contact, that it does not contribute to my academic career in any way.

These results may be compared with Cañibano et al.'s (2018) study of two prestigious history departments in Spain. The authors' interviewees were critical of the emphasis on publishing articles in English in internationally recognised journals. They said that this aspect of the system was detrimental to the originality of their research and to their long-term intellectual projects, and that it made them publish fewer books and more articles. Broadly speaking, the participants in the Spanish study and the ones described in the present paper shared the perception of the research evaluation reforms as a negative external influence on their own discipline. However, the report from the Spanish study only makes brief mentions of publishing in multiple languages, and these are just the languages spoken in Spain. In addition, the participants of that study claimed that the reforms had the benefit of fostering more collaborative forms of work. Moreover, none of the Spanish interviewees expressed a very strong negative sentiment toward the national evaluation system, possibly because these participants were able to easily meet the respective requirements.

5.2. Philosophy

In this group, too, there were several participants who did not mention any published works in English. Another analogy with history is that these participants – the localists – presented no multilingual track record, and that they were generally opposed to evaluation metrics.

Yet philosophy proved different than history in that it yielded a distinct subgroup of several internationalists. According to their self-description, they published

mainly in highly ranked English-language journals related to their areas of interest (e.g., philosophy of science and experimental philosophy). They also largely accepted the system of metrics in the form instituted in the 2010s.

An outlying case was the interview with a PhD who presented his publishing biography as a story of clear advancement: from Polish journals, to international English-language journals that he had read and cited himself, to the most important journals in his field. At the latter stage, he had begun to select journals based on a clear hierarchy. In fact, in the interview he discussed Polish points and international bibliometric indicators expressly as a way to meet his ambitions and accumulate prestige by comparing his work favourably to that of others, including his friends and colleagues.

In the entire material, this participant was the most unequivocal internationalist. Taking his case together with several others, one can state that an ideal-typical internationalist philosopher in Poland would perform the following practices:

- (1) Speaking favourably of English-language publishing patterns.
- (2) Evaluating ministerial rankings in a positive manner.
- (3) Discussing metrics frequently in a positive or neutral context.
- (4) Presenting metrics, directly or indirectly, as a proxy of prestige.
- (5) Affirming metrics as a good way to value the scholars' work.
- (6) Describing the metrics as a criterion in one's selection of publication venues.
- (7) Treating metrics as goals in themselves.

As for those who favoured a more multilingual position, only a few philosophers talked directly about publishing in languages other than Polish and English. However, several participants said they had translated foreign works into Polish. Half of them had worked

with English, and the other half had worked with German or French. Some translators underscored that this was an important part of their scholarly practice, and some claimed that it required specialised skills, linguistic competence, and spending significant amounts of time on introductions, footnotes, explanations, etc. With regard to metrics, some emphasised the value of translations for Polish culture while also claiming that too few Polish points were given for translations:

[What] we likely share with historians, and probably with philologists, is [our criticism of] the total devaluation of translations and source editions . . . [I]n Poland, we can't say we have too many translations of classic world [philosophical] literature . . . And on the other hand, we are expected at once to take part in some global publishing race.

Yet the value of translations was likely questionable to some other philosophers. While the non-translators rarely brought up the topic themselves, one offered a somewhat sarcastic comment:

[W]e are a young and dynamic group, let's say also internationally fulfilled . . . and [our institution also has] scholars who are, well, a bit less distinguished . . . who felt really threatened that . . . they wouldn't get some points for translations, whereas the philosophical translation is [such] a very important creative form . . . [T]he well-publishing scholars, so to speak, had the impression that they overcontributed for these, let's say, evaluation duffers. And that could've been a source of conflict.

For comparison, Feenstra and Delgado López-Cózar (2022) have conducted a survey- and interview-based study among Spanish philosophers and ethicists. The report from that study does not describe any counterparts of the Polish internationalists, and it says the participants only identified few positive aspects of the Spanish evaluation system (though one of them – improved transparency and impartiality – was mentioned by more than a half of the interviewees). In the opinion of many participants,

the evaluation requirements in Spain clash with disciplinary practices, privileging the research agenda of analytical philosophy and discouraging book publications (more specifically, established scholars criticised the latter change but early-career researchers were more eager to embrace the form of journal articles).

5.3. Economics

Nearly all participants in this group said that they published in English. Among the few who did not – the localists – all had a long experience in Polish academia. A negative response to metrics, particularly Polish points, was shared by several of the English-publishing participants. One even called the latest evaluation regulations ‘scandalous’. These several participants reported publishing in English at home or abroad, but not in highly ranked international journals (hence, they may not have been content about the point scores of their publications).

However, more economists were either neutral or positive towards the metrics system. Two further subgroups could be distinguished here. The first, smaller, was the participants who presented their publishing criteria as relatively constant throughout the years. The second subgroup consisted of participants who discussed changes in their publishing criteria. Some did so in a seemingly value-neutral manner, but more described their trajectory – from localist toward internationalist – as a positive one.

A generally positive description could still have a bittersweet tinge. One senior participant published frequently with foreign co-authors, selecting journals that were not top-ranked but still internationally recognisable. Earlier in her career, however, she had only aspired to publishing in Poland. According to her, many doctorates at that time (though not her own) had been based on Polish literature alone, and she regretted that her generation’s supervisors had not had enough international experience to share with

their students: ‘my generation . . . had to create this academic world for ourselves’.

It had only been her first longer research stay abroad, around the age of thirty, that had really introduced her to publishing in English-language journals. Now she was picking journals based on thematic criteria and peer recognition rather than Polish points.

She expressed anxiety about the bureaucratisation and dehumanisation of contemporary academia. She did accept the idea of evaluation, but was sceptical about the obscurity, complexity, and heavy quantification of Polish evaluation procedures. In short, she could still be classified as an internationalist, but her academic biography had apparently predisposed her to be somewhat critical of the rise of English.

In most cases, however, the descriptions of the upward trajectory had no marked bittersweet component. This quotation illustrates ‘a typical evaluative journey’:

I began to write in Polish. First in conference materials, domestic or international . . . Then I began attending international conferences . . . Then I changed the language I wrote in, so that I would write in English . . . And then I no longer published in conference materials; rather, I tried to publish in journals. And also [I started] from, let’s say, the lower rated ones, I tried to go through all the stages . . . And now my aim is about 40 points at a minimum . . . Western journals, recognisable ones . . . well indexed, so that it will translate into citations and [my own] recognition. Because I think that after I’ve gone through these stages, it’s not at all much more difficult to write a paper for a mid-level or even good English-language journal.

There is some correspondence between this analysis and a smaller study – based mostly on surveys, with two interviews – conducted at one Polish management and economics faculty (Szuflita 2014). In that study, Polish points were the most frequently declared factor influencing the choice of publication venues. This result may indicate that already a decade ago most Polish economists paid close attention to the point system.

5.4. Law

Here scholars with no history of English-language publishing, whom I have termed ‘the localists’, composed the largest group in all four disciplines. They frequently criticised the use of international indicators in evaluating the work of individual scholars. These indicators were often said to be unfit for the discipline, and for the social sciences and humanities at large.

This type of response was expressed in a particularly pronounced form in an interview with a senior scholar who mentioned only publishing in Polish. When asked about the use of citation counts in evaluating scholars, he claimed it was ‘extremely suspicious’. He said that his colleagues from different fields (e.g., English studies) were sometimes asked by well-known foreign journals, with ‘Bolshevik honesty’, to cite specific scholars under pain of getting their papers rejected. The participant called this ‘intellectually corrupting’. Such language of suspicion, of which the above indication is not an isolated case, captures the distance which legal scholars tended to put between themselves and international scholarly publishing.

The critique of the use of international bibliometric indicators to evaluate scholarly output was constructed by legal scholars in the following ideal-typical way. The criticism departed from a widespread assumption that there were things which could not be measured, and that scholarship was already overregulated. On this basis an argument was made about the uniqueness of national law and the resulting scarce international interest in Polish law. As international indicators are heavily influenced by the number of scholars working in a given field writing in English – so the participants seemed to reason – high scores were only achievable in such areas as international law and European law. Therefore, legal scholars in Poland dealing with issues of national law emphasised their disadvantage in comparison to their colleagues. And the problems

resulting from the specificity of the national discipline overlapped with broader issues, such as the fact that Polish journals and especially monographs go largely unnoticed by international indexing algorithms.

Negative assessments of international indicators were common in the entire group of legal scholars, although a few participants did recognise such indicators as good evaluation tools. There were also individual claims that a use could be found for a uniformly accepted database respecting the specificity of law, or for a set of indicators that would be objectivised and fair in (dis)incentivising particular practices.

Compared with the participants from the other disciplines, the legal scholars talked the most about the connection between publishing patterns and social ties. One relatively frequent example would be choosing publication venues based on personal invitations. Several participants even claimed that social ties were a necessary condition of access to favourable Polish publication venues. The legal scholars also seemed to contribute to *festschriften* more than the other interviewees. In addition, the border between academic and non-academic spaces appears to be especially porous in law – several participants talked about embedding their scholarly publications (e.g., glosses) in non-academic legal practice or about preparing scholarly publications with a view to improving the national legal system.

About half of all legal scholars interviewed declared publishing in English, but just a handful were internationalists. And even among the latter, the acceptance of the system of Polish points was ambiguous. There were claims that ‘a number of great [legal] journals’ had been underrated by the ministry, or that the Polish journal ranking was ‘awfully disgusting’ and often ‘completely senseless’. Another participant accepted the point system in a fatalistic manner, saying that ‘we live in the reality we live in’. Still another said that the general direction of the reforms was ‘rather positive’ because

they incentivised publishing fewer texts but ‘in better publishing houses and in better journals’; yet at the same time ‘not everything can be measured and weighted’ and ‘there is too much reporting, too many points, numbers, and equations, which constantly replace . . . what should be the main goal, that is, doing research’. The following excerpt reflects the prevailing sentiment in the internationalist subgroup as far as the English language is concerned:

[I]nternationalisation is certainly very important . . . but it can’t be done at the cost of domestic publications . . . [L]aw is one of the examples – where domestic discussions often have a meaning that’s super important, they develop scholarship, they develop practice and they lead to something good, while internationalising some of these discussions wouldn’t bring anything meaningful.

Let us compare this analysis with the paper by van Gestel, Byland, and Lienhard (2018), who have described surveys among Swiss and Dutch legal scholars. One similarity lies in the fact that the survey respondents strongly preferred the assessment of the content of publications over the use of citation counts. But there is also a marked difference: about 75% of the respondents in Switzerland and the Netherlands claimed that they focused on publishing for international audiences. In the case of the Netherlands, the authors of the paper suggest that this proportion has grown significantly in the last decades, and that this growth has been caused at least partly by the country’s research evaluation policies. In different countries, then, the legal scholars’ responses to internationalisation-oriented reforms can be drastically different.

6. Discussion

The global role of the English language in scholarly publishing has risen greatly since the mid-20th century. In many countries where other languages are spoken more, research evaluation systems have been reformed in recent decades to encourage

publishing in English in highly ranked international venues. Social scientists and humanities scholars responding to the rise of English have concomitantly responded to these reforms. In academic literature written itself in English, this rise has either been accepted and at times directly promoted (in much of the internationalisation discourse) or criticised (in certain parts of the internationalisation discourse and in the discourses of Englishisation and multilingualism). What this literature is mostly missing is qualitative comparisons of different scholarly disciplines.

In this paper I have analysed interviews with 123 Polish historians, philosophers, economists, and legal scholars. I have described their responses to a national research evaluation system that encouraged publishing in English in prestigious international venues. In each of the four disciplines, I have divided most participants into internationalists, multilinguals, and localists. The internationalists were the most numerous in economics, and also noticeable in philosophy. They were few in history and nearly absent in law. The multilinguals, in turn, were mostly represented among the historians, and also present among the philosophers. There were almost no multilinguals in economics and law. Finally, the localists could be found in each discipline, with the highest proportion in law.

We can compare these distributions to the data collected by Kulczycki et al. (2020) on peer-reviewed journal articles published by Polish scholars between 2013 and 2015. First, the share of English-language articles in this dataset is the highest in economics and business (29%), lower in history and archaeology (18%) as well as in philosophy, ethics, and religion (16%), and the lowest in law (10%). Second, the share of articles in languages other than English and Polish is the highest in history and archaeology (6%), lower in philosophy, ethics, and religion (4%), and the lowest in law (2%) and economics (1%). Third, law has the highest share of Polish articles and the

lowest mean number of publication languages. Even though the distributions in the present study are necessarily imprecise and most participants' disciplines are not exactly the same as OECD fields in the paper by Kulczycki et al., there is still a notable similarity.

The present study connects these publishing patterns with the scholars' responses to the metrics used widely in the Polish research evaluation system in the 2010s. The participants normally affirmed the metrics that favoured the publications which fit their own declared publishing patterns, and they normally disapproved of the metrics thought to assign insufficient ranks to such publications. Therefore, the research evaluation system seems to have found the most support among economists, significant support in a particular subgroup of philosophers, and rather little support among historians and legal scholars. It is also likely that the discourse of multilingualism would appeal the most to historians and some philosophers, but not so much to economists and legal scholars. And the marked presence of the localists in all four disciplines demonstrates the lasting impact of the native language on Polish academia despite the internationalisation-oriented reforms – just like in many other countries, as different as Kazakhstan (Moldashev and Tleuov 2022) and Taiwan (M.-C. M. Liu 2017).

Every discipline also displayed some specific traits. The historians talked the most about their collaboration with scholars and institutions from other non-Anglophone countries, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe; they also emphasised that the Polish evaluation system did not properly recognise journals and publishing houses from these countries. The philosophers provided an example of the tensions existing in the humanities between internationalists on the one hand, and multilinguals and localists on the other hand; one such tension was pointed out in regard to translations. The economists presented an upward trajectory from localist to

internationalist publishing, in an unambiguously positive version and in a bittersweet one. The legal scholars mounted the most severe criticism of international bibliometric indicators, and they put the strongest emphasis on the relationship between publishing patterns and social ties.

What is the relation between these interviews and the three discourses outlined in the introduction? The discourse of internationalisation clearly found its way into the interviews, as a positive and a negative point of reference; the most salient marker is the sheer frequency of the Polish variant of the term ‘internationalisation’, *umiędzynarodowienie*. But there were no clear counterparts of the terms ‘Englishisation’ and ‘multilingualism’. Nor did many participants decry a global threat to vernacular languages, or express an interest in global preservation of linguistic diversity. Just some elements of the discourses of Englishisation and multilingualism are there to be discerned: in the anxiety that the Polish language may be marginalised, and in the mentions of some participants’ publications in German or French. Insofar as the interviews can indicate, the struggle over the use of English in scholarly publishing in Poland was waged mainly between the internationalists and the localists. And this still appears to be the case today.

The findings above cannot be immediately generalised to other national or regional contexts. We have seen that the local orientation of Polish legal scholars is in stark contrast with the international orientation of Swiss and Dutch ones. And yet there are also analogies: many Polish and Spanish historians apparently share the sense of being unfairly subjected to national research evaluation systems, seen as external threats to the autonomy of academic history. In both countries, large parts of history and philosophy seem to be grounded in epistemic traditions that work as heterogenising

forces against the forces of evaluative homogeneity (Krzeski, Szadkowski, and Kulczycki 2022) and linguistic homogeneity.

In each discipline there were some participants who published in English but not in highly ranked venues. This form of publishing is often associated with the so-called predatory journals (F. Krawczyk and Kulczycki 2021), the ostensible internationalisation of journals (Kulczycki, Rozkosz, and Drabek 2019), or the token conformity to state-driven internationalisation policies (Moldashev and Tleuov 2022). Publishing in English in lowly rated venues may remain unnoticed because of such negative associations, but also because – like multilingual publishing – it is not recognised either by adherents of internationalisation or by advocates of localism. And while it might be argued that highly ranked venues are less likely to accept works of insufficient quality, this argument is not always fully relevant. For instance, scholars coming from different countries in the same region may want to use an English-language journal to communicate about that region. If the research evaluation system encourages them to publish in more prestigious journals, this opportunity for regional communication may be lost.

On a last note, I have analysed interviews that were carried out when the internationalisation-oriented reforms seemed largely unchallenged in Poland. The participants could not know that the next Minister for Education and Science would modify the Polish journal ranking in a different direction, this time bypassing the standard procedures. He improved the overall standing of national journals in relation to foreign ones, and critics stated that some journal scores were now based on personal or ideological connections to the Minister and his government (Kosc 2022). Along the same line, many countries are now adapting neo-nationalist policies in academia, reducing the focus on English and internationalisation (Douglass, 2021). With regard to

higher education, Danish scholars have termed this process ‘de-internationalisation’ (Brøgger 2023). With regard to scholarly publishing, a significant example is the refashioning of the national research evaluation system in China (Ahlers and Christmann-Budian 2023). Neo-nationalism in academia is quite new; it has not been discussed much in the discourses of Englishisation and multilingualism, and vice versa. If we integrate these perspectives and also include the perspective of internationalisation, we may find it easier to understand the entanglement in which today’s social scientists and humanities scholars operate.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Jakub Krzeski, Krystian Szadkowski, and Emanuel Kulczycki for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Science Centre in Poland (Narodowe Centrum Nauki) under Grant UMO-2017/26/E/ HS2/00019.

Disclosure statement

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

ORCID

0000-0003-3548-1046

References

- ‘Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment’. 2022. *The Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment*. 19 July. <https://coara.eu/agreement/the-agreement-full-text/>.
- Ahlers, A. L., and S. Christmann-Budian. 2023. ‘The Politics of University Rankings in China’. *Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01014-y>.

- Archambault, É., É. Vignola-Gagne, G. Côté, V. Larivière, and Y. Gingras. 2006. 'Benchmarking Scientific Output in the Social Sciences and Humanities: The Limits of Existing Databases'. *Scientometrics* 68 (3): 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-006-0115-z>.
- Balula, A., and D. Leão. 2021. 'Multilingualism within Scholarly Communication in SSH: A Literature Review'. *JLIS.It* 12 (2): 88–98. <https://doi.org/10.4403/jlis.it-12672>.
- Boussebaa, M., and J. Tienari. 2021. 'Englishization and the Politics of Knowledge Production in Management Studies'. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 30 (1): 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492619835314>.
- Brøgger, K. 2023. 'Post-Cold War Governance Arrangements in Europe: The University between European Integration and Rising Nationalisms'. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 21 (2): 278–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2022.2075832>.
- Cañibano, C., I. Vilardell, C. Corona, and C. Benito-Amat. 2018. 'The Evaluation of Research Excellence and the Dynamics of Knowledge Production in the Humanities: The Case of History in Spain'. *Science and Public Policy* 45 (6): 775–89. <https://doi.org/10.1093/SCIPOL/SCY025>.
- Curry, M. J., and T. Lillis. 2022. 'Multilingualism in Academic Writing for Publication: Putting English in Its Place'. *Language Teaching*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000040>.
- Douglass, J. A. 2021. *Neo-Nationalism and Universities: Populists, Autocrats, and the Future of Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.85165>.
- Feenstra, Ramón A., and E. Delgado López-Cózar. 2022. 'The Footprint of a Metrics-Based Research Evaluation System on Spain's Philosophical Scholarship: An Analysis of Researchers' Perceptions'. *Research Evaluation*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvac020>.
- Gestel, R. van, K. Byland, and A. Lienhard. 2018. 'Evaluation of Legal Research: Comparison of the Outcomes of a Swiss and Dutch National Survey'. *Tilburg Law Review*, 23(1–2), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.5334/tlrl.6>.
- Gordin, M. D. 2015. *Scientific Babel: How Science Was Done Before and After Global English*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/S/bo14504917.html>.

- Guédon, J.-C., M. Jubb, B. Kramer, M. Laakso, B. Schmidt, E. Šimukovič, J. Hansen, et al. 2019. 'Future of Scholarly Publishing and Scholarly Communication: Report of the Expert Group to the European Commission'. *Publications Office of the European Union*. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/836532>.
- Kosc, Wojciech. 2022. 'Academics Say University Evaluation Was Driven by Politics'. *University World News*, 27 August. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20220826082900647>.
- Kosmützky, A., and R. Putty. 2016. 'Transcending Borders and Traversing Boundaries: A Systematic Review of the Literature on Transnational, Offshore, Cross-Border, and Borderless Higher Education'. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 20 (1): 8–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315315604719>.
- Krawczyk, F., and E. Kulczycki. 2021. 'On the Geopolitics of Academic Publishing: The Mislocated Centers of Scholarly Communication'. *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society* 4 (1). Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25729861.2021.1984641>.
- Krawczyk, S., K. Szadkowski, and E. Kulczycki. 2023. 'Identifying Top Researchers in Highly Metricized Academia: Two Discursive Strategies of Senior Officials in Poland'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 269–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2021.1993792>.
- Krzeski, J., K. Szadkowski, and E. Kulczycki. 2022. 'Creating Evaluative Homogeneity: Experience of Constructing a National Journal Ranking'. *Research Evaluation* 31 (3): 410–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvac011>.
- Kulczycki, E. 2017. 'Assessing Publications through a Bibliometric Indicator: The Case of Comprehensive Evaluation of Scientific Units in Poland'. *Research Evaluation* 26 (1): 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvw023>.
- Kulczycki, E. 2023. *The Evaluation Game: How Publication Metrics Shape Scholarly Communication*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009351218>.
- Kulczycki, E., T. C. E. Engels, J. Pölönen, K. Bruun, M. Dušková, R. Guns, R. Nowotniak, et al. 2018. 'Publication Patterns in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Evidence from Eight European Countries'. *Scientometrics* 116 (1): 463–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2711-0>.

- Kulczycki, E., E. A. Rozkosz, and A. Drabek. 2019. 'Internationalization of Polish Journals in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Transformative Role of The Research Evaluation System'. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 44 (1): 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.29173/cjs28794>.
- Kulczycki, E., R. Guns, J. Pölönen, T. C. E. Engels, E. A. Rozkosz, A. Zuccala, K. Bruun, et al. (2020). 'Multilingual Publishing in the Social Sciences and Humanities: A Seven-Country European Study'. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 71 (11): 1371–1385. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24336>.
- Kulczycki, E., E. A. Rozkosz, K. Szadkowski, K. Ciereszko, M. Hołowicki, and F. Krawczyk. 2021. 'Local Use of Metrics for the Research Assessment of Academics: The Case of Poland'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 43 (4): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2020.1846243>.
- Kwiek, M. 2015. "Internationalists" and "Locals" in Research: Similar Productivity Patterns Across Europe'. *International Higher Education*, no. 83: 7–9. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2015.83.9076>.
- Kwiek, M. 2021. 'What Large-Scale Publication and Citation Data Tell Us about International Research Collaboration in Europe: Changing National Patterns in Global Contexts'. *Studies in Higher Education* 46 (12): 2629–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1749254>.
- Lee, J. J., and B. Stensaker. 2021. 'Research on Internationalisation and Globalisation in Higher Education: Reflections on Historical Paths, Current Perspectives and Future Possibilities'. *European Journal of Education* 56 (2): 157–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12448>.
- Liu, M.-C. M. 2017. 'Conformity, Resistance, and Gaming: The Impact of World University Ranking on Faculty Scholarship at a Taiwanese University - ProQuest'. PhD diss., University of Wisconsin–Madison. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/f2209f10247f72244352c7f16a4985d3/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>.
- Liu, W. 2017. 'The Changing Role of Non-English Papers in Scholarly Communication: Evidence from Web of Science's Three Journal Citation Indexes'. *Learned Publishing* 30 (2): 115–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1089>.

- Marginson, S. 2022. 'Space and Scale in Higher Education: The Glonacal Agency Heuristic Revisited'. *Higher Education* 84 (6): 1365–95.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00955-0>.
- Marginson, S., and X. Xu. 2021. 'Moving beyond Centre-Periphery Science: Towards an Ecology of Knowledge'. *Centre for Global Higher Education*, April.
<https://www.researchcghe.org/publications/working-paper/moving-beyond-centre-periphery-science-towards-an-ecology-of-knowledge/>.
- Mittelmeier, J., and Y. Yang. 2022. 'The Role of Internationalisation in 40 Years of Higher Education Research: Major Themes from Higher Education Research & Development (1982–2020)'. *Higher Education Research & Development* 41 (1): 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.2002272>.
- Moldashev, K., and A. Tleuov. 2022. 'Response of Local Academia to the Internationalization of Research Policies in a Non-Anglophone Country'. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 30 (56).
<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6788>.
- Nordbäck, E., M. Hakonen, and J. Tienari. 2022. 'Academic Identities and Sense of Place: A Collaborative Autoethnography in the Neoliberal University'. *Management Learning* 53 (2): 331–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076211006543>.
- Ostrowicka, H., J. Spsychalska-Stasiak, and Ł. Stankiewicz. 2020. *The Dispositif of the University Reform*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Dispositif-of-the-University-Reform-The-Higher-Education-Policy-Discourse/Ostrowicka-Spsychalska-Stasiak-Stankiewicz/p/book/9781032174983>.
- Phillipson, R. 2009. *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. New York and London: Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Linguistic-Imperialism-Continued/Phillipson/p/book/9780415872010>.
- Pölonen, J., E. Kulczycki, H. Mustajok, and V. Røeggen. 2021. 'Multilingualism Is Integral to Accessibility and Should Be Part of European Research Assessment Reform'. *LSE Impact Blog. London School of Economics and Political Science*. 7 December.
<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2021/12/07/multilingualism-is-integral-to-accessibility-and-should-be-part-of-european-research-assessment-reform/>.

- Rodriguez Medina, L. 2019. 'A Geopolitics of Bad English'. *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society* 2 (1): 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/25729861.2019.1558806>.
- Schreier, M. 2012. *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Sivertsen, G. 2016. 'Patterns of Internationalization and Criteria for Research Assessment in the Social Sciences and Humanities'. *Scientometrics* 107 (2): 357–68.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-1845-1>.
- Steigerwald, E., V. Ramírez-Castañeda, D. Y C Brandt, A. Báldi, J. T. Shapiro, L. Bowker, and R. D. Tarvin. 2022. 'Overcoming Language Barriers in Academia: Machine Translation Tools and a Vision for a Multilingual Future'. *Bioscience* 72 (10): 988–98. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biac062>.
- Stein, S., and D. M. McCartney. 2021. 'Emerging Conversations in Critical Internationalization Studies'. *Journal of International Students* 11 (S1): 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v11iS1.3840>.
- Suzina, A. C. 2021. 'English as Lingua Franca. Or the Sterilisation of Scientific Work'. *Media, Culture & Society* 43 (1): 171–79.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443720957906>.
- Szuflita, M. 2014. 'Scholarly Communication Activities in the Fields of Chemistry and Economics. A Polish Perspective'. Master's thesis, University of Borås.
<https://depot.ceon.pl/handle/123456789/6533>.
- Tam, K. 2019. *The Englishized Subject: Postcolonial Writings in Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia*. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2520-5_12.
- Tardy, C. 2004. 'The Role of English in Scientific Communication: Lingua Franca or Tyrannosaurus Rex?' *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3 (3): 247–69.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2003.10.001>.
- Woldegiyorgis, A. A., D. Proctor, and H. de Wit. 2018. 'Internationalization of Research: Key Considerations and Concerns'. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 22 (2): 161–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315318762804>.