....

Preface

....

The pressure to publish is not new for academics as it has always been necessary not only as a means for disseminating scholarly ideas and expanding existing research, but also as a way to advance our academic careers and meet employment requirements. However, there is a new aspect of this pressure which is different today: the promotion of a "winner-takes-all" system (Frank, & Cook, 2010), supported by mainstream journals' policies, in which "there are no benefits at all for almost getting something published in a top journal, and the benefits of publishing in lower status journals decline rapidly" (Philips, 2019, p. 307). The "winner-takes-all" system is based on the journal-proxy method[1] that relies on quantifiable measures to assess research

---

[1]   There is a number of journal-proxy indexes used to evaluate scholarly research output. The most valued measures include impact factor and citations and the most referred to indexes are SCImago, Thompson Reuters Web of Science, Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science and Social Science Citation Index. Publication rankings depend on the citations each article gets and individual scholars are assigned an H-index which has the following formula: h-index = the number of publications with a citation number greater than or equal to h.

value. Unfortunately, it does not give an evaluation of the qualitative aspects of scholarly texts, such as the communicative efficacy or the potential practical application of the findings. Putting this in Hyland's words, the global scientific publishing industry has made scholarly writing a space "where individual reputations and institutional funding coincide; the result of managerialism and an accountability culture that seeks to measure 'productivity' in terms of papers, and citations to those papers" (Hyland, 2016, p. 58). Furthermore, the role of journal gatekeepers in bringing a text to publication is somewhat difficult to determine. Undoubtedly, there are reviewers and editors who offer constructive comments to authors and help them develop their research. However, it is often the case that rejection decisions are communicated in short and generic e-mails, reducing the reviewer's role to a "screening device" (Rousseau, 1995).

Having the experience of becoming and being a bilingual scholar myself, I am convinced that writing for global discourse communities is equally challenging for mother tongue and non-mother tongue scholars. Regardless of our cultural, linguistic and disciplinary background, it is always a tough struggle to find 'the right' voice with which to write about our research. The section "Reflections on writing for publication in scholarly journals" offers accounts of actual experiences academics have had in writing for publication in peer-reviewed scholarly journals. The idea for the theme of this issue was born from criticism appearing within top-tier academic publications addressing such matters as:

1) ineffective communication of disciplinary knowledge and beliefs,
2) established and dysfunctional norms for producing and evaluating research,
3) the exclusion of traditionally marginalised groups, i.e., non-Anglophone scholars, junior researchers and doctoral students.

The personal accounts gathered in this section provide insights into the challenges we face when writing for publication in scholarly journals and hopefully point to means of addressing these challenges.

Iga Maria Lehman (University of Social Sciences, Poland ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2092-8119)

References

Frank, R. H., & Cook, P. J. (2010). *The winner-take-all society: Why the few at the top get so much more than the rest of us*. New York: Random House.

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

Philips, N. (2019). What is academic success anyway? A rejoinder to "Confronting the crisis of confidence in management studies". *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *18*, 306–309.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). Publishing from a Reviewer's Perspective. In L. L. Cummings, & P. J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences* (pp. 151–163). Foundations for Organizational Science: A SAGE Series.