

Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies

Paper 184

**“We have learned your paper”:
Academic inequality and the discourse of
parasite publishers**

by

Josep Soler & Andrew Cooper[©] (Stockholm University)

josep.soler@english.su.se

andrew.cooper@english.su.se

May 2017



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

“We have learned your paper”: academic inequality and the discourse of parasite publishers

Josep Soler and Andrew Cooper
Department of English, Stockholm University

In this paper, we analyse the discourse of what has been termed predatory open-access journals with a corpus of scam emails sent to scholars by hitherto unknown publishers. Framed against the background of a sociolinguistics of mobility, these emails become interesting objects of analysis because of their different indexical values. In particular, beyond issues of ordered indexicalities, we argue that these texts point to the seriously flawed nature of the field of academic publishing and the associated inequalities that are currently present in this field. In the paper, we propose that examining such inequalities based exclusively on the native/non-native English speakers divide is not useful, nor is it enough to raise awareness against such predatory publishers. Instead, we argue in favour of a more sociologically informed analysis of academic publishing, something that we see as necessary if we wish to enhance more democratic means of access to key resources in publishing.

KEYWORDS: Academic publishing, predatory publishers, indexicality, linguistic resources, repertoire, mobility.

1. Introduction

- >Dear Dr. JOSEP SOLER-CARBONELL,
- >This is Emma Woo from Journal of Journalism and Mass Communication (ISSN 2160-6579, USA). Welcome for paper submissions.
- >I am wondering if you have received our call-for-paper email for you several days ago.
- >As I haven't got any reply from you yet, so I'd like to contact you again about the issue.
- >Hereby I forward the email below to you again for you.
- >If you have any original and unpublished article, and you are interested in our journal, please feel free to contact us.
- >Looking forward to your reply.
- >Best regards,
- >Emma Woo

For many academics, receiving unsolicited emails like the one above asking to submit unpublished work to their journals has become an everyday experience. Indeed, the kinds of unsolicited emails of this type are expanding, now including invitations to (online) conferences, with more and more such emails being sent to large numbers of academics all around the world. In this paper, we investigate invitations from what has been termed predatory open-access (OA) journals (more on this term below) and argue several points in connection to their nature and social significance. First of all, as with other fraud emails (cf. Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006), predatory OA emails show high levels of their authors' IT skills and cultural knowledge of academic publishing, but this knowledge is not matched by the senders' more fine-grained linguistic skills, with the potential of making the emails lose their effectiveness. Secondly, in addition to being a prime example of a sociolinguistics of globalization (Blommaert 2010), these emails also index the inequalities in terms of access to and availability of key resources in academic publishing, and we argue that in examining the inequalities in this field, we need to look beyond (English) language nativeness. In essence, therefore, the main questions that we want to address in the paper are: what do predatory OA emails index, what are their underlying messages? How can we account for their emergence in this particular historical moment?

Although predatory OA journals are a relatively recent development, the problematic issues they represent are not new and they have attracted significant attention from analysts and commentators in recent years (e.g. Bartholomew 2016; Beall 2013; Butler 2013; Gasparyan et al. 2015; Simón 2016; Van Noorden 2013; Xia et al. 2015). The discussions mainly revolve around the danger that these publishers represent to science itself, not only because such journals appear to be happy to publish virtually any paper that is submitted to them (Stromberg 2014), but also because many of them seem to disregard any established ethical research standards (Bohannon 2013). By attaching themselves to the business model of 'gold open-access', where the author pays to have their work published, disreputable publishers can see a quick cash return for a minimal investment.

From 2009 to 2017, Jeffrey Beall compiled a list of predatory open-access publishers, whose services are not recommended on the grounds of their quasi-legal and unreliable operations. Despite its usefulness to scholars, Beall's definition of 'predatory publishers' has raised some concerns. This is mainly because of his criteria for inclusion to the list which, while detailed and comprehensive, are based ultimately

on his own judgment (see Beall 2015). The level of controversy around this blacklist of publishers seems to have peaked in mid-January 2017, when for reasons still unknown at the time of writing, Beall's blog (www.scholarlyoa.com) has been closed down and is no longer accessible, only days after releasing the latest version of his list. Broad-brushed or not, Beall's list has helped raise awareness about publishers who offer illegitimate services which may deceive more vulnerable scholars. The list increased exponentially each year, and expanded from 18 such predatory publishers in 2011 to 1155 in 2017 (Beall 2017). Judging by the regularity in which emails by publishers in the list arrive to the mailboxes of the scholars in this study, their level of activity remains high.

Our analysis shifts attention to the sociolinguistic aspects of the emails sent by predatory OA publishers and journals. We draw on the notions of indexicality (Blommaert 2005; Silverstein 2003), resources and repertoires (Blommaert 2010; Busch 2015) in order to describe the typical features and intended functions of these emails. To achieve this, we trace how certain meanings are activated and accessed (or not) through the use of certain linguistic and discursive forms, and how these resources are codified and potentially de-codified by speakers with situated repertoires. In the paper, we draw inspiration from Blommaert (2010) and Blommaert and Omoniyi (2006) and their analyses of fraudulent scam emails, texts that show high levels of competence in certain communicative resources (IT skills and cultural knowledge) but low levels in others (fine-grained linguistic details and literacy skills), which can have consequences for the success (or lack thereof) of these emails. As we illustrate below, the emails we analyse here also represent instances of unequal Englishes (Tupas and Rubdy 2015) that index different forms of access to and availability of material and symbolic resources belonging to those involved in the creation and interpretation of such texts. The discussion developed in the paper provides relevant additional arguments in the current debate around inequalities in academic publishing (e.g. Hyland 2016; Politzer-Ahles 2016), to which we turn in the next section.

2. The problem with present-day academic publishing: Structures and affordances in the field

It has been argued that the current business model of academic publishing is highly problematic, even unsustainable (Blommaert 2014; McGuigan and Russell 2008). A key factor is that the large corporations and publishing houses that own and manage well-established journals in academia are supported by and benefit from the unpaid work that the academic community delivers to them. In the case of publicly funded research, this is even more problematic because commercial academic publishers profit both from the privatization of publicly funded labour and a monopoly on selling the products of that labour. This has been the case for quite some time (Bergstrom 2001).

Increasingly, the value of scholars' research output is measured by the metrics generated from indexed journals; scholars are obliged to follow rules imposed by public administrators, to the benefit of privately owned corporations (Blommaert 2014). There are several problems associated with this commodification of science (Nylander et al. 2013), and two of them are highlighted in our study. Firstly, some scholars depend more on pedigree publications than others (e.g. early-career researchers and academics working from 'the periphery'), and secondly, the same

more disadvantaged scholars are more likely to lack the skills and the resources that enable access to highly ranked journals (and therefore have a lesser chance to develop those skills). The system, thus, generates inherent advantages and disadvantages for different scholars in need of quantifiable metrics and of publishing more and more in a larger variety of outlets.

The language used as a medium for publication purposes is frequently discussed in terms of advantages or disadvantages for authors: if research in highly ranked journals is published almost exclusively in English, does that generate an imbalance between native and non-native speakers of the language? Previous work has highlighted the pressures felt by multilingual scholars developing an international publication record (e.g. Burgess and Martin 2008; Canagarajah 1996; Curry and Lillis 2010). It is argued that while English represents a useful tool for international cooperation, native speakers of the language enjoy an inherent advantage vis-à-vis non-native speakers (Ammon 2007; Flowerdew 2007; Van Parijs 2007). More recently, arguing that linguistic privilege exists in favor of L1 English-speaking academics, authors have focused on two of their privileges: for native English speakers, publishing may require less effort (they might need to spend less time on it), and publishing may be biased in their favor (reviewers and editors will read their manuscripts more favourably by default) (Poltzer-Ahles et al. 2016).

Research on non-Anglophone academic writers has not, however, reached a conclusive consensus on this disadvantage argument. Even though studies of writer perceptions have reported that English L2 academic writers feel higher levels of anxiety because of language-related problems (Flowerdew 1999; Hanauer and Englander 2011; Pérez-Llantada 2014), the overall picture of survey results is mixed and mainly reflects 'the context-dependent nature of attitude surveys' (Hyland 2016: 60); the influence of how the question is asked in large scale surveys or in face to face interviews cannot be denied (Kuteeva 2015). Additional studies show that it is the less experienced and more disenfranchised scholars who are more likely to be vulnerable in the writing for publication process, and it has been shown that authors from for example South America will tend to face more important challenges when attempting to publish their work, both materially and symbolically (cf. Salager-Meyer 2008). The term 'off network' has been proposed (Belcher 2007; Ferguson 2007) in order to capture the 'centre' vs. 'periphery' dichotomy (Canagarajah 1996) and to highlight the importance of the 'need for access to networks of people who can facilitate the process [of publishing internationally]' (Flowerdew 2013: 305). Increasingly, as we will further develop below, this centre-periphery dichotomy is becoming less geographically tied, linked instead to other symbolic features and the ways international publication spaces are defined and created (Paasi 2005).

With this in mind, it can be argued that the native/non-native dichotomy is unproductive, and we should rather be looking at scholars' means of production, their capacity to access well resourced libraries and their opportunities to engage meaningfully with relevant members of their discourse communities (Meriläinen et al. 2008; Hyland 2016). Kuteeva and Mauranen (2013: 2) add that 'it is rather the level of professional expertise and academic seniority that is more important when it comes to successful academic publishing'.

In a context where the pressure to publish in highly-ranked, ISI-indexed, English-medium journals is now being applied not just to individual researchers, but to entire departments and units (Curry and Lillis 2013: 210), scholars all over the world are struggling to find the way to get their research published. While it is true that, regardless of their L1, many are successful in having their work published

(Hyland 2016), many others are left behind (Moizer 2009). These are the cracks in the system that predatory publishers seem ready to exploit. Indeed, it is against the background of the neoliberal discourses that dominate large parts of the higher education systems in many countries (cf. Holborow 2015; Lee and Lee 2013; Piller and Cho 2013) that we may begin to understand the emergence of emails sent by predatory OA publishers.

3. Predatory OA journals: Indexicality, polycentricity, and the linguistic repertoire

As noted above, emails like those analysed in this paper become interesting objects of analysis when we examine them from the point of view of a sociolinguistics of mobility. In highly connected global communication flows, linguistic and cultural resources travel faster and more easily than before, but what does not travel with so much ease are the values associated with specific features (Blommaert 2010). Indexicality becomes crucial to understand how email scams (from predatory publishers or not) are read and interpreted by their recipients. Extending and building up on the exaphoric use of the concept, i.e. the idea that language can be used ‘in reference to objects in the speech setting’ (Hanks 2000: 125), authors have shown how language is key in producing registers and social categories (Agha 2005; Silverstein 2003), establishing ‘a more or less coherent semiotic habitat’ (Blommaert 2007: 117). As Bakhtin notes, ‘all words have the “taste” of a profession, a genre, a tendency, a particular work, a particular person, a generation, an age group, the day and hour. Each word tastes of the context and contexts that it has lived its socially charged life, all words and forms are populated by intentions’ (1981: 293).

Importantly, as Blommaert (2007; 2010) has highlighted, indexicality is not messy and unorganized, but it is in fact ordered and stratified: some ‘forms of semiosis are systematically perceived as valuable, others as less valuable, and some are not taken into account’ (Blommaert 2007: 117). The crucial point is one of access: access to producing and access to retrieving certain semiotic forms with a particular set of associated values. This is done not in the vacuum, but in real ‘contextualising spaces in which particular forms can be attributed meaning’ (Blommaert 2005: 76). This mapping activity can be problematic in two ways: on the one hand, speakers may have different access to forms (resources), and on the other hand, speakers may have different access to contextual spaces, where forms are given value, where meanings are ratified or contested, and where forms are interpreted.

The question, then, becomes one of linguistic authority, of what are the norms and what constitutes deviations from them. In every language utterance, there is always a tension between following or deviating from what is perceived as normative and appropriate for a particular domain. Language utterances can be more or less oriented towards a normative centre, but the dialogical tension between centre-periphery (a continuum rather than a binary opposition) is always inherent in every utterance. Bakhtin further notes that ‘the authentic environment of an utterance, the environment in which it lives and takes shape, is dialogised heteroglossia, anonymous and social language, but simultaneously concrete, filled with specific content and accented as an individual utterance’ (1981: 273).

The corpus of emails in our study shows a variety of linguistic and communicative resources on the move. In their journey, the resources that may have been deemed ‘good enough’ or ‘normative enough’ by the producers of the emails

might not receive the same kind of evaluation by their recipients. What we see in these texts are the traces of the repertoires of the writers who produced them (Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006): we see texts indexing high levels of IT skills and cultural knowledge that are not matched by a proper mastery of the ‘right’ linguistic features in the particular communicative context. Crucially, therefore, we should emphasize the importance of the resources and repertoires of those involved in the communicative exchange. In order to understand the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of texts like those we will analyse, we need to pay attention to the repertoires and the resources available to those at the producing and at the receiving ends of this communication chain, resources that go beyond linguistic and communicative competence.

Originally introduced by Gumperz (1964: 138) as ‘all the accepted ways of formulating messages’, the linguistic repertoire ‘provides the weapons of everyday communication. Speakers choose among this arsenal in accordance with the meanings they wish to convey’ (in Busch 2015: 5). Gumperz’s notion of the linguistic repertoire has been recently reintroduced in sociolinguistic research to emphasize the idea that as individuals progress across their lifespan, their linguistic trajectory is inextricably linked and shaped by their life’s path (Blommaert and Backus 2011; Busch, 2015; Pujolar and González 2013). It is not only a question of different languages or language varieties becoming more present and more prominent in one’s life, but it is actual linguistic features and knowledge of cultural norms that become more tangible: ‘the social etiquette of language choice is learned along with grammatical rules and once internalized it becomes a part of our linguistic equipment. Conversely, stylistic choice becomes a problem when we are away from our accustomed social surroundings’ (Gumperz 1964: 138, in Busch 2012: 504).

Busch’s *Spracherleben* (2015) represents an important addition in defining the evolution of one’s linguistic repertoire, which she models on three components: (1) the linguistic ‘baggage’, what speakers bring with them when they enter a space; (2) the linguistic ideologies, how speakers are positioned discursively within a given space; and (3) the ‘feelings and bodily sensations’ that speakers experience (Busch 2015: 2). A combination of the three factors will thus determine the shape and the scope of one’s linguistic repertoire at any given interaction. Importantly, Busch’s addition highlights the social nature of the linguistic repertoire and the fact that it is constantly co-constructed by speakers in interaction (on- or offline), intersubjectively. So, unequal life trajectories will almost necessarily result into unequal access to linguistic and cultural forms and to spaces where their functions are ratified, contested, or interpreted. In order to gain a full perspective of the ‘total linguistic fact’ (Silverstein 1985: 220) generated by the emails like those we shall analyse, we need to understand their indexical field and indexical values, and the resources and repertoires available to all of those involved in such kind of email communication, the senders and the receivers. In our study, therefore, we analyse our material as texts pointing into three directions: to the past, to their authors and to their accumulated linguistic repertoire, to the present, to other texts with which the emails are intertextually connected, and to the future, to their intended addressees.

With this in mind, we turn now to the analysis of our data, first providing a general description of our corpus of emails; secondly, we show how the texts indicate a degree of success and convergence in at least two levels: IT skills and cultural knowledge; finally, we unpack the areas where texts are not as successful, namely at the level of fine-grained linguistic competence (cf. Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006).

4. An analysis of emails by predatory OA journals

4.1. *The data: general overview*

We collected a corpus of 58 tokens of unsolicited emails offering publication services, which were later refined to 25 types. These were received by members of the Department of English in Stockholm University between March and October 2016. The corpus also includes emails received by Soler at his email account from a previous affiliation with the University of Tartu between August 2014 and October 2016. We excluded from our corpus emails sent by traditional (i.e. more established) publishers, who are also increasingly sending emails inviting authors to submit to their newly created OA platforms (e.g. Taylor & Francis' *Cogent*). The emails included in our corpus were identified as suspicious according to a list of criteria (described below). The corpus comprises 49 emails from 14 companies and an additional 11 emails from standalone journals. The Table in the appendix provides further details.

4.2. *Converging forces: IT skills and cultural knowledge*

Much like in Blommaert and Omoniyi's (2006) analysis, emails in our corpus show a fairly high degree of competence by their authors in at least two levels: IT skills, on the one hand, and cultural knowledge, on the other. Their level of IT literacy is undeniable, with an excellent management of key elements in IT and online communication, such as the use of aliases. Senders sometimes use generic free email providers while others have email addresses associated with superficially plausible websites. Most emails are "signed", in the sense that they feature a name and contact details after the main body text. In no instance in our corpus, however, does the email sender's match with the signatory in the email text, which indicates an awareness of the importance of remaining anonymous by the senders. In the case of the more prolific companies in the corpus, the sender is given the name of a celebrity, sometimes with slight changes, e.g. Jeniffa Lopez (#2) or Natalia Portman (#10). Other companies use job titles for the local part of the address, i.e. editor@... (#44), journalism@... (#17). Signatory names are occasionally plausible generic Anglophone names like "Dr Michael King" (#13) of which there must be hundreds, even if one excludes medical doctors. Sometimes the names are traceable to individual scholars, whose involvement with the actual journal is questionable.

Most publishers (15 of 21) explicitly claim that they are located in the US, a piece of information that is sometimes repeatedly made explicit in the email. Some give several locations, in which case the US is always included, three give no location. The other countries that appear explicitly mentioned in our corpus are China, UK, India, the Netherlands, Germany and Indonesia. In Example 1, two addresses are given – a principal place of business in China and a post office box in the US. We assume that this information is true, although we could not confirm the Chinese address.

Example 1 (# 36)

>Principal Place of Business: Building 5, Headquarters Space of Optical Valley, Tangxun Lake North Road #38, East Lake High-Tech Development Zone, Wuhan 430223, Hubei Province, China.

>For ease of communication: Scientific Research Publishing Inc., P. O. BOX 54821, Irvine CA 92619-4821, USA.

It does seem, then, that for the majority of the companies in our study, presenting themselves as associated with the USA is an important element to include in the email. Indeed, companies which operate from outside Anglophone countries can associate themselves with for example the USA by the use of PO boxes, mail forwarding services or false addresses. Some emails specifying a USA location are signed with an English first name and Chinese family name, as one would expect from a Chinese company, e.g. Emma Woo (#17), Bessy Zhu Sun (#30). Other examples are signed simply with a first name e.g. Emma (#40), or a combination of first name and initial, with punctuation e.g. Sunny, H. (#46), neither of which are usual in American letter-writing.

All of the emails in our corpus were tailored for humanities, social science and education, which if automated, shows a high level of IT ability compared to more general broadcast scams (as in Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006). Another good indicator of sound IT skills is the personalization of the message, although this can lead to glaring mistakes in the text. In personalised salutations, the text is formatted as if it had been automatically inserted from a source with another format, as seen in Example 2, with a selection of salutation lines of several samples in the corpus.

Example 2

Dear Soler-Carbonell, Josep (#13)
Dear JOSEP SOLER-CARBONELL (#17)
Dear Ms/Mr Soler-Carbonell, Josep (#22)
Dear and Josep Soler-Carbonell (#32)

The order of parts of the name is sometimes correct, sometimes disordered. The name can be correct but in all caps. Alternative honorifics can be included. The last in the list above has presumably been taken from a source where Soler was not the first author, and the coordinator has not been removed. These samples above reflect a marked choice to personalize the message, which risks these sorts of mistakes (we return to these later below in more detail). In addition to the salutation line, invitations to submit a paper can be even further personalised, and accompanied by a reference to previous work, such as a conference presentation, presumably with automated text.

All in all we see a fairly good amount of high-level IT literacy and skills displayed in the emails in our corpus. Beyond this, there is another layer of communication in which email authors good skills too: cultural knowledge. Cultural knowledge, including the correct text features and linguistic register for letter writing and academic business are fulfilled quite satisfactorily. In terms of their textual structures, our corpus can be divided into three main categories: (1) messages containing a first-contact email text; (2) messages with a first-contact email together with a call for papers (CFP) for the journal that is being advertised; and (3) messages containing only the CFP for a journal. All of these categories display a fairly high degree of knowledge and awareness of the 'what' and 'how' in composing texts of this kind. Prototypically, the first moves in the message briefly introduce the journal (with its title and claimed location), and then provide a reason why the author is being contacted. This is vaguely reminiscent of the financial fraud genre of emails (cf. Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006), where senders feel the need to give an explanation of why recipients are being contacted unexpectedly and with a very unusual proposal.

The difference here is that this reason is even more personal and of apparently direct relevance to the recipient. Additionally, in most cases, we assume that the offer to publish is in a sense legitimate, although the services provided are practically worthless and largely overpriced. In Example 3, a version with automatic text insertion follows these moves.

Example 3 (#13)

>Dear Soler-Carbonell, Josep,

>This is *Journal of Modern Education Review* (ISSN 2155-7993), a professional journal published worldwide by Academic Star Publishing Company, New York, NY, USA.

>We have learned your paper "**Speakers' notions of Academic English in Estonian higher education: A discourse approach**" at **The Nordic Interdisciplinary Conference on Discourse and Interactio**. We are very interested to publish your latest paper in the *Journal of Modern Education Review*. ... All your original and unpublished papers are welcome.

The invitation to publish follows two parallel strategies: constructing the recipient as an expert in their field, regardless of how exaggerated this might sound in the case of early-stage researchers; and indicating that the journal is a trustworthy, professional, and international outlet. This shows an awareness of two important things: that flattering academics is a productive strategy, and that reliability, professionalism and internationalism are viewed as being valued in academia. This is confirmed in Example 4, where the appeal to the vanity of the recipient is even more explicit:

Example 4 (#30)

>Through your works, I know you are an expert in this field. We are seeking submissions for the forthcoming issue published in December 2014 currently. Your submission will make an important contribution to the quality of this journal.

In Example 5, the appeal to vanity is supported by an (admittedly oddly phrased) offer of friendship.

Example 5 (#13)

>Hope to keep in touch by email and publish some papers or books from you and your friends in USA. As an American academic publishing group, we wish to become your friends if necessary. We also want to invite some people to be our reviewers or become our editorial board members. If you are interested in our journal, you can send your CV to us. You can find our sample paper in the attachment. Expect to get your reply soon.

In addition to wishing to become our friends "if necessary" which in violation of the Gricean maxim of manner combines the obligation of necessity with the positiveness of friendship, this journal offers academic work. An informal request to continue cooperation is included (see Example 6).

Example 6 (#30)

>We are also recruiting reviewers for the journal. If you are interested to be a reviewer, it's our great honor to invite you to join us. ... After assessment, the

editorial board will decide whether we offer you the position of reviewer or not.

Example 6 reinforces a similar job offer in flattering terms, and then describes the hiring process in the simplest possible terms. The moves shown in Examples 4-6 indicate that the sender is trying to establish a close connection and familiarity, while at the same time maintaining a sense of professionalism and an appearance of rigor, even if the result is that it appears to be easier to become a published author than a reviewer for the journal, something that is usually the reverse.

In trying to entice a reaction from the reader, recipients can be encouraged to respond with a missed connection message, as in Example 7.

Example 7 (#18)

- >Did you get my last email about Invitation for paper submission?
- >We hereby forward it again, please kindly confirm receipt.
- >If you or your colleagues (or friends) have any unpublished papers, please kindly submit it by email attachments.
- >Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Here, a missed connection message referring to the title of a purported previous email (which in this case had not been received) is accompanied by a receipt confirmation request. As well as constructing the recipient as a busy person who may not notice correspondence, this also activates a sense of guilt over uncompleted tasks, which may encourage a quick response by the reader. This is further evidence of cultural competence in understanding the status of junior scholars.

The phrase “call for papers” appears in almost every example, and in a few cases, there is nothing more than a CFP. The CFP section prototypically includes a description of the journal’s areas of interest, accompanied by an indication of the databases in which it is indexed. These are representative of ‘quality signs’, along with an explicit statement of peer-review policy and a (usually unfeasibly short) timeframe to publication.

In cases where publication topics are listed, they are remarkably broad, sometimes to the extent that they outstrip the title of journal. Example 8 comes from the *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, which includes several areas of interest in literature studies.

Example 8 (#1)

- >The journal publishes research papers in the all the fields of language, literature and linguistics such as fundamentals of languages, ELT, the sounds and words of language, structures and meanings, language and gender, sociolinguistics, English syntax, historical linguistics, origins/evolution of language, experimental linguistics, phonology, endangered/minority languages, language and nature, communicative strategies, linguistic anthropology, linguistic analysis, language and alienation, Hispanic linguistics, analyzing Chinese language, philosophy of language, psychology of language, field methods in linguistics, history of the Spanish language, Spanish dialectology, applied linguistics, language, brain and society, advertising and propaganda, phonetics, morphology narrative and memory, thinking and writing across the curriculum, literary research methods, literary discourse, British literature, American literature, professional writing, conflict and community, studies in

trauma literature, creative writing, critical writing, African literature, literature of American diversity, American fiction, the epic tradition, biographic arts, women in literature and psychology, film and literature, romanticism, Victorian literature, world literature, and so on.

The breadth of this journal's remit serves to be both inclusive of all likely recipients' research interests, and to reinforce the sender's position as an extensive and capable publisher, even if the result is a rather incoherent catalogue of research areas included in the journal. This also provides a large block of text, which gives the impression of thoroughness. A similar practice is to provide lists of databases in which the journal claims to be included. These can be given as a block of text, or numbered, as in Example 9. This shows a further awareness of the importance of this information for authors to decide where to publish their work.

Example 9 (#22)

>Indexing Partners

- >1. Google Scholar
- >2. Turkish Education Index
- >3. OCLC (Online Computer Library Center, Inc.), USA
- >4. Polish Scholarly Bibliography
- >5. LLBA database of CSA (Cambridge Scientific Abstracts), USA
- >6. Ulrich's Periodicals Directory
- >7. Chinese Electronic Periodical Service (CEPS), Airiti Inc., Taiwan
- >8. Chinese Cultural University Library, Taiwan
- >9. Chinese Scientific Journals Database, VIP Corporation, Chongqing, P.R.C.
- >10. CNKI, P.R.C.
- >11. WorldCat
- >12. Summon Serials Solutions
- >13. Electronic Journals Library
- >14. Scholar Steer
- >15. InfoBase Index
- >16. Bielefeld Academic Search Engine
- >17. University of Southern Denmark Library
- >18. University of Saskatchewan Library
- >19. Academic Keys
- >20. New Jour
- >21. SJournal Index

There is also awareness that some indexing databases are more relevant or worthy than others (e.g. ISI and Scopus), as we see in Example 10.

Example 10 (#1)

>IJLL is indexed with and included in Cabell's, EBSCO, Ulrich's, DRJI, InfoBase Index, and Gale. Moreover the journal is under the indexing process with ISI, ERIC, DOAJ, Scopus, and Econlit.

Peer-review is typically mentioned as a marker of quality. The process is sometimes described in detail, as in Example 11.

Example 11 (#30)

>We use double-blind system for peer-review; the reviewers' identities remain anonymous to authors. The paper will be peer-reviewed by three experts; one is an editorial staff and the other two are external reviewers. The review process may take 1-2 weeks.

This text is plagiarized from the policy statement of a legitimate publisher based in Melbourne, Australia. As such it closely mirrors professional practice. The time scale, however, is too tight to feasibly accommodate a real and thorough peer-review schedule.

The inclusion of an impact factor is an interesting feature of some CFP sections, although it appears in only two samples of our corpus. This is a clear attempt to mark the quality of the journal, and indicative of the awareness that impact factors drive choice and determine the value of academic publications, as in Example 12.

Example 12

(#45)

>Impact Factor:1.315 [JIF], 2.19 [SCI Xplore Indexing]

(#65)

>Google-based Impact Factor: 0.89

>This impact factor is an alternative impact factor which is based on Google Scholar citations count.

Unlike ISSN or DOI numbers, and inclusion in databases, which might be legitimate, we assume that these impact factors are fabricated, i.e. self-calculated. ISSN numbers, explicitly repeated several times in the email in a number of messages in our corpus, are cost-free, effectively unlimited and can be ordered in advance of publication.

Significantly, explicit language criteria were found in only two of the samples. Even in these two cases, no reference to language correctness or style was made, only a requirement to authors to submit papers in English (see Example 13).

Example 13

(#18)

>We would like to invite you to submit unpublished English papers.

(#22)

>Please send us the English version of your paper in MS word format.

Taken together, these examples demonstrate that the authors of these texts possess a high level of competence and skills in at least two core areas of communication: IT skills and computer literacy on the one hand, and cultural knowledge of academic publishing, on the other. However, a closer reading of these emails reveals a distance from the content and forms that would be expected in legitimate academic invitations. It is, therefore, in the small, fine-grained details of the linguistic features employed in the texts that we can locate the centre-periphery tension and the capacity, or lack thereof, of these emails to trigger meanings of 'potential fraud' or 'reliable publisher' in the reader. It is to these micro-level features that we now turn to.

4.3. Diverging forces: micro-level, linguistic features

As already seen from the examples above, the texts in the emails of our corpus exhibit a number of deviant features of grammatical, lexical, and syntactic nature. It is precisely at this level that diversity and divergence emerge more strongly and clearly,

where the more fine-grained details become salient and may unmask the connection between the senders of these emails and their claimed identities as professional and trustworthy publishers. That said, however, it can also be argued that the errors in these messages are not as profoundly marked as in the case of more general fraud scams, in which the deviant features are much more apparent (Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006). Herley (2012) has proposed that in more general fraud scams, non-standard features serve as a filter to dissuade those who are not likely to go through the scamming process while attracting those who are more likely to do so. In the academic publishing emails that we analyse, this seems less feasible, since the very nature of communication in the field requires more control of the standard and of specific formulae. Even so, deviant features are apparent in many instances of the email texts, sometimes minimally offensive, sometimes with highly marked choices, denoting the ‘unfinished’ (Blommaert 2010) character of the repertoire of their authors.

One aspect that authors of the emails in our corpus control at a fairly successful level is that of punctuation and capitalisation issues, or “grassroots literacy” (cf. Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006: 599-600). There are a very limited number of problematic instances at that level, although sometimes problems of this type can appear in key moments of the email, as in the opening salutation line (see the instances above in Example 2, with marked choices of capitalisation norms, as well as choice of title of address, and the order of the name and last name of the addressee). Other examples of marked choices in the opening salutation lines of the emails include non-personalised salutations, as in ‘Esteemed Sir/Madam’ (#43), ‘Dear Professors/Teachers/Academicians/Research Scholars’ (#45), or ‘Dear Scholar/Processor’ (#58). The latter might have been a typographical error, but it is remarkable that it was overseen and made it to the sent version of the email.

Signature lines can also include marked choices, which can range from less to more noticeable. For example, in the emails sent by one specific company, the text is signed invariably by ‘Best regards’ followed by only the first name of the email author, without the last name; in professional emails of this type, signing without the last name in a first-contact message is uncommon. In other occasions, signature lines are more marked than that, as in those included in Example 14 below, from two samples in our corpus.

Example 14:

(#14)

>Thank you,
>With best regards

(#75)

>Looking forward for long lasting academic relationship
>With Regards

In many cases, a superficial reading of the emails might not lead to raising serious suspicions about the intentions of the senders. However, close reading of the material reveals frequent grammatical errors of higher or lower intensity; at any rate, even the more inoffensive cases indicate non-standard usage, such as in Example 15, where the sender asks the reader to recall a missed message.

Example 15 (#17)

>I am wondering if you have received our call-for-paper email for you several days ago... Hereby I forward the email below to you again for you.

The inclusion of *for you*, perhaps fulfilling the role of a dative particle for reinforcement purposes, is non-standard, as is the use of *hereby*, which is obsolete in standard English. Note also the lack of pluralisation in the (oddly hyphenized) expression ‘call-for-paper’. Other offers have more serious errors that are highly marked and deviant. The most easily identifiable of these are collocation and word choice errors, as in Example 16.

Example 16 (#45)

>The organization aims at undertaking, co-coordinating and promoting research and development. It provides professional and academic guidance in the fields of basic inculcation, Higher inculcation. Engineering Research Publication mission is to Promote and support, High Quality basic, Scientific Research and development in the fields of Engineering, Technology and Sciences. Generate Public awareness, provide advice to scholar’s researchers and communicate research outcomes.

Fragments like this, which aim at emulating a formal academic English, reflect marked problems of word choice (*inculcation* for *education*), capitalisation errors, and coordination errors. Odd word choice is a common feature in much of the corpus, as in Example 17, which also includes word order errors (*only in* instead of *in only*), problems of noun inflection, and sentences without main clauses.

Example 17 (#58)

>Grasp the Privilege for Publishing Paper... Only in 30-50 days, paper with good quality can be published.
>Our newly launched journals containing a wide range of academic disciplines.

Finally, and importantly, convincing scholars to submit their work to the journal is probably one of the more delicate moves in the email. Ironically, it is oftentimes precisely in this part of the text where more marked and deviant choices are apparent; many times, such deviant choices are apparent in oddly formulated passages, as in the extracts from different samples in Example 18.

Example 18

(#33)

>We do not only published papers, but also spread them to other channels to increase their downloads and citations. We also help submit papers to databases and indexes. We have been doing our best for world wide researchers, since we believe science is fantastic and your research is fantastic.

(#48)

The perception of the journal is to bequeath with an academic podium to researchers across the global to publish their original, innovative, pragmatic and high-quality research work.

(#50)

Our journals have been chosen by academicians of many famous universities like Harvard, Columbia University, Cambridge, University of Chicago, Yale University, University of Göttingen, etc. Please see [here](#).

Not infrequently, attempts to persuade researchers go beyond odd formulations and also include marked errors of syntactic and grammatical nature, as in the extracts in Example 19.

Example 19

(#58)

>We honestly ask you to submit paper to our newly launched journals. (...) You can publish one paper without APC in one of the our newly launched journals if you submit the paper before Oct. 31, 2016. Here is some newly launched journals.

(#57)

In order to gratitude to authors' consistent supports, we now invite you to submit your paper in our newly launched journal to enjoy the privilege before Oct. 31, 2016.

All in all, the messages in our corpus contain plenty of fine-grained details that are problematic and that distance their authors from the image of the professional and reliable academic partner that they are trying to convey. We turn next to discuss the (failed) indexicalities of the emails in our corpus, and conclude at the end with a more general reflection on the nature of OA predatory emails in the context of present-day academic publishing.

5. Discussion: Intertextuality, (failed) indexicalities, and inequalities in emails by OA predatory journals

In the previous sections, we have shown that emails from OA predatory publishers indicate a high level of competence of their authors in at least two areas: IT skills and cultural knowledge. Advanced linguistic competence, however, appears to be more problematic, and it is at that level that the emails become eventually decodable as 'potential fraud', rather than 'reliable publisher'.

To return to Bakhtin and the polyphonic nature of language, we can see how the texts in our corpus point to three different time directions: (a) backwards or to the past (to their authors and their situated repertoires), (b) sideways or to the present (to other related texts in the field of academia and academic publishing more specifically), and (c) forwards or to the future (to their intended readers and their situated repertoires). Diachronically, emails from OA predatory publishers point to the past, to the history of those who produced them and the nature of their situated repertoire and their knowledge of the field of academia and academic publishing. As in fraudulent scams (cf. Blommaert 2010; Blommaert and Omoniyi 2006; Dyrud 2005; Ottenheimer and Ottenheimer 2006; Shaw 2004), these emails exhibit a set of repertoires that are more highly developed at some levels, but less in others. Authors of academic scams have advanced IT skills that allow them to spread personalized emails to presumably millions of scholars. Senders also know that certain specific features 'work' in academic publishing, and so they possess good knowledge of the cultural conventions

in the field. They have an idea of what elements will likely make them sound and look like credible publishers. For example, they know that fancy journal titles work, particularly if they include ‘International’ or ‘American’ in their title. They know that ‘Anglophone’ works, so they go to great lengths to emphasize (deceptively) that their journals are based in the USA, and they sign their emails with a plausible Anglophone name (although, even if marginally, non-Anglophone regions and names appear also in these messages). Senders also know that flattering academics works, that they are busy people that need to be reminded of their duties and do not have time to read correspondence in detail. They know that numbers are important to show quality, rigorousness, and compliance to standards; so, in their emails they include information such as (fake) impact factor rates; and they know that fast peer-review time-frames and low processing fees will be attractive, and assume that the reader will not find fast time frames too suspicious. Finally, we see in these emails a collection of semiotic signs (e.g. a profuse repetition of ISSN numbers in the text, or large chunks of numbers and other signs in the contact details of the sender) that, much like with the more general fraud emails analysed by Blommaert and Omoniyi (2006), do not have any referential value at all, but they completely work at an indexical level, in their attempt to convey well established indexicals of professionalism and trustworthiness (ibid.: 589).

Synchronically, these emails are connected to other texts within the field of academia and academic publishing. The most obvious connection is the actual medium by which the texts travel: email. Academics engage in email communication daily, it is second nature. Emails are used to circulate all kinds of relevant information for academics, so it is only natural that OA predatory publishers choose email communication to spread their messages. These emails, therefore, are inserted in a complex matrix of other texts. In particular, they show a significant degree of connectivity with other texts in academic publishing, namely: academic journals’ websites. Indeed, these emails show a compilation of details that are present also in the websites of academic journals, and the authors of these emails go at great lengths to make sure their texts resemble those of academic journals, with knowledge of the features noted above. In short, writers of these texts know plenty of information about ‘the what’, the substance that might trigger meanings of quality and trust.

However, when it comes to the intended readers of these messages, we begin to have a different, fuller picture of the meanings of these emails, activated by the micro-level, fine-grained linguistic details and the actual content of the emails. At that level we can perceive the polycentric nature of language and the tension between the centre and the periphery. With their advanced IT skills and their good knowledge of cultural conventions, the writers of these messages succeed in producing what might be expected in texts of this type, but only up to a point. Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine a researcher with a little experience being lured by a journal that identifies itself as having a Google Scholar-based impact factor, or with a 1-2 week period of peer-review process. Furthermore, as intellectually vain as scholars can be, calling an early-stage researcher an ‘expert’ in the field is likely to sound exaggerated to many at that level, which would further be exacerbated by receiving an unexpected invitation to become a member of an editorial board.

However, decoding these elements as ‘red flags’ indexing ‘potential fraud’ rather than ‘legitimate publisher’ is not as straightforward an operation as one might imagine, and this is a key point that we need to emphasize. This is due to ‘second order indexicality’, the idea that ‘every emblem of distinction in societies is subject to ... the delicate play of voices in polyphonic discourse ... of availability and

accessibility, inclusion and exclusion' (Blommaert 2007: 128). So, in accounting for what happens in the communication chain of these emails, we need to place significant emphasis on the individual speakers (writers or readers) involved in it. Furthermore, in doing this, we need to highlight the importance of their linguistic repertoire, of what 'baggage' speakers bring with them in their interactions and how this 'baggage' is used to position themselves inter-subjectively and ideologically as certain types of speaker (Busch 2015).

We cannot simply take it for granted that because certain linguistic features in these texts are obvious to some readers, that these features will be invariably decoded as 'potential fraud' instead of 'reliable publisher'. Activating one or the other kind interpretation depends on the reader's trajectory and the opportunities they may have had to access social spaces where the meanings of specific linguistic and cultural features are constructed. The key here is the availability of certain linguistic features and the accessibility of certain cultural and social spaces where the values of these features are validated, negotiated, or challenged (Blommaert 2005). Seen from this perspective, we can better grasp and fine-tune the claims by previous authors that emails from OA predatory publishers both originate in and target scholars (particularly junior colleagues) in developing countries (e.g. Bohannon 2013; Xia et al. 2015). It may not be the case that these scammers specifically target these groups, but rather that these researchers are more likely to have had life trajectories which limit their ability to identify these emails as 'fraudulent', but may see them as 'genuine' instead. Indeed, as Blommaert (2010: 132-133) has noted, email scams do work insofar as the communicative resources employed in the production of the text and the repertoire of the text producer overlap to some extent with those of the receiver of the text.

Perhaps the fact that there is no reference to language correctness in these emails (despite it being a feature in many journal descriptions and their author guidelines) could be an indication that OA predatory scammers know that they are more likely to be successful among scholars from developing countries, and knowing this, design their messages with a specific style. It also could discourage the recipient from consulting a native speaker before submission. This is the usual advice of journal editors, but for the scammer, the fewer people who are consulted, the better. The array of features that index a refined knowledge of the 'what' of scholarly communication in these emails shows that their intended audience is broader than just scholars in developing countries. Could it be that researchers in developing countries are aware of the dubious quality of these publishers, but still submit their work there, because these are their optimal avenues to get their research published? That seems less likely, but it is a question that future studies could empirically tackle.

6. Concluding remarks

In a sociolinguistics of mobility, where online (written/visual) communication has become a prominent part of our daily interactions (Androutsopoulos 2006), our resources and repertoires have concomitantly expanded. Online communication, however, has the potential effect of creating an illusion of homogeneity: because we all engage with it on an apparently equal footing, we may think that our resources are equally valued and valuable everywhere, but they are not (Blommaert 2010: 133). The analysis presented above demonstrates that global inequalities in academia are specifically perpetuated by the current state of affairs in academic publishing, and that

predatory OA publishers depend on this inequality. As a form of capital and in line with the marketization of higher education that has increasingly solidified over the past decades (Faiclough 1993), the commodification of science has turned knowledge production and dissemination into a product, something sellable and buyable. As in all late-capitalist production lines, at the end of this one we see harsh structural inequalities that as social scientists we should not overlook. Scam email invitations show global inequalities whereby unequal forms of English (Tupas and Rubdy 2015) point to unequal forms of access to linguistic, social, and cultural capital.

We have observed above that the field of academic publishing is seriously flawed. While the publishers described in this paper can be considered predatory on inexperienced scholars, a more precise metaphor would be that they are parasites on a publishing industry in crisis. Our critical analysis adds some insights to the debate of academic publishing. First of all, framing the discussion in terms of injustices and inequalities between native and non-native English speaking scholars exclusively (e.g. Ammon 2007; Gazzola and Grin 2007; Politzer-Ahles et al. 2016; Van Parijs 2007) is not productive (Hyland 2016). The emails analyzed here, written in distinguishable non-native English varieties, do work, in that they can influence scholars whose L1 is English, especially if they are less experienced and less well connected to more central networks in the field. English has become central to international academic publishing, but it is important to acknowledge that it is not just English in its generality, but a particular form of English, that is at the centre of structural and material inequalities. The extent and impact of these inequalities is determined by having access to certain material and symbolic resources. Off-network scholars (Belcher 2007; Ferguson 2007) are more likely to suffer from these inequalities, and at present, being off-network or not is less likely to be tied to geography (cf. Canagarajah 1996) as it is to other features of each individual and his or her life trajectory.

A more ideologically and sociologically informed analysis can tell us more about the nature and the sustainability of such inequalities. So, beyond recognizing the inherent creativeness and performative characteristics of localized linguistic practices and varieties of English, we need to move questions of unequal means of access to material and symbolic resources, and the inequalities that this generates to the centre of the analysis (Dovchin et al. 2016; Kubota 2015). In recent years, Block (e.g. 2014) has insisted on the need to consider social class issues in a much more prominent way in applied linguistics research; this call should be taken on board in research on English for publication purposes, placing at the closely examining the individual speaker/writer and their social position. Indeed, raising awareness of the existence of predatory OA publishers is a necessary but not sufficient first step (Beall 2013; Bohannon 2013; Xia et al. 2015). This may help some researchers to avoid these traps, but that alone will not be enough. Beall (2012: 179) writes: “Scientific literacy must include the ability to recognize publishing fraud. [...] The worst offenders can usually be discovered without too much effort: their websites are littered with grammatical errors and they list bogus contact details. The borderline cases are more difficult to spot – here we need open-access zealots to open their eyes to the growing quality problems”. This is problematic, because it assumes a direct connection between certain communicative features and the capacity of these features to trigger certain meanings, and as we have shown in the paper, indexicality is not unidirectional and it is not always the case that certain meanings are universally accessible.

If one of our aims as academics is to foster the development of more democratic and equal social practices, we need to take seriously all practices and ideologies that currently produce and maintain structural inequalities. In the case of academic publishing, these are frequently produced and maintained by established commercial publishers, with the help of public university administrators and policy-makers. The phenomenon of parasite publishers, as we have shown here, is a symptom of a disorder in academia, and one that disproportionately affects our more vulnerable and disenfranchised colleagues.

References

- Ammon, Ulrich. 2007. Global scientific communication: Open questions and policy suggestions. *AILA Review* 20, 123-133.
- Androutopoulos, Jannis. 2006. Introduction: Sociolinguistics and computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10, 419-438.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The dialogic imagination. Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1974. *S/Z. An essay*. Translated by Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bartholomew, Robert E. 2016. Science for sale: the rise of predatory journals. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 107, 384-385.
- Beall, Jeffrey. 2012. Predatory publishers are corrupting open access. *Nature* 489, 179.
- Beall, Jeffrey. 2013. Medical Publishing Triage – Chronicling Predatory Open Access Publishers. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery* 2, 47-49.
- Beall, Jeffrey. 2014. *Corrupt and Questionable Practices in the Scholarly Publishing Industry*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272789832_Corrupt_and_Questionable_Practices_in_the_Scholarly_Publishing_Industry (accessed 12 April 2016).
- Beall, Jeffrey. 2015. Criteria for Determining Predatory Open-Access Publishers (23rd edition). Retrieved from <https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/criteria-2015.pdf> (accessed 21 November 2016).
- Beall, Jeffrey. 2017. Beall's list of predatory publishers 2017. Retrieved from: <https://scholarlyoa.com/2017/01/03/bealls-list-of-predatory-publishers-2017/> (accessed 14 January 2017).
- Bergstrom, Theodore. 2001. Free labor for costly journals? *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 15, 183-198.
- Block, David. 2014. *Social class in applied linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2014. The power of free: In search of democratic academic publishing strategies. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 114.
- Blommaert, Jan and Ben Rampton. 2016. Language and superdiversity. In Karel Arnaut, Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton and Massimiliano Spotti (eds.), *Language and superdiversity*. New York: Routledge. 21-48.
- Bohannon, John. 2013. Who's afraid of peer review. *Science* 342, 60-65.
- Burgess, Sally and Pedro Martín (eds.). 2008. *English as an additional language in research publication and communication*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Busch, Brigitta. 2012. The linguistic repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 33, 503-523.
- Busch, Brigitta. 2015. Linguistic repertoire and Spracherleben, the lived experience with language. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 148.
- Butler, Declan. 2013. The Dark Side of Publishing. *Nature* 495, 433-435.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 1996. "Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, material resources of peripheral scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication* 13, 435-472.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2002. *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Curry, Mary Jane and Theresa Lillis. 2010. Academic research networks: Accessing resources for English-medium publishing. *English for Specific Purposes* 29, 281-295.
- Curry, Mary Jane and Theresa Lillis. 2013. Introduction to the thematic issue: Participating in academic publishing - consequences of linguistic policies and practices. *Language Policy* 12, 209-213.
- Dovchin, Sender, Shaila Sultana and Alastair Pennycook. 2016. Unequal translingual Englishes in the Asian peripheries. *Asian Englishes* 18, 98-102.
- Dyrud, Marilyn. 2005. I brought you a good news: An analysis of Nigerian 419 letters. *Proceedings of the 2005 Association for Business Communication Annual Convention*, 20-25.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1993. Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society* 4, 133-168.
- Flowerdew, John. 1999. Problems in writing for scholarly publication: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8, 243-264.
- Flowerdew, John. 2007. The non-Anglophone scholar on the periphery of scholarly publication. *AILA Review* 20, 14-27.
- Gasparian, Armen Y., Marlen Yessirkepov, Svetlana N. Diyanova and George D. Kitas. 2015. Publishing Ethics and Predatory Practices: A Dilemma for All Stakeholders of Science Communication. *Journal of Korean Medical Science* 30, 1010-1016.
- Gazzola, Michele and François Grin. 2007. Assessing efficiency and fairness in multilingual communication: Towards a general analytical framework. *AILA Review* 20, 87-105.
- Gumperz, John J. 1962. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist* 66, 137-153.
- Hannauer, David and Karen Englander. 2011. Quantifying the burden of writing research articles in a second language: Data from Mexican scientists. *Written Communication* 28, 403-416.
- Herley, Cormac. 2012. "Why do Nigerian scammers say they are from Nigeria?". Retrieved from <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/why-do-nigerian-scammers-say-they-are-from-nigeria/> (Accessed 21 November 2016).
- Holborow, Marnie. 2015. *Language and neoliberalism*. London: Routledge.
- Hyland, Ken. 2016. Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 31, 58-69.
- Kachru, Braj. 1992. World Englishes: Approaches, issues, and resources. *Language Teaching* 25, 1-14.
- Kubota, Ryuko. 2015. Inequalities of English, English speakers, and languages: A critical perspective on pluralist approaches to English. In Ruanni Tupas (ed.),

- Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 21-42.
- Lee, Hikyoung and Kathy Lee. 2013. Publish (in international indexed journals) or perish: Neoliberal ideology in a Korean University. *Language Policy* 12, ADD PAGES.
- McGuigan, Glenn S. and Robert Russell. 2008. The business of academic publishing: A strategic analysis of the academic journal publishing industry and its impact on the future of scholarly publishing. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship* 9.
http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v09n03/mcguigan_g01.html
- Meriläinen, Susan, Janne Tienari, Robyn Thomas and Annette Davies. 2008. Hegemonic academic practices: Experiences of publishing from the periphery. *Organization* 15, 584-597.
- Moizer, Peter. 2009. Publishing in accounting journals: A fair game? *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 34, 285-304.
- Nylander, Erik, Robert Aman, Anders Hallqvist, Anna Malmquist and Fredrik Sandberg. 2013. Managing by measuring: Academic knowledge production under the ranks. *Confero: Essays on Education Philosophy and Politics* 1, 5-18.
- Ottenheimer, Harriet J. and Davi Ottenheimer. 2006. Urgent/Confidential - An appeal for your serious and religious assistance: The linguistic anthropology of "African" scam letters. In Harriet J. Ottenheimer (ed.), *The anthropology of language. An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Belmont: Wadsworth. 213-227.
- Paasi, Anssi. 2005. Globalisation, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning* 37, 769-789.
- Pérez-Llantada, Carmen. 2014. *Scientific discourse and the rhetoric of globalization*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Piller, Ingrid and Jinhyun Cho. 2013. Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society* 42, 23-44.
- Salager-Meyer, Françoise. 2008. Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7, 121-132.
- Shaw, Philip. 2004. Purpose and other paradigmatic similarities as criteria for genre analysis: The case of '419 Scam' emails. In Paul Gillaerts and Maurizio Gotti (eds.), *Genre Variation in Business Letters*. Bern: Peter Lang. 257-280.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1985. Language and the culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In Elizabeth Mertz and Richard Parmentier (eds.), *Semiotic mediation*. New York: Academic Press. 219-259.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication* 23, 193-229.
- Simón, Armando. 2016. Pitfalls of predatory journals: A personal account. *Comprehensive Psychology* 5, 1-5.
- Stromberg, Joseph. 2014. "'Get Me Off Your Fucking Mailing List' is an actual science paper accepted by a journal". *Vox* November 21 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.vox.com/2014/11/21/7259207/scientific-paper-scam> (Accessed 21 November 2016).
- Tupas, Ruanni and Rani Rubdy. 2015. Introduction: From World Englishes to unequal Englishes. In Ruanni Tupas (ed.), *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-17.

- Van Noorden, Richard. 2013. The true cost of science publishing. *Nature* 495, 426-429.
- Van Parijs, Philippe. 2007. Tackling the Anglophones' free ride: Fair linguistic cooperation with a global lingua franca. *AILA Review* 20, 72-86.
- Xia, Jingfeng, Jennifer L. Harmon, Kevin G. Connolly, Ryan M. Donnelly, Mary R. Anderson and Heather A. Howard. 2015. Who publishes in "predatory" journals? *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 66, 1406-1417

Appendix: Overview of the data

Publisher	Journal Title	Location	Email host	Signed by	Senders	Text (significant features)	Sample n°
Center for Promoting Ideas	International Journal of Language and Linguistics	USA	Yahoo.com	Dr. Michael King	Vladimir Ushmov; Jeniffa Lopez; Rosariar Caleca; Rearden Mamie; Vensate Henry; Bertha Louis;	CFP ¹ including Intro ² , long list of diverse topics, repeated ISSN, list of databases in which the journal is indexed.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
	International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences		Yahoo.com	Dr. J. Sabrina Mims-Cox	David Sasa; Stuart Micky; Natalia Portman		8 9 10
	American International Journal of Social Science		Yahoo.com	Dr. Stewart Lehman	Guiliana Rancic; Abubakar Bernarda;		11 12
Academic Star Publishing	Journal of Modern Education Review	USA (2 in New York, both florists)	academicstar.us	Laura; Ivy; Cindy; Cassiel	<i>education@...</i>	Intro, repeated ISSN, personalised invitation ³ , CFP.	13 14 15 16
David Publishing	Journal of Mass Communication	USA (residential NY)	davidpublishing.org	Emma Woo	<i>journalism@...</i>	Intro, personalised missed connection, recall request, CFP.	17
	Journal of Literature and Art Studies		davidpublishing.org	Doris Carly	<i>literature.art@...</i>		18
	Cultural and Religious Studies	USA (mail forwarding, NY)	davidpublishing.org	Emma	<i>culture@...</i>	Intro, personalised invitation, repeated ISSN, DOI, CFP.	19
	US-China Education Review A & B		davidpublishing.org	Sunny, H.; Lily, R.	<i>teacher@...</i>		20 21
	US-China Foreign Language; Sino-US English Teaching		davidpublishing.org	Betty Hinshaw	<i>linguist@...</i>		22
American Research Institute for Policy Development	International Journal of Linguistics & Communication	USA (San Diego)	Hotmail.com; Gmail.com	Dr. Lasisi Ajayi	Sunday Leen; Marry Cristain; Livi Vade; Beatrice Cooper; Cinthia Rebecca; Buari Nadia	CFP, Intro, repeated ISSN, DOI.	23 24 25 26 27 28

¹ Call for papers.

² Introduction and brief description of the journal.

³ The "personalised invitation" form includes a recipient's name as part of the text.

	Journal of Power, Politics & Governance	USA (Prarie View)	Yahoo.com Gmail.com	Dr. Jackson de Carvalho	Paisley Reagan		29
Publisher	Journal Title	Location	Email host	Signed by	Senders	Text	Sample n°
Sciedu Press	English Linguistics Research	Canada (mail forwarding)	sciedu.ca	Bessy Zhu Sun	<i>elr@...</i>	Intro, personalised invitation, detailed application procedure, database list, explicit fee of 300USD.	30
	International Journal of English Language Teaching		sciedupress.com	Jessica Collins	<i>ijelt@...</i>		31
Scientific Research Publishing	(newsletter)	USA (PO Box), China	sciresearchpubnews.org	<i>not signed</i>	<i>newsletter@...</i>	Personalised intro, list of articles, application procedure.	32 33 34
	Open Journal of Social Sciences	USA, China	cehuor.info	Ms Jingjing FENG	<i>jss@...</i>	“Special Issue”, personalised intro, CFP, repeated ISSN, list of articles, list of other special issues.	35
	Creative Education	USA, China	romekor.com	Dr. Cathy H. Qi	<i>ce@...</i>		36 37
Macroworld	Journal of Game-Supported Interactive Learning	USA, UK	macroworld.com	Suzanne Horn, Ezendu Ariwa.	<i>news@...</i>	Invitation, CFP, links & pictures.	38 39
Scientific Direct	English Teaching: Practice & Critique	USA	sci.scientific-direct.net	Sharon Parkinson	Emerald@...	Personalised intro, SSCI, “free access”, list of articles, invitation.	40
American Association for Science and Technology	(newsletter)	USA	aascit.org	<i>not signed</i>	Marvin@arhelpy.net	Intro, list of journals, special offers.	41
Science Publishing Group	(newsletter)	<i>not given</i>	poodder.org	<i>not signed</i>	Wade	Intro, list of journals, 50% off, database list.	42
ARC Publications PVT LTD	International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature	<i>not given</i>	bestpaperonline.com	Editorial office	<i>admin@... , editor@...</i>	Intro, repeated ISSN, invitation, CFP.	43
Engineering Research Publication	International Journal of Engineering and Technical Research	India, USA, Netherlands, Indonesia	gmail.com	Engineering Publication Team	<i>editor@...</i>	Intro, list of topics, repeated ISSN, impact calculation, CFP.	44 45
Horizon Research Publishing	Sociology and Anthropology	USA	hr-publishing.org	Timothy Collins	<i>conference@...</i>	Intro, “peer-reviewed” ISSN, database list,	46
Redfame Publishing	International Journal	USA (Mail	redfame.com	James Young	<i>ijsss@...</i>	Personalised intro, invitation,	47

	of Social Science Studies	forwarding)				repeated ISSN, DOI, fee 300USD, CFP.	
Publisher	Journal Title	Location	Email host	Signed by	Senders	Text	Sample n°
<i>not given</i>	International Engineering and Technological Applied Research Journal	<i>not given</i>	ietarj.com	R. Dave	<i>editor@...</i>	Intro, long list of topics, detailed submission procedure, list of article types, CFP.	48
<i>not given</i>	Journal of Multidisciplinary Engineering Science and Technology	Germany	jimest.org	Prof. Karl Heinz	<i>editor@...</i>	Intro, list of topics, repeated ISSN, database list, CFP.	49
<i>not given</i>	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science	UK, USA, India	sciencedomein.com	Ms. Isita Sen	Dr. Mahua Roy	Intro, ISSN, fee of 105 USD, “save 395 USD”, “transparent and high standard peer review”, “indexing” list, list of articles.	50 51
<i>not given</i>	International Journal of Education	Indonesia	ajourmonline.net		<i>juvenitae_alex@...</i>	Invitation, CFP, list of topics.	52
<i>not given</i>	Journal of Advances in Linguistics	<i>not given</i>	gmail.com cirjal.com		<i>editor@...</i> <i>jalonline@</i>	Impact factor, repeated ISSN, submission guidelines, “peer-reviewed”, “fully refereed”, database list, invitation.	53 54 55
<i>not given</i>	Frontiers in Language Teaching Research	<i>not given</i>	sina.com	Ms.Kelly Xiao	<i>fltr2015_2@...</i>	Personalised intro, “international open access and refereed”, list of topics.	56
<i>not given</i>	(newsletter)		chartod.org; tender.org		Julieta; Faith	Intro, list of journals, “50% off”, database list.	57 58