Scholars Experiencing Epistemic Injustice Due to Management of Scholarly Outputs

Ford, Angela

Judson University, USA|
angela.ford@judsonu.edu

Alemneh, Daniel

University of North Texas, USA|
daniel.alemneh@unt.edu

ABSTRACT

Scholars from regions outside of high-income countries experience additional barriers as active consumers, producers, and sharers of scholarly outputs. This study will examine these barriers through a lens based on critical theories, specifically those focused on epistemic injustice. The findings will highlight the experienced impediments and demonstrate theoretically how disparities can be categorized. The findings will also highlight current publishing paradigms affecting the management of scholarly outputs and at times perpetuating these injustices. Possible future research to support these claims will also be discussed.

KEYWORDS

Epistemic injustice; critical theories; scholarly communication; LMIC, research output managment

INTRODUCTION

Injustices occur in many areas of academia and the focus of this paper is on those injustices affecting scholars who find themselves outside of the core research countries or high-income countries often found in the Global North. The injustices create additional barriers or obstacles for these scholars when they attempt to actively engage with the wider research communities. Throughout this paper, the historical background of global engagement in scholarly communications will be explored with an emphasis on the experiences of scholars who find themselves in low- and middle- income countries (LMIC). This exploration is a broad overview with the purpose of creating a foundation for future investigations exploring specific experiences and effects of scholars from LMICs as they attempt to consume, produce, and share scholarly outputs.

Several critical theories could establish an effective framework to investigate the plight of scholars from low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) when attempting to access, produce, and disseminate scholarly outputs. See Table 1. Prejudice and discrimination are often experienced by these scholars as they try to join scholarly conversations either as active receivers, producers, or deliverers of knowledge. The lived experiences of many scholars would support the claim that approaching entrance into global academic conversations from a geopolitical location or a view other than a Western one, is accompanied with additional barriers. Research using critical theory lenses could assist in obtaining evidence to support such claims.

Obstacles		Theories
Consuming	Access to Scholarly Outputs	Distributive Epistemic Injustice (Fricker, 2013)
Producing	High Quality Research Studies	Discriminatory Epistemic Injustice (Fricker, 2013)
	Academic English	Apartheid of Knowledge (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002)
Sharing	Presenting at Academic and Professional Conferences	Epistemic Alienation (Nkoudou, 2020)
		Testimonial and Hermeneutical Injustice (Fricker, 2007)
	Publishing in Peer-Reviewed Journals	Contributory Injustice (Dotson, 2012)

Table 1. Obstacles Faced by LMIC Scholars and Theories for Examination

Critical research would be appropriate for such research as a clear distinction can be made between traditional research and critical research. Traditional researchers see their task as the description, interpretation, or reanimation of a slice of reality, whereas critical researchers often regard their work as a first step toward forms of political action that can redress the injustices found in the field or constructed and perpetuated in the very act of research itself (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2011). This investigation will demonstrate how critical lenses would encourage the identification of the injustices by allowing the research to be centered from the views and experiences of the scholars from LMICs.

Scholars' personal and professional experiences would highlight the effects of scholarly output management, including the limited dissemination of scholarly outputs and the methods in which research is chosen for publication and dissemination. The current management of scholarly outputs allows for and at times even encourages exclusion of underserved populations such as scholars that do not find themselves in privileged Western countries. Much like the hand of ideology discussed by Timar & Tyack, (1999) in reference to the governance of schools in the U.S., and much like the "apartheid of knowledge" discussed by Bernal and Villalpando (2002) about governance in institutions of higher education, there are similar concerns within publishing companies, non-profit organizations, and academic societies, that oversee who are invited and embraced into scholarly communications and who are excluded. This closing out of scholars is detrimental to true and valid advancement of knowledge in many disciplines. Bernal and Villalpando (2002) stated, "the apartheid of knowledge, therefore, poses dire consequences for all of academia. If the structures that discriminate remain in place all sorts of diversity initiatives are bound to fail" (p. 368).

In a study examining experiences of scholars of color within the U.S., Bernal and Villalpando (2002) discussed the idea of "legitimate" knowledge as an epistemic definition provided by those in power. They stated, "too frequently, an epistemology based on the social history and culture of the dominant race has produced scholarship which portrays people of color as deficient and judges the scholarship produced by scholars of color as biased and nonrigorous" (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002, p. 169). In this argument, we could replace people of color or scholars of color, with any scholars who find themselves in geopolitical locations outside of the dominant nations producing research. They went on to state, "a Eurocentric epistemological perspective can subtly –and not so subtly –ignore and discredit the ways of knowing and understanding the world that faculty of color often bring to academia" (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002, p. 171) International scholars find themselves in similar positions as these U.S. faculty of color to which Bernal and Villalpando refer. Similar claims could be made about the experiences of women in academia, and even more so for women of color who experience what Donnelly (2018) labels "willful hermeneutical ignorance" from many White women in academia. Clavero and Galligan (2021) suggest that an epistemic lens is what is needed to understand and manage gendered power relations in academia.

Management of scholarly outputs are predominantly conducted by scholars from the Global North where Western perspectives dominate. This management requires accessing the quality of research and the topics that will be disseminated through conference presentations and publications. Unfortunately, these mechanisms of quality assessment often cloak biases that intentionally or unintentionally hinder scholars outside of the dominant research culture as they are not represented in the decision-making processes. The ideas shared by Smith, (2006) and Smith and McInerney (2017) of opening up space for underserved students in U.S. educational institutions could be paralleled in application to the idea of inviting in scholars who find themselves on the periphery of their domains such as those from LMICs. Scholars from outside of the Global North could be more welcomed into scholarly communication through several ways, including sharing their experiences working within these systems, providing perspectives on changing these systems, and becoming active participants in the management of such systems.

One must note, there are benefits felt by those already in power in these management systems, benefits that perpetuate exclusion and therefore transformations to be more inclusive are resisted. Schweiger (2016) stated, "Besides being the victims of harsh injustices, the global poor are also trapped in a state of epistemic powerlessness" (p. 105). Schweiger (2016) goes on to argue that giving access to knowledge resources is not enough, individuals experiencing epistemic injustice must themselves be heard and allowed to share their voices by "giving them the opportunity to tell their stories and experiences" (p. 105). Boni and Valasco (2019) state, "(K)knowledge, scholarship, and research are not neutral projects, but rather are conterminously shaped by history and the societies in which the work is undertaken, and in which the researchers are themselves molded and positioned" (p. 2).

The focus of this paper will be on injustices faced by scholars from LMICs when attempting to engage in scholarly communications through accessing existing studies in the form of peer-reviewed literature; through their ability to engage in research activities and produce high quality studies; and through their ability to share their research outputs. Lack of access to scholarly literature keeps researchers from being able to make the connections they would need to initiate and conduct novel studies, and this is a form of *distributive epistemic injustice* (Fricker, 2013). The lack of ability to create, share, and widely disseminate findings is a form of *discriminatory epistemic injustice* (Fricker, 2013) as this indicates the voices and views are not valued by those ruling the academic conference and publishing venues (Fricker, 2013). Fricker (2009) defined discriminatory epistemic injustice further by declaring two categories, testimonial and hermeneutical. Testimonial injustice occurs when a hearer discounts the credibility of the person delivering the message and hermeneutical occurs when the deliverer of the message is unable to clearly articulate the message they are trying to convey. Hermeneutical can be further broken down into systemic hermeneutical injustice and what Dotson (2012) and Donnelly (2018) call "willful hermeneutical injustice," otherwise labeled contributory injustice. Donnelly (2018) stated, "the concept of contributory injustice, essentially the injustice committed by an agent when engaging in willful hermeneutical ignorance." (p. 9) See Table 2 for a non-exhaustive list of possible

theories or frameworks and their definitions that could be used to examine the epistemic injustices, obstacles, or challenges faced by scholars from LMICs.

Theories/Frameworks	Definitions
Distributive Epistemic Injustice	"(U)nfair distribution of epistemic goods such as education or information" (Fricker, 2013, p. 1318).
Discriminatory Epistemic Injustice	Being wronged as a knower; divided into testimonial and hermeneutical injustices (Fricker, 2013).
Apartheid of Knowledge	"(M)arginalizes, discredits, and devalues the scholarship, epistemologies, and other cultural resources" of the non-dominant group (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002, p. 169)
Epistemic Alienation	"(D)istortion of one's native way" of communicating about one's reality, causing cognitive distortion (Nkoudou, 2020, p. 32).
Testimonial Injustice	"(O)ccurs when prejudice causes a hearer to give a deflated level of credibility to a speaker's word" (Fricker, 2007, p. 1).
Hermeneutical Injustice	"(W)hen a gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their social experiences" (Fricker, 2007, p. 1).
Contributory Injustice	"Willful hermeneutical ignorance," unwillingness of the hearer or reader to use the knowledge or tools that would help them understand as the deliverer is knows and understands (Dodson, 2012)

Table 2. Critical Theories/Frameworks and Definitions

ACCESS TO SCHOLARLY OUTPUTS

Applying critical theory lenses to lack of access to scholarly outputs would give voice to those experiencing the inability to obtain the scholarly outputs. The ability to access scholarly outputs may be different based on disciplines and will be revisited in the section about avenues to obtain empirical evidence. Scholars would be able to explain from their perspectives how barriers affect their ability to advance their knowledge and understanding of the research in their disciplines. As it stands, studies have been conducted that examine impediments to access, however, studies using a critical lens could add to the literature and provide a clearer and more representative picture, by centering the voices of those most affected.

Institutions in LMICs are often not able to purchase as many journal subscriptions or books, creating a deficit in access to peer-reviewed literature for their scholars. These resources are needed to investigate topics, keep up to date on disciplines, identify gaps, and ground new research. Without robust or even adequate access, completing a high-quality research project can be nearly impossible. This unfair distribution of scholarly outputs is a form of *distributive epistemic injustice* (Fricker, 2013). "Researchers need to be able to access, read, test, augment, refine, and refute each other's work – that is the way research moves forward" (Pinfield et al., 2020). When scholars are excluded from accessing knowledge, they are handicapped from engaging in informed discussions.

Since lack of access to scholarly outputs has a direct effect on research outputs, it has spurred the Open Access (OA) movement (Arunachalam, 2017; Bacevic & Muellerleile, 2018; Chattopadhyay et al., 2017; Demeter, 2020; Nobes & Harris, 2019; Pinfield, et al., 2020; Piwowar et al., 2018). The movement to OA was intended to make access to scholarly resources more equitable, so that even in poor geographical areas, scholars could read and use peer-reviewed literature to inform and advance their research. The proponents of OA argue that scholarly outputs should not be locked behind paywalls where only those with well-equipped academic libraries can obtain them. They also argue that OA helps improve scholarly communication by disrupting traditional scholarly publishing and making access equitable. Even though OA dissemination is growing, only about a quarter of scholarly literature is openly available on the Internet (Roehrig et al., 2018), therefore, individuals without institutional access or other means of obtaining literature are locked out of access to 75% of available research. A situation many scholars from LMICs experience.

Nobes and Harris (2019) conducted a study examining the perspectives of 507 self-selected researchers from LMICs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Their findings from the perspectives of these researchers, indicated that many have trouble accessing the research they need to complete a thorough review of what has and has not been done in

their areas of interest. Only 8.1 % of the participants from a wide variety of disciplines expressed that they were able to access all the research they felt they needed.

Lack of access contributes to a culture of not reading widely and deeply among scholars in LMIC (Fussy, 2019) and undermines research outputs (Chattopadhyay et al., 2017; Ford & Alemneh, 2022). Green and Yu (2016) argued for the importance of epistemic cognition for educating critical thinkers. It could be argued that limited access to scholarly literature directly and indirectly diminishes the encouragement of critical thinking in the populations lacking access.

Ola (2018) stated,

> The high cost of journal subscriptions, the frustrations experienced by user's due to an inability to access information, the need to explore new business models for publishing as well as the moral sensitivity of the human soul to share knowledge has precipitated the emergence of the movement advocating for free unrestricted access to use and reuse peer-reviewed literature off the internet. (p. 5)

Access to knowledge would not be the panacea for researchers from LMICs to become active participants in scholarly communication, however, improved access could reduce frustrations, and acknowledge the ability of these individuals to be knowers. The frustration caused by not being able to search, obtain, and read empirical studies needs to continue to be a focus of OA and other mechanisms, as without access, individuals are being slowed down and stunted in their ability to advance and become active participants in scholarly discourse. Whereas opening up access to scholarly literature may allow the reading of outputs, if this is as far as the efforts go, it remains a one-sided situation where one group of scholars, the dominant high income country scholars, convey their messages, without ever listening to responses or the voices and writings of the scholars from LMICs. This suppression prevents accurate and full discourse and open scholarly communication. OA can be seen as an equalizer in knowledge distribution, however, in order for OA to be an overall equalizer, there should be adequate representation of research outputs from LMICs (Ford & Alemneh, 2021). Next, a couple challenges for scholars from LMICs to conduct research will be explored.

CONDUCTING ACCEPTABLE AND PUBLISHABLE RESEARCH

Critical theory research could provide enlightenment to both the obstacles scholars experience in being able to conduct high quality research and then the additional barriers to having their research accepted by the wider communities of their disciplines. Exploring all the challenges for scholars from LMICs to perform high quality research is beyond the scope of this paper, however, a few challenges that tie in directly to epistemic injustice will be covered. The challenges to be explored include living with the remnants of colonialism as well as the effects of neocolonialism; the inability to determine topics of interest and relevance to the scholars in their own contexts; and the unfair connections often made through international collaborations (Asare et al., 2020).

Much research, to be heard and published on the global stage, is expected to be conducted with strict rules that are ingrained in the societal norms of the privileged group and can be foreign to those from cultures outside of these core Western perspectives. Kincheloe and McLaren (2011) stated, "In a research context, critical theorists claim that many rationalistic scholars become so obsessed with issues of technique, procedure, and correct methods that they forget the humanistic perspective of the research act" (p. 289). The hermeneutics or interpretations that take place in research are not benign or without the influence of the researcher's perspective or perception. Yet the systems in place for research acceptance and dissemination welcome the voices and perspectives of the dominant cultures and at the same time often shut out voices that sound different or contain non-traditional research interpretations.

Even though more populations are increasingly being studied than just the Western middle and upper class, the problem is with who is conducting the research, from data collection, to analyzing and interpreting the data, and to the final stage of presenting and publishing. Most research produced from the West, even for studies conducted in the South, have a Western perspective applied to interpretation (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2011; Parker & Lynn, 2002). When researchers are not a part of the communities or cultures where they are conducting the research, they should at least be clear to themselves and their readers about their affiliations and understand that where they come from and their life experiences, in essence, where they place themselves in the world, affects their interpretations (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2011). Even researchers who have good intentions can have biases and positions that affect how they interpret findings about people outside of their own groups.

Koggel (2018) provides a clear picture of how epistemic injustice can be applied to colonized communities. She examines the experiences of populations in Canada; however, her work could easily be paralleled in any country that was founded in similar ways. Much of it could also be applied to countries that were colonized and have since been considered free of their colonizers, or countries affected by neocolonialism, which encompasses many LMICs. Koggel (2018) explains that non-indigenous people who settled Canada intentionally erased much of the history of the indigenous people and even though there have been attempts at reconciliation, much of the history remains silenced and devalued through various forms of epistemic injustice. She shows through government documentation that the "collective interpretive resources" of the indigenous people remain unheard and unacknowledged because they are

often seen as tradition and not law. "The assumption is that tradition is inferior to law and especially the law of the land" (Koggel, 2018, p. 246). Similar experiences could be shared from many scholars in LMICs, in respect to colonialism or neocolonialism and the exclusion of forms of research not accepted widely in high income countries causing epistemic alienation (Nkoudou, 2020; Roh, et al., 2020).

Many LMICs remain tied to their colonizing countries in many ways, and even a country such as Ethiopia, that was not colonized, still feels the effects through systems operating on global levels, such as through higher education. When looking at sub-Saharan Africa, the massification of higher education and the institutional structures have been modeled after Western countries, where neocolonialism is alive and thriving. Massification of higher education institutions has resulted in a lack of resources and qualified faculty and has therefore affected the quality of research outputs from the continent.

In a study funded by the British Council and the German Academic Exchange Service, the African Network for Internationalization of Education (ANIE) it was discovered that in six countries on the African continent there was a consistent shortage of faculty, and of those serving in this capacity only 8 to 43 % held doctorates (ANIE, 2018). Thus, the faculty lack academic capital to fully develop and support their students. Demeter, (2020) discusses how the obtainment of academic capital is harder to get when you begin on the periphery. Academic capital consists of "certificates, degrees, diplomas, research grants, fellowships and so on." (Demeter, 2020, p. 45). This lack of academic capital has a direct effect on other opportunities to effectively network, collaborate, and co-author studies (Demeter, 2020), perpetuating the problem of being an outsider. Demeter (2020) posited

> (T)he global community should recognize that the academic field, insofar as it seeks to uphold its self-definition as a meritocracy, must abolish its center/periphery structure, make every talent visible regardless of geopolitical position, educational trajectory, and social class, and it should do everything in its power to apprehend global processes in their totality. (p. 31)

This leads directly into the challenge of what topics researchers can cover and what methodologies are considered acceptable. If a topic is of local interest and used in a LMIC, it may be deemed unacceptable for international audiences even if the research methods and academic writing are strong (Roh et al., 2020). This struggle is often not felt for researchers from high income countries, because their topics are almost always deemed appropriate for a global audience. Research from LMICs can be easily rejected for reasons labeled as quality, methodology, or not being of current interest, however, other more nefarious reasons may remain hidden (Roh et al., 2020). These concerns affect the types and foci of research to be performed, however, they also affect the ability to present, and publish as will be discussed it the next section.

One final area of concern in producing high quality research is that of international connection, collaborations, or partnerships (Asare et al., 2020). Often such collaborations perpetuate injustices by the collection and analyzing of data through a Western perspective and the publications being led by the scholars from high income countries. In order for partnerships to be equitable and beneficial for all, all partners must have a voice in determining the goals of the research, rather than a paternalistic relationship where one partner is seen as superior in knowledge, perpetuating epistemic injustices. Partnerships should be designed to be mutually beneficial for each partner (Tekleselassie & Ford, 2019), and through an equitable design benefit the field more broadly. Next the inequities affecting the presentation and publication of research will be discussed.

SHARING RESEARCH OUTPUTS

Clearly, opening up access to scholarly outputs does not accomplish equal engagement in scholarly communication. Once more equitable access has been achieved, and high-quality research has been conducted, the next step would be to equalize the ability to engage with other researchers to share findings. Scholarly communication comes in many forms, however, for the purposes of this paper, the foci will be on presenting at academic conferences and publishing in academic peer-reviewed journals. Individuals or even groups accepting conference proposals and manuscript submissions are normally individuals from high income countries, leaving those from LMICs without a voice as to whose presentations or articles are accepted or even considered for acceptance. Metaphorically, this means they do not have a seat at the table; a term Fricker (2013) called *representation*. When scholars in developing countries are viewed as lower in development, they are being placed in a similar position to children who are not as high on the developmental ladder and are therefore assigned to a set at a different table; much like children at a family gathering that are not allowed to eat with the adults. This clearly establishes who holds the authority and power to dictate what is important and to tell/teach them without listening to their voices. This positioning assumes progress is needed to help 'the others' develop intellectually.

First, the presentations, proposals, and manuscripts must be created and polished for submission. English language skills are a major hurdle for those who are forced to write in a language different than the one they were raised using (Fussy, 2019). However, even for those who grew up talking and learning with English, the skills necessary to write

for academic journals are specific and challenging to obtain. Writing in academic English is another part of academic capital that many scholars from LMICs do not possess as much of as their counterparts from more affluent countries and institutions (Demeter, 2020).

Second, students and researchers from LMICs often find themselves on the periphery, or outside of the core of research simply due to their geographic location and lack of direct contact with well-known and highly productive researchers. By being on the periphery, their trustworthiness and validity as researchers is often questioned before their presentations are attended or their manuscripts are read. McConkey (2004) stated, "Fricker's epistemic injustice furnishes us with a deeper analysis as it aims to identify the power structures that prevent the claims of marginalized groups being accepted as true" (McConkey, 2004, p. 199). McConkey (2004) went on to state that this is a form of cultural imperialism.

When it comes to attending conferences, even scholars who find themselves in high-income countries, often have to self-fund or spend time and effort on locating or raising the funds to attend. For scholars from LMICs, less personal capital as well as institutional capital are available, making these obstacles even bigger for them than their counterparts. In addition to funding, scholars from LMICs face challenges to attend conferences, because few if any are held in their home countries. This causes international travel challenges including obtaining Visas to visit other countries, being charged additional fees based on their country of origin, having to prove they do not intend to stay in the foreign country where the conference is being held, and often having to write a proposal in a language that is not their language of birth (Albayrak-Aydemir, 2020). When scholars from LMICs are excluded from conference attendance, this perpetuates suppression and the ability to become known in the international communities in which they belong (Albayrak-Aydemir, 2020), keeping them on the periphery. This is a clear example of epistemic injustice that is frustrating and demotivating. McConkey (2004) stated, "If we reflect on the importance of being accepted as an authoritative knower, we will understand that lacking credibility is a considerable difficulty if one wants to make significant knowledge claims" (p. 199).

When it comes to academic publishing, researchers have several decisions to make. One of these decisions is whether to publish with a traditional publisher or to publish in OA. For researchers with limited access to scholarly outputs who are able to push past the various obstacles and arrive at the stage of publication, it is possible that if they do not choose OA, they may not be able to access their own research outputs to promote or share their findings. However, if they do choose OA, they need to consider the author processing charges that are often a financial hinderance.

The focus is not to cover all the differences, benefits, and challenges, of each publishing type here as copious volumes would be needed but will rather focus on the exclusionary nature of publishing in general for those that find themselves outside of the dominant research 'in groups' that are often gatekeepers of this industry. For scholars from LMICs any form of reputable publishing entails going through the same rigorous reviews as their counterparts from high income countries, but without the same access to editorial services and many with the additional challenges of the required high levels of academic English language skills. This causes many editors to reject studies based on the quality of writing as opposed to the quality of the research design or methodologies. This perpetuates the higher publication rates of scholars from Western countries where academic English writing is integrated throughout secondary education and then further strengthened in tertiary education, as opposed to many countries where academic English writing begins at the university level. Findings demonstrate that even a journal that is international in may predominantly publish research from authors from the West (Bedenlier et al., 2018).

Academics in the core research countries also experience challenges when writing for academic journals, however, they often have access to the social capital and resources to pursue and even persist in the original writing and the revisions necessary to publish in high ranked journals. Academics in periphery contexts, do not have these same resources. Fussy (2019) discussed how the lack of writing culture means many faculty members do not even have a single publication. Globally, scholars are encouraged to publish in prestigious journals, however, scholars from LMICs face additional obstacles to even submit for such publications and when they do submit, they are often met by the gatekeepers from high income countries that reject these submissions (Nkoudou, 2020). Not allowing and even welcoming marginalized scholars to be a part of scholarly conversations affects them individually, but also affects the larger community by not providing others with the perspective and novel connections that could be delivered (McConkey 2004).

Researchers from Western countries have power to share their findings in ways that those from LMICs do not. Kincheloe and McLaren (2011) stated that, "Privileged groups, criticalists argue, often have an interest in supporting the status quo to protect their advantages; the dynamics of such efforts often become a central focus of critical research" (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2011, p. 288). Evidence suggests that those holding the power for admission to academic conference venues and those holding the power for publishing are mainly from privileged groups. Meaning by the very nature of these structures the lived experiences of scholars from LMICs must pass through gatekeepers causing their voices to often be muffled or silenced.

The management of many scholarly publication maintains subtle forms of power and dominance, not grounded in laws to keep people suppressed (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2011). For example, when it comes to conferences and publications, there are not explicit rules excluding anyone, but rather everyone is encouraged to submit, however the submission standards still must be met. Anyone is allowed to submit proposals or manuscripts; however, it is not always as clear cut as to who will have a proposal or manuscript selected and approved. The individuals or groups making the decisions about acceptance can have hidden motivations covered up by the argument that they are simply trying to maintain high quality. No one is *officially* excluded, making this a more subtle form of discrimination.

An additional consideration based on Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) discussion of critical race theory is that there three propositions; that race remains a factor of inequity in the U.S, and that property rights are foundational in U.S. society, as well as the idea that the intersection between these two provide a lens to analyze the state of inequity. These propositions could also be applied when investigating how capitalism affects global scholarly communication since a majority of publishing paradigms are built on capitalist structures. It is posited that this focus on property and rights would carry over into international interactions or avoidance of them. Do scholars from wealthy nations value their own intellectual property rights, but not attribute the same value to scholars from LMICs? If so, this is another clear example of epistemic injustice that could be added to those previously discussed that would be appropriately examined through critical theories.

POSSIBLE AVENUES FORWARD TO OBTAIN EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

Moving forward with research grounded in critical theories would center the scholars most affected by the epistemic injustices under investigation and advance global social justice research (Ford & Alemneh, 2021). This could be accomplished through myriad research methodologies and studies of affected populations working within a variety of disciplines, a few of which will be discussed here. Portraiture methodology may be a viable option for empirical research on scholars from LMICs (Chapman, 2007). "In portraiture, a researcher investigates and presents the multiple contexts and interactions that surround participants" (Chapman, 2007, p. 157). Chapman (2007) also articulated how critical race theory (CRT) helps to center race as part of the theoretical framework. The combination of portraiture and CRT could allow for the participants in studies to tell their stories of attempting to become a part of the global scholarly communities in which they should be conducting research and disseminating their findings. The idea of storytelling is also supported by Parker and Lynn (2002) and Bernal and Villalpando (2002) who argue that stories can shed light on different forms of racism, both those experienced overtly and those that are more systemically ingrained in organizations and institutions. We posit the scholars from LMICs could tell stories that would reveal that they experience both explicit and more subtle forms of prejudice.

Participants being examined through these frameworks would be able to tell of the positive experiences and those that were not positive. This would allow and hopefully encourage readers of their stories to reevaluate their own views of the structures that impede scholars from LMICs. These explorations would shed more light on how these scholars experience epistemic injustice by being silenced or excluded from communications.

Not only could a variety of methodologies be employed in these types of studies, but studies grounded in specific theories as discussed from the history, and studies highlighting the effects on specific populations of scholars based on their geopolitical locations, connections in the global community, language use, etc. Studies examining the current state of different disciplines would also add to the body of knowledge about how injustices are experienced differently based on the fields in which academics work. Combination studies could center academics in different parts of the world working in a variety of disciplines to further examine the unique experiences. Examples might be investigating scholars in sub-Saharan Africa working in Medicine or scholars in Southeast Asia in the field of engineering, or scholars in South America working in. social sciences. The list of possible studies is as endless as the intersections experienced by individuals.

CONCLUSION

The systemic inequities in scholarly communication are often maintained by the structures of management in institutions of higher education, commercial publishing houses, university presses, and academic organizations. These inequities often take the form of epistemic injustices, which summarily detract from some scholars' abilities to know and to communicate their limited understandings in their specific domains. A call to challenge scholars who find themselves at the core of academia due to their geopolitical location in the world could be made; a call stated through the following questions. Are we listening to and embracing research coming from countries different from our own? Are we allowing researchers to use their authentic voices or are we requiring them to adhere to our standards and jump through enough academic hoops to frustrate their efforts to engage us? Are we willing to share a space at the table with researchers who speak and think differently than us and truly listen to the messages they bring? Are international collaborations we participate in fair and beneficial to all parties or do they benefit scholars already positioned within the dominant research communities?

REFERENCES

African Network for Internationalization of Education [ANIE]. (2018). *Building PhD Capacity in Sub-Saharan Africa*. https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/he-science/knowledge-centre/developing-talent-employability/phd-capacities-sub-saharan-africa

Albayrak-Aydemir, N. (2020). The hidden costs of being a scholar from the Global South. *LSE Higher Education Blog*. http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/111795/

Arunachalam, S. (2017). Social justice in scholarly publishing: Open access is the only way. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, *17*(10), 15-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2017.1366194

Asare, S., Mitchell, R., & Rose, P. (2020). How equitable are South-North partnerships in education research? Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2020.1811638

Bacevic, J., & Muellerleile, C. (2018). The moral economy of open access. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *21*(2), 169-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431017717368

Bedenlier, S., Kondakci, Y., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2018). Two decades of research into the internationalization of higher education: Major themes in the Journal of Studies in International Education (1997-2016). *Journal of Studies in International Education, 22*(2), 108-135. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315317710093

Bernal, D. D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the" legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(2), 169-180. https://doi.org/10.1080/713845282

Boni, A., & Velasco, D. (2020). Epistemic capabilities and epistemic injustice: What is the role of higher education in fostering epistemic contributions of marginalized knowledge producers? *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric, 12*(01), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.21248/gjn.12.01.228

Chapman, T. K. (2007). Interrogating classroom relationships and events: Using portraiture and critical race theory in education research. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(3), 156-162. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07301437

Chattopadhyay, S., Myser, C., Moxham, T., & De Vries, R. (2017). A question of social justice: How policies of profit negate engagement of developing world bioethicists and undermine global bioethics. *The American Journal of Bioethics, 17*(10), 3-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2017.1365185

Clavero, S., & Galligan, Y. (2021). Delivering gender justice in academia through gender equality plans? Normative and practical challenges. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *28*(3), 1115-1132. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12658

Demeter, M. A. (2020). Academic knowledge production and the global south: Questioning inequality and under-representation. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Donnelly, M. (2018). *Epistemic injustice in White academic feminism*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Georgia State University.

Dotson, K. (2012). A cautionary tale: On limiting epistemic oppression. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, *33*(1), 24-47. https://doi.org/10.5250/fronjwomestud.33.1.0024

D'Souza, R.A., & Pal, M. (2018), Encountering the postcolonial in academia, *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 7(*3), 361-372. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOE-10-2017-0046

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

Fricker, M. (2013). Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom? *Synthese*, *190*(7), 1317-1332.

Ford, A. & Alemneh, D. (2021). Equitable educational planning: Embracing open educational resources for the post pandemic era. *Educational Planning*, *28*(3), 21-30.

Ford, A. Y. & Alemneh, D. G. (2022). The role of open access in equitable research curriculum and research outputs: Global context. In D.G. Alemneh (Ed.), *The Handbook of Research on the Global View of Open Access and Scholarly Communications* (pp. 126-147). IGI Global.

Fussy, D. S. (2019). The hurdles to fostering research in Tanzanian universities. *Higher Education, 77*(2), 283-299. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0276-8

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2011). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In Hayes, K., Steinberg, S. R., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). *Key works in critical pedagogy* (pp. 285-326). Brill Sense.

Koggel, C. M. (2018). Epistemic injustice in a settler nation: Canada's history of erasing, silencing, marginalizing. *Journal of Global Ethics*, *14*(2), 240-251. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2018.1506996

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers college record*, *97*(1), 47-68. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819509700104

McConkey, J. (2004). Knowledge and acknowledgement: 'epistemic injustice' as a problem of recognition. *Politics*, *24*(3), 198-205.

Nkoudou, T. H. M. (2020). Epistemic alienation in African scholarly communications: Open access as a Pharmakon. In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling scholarly communications: Histories, infrastructures, and global politics of Open Access*. (pp. 25-40).

Nobes, A., & Harris, S. (2019). Open Access in low-and middle-income countries: attitudes and experiences of researchers. *Emerald Open Research*, *1*, 17. https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13325.1

Ola, K. (2018). Theories of open access. *Journal of Open Access L., 6*, 1. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kunle-Ola/publication/333164518_Theories_of_Open_Access/links/5cdea881299bf14d959ff629/Theories-of-Open-Access.pdf

Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative inquiry*, *8*(1), 7-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040200800102

Pinfield, S., Wakeling, S., Bawden, D., & Robinson, L. (2020). *Open access in theory and practice: The theory-practice relationship and openness* (p. 256). Taylor & Francis.

Piwowar, H., Priem, J., Larivière, V., Alperin, J. P., Matthias, L., Norlander, B., Farley, A., West, J., & Haustein, S. (2018). The state of OA: a large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of Open Access articles. *PeerJ, 6*, Article e4375. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4375

Roehrig, A. D., Soper, D., Cox, B. E., & Colvin, G. P. (2018). Changing the default to support open access to education research. *Educational Researcher, 47*(7), 465-473. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X18782974

Roh, C., Inefuku, H. W., & Drabinski, E. (2020). Scholarly communications and social justice. In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling scholarly communications: Histories, infrastructures, and global politics of Open Access*. (pp. 41-52).

Schweiger, G. (2016). Epistemic injustice and powerlessness in the context of global justice. An argument for "Thick" and "Small" knowledge. *Wagadu. A Journal of Transnational Women, 15*, 105-115.

Severin, A., Egger, M., Eve, M. P., & Hürlimann, D. (2020). Discipline-specific open access publishing practices and barriers to change: an evidence-based review. *F1000Research*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.17328.2

Tekleselassie, A., & Ford, A. (2019). Planning and implementing a mutually beneficial international university partnership in educational leadership between US and Middle Eastern institutions. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 28*(2), 179-206. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056787919841500

Timar, T., & Tyack, D. (1999). *The invisible hand of ideology: perspectives from the history of school governance.* Education Commission of the States. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED433609.pdf