

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Károly, Adrienn

Title: Translation and dealing with “the other” in scholarly research and publishing : A call for more reflexivity

Year: 2022

Version: Published version

Copyright: © 2022 the Authors

Rights: CC BY 4.0

Rights url: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Please cite the original version:

Károly, A. (2022). Translation and dealing with “the other” in scholarly research and publishing : A call for more reflexivity. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 16(3), 87-101.
<https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.114741>

Translation and dealing with “the other” in scholarly research and publishing: A call for more reflexivity

Adrienn Károly, University of Jyväskylä

Although languages other than English, along with various forms of translation, are intrinsic to multilingual researchers' scholarly activities, they generally remain less visible in English-medium publications. In this discussion paper, I explore this topic from a broader sociopolitical perspective by looking at the use and function of translation in various stages of research and writing for publication. Drawing on recent studies on multilingualism in academia and my own experience as a teacher of research communication, I argue that in the academic context, translation cannot be seen as a mere linguistic act or a communication tool as it is inextricably tied to complex and multilayered contexts, identities, and ideologies. Thus, translation decisions should not be based solely on practical considerations but also on a critical evaluation of the intricate social, cultural, ethical, and ideological dimensions of scholarly communication and interaction. Developing a greater awareness of the multiple functions and far-reaching effects of translation is beneficial for all actors directly or indirectly involved in scholarly research and publishing. I believe that a deeper reflection on these issues not only contributes to more diversity and equity in academia but enables novice multilingual writers to embrace their agency and make decisions that are better aligned with their personal values, interests, and goals.

Keywords: multilingual scholars; reflexivity; translation; visibility of languages other than English; writing for research and publication

1 Introduction

“If I write in English, can I include direct quotations in other languages?” “In the reference list, do I need to translate the title of a book into English?” “Can I publish a translated version of my article?” “Who is the best person to help me with translation during my data collection?” Doctoral students attending my research communication courses frequently ask similar questions. Sure enough, they expect straightforward answers to such seemingly technical questions, but most importantly, I see the questions as unique opportunities to explore broader—often dismissed or underrated—topics in scholarly research and

Corresponding author's email: adrienn.karoly@jyu.fi

eISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: University of Jyväskylä, Language Campus

© 2022: The authors

<https://apples.journal.fi>

<https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.114741>

publishing and reflect on personal beliefs, attitudes, values, and practices regarding languages and knowledge construction in contemporary academia.

My students are multilingual scholars, working in contexts where the local language or language of daily communication is not English (Curry & Lillis, 2019). Also, they have diverse linguistic, cultural, and disciplinary backgrounds, along with different degrees of research and publication experience. They are generally very keen to discuss the challenges of writing and publishing in English, especially disciplinary and cultural differences in discourse conventions, but they often bring up the external pressures they grapple with generated by evaluation systems and mechanisms. Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, the specific translation questions they raise tend to relate to individual linguistic or technical difficulties, mostly in the stages of writing for publication.

This leads us to some questions: To what extent are doctoral students aware of the value of languages other than English and the important role of translation in their research? And equally intriguing: What and whose perspectives and ideologies are reflected in citation guidelines concerning the use of other languages and translation? This discussion paper adds to the growing dialogue on multilingualism in academia by looking at the use of translation in various stages of the process of research and writing for publication. I aim to show that it is necessary to go beyond a purely linguistic and instrumental approach to translation and make translation decisions that are based not only on practical but also on broader and more critical social, cultural, ethical, and ideological considerations.

I believe that a deeper reflection on the complex functions and wide-ranging effects of translation is beneficial for all actors involved in knowledge-making in contemporary academia, but especially for novice multilingual writers. They may lack higher-level decision-making power, yet they also shape discourses and policies in their relevant contexts. The way they approach and manage risks (Thesen, 2013) by accepting, negotiating, rejecting, or resisting existing processes can make a difference. But these acts of identity require an awareness of and sensitivity to the broader social and geopolitical context of research and publishing, including the discourses and ideologies surrounding language and translation.

2 Research into the practices of multilingual scholars: Language(s) vs. (trans)linguaging

Multilingual scholars' writing and publication practices have been extensively researched in the past few decades from a variety of perspectives (see Curry & Lillis, 2017, 2019; Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014; Lillis & Curry, 2010). Studies focusing on the product of multilingual scholars' efforts, especially the language of publication, indicate a clear dominance of a monolingual approach, while also acknowledging disciplinary differences. Researchers in STEM fields tend to publish almost exclusively in English, referred to as *disciplinary monolingualism* by Hynninen and Kuteeva (2020), while those in the humanities and social sciences seem to be more open to publishing also in other languages, often in their native

language(s) (*dual monolingualism*)¹. Similar trends have been reported in other studies (e.g., Ammon, 2012; Liddicoat, 2016; Salö, 2015), but I can confirm these findings also from my own experience as a teacher of research communication.

Publishing in English may suggest the acceptance of English-medium publishing as a pragmatic reality—a phenomenon referred to as “taming *Tyrannosaurus rex*” by Kuteeva and McGrath (2014)—, but scholars use a variety of strategies and tactics to navigate the clashes between external expectations and personal agendas (Curry & Lillis, 2014). Even more importantly, when looking at the entire research process and the interactions in various social spaces, the prominent and indispensable role of other languages becomes clear. Multilingual scholars, even in fields where English publications dominate, typically describe their activities as multilingual in the phases of research and knowledge construction, referred to as *functional epistemic multilingualism* by Hynninen and Kuteeva (2020). Many of my doctoral students work in transnational and often multidisciplinary teams, have extensive professional networks, and routinely engage with scholarly and other texts written in different languages. Unfortunately, these diverse and often translinguistic activities typically remain invisible—become *entextualized*—in English-medium publications (Canagarajah, 2018). Since multilingual scholars inevitably work in *contact zones* (Thesen, 2013), when studying their practices, we need to consider the diverse spatial and sociocultural dimensions and look at the entire research process from the birth of the topic to publication, and even afterwards.

Canagarajah (2018) has recently pointed out that through their complex translingual practices in less formal and less public interactions in the early stages of the research and writing process, multilingual scholars indirectly contribute to the gradual transformation of dominant language ideologies and may help diversify language practices even in high-stakes academic genres. I believe that this transformative potential could be more effectively harnessed if researchers and other actors developed a deeper awareness of the multi-layered functions and effects of translation, leading to more informed decisions.

Below I take a closer look at multilingual scholars’ practices during various stages of the research and writing process to illustrate and problematize current understandings of the nature and function of translation. Note that the distinction between these stages only serves the purpose of presentation—in practice, they are closely intertwined. Writing includes creative and transformative processes closely linked to identity and critical thinking, including cognitive and dispositional elements (see Davies & Barnett, 2015), and some even see writing as a method of inquiry in its own right, especially in qualitative research (Gibbs, 2015; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2018). As Negretti and McGrath have pointed out (2022), the stages of writing correspond with stages in their development as academic writers, which is essentially a process of becoming an independent

¹ Deciding on the language in which to write and/or publish is not always as straightforward as it may seem. External and internal factors affecting language choices include performance evaluation systems, dominant discourses on impact, personal interests and priorities, professional identity, individual feelings of responsibility, perceptions regarding the most relevant audiences, and (perceived) levels of language competence (Hynninen & Kuteeva, 2020). The pressure to publish in English and the privileged position of English in the most widely used international scientific research evaluation indexes may clash with institutional and national evaluation regimes (e.g., Smirnova et al., 2021; Liu & Buckingham, 2022). The problems with the current discourses on impact are discussed in this issue by Enns-Kananen, Károly, and Saarinen.

writer with an awareness of the social dimensions of research writing. Teachers of research communication need to bear in mind that in contemporary academia, researchers – especially in fields traditionally referred to as ‘applied’ – often have complex, fluid, and dynamic disciplinary identities, and write in hybrid genres for heterogeneous audiences (Negretti & McGrath, 2022). Learning to navigate the complexities of such writing contexts requires support from the onset of doctoral studies. Teachers of research communication have a crucial role in sensitizing doctoral students to the social and ideological dimensions of writing, including aspects related to language and translation – an approach that can help young scholars develop a strong sense of agency and write more strategically and effectively.

3 Translation in reading and knowledge construction

Multilingual researchers often read various sources in languages other than English, including their native language(s). In the humanities and social sciences, they also regularly engage with non-English primary sources in different modes and/or grey materials (e.g., in business, law, or policy research), which often require translation in some form. Regardless of who does the translation, the author(s) or someone else, meaning needs to be carefully negotiated and (re)constructed, especially when the interpretation is reported in English. Even a single word or phrase may present challenges, especially disciplinary terms or cultural references without a direct equivalent in English. It is easy to see that translation requires not only linguistic competence in the broad sense but also subject knowledge, the ability to use translation tools and resources, cognitive and attitudinal elements, and translation routine or transfer competence – the importance of which is often overlooked or underestimated in non-professional contexts (for holistic models of translation competence, see Göpferich, 2009 or the PACTE group, 2003).

4 Translation in data collection and analysis

When qualitative data is collected, decisions concerning the language in which data is collected and analyzed and the need for translation or interpretation are crucial. Researchers need to keep in mind that translation is not simply a tool to ensure validity but is an ethnographic encounter where language mediates the representation of others (Young & Temple, 2014). Through translation, researchers symbolically represent identities – individual, group, community, or cultural –, discourses, and ways of thinking and knowing. Thus, translators and interpreters should not be considered a “functional necessity”: they are not merely *language brokers* (Curry & Lillis, 2013) but *cultural mediators* (Bennett, 2013) directly involved in the co-construction of knowledge.

Due to these social, epistemological, and ethical dimensions (see Broesch et al., 2020), translators need to be selected carefully, considering their communicative and cultural competence along with their attitudes and values, particularly in interpreting situations. Note that professional translators may not know the target population or local conditions as well as individuals with long and extensive experience with the community – something that my students frequently bring up.

To tackle these issues, a collaborative approach is recommended, with different people working with the researcher(s) during the translation and review process, including professionals with direct experience with the target population, bilingual research participants, members of the community (non-participants), and language experts (see Thompson & Dooley, 2019).

When translating a survey instrument, a purely linguistic orientation is not appropriate as the text needs to function in the target context, which is even more challenging when the participants have diverse cultural backgrounds. Also, when translating a questionnaire developed and validated in a specific context, differences between the source and target contexts become crucial. When reporting the findings, reflexivity and transparency regarding translation decisions are essential since they have far-reaching consequences for validity and reliability (see also Temple, 2005; Young & Temple, 2014). Thus, researchers need to be aware that the ideal translator is not simply a highly competent language user—not necessarily a native speaker—but someone with relevant subject knowledge along with translation routine and experience.

Transcribing qualitative research data is another intriguing topic, which, at first, may seem unrelated to translation. However, transcription can be regarded as an act of *intersemiotic* translation². Although it involves a shift in modality, it is essentially a process of mediation and interpretation. During the inscription of talk into text, key decisions are made, especially when the transcript represents multilingual and multimodal interaction. Haberland and Mortensen (2016) consider transcription *second-order entextualization*, which can only partially represent the original interaction. Multilingual interactions, characterized by differences in pronunciation and fluid boundaries between languages, can be particularly challenging to capture by using standard coding systems and orthographies, especially when non-Latin scripts are used. In particular, researching translanguaging practices, where language is seen as a “multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory, and multimodal resource” used for meaning-making and communication (Li, 2018, p. 26), requires novel perspectives and methodological considerations (Lee, 2022; Wei, 2022). In this sense, translanguaging is a stance that forces researchers to address the power dynamics in research design and methodology, including the relationship with participants (Vogel, 2022).

Researchers should remember that transcription is an interpretive process permeated by individual and institutional ideological biases. The challenges of choosing between alternative or even competing interpretations are vividly demonstrated in Vigoroux’s (2009) study, where the researcher and two research participants did the transcription in collaboration. The message was clear: when we transcribe, we consciously or unconsciously construct the identities of our research participants and represent them in a particular way.

Unfortunately, transcription standards can restrict meaning-making processes during data analysis, which can be particularly problematic in multilingual

² In Translation Studies, Jakobson (1959) distinguished three types of translation: *intralingual*, *interlingual*, and *intersemiotic* (the traditional focus of the discipline being the first, ‘translation proper’), but today the conceptual boundaries of translation are seen as fluid and evolving (for an overview, see Chesterman, 2018), and translation is considered to be an open ‘cluster concept’ (Tymoczko, 2005), which can have more prototypical or peripheral forms (Halverson, 2002). It can even include *interspecies* translation (translation across species, e.g., between humans and animals) (Vihelmaa, 2015).

research. In addition, the central status of the *written* transcript³ suggests not only the superiority of the written word but also of the verbal mode of communication, which may hinder or even prevent a holistic view of interaction. In the context of multilingual narrative research, Pavlenko (2007) mentions two main errors during transcription which may influence the analysis: adding something new (even a punctuation mark) or omitting potentially crucial layers of the interaction, such as interlingual differences, paralinguistic features, visual or spatial modalities of communication. In short, transcripts cannot be regarded as objective and neutral forms of representation as they are unable to fully capture the discursive richness of the original speech event, including feelings, emotions, attitudes, and nonverbal cues (Sarangi, 2009). Thus, researchers need to be sensitive to broader dimensions of interaction and contemplate the epistemological and ethical consequences of their choices.

Another pivotal question is what language(s) to use for data collection, and whether data should be analyzed in the original language or should first be translated. Scholars recommend the former although the language proficiency of the analyst(s) is a decisive factor. These decisions require thinking about the implications and effects of translation on the analysis. At any rate, Pavlenko's point (2007) about the difficulty to separate content from form (i.e., language) and context is certainly food for thought.

Finally, an important consideration for researchers of multilingual interaction is adopting a translanguaging approach to data collection, which respects and values the dynamic and diverse communicative practices of multilingual speakers. It implies that researchers give up their traditional understandings of language as a distinct and bounded entity with a fixed set of linguistic norms and focus not only on linguistic but also on semiotic, sensory, and multimodal data. In practice, this could mean that in an interview, languages are used flexibly – if they are shared by the participant(s) and the interviewer –, and in questionnaire studies, instead of “forcing” one language or offering a list of predetermined languages, respondents could freely draw on their linguistic repertoires when answering individual questions.

5 Translation in writing for publication

The most common language challenges faced by multilingual scholars when writing for publication in English concern the use of non-English research data and source materials in the text and the translation of scientific texts. These issues frequently come up in my classes, and as I mentioned, my goal is to guide students to go beyond a practical orientation and consider broader aspects and deeper implications.

³ With the development of digital technologies, scholars, especially in the social sciences, have developed alternative ways of transcription, such as *visual transcription* (see Aarsand & Sparrman, 2021).

5.1 Reporting non-English qualitative data

Researchers can give their participants a voice by integrating direct quotes from them. However, when the textual data is not English, things may get complicated. Many of my students bring up this issue in class, often complaining about the lack of guidelines or lack of clarity in international style guides. In the American Psychological Association (APA) and Modern Language Association of America (MLA) styles, quotations from research participants are allowed provided confidentiality and anonymity are not compromised. However, the APA style does not include any guidance on incorporating non-English quotations from research participants. If the APA style is required by the journal where the student is planning to submit the manuscript, it is important to check the journal guidelines or ask the editor for advice. The MLA style covers the topic at length and generally requires an English translation after the original to enable readers to assess the translation. This indicates a recognition that some readers are multilingual—a novel idea compared to styles using a traditional, English-only approach.

However, providing an English translation even for a short and seemingly simple sentence or passage, or even for a word or phrase, may require skill or experience. The function of translation in these cases should not be underestimated: just like the original text, the translation represents the participants' unique views and perspectives as embedded in a larger sociopolitical and historical context and shaped by dominant ideologies. On top of that, the translation carries information not only about the positionality and identity of the translator but also about the accuracy of interpretation and representation (e.g., alterations or information filtered out).

5.2 Using non-English sources in the text

Including direct quotes from outside sources may at times be useful. However, if the original text is written in a language other than English, it may be difficult to incorporate the ideas into the English text if the citation guidelines are too rigid. If the use of other languages is allowed, the original textual material generally needs to be translated into English, except for well-known words or phrases of foreign origin. Unfortunately, the latest edition of the APA style (2020) fails to address the topic of direct quotes in other languages and suggests paraphrasing or summarizing everything in English (i.e., translation). This has far-reaching implications not only for representation and authenticity, especially when the original is an idea or argument rather than factual information. A related problem is that most international styles do not cover the use of quotation marks around English translations, or they do it only from a technical point of view without linking it to cognitive conceptualizations of translation (translation as *descriptive* vs. *interpretive* language use).

International style guides represent centripetal forces in academia, striving toward uniformity. Over the decades, both the APA and MLA styles have expanded beyond means both in length and content and are no longer simply citation and referencing guides. While these “rules” may simply have a pragmatic purpose, we should not forget that these style guides represent disciplinary norms that can have an authoritative force and can be used to reject writing that does not conform to their overly rigorous and often highly technical norms. Certainly,

journal editors and reviewers do not use these manuals of style uncritically, and journals often have additional guidelines for multilingual writers, but the lack of explicit guidance related to other languages and translation in most of the international style guides may be interpreted wrongly by multilingual doctoral students. The fact that many style guides neglect the topic of other languages and translation may indicate that the diverse multilingual realities of contemporary academia are still not fully acknowledged. Thus, research communication courses should explicitly address these issues and encourage doctoral students to use these style guides critically.

5.3 Referencing non-English sources

The role of translation in formatting reference list entries for non-English sources is another interesting topic. The title of the work in the original language is generally required, followed by an English translation in brackets. Adding the translation is either mandatory (e.g., APA), or optional (e.g., MLA). The MLA style recommends the inclusion of the English translation if the audience “is likely to include readers unfamiliar with the language” (MLA, 2021, p. 194), while the APA style justifies the need for adding an English translation by “giving readers a sense of what the work is about” (APA, 2020, p. 301). Both approaches may be well-intentioned, but they are based on assumptions and generalizations about the readers of a journal and their language abilities. Today, the readership of scholarly journals is difficult to predict, but international journals are likely to have culturally and linguistically diverse readers. Note that the dichotomy of international vs. local journals often implies the language in which the journal is published, which is also problematic.

Having an original text in a non-Latin script further complicates matters. The APA style generally requires transliteration, allowing the original script “if transliteration is not possible or advisable” (APA, 2020, p. 301), leaving us pondering what exactly these cases refer to, especially the second one. Also, we cannot find any justification for the requirement of transliteration in the manual. The MLA style recommends transliteration if the reference list includes more than one work in the same non-Latin script under the same author, but no further explanation is given.

An important but dismissed consequence of the requirement to supply transliteration and translation is that they add to the overall length of the reference item. If the title is long, it can mean a substantial increase in length, especially for a book chapter written in a non-Latin script, when both the chapter and the book title need to be transliterated and translated (e.g., APA). The problem is that this may discourage authors from including such works, especially when the overall word count includes the reference list.

We can look at the impacts of these requirements from yet another perspective. By adding transliteration and/or translation, non-English sources are marked as different based solely on language. We can problematize this issue by applying Sakai’s (2009; 2014) notion of *bordering*. Traditionally, translation is understood as communication between distinct and homogeneous languages and cultures, referred to as source and target language and culture. In a metaphorical sense, this *regime of translation* – as Sakai refers to it – produces and maintains linguistic and cultural borders and reproduces the global system of nation-states and national languages, bringing difference into focus.

The requirements for translation and transliteration and the visibility of other languages and scripts in English scholarly texts can also be discussed by applying the concept of macro-level translation strategy, which is closely linked to culture, ideology, and power. The strategy of *domestication* strives to eliminate difference by creating the illusion that the source text is not a translation, while *foreignization* (Venuti, 1995) brings linguistic and cultural difference to the forefront by highlighting the foreignness of the text.

Finally, we should not forget that the reference list functions as a *paratext*, which has important implications for the peer-review process. Citation practices are shaped by a variety of factors (see Lillis et al., 2010), but as I mentioned above, formal requirements regarding the reference list may also influence authors' decisions as to what sources to include and exclude. This has bearing on the content and thus may indirectly sustain the intellectual hegemony of the Anglophone West. By citing sources written in other languages, multilingual researchers can not only make non-Anglophone scholarship more visible but can also avoid incomplete research data and thus knowledge gaps and biases in understanding a topic on a global level (see Angulo et al., 2021).

These examples illustrate that citation is not simply a practical question and is not a neutral act but has multiple dimensions and broad implications (see also Ennser-Kananen, 2019). To my surprise, some of my doctoral students mentioned having received comments on the (too high) number of non-English sources when submitting their English manuscripts to an “international” journal—an issue reported also in Lillis et al. (2010). Certainly, these may be isolated cases, but we can only hope that all editors and reviewers focus primarily on the content and the overall soundness of the research rather than the language of the cited works. Editors and reviewers need to be aware of the ideologies underpinning their journal guidelines and individual practices regarding other languages and translation.

5.4 Translating scientific texts

Finding the ideal translator for scientific texts—typically articles, abstracts, or grant proposals—written in another language is not easy. Constrained by time and resources, authors often need to settle for less optimal solutions, but the main question is what criteria they use when selecting the translator. Academic translators need to know genre-specific norms governing text production in both languages as well as the discourse conventions of the discipline. However, the traditions of writing and knowledge construction are deeply rooted in the sociopolitical history of disciplinary scholarship in a given country or area and thus can be very different in different languages (Bennett, 2015; Smirnova et al., 2021). Academic translators also need proactivity when negotiating authorial identity to preserve the author's original values and intentions encoded in the source text. Machine translation may seem like a quick and inexpensive solution for authors, but it requires critical thinking (referred to as *machine translation literacy* by Bowker & Buitrago-Ciro, 2019) including consideration of confidentiality and privacy issues.

Interestingly, self-translation is a largely unexplored research topic in the academic context even though it is widely practiced. For example, my Finnish-speaking doctoral students often translate the abstract of their doctoral dissertation themselves. In our university, abstracts have to be provided in at least

two languages, Finnish and English, regardless of the language of the dissertation. Trusting their skills or being constrained by resources, some authors opt for self-translation when they need to provide (a) parallel language version(s) of their article or the abstract for a bi- or multilingual academic journal – still uncommon practice in most fields.

Self-translation, both from and into their native language, is an attractive solution for authors with extensive publication experience in both languages as they are generally aware of the academic and disciplinary writing conventions in both languages. Also, authors generally enjoy the freedom to make changes and often go back and revise even their original text (Pisanski Peterlin, 2019). This illustrates the profound effect of translation on thinking. Curry and Lillis (2013) refer to these parallel texts as 'equivalent' versions and emphasize the often significant differences between them. The few empirical studies that examined academic self-translation found that lexical – especially terminological – challenges are very frequent even when translating into one's native language. Without an equivalent term in their native language, authors need to introduce one, which can be very tricky. Also, as Puszta-Varga (2018) showed, authors tend to overestimate their translation ability, not being aware of the multi-faceted nature of translation and the skills it requires. This points to the popular misconception that foreign language proficiency is sufficient to produce a high-quality translation.

6 How to move forward? A call for reflexivity and a shared responsibility

Recently, scholars have called for more social justice and epistemic equity in academia (e.g., Ennser-Kananen, 2019; Hultgren, 2020; Kuteeva, 2020), which entails the acknowledgment and promotion of linguistic and cultural diversity. As illustrated above, language and translation are inextricably tied not only to identities but also to ideologies and power, especially when the English language is involved. However, the conflicts of interest arising from translation often remain unnoticed, unacknowledged, downplayed, or completely overlooked (see also Cunico & Munday, 2007). I argue that academia would gain from going beyond a narrow and instrumental view of translation, which sees it as a simple linguistic act of meaning transfer or just a tool to enable or facilitate communication across languages and cultures. Instead, translation should be regarded as a complex social, cultural, and political act with ethical consequences. Especially doctoral students and early-career multilingual scholars need to understand that seemingly technical issues have ideological dimensions, and the decisions can have far-reaching effects.

I strongly believe that raising awareness contributes to more diversity and equity in academia but equally important is agency. Critically reflecting on our translation choices and the ways we – often unwittingly – treat languages is not only an illuminating experience in itself but can inspire researchers to embrace their agency rather than uncritically meet expectations and follow templates, thereby sustaining dominant disciplinary norms. By taking a more agentic approach, novice writers can better respond to external pressures without dismissing their personal values, interests, and goals.

I am certainly not the only one advocating more reflexivity, but I want to emphasize a shared responsibility: in addition to researchers, all actors directly

or indirectly involved in scholarly research and publishing – and especially those in gatekeeping roles – need to examine the assumptions underpinning their personal views and practices and revisit them if necessary. This includes supervisors, advisors, teachers of research methodology and research communication, professional and non-professional translators and interpreters, language consultants, journal editors, reviewers, publishers and also those who shape and develop language policies and research evaluation regimes.

As Thesen (2013) has pointed out, risk permeates academic writing in the contact zone. Academic gatekeepers may see “otherness” as a risk, and the approach they take is crucial. Steyaert and Janssens (2013) provide some useful tips for editors, such as considering a bi- or multilingual journal format, publishing the English translation of non-English articles upon (editor) recommendation, or publishing reviews of books written in other languages. Additionally, they can revise their guidelines for authors and reviewers from a much broader perspective to ensure that they value non-English sources and do not unwittingly discourage their use.

As teachers, we need to provide opportunities for our students to examine and compare individual and disciplinary views and perspectives. This reflection may be guided by questions such as: “How important are other languages in your discipline and your research project?” “What language(s) are you going to use for data collection?” “If needed, how are you going to select the translator?” “Do you find it important to quote your research participants in the original language?” “Are you going to cite non-English sources?” “How would you react to a negative comment from your reviewer concerning the language of the sources you used?” “What do you think of the idea of self-translation?” or “Are you planning to publish in languages other than English?”

Given the multifaceted nature of the topic, an independent course or a series of writing circles or workshops around these issues can be very helpful for first-year doctoral students in any discipline. They could complement traditional courses focusing on specific genres and research communication in the global context of academia and offer spaces for emotional sharing and low-stake critical discussions on risk, contemplating “the tilting point between self and other, where the other refers to ideas, beliefs, places, relationships, audiences, and forms” (Thesen, 2013, p. 15). And naturally, further empirical research should explore different actors’ individual beliefs, practices, and experiences concerning the role of other languages and translation in research and publication, including self-translation.

Disclosure statement

The author declared no conflict of interest.

References

- Aarsand, P., & Sparrman, A. (2021). Visual transcriptions as socio-technical assemblages. *Visual Communication*, 20(2), 289–309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470357219852134>
- American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Ammon, U. (2012). Linguistic inequality and its effects on participation in scientific discourse and on global knowledge accumulation – With a closer look at the problems of the second-rank language communities. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 3(2), 333–355. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2012-0016>
- Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Adamjy, T., Ahmed, D. A., Akulov, E., Banerjee, A. K., Capinha, C., Dia, C. A. K. M., Dobigny, G., Duboscq-Carra, V. G., Golivets, M., Haubrock, P. J., Heringer, G., Kirichenko, N., Kourantidou, M., Liu, C., Nuñez, M. A., Renault, D., ... Courchamp, F.. (2021). Non-English languages enrich scientific knowledge: The example of economic costs of biological invasions. *Science of the Total Environment*, 775, 144441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144441>
- Bennett, K. (2013). The translator as cultural mediator in research publication. In V. Matarese (Ed.), *Supporting research writing: Roles and challenges in multilingual settings* (pp. 93–106). Chandos Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-1-84334-666-1.50006-0>
- Bennett, K. (2015). The transparency trope: Deconstructing English academic discourse. *Discourse and Interaction*, 8(2), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2015-2-5>
- Bowker, L., & Buitrago-Ciro, J. (2019). Machine translation and global research: Towards improved machine translation literacy in the scholarly community. Emerald Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/9781787567214>
- Broesch, T., Crittenden, A. N., Beheim, B. A., Blackwell, A. D., Bunce, J. A., Colleran, H., Hagel, K., Kline, M., McElreath, R., Nelson, R. G., Pisor, A. C., Prall, S., Pretelli, I., Purzycki, B., Quinn, E. A., Ross, C., Scelza, B., Starkweather, K., Stieglitz, J., & Mulder, M. B.. (2020). Navigating cross-cultural research: methodological and ethical considerations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 287(1935), 20201245. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1245>
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041>
- Chesterman, A. (2018). Moving conceptual boundaries: So what? In H. V. Dam, M. N. Brøgger & K. K. Zethsen (Eds.), *Moving boundaries in translation studies* (pp. 12–25). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315121871-2>
- Cunco, S., & Munday, J. (2007). Encounters and clashes: Introduction to translation and ideology. *The Translator*, 13(2), 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799235>
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2013). A scholar's guide to getting published in English. Critical choices and practical strategies. *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090617>
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. M. (2014). Strategies and tactics in academic knowledge production by multilingual scholars. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22, 32. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n32.2014>
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783099245>
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2019). Unpacking the lore on multilingual scholars publishing in English: A discussion paper. *Publications*, 7(2), 27. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7020027>
- Davies, M., & Barnett, R. (2015). Introduction. In M., Davies & R. Barnett (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education* (pp. 1–25). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137378057_1

- Ennser-Kananen, J. (2019). Are we who we cite? On epistemological injustices, citing practices, and #metoo in academia. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(2), 65–69. <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201905092524>
- Gibbs, A. (2015). Writing as method: Attunement, resonance, and rhythm. In B. Timm Knudsen & C. Stage (Eds.), *Affective methodologies: Developing cultural research strategies for the study of affect* (pp. 222–236). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137483195_11
- Göpferich, S. (2009). Towards a model of translation competence and its acquisition: The longitudinal study *TransComp*. In S. Göpferich, A. L. Jakobsen, & I. M. Mees (Eds.), *Behind the mind: Methods, models and results in translation process research* (pp. 11–37). Samfundslitteratur.
- Haberland, H., & Mortensen, J. (2016). Transcription as second-order entextualization: The challenge of heteroglossia. In A. Capone & J. L. Mey (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society* (pp. 581–600). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6_23
- Halverson, S. (2002). Cognitive models, prototype effects and ‘translation’. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 3(1), 21–43. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.3.2002.1.2>
- Hultgren, A. K. (2020). Introduction: Global English and social justice. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(3), 1–9. <http://doi.org/10.35360/njes.573>
- Hynninen, N., & Kuteeva, M. (2020). Researchers’ language practices concerning knowledge production and dissemination: Discourses of mono- and multilingualism. In M. Kuteeva, K. Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities* (pp. 323–350). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6_13
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On translation*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674731615.c18>
- Kuteeva, M. (2020). Whose English? Whose diversity? Towards a more holistic understanding of Global English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(3), 81–100. <http://doi.org/10.35360/njes.579>
- Kuteeva, M., & Mauranen, A. (Eds.). (2014). Writing for publication in multilingual contexts. [Special issue]. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13.
- Kuteeva, M., & McGrath, L. (2014). Taming Tyrannosaurus Rex: English use in the research and publication practices of humanities scholars in Sweden. *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 33(3–4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0017>
- Lee, J. W. (2022). Translanguaging research methodologies. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 100004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100004>
- Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Multilingualism research in Anglophone contexts as a discursive construction of multilingual practice. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11(1), 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2015.1086361>
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Routledge.
- Lillis, T., Hewings, A., Vladimirov, D., & Curry, M. J. (2010). The geolinguistics of English as an academic lingua franca: Citation practices across English-medium national and English-medium international journals. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 111–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00233.x>
- Liu, Y., & Buckingham, L. (2022). Language choice and academic publishing: A social-ecological perspective on languages other than English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2080834>
- Modern Language Association of America. (2021). *MLA handbook for writers of research papers* (9th ed.).

- Negretti, R., & McGrath, L. (2022). Setting the stage(s) for English for Research and Publication Purposes: Authors, audiences, and learning the craft. *Ibérica*, 43, 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.43.13.7>
- PACTE. (2003). Building a translation competence model. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating translation: Perspectives in process-oriented research* (pp. 43–66). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.45.06pac>
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 163–188. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm008>
- Pisanski Peterlin, A. (2019). Self-translation of academic discourse: The attitudes and experiences of authors–translators. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 27(6), 846–860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1538255>
- Pusztai-Varga, I. (2018). Többszörös határátlépés: tudományos szövegek önfordítása [Multiple border crossing: Self -translation of academic texts]. In E. Robin & V. Zachar (Eds.), *Fordítástudomány ma és holnap* (pp. 142–156). L'Harmattan.
- Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. (2018). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 1410–1444). SAGE Publications.
- Sakai, N. (2009). How do we count a language? Translation and discontinuity. *Translation Studies*, 2(1), 71–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700802496266>
- Sakai, N. (2014). Language as a countable and the regime of translation. In S. Sato & N. M. Doerr (Eds.), *Rethinking language and culture in Japanese education: Beyond the standard* (pp. 35–60). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783091850-004>
- Salö, L. (2015). The linguistic sense of placement: Habitus and the entextualization of translanguaging practices in Swedish academia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19(4), 511–534. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12147>
- Sarangi, S. (2009). Entextualizing the institutional [Editorial]. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 29(5), 481–483. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2009.025>
- Smirnova, N. V., Lillis, T., & Hultgren, A. K. (2021). English and/or Russian medium publications? A case study exploring academic research writing in contemporary Russian academia. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 53, 101015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101015>
- Steyaert, C., & Janssens, M. (2013). Multilingual scholarship and the paradox of translation and language in management and organization studies. *Organization*, 20(1), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508412460998>
- Temple, B. (2005). Nice and tidy: Translation and representation. *Sociological Research Online*, 10(2), 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.1058>
- Thesen, L. (2013). Risk as productive: Working with dilemmas in the writing of research. In L. Thesen & L. Cooper (Eds.), *Risk in academic writing: Postgraduate students, their teachers and the making of knowledge* (pp. 1–24). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783091065-004>
- Thompson, G., & Dooley, K. (2019). Ensuring translation fidelity in multilingual research. In J. McKinley & H. Rose (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 63–75). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367824471-6>
- Tymoczko, M. (2005). Trajectories of research in translation studies. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 50(4), 1082–1097. <https://doi.org/10.7202/012062ar>
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- Vigouroux, C. B. (2009). The making of a scription: A case study on authority and authorship. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 29(5), 615–637. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2009.032>
- Vihelmaa, E. (2015). Kuusi merkitystä. Mistä lajienvälisessä kääntämisessä on kyse? [Six meanings. What is interspecies translation about?] *Trace: Finnish Journal for Human–Animal Studies* 1, 24–61. <http://ojs.tsv.fi/index.php/trace/article/view/48383>

- Vogel, S. (2022). Attending to and transforming power dynamics in translanguaged research relationships and methodology. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(3), 100021. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100021>
- Young, A., & Temple, B. (2014). *Approaches to social research: The case of deaf studies*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199929535.001.0001>
- Wei, L. (2022). Translanguaging as method. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(3), 100026. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100026>

Received April 13, 2022
Revision received September 14, 2022
Accepted September 22, 2022