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# Segment 1:

# KL: Welcome to “Research in Action,” a weekly podcast about topics and issues related to research in higher education featuring experts across a range of disciplines. I’m your host, Dr. Katie Linder, research director at Oregon State University Ecampus, a national leader in online education. Along with every episode, we post show notes with links to resources mentioned in the episode, a full transcript, and an instructor guide for incorporating the episode into your courses. Visit our website at ecampus.oregonstate.edu/podcast to find all of these resources.

**KL:** On today’s episode, I’m joined by Mary Jane Curry, an associate professor in the Department of Teaching and Curriculum at the Warner Graduate School of Education at the University of Rochester. She has co-authored or co-edited six books, including Global Academic Publishing: Policies, Perspectives and Pedagogies (edited with Theresa Lillis, Multilingual Matters, 2018), A Scholar’s Guide to Getting Published in English: Critical Choices and Practical Strategies, (co-authored with Theresa Lillis, Multilingual Matters, 2013) and Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English (co-authored with Theresa Lillis, Routledge, 2010). She has published articles in journals including English for Specific Purposes and the Journal of English for Academic Purpose. She is co-associate editor of the Brief Research Reports section of TESOL Quarterly and co-editor of the Multilingual Matters book series, Studies in Knowledge Production and Participation. She was awarded a Fulbright fellowship to Chile in 2014 and was Principal Investigator of a U.S. Department of Education National Professional Development Grant, Project CELLS: Western New York Collaboration for English Language Learner Success from 2012-2017. She is currently working on a book, AWK: Academic Writing Keywords: A Guide for Graduate Students, with a group of graduate students.

Thanks so much for joining me on the show today, MJ.

**MJC:** Thank you for inviting me to be here.

**KL:** So I am really excited to learn a little bit more about your research on multilingual scholars to kick us off, can you just tell us a little bit more about this research?

**MJC:** This is a project of the major part of my work called professional academic writing that I started in 2001 with a colleague in the UK, Theresa Lillis. So we've been equal partners in this research since the very beginning. And, over time, we developed what we call a longitudinal text ethnographic project to look at scholars—multilingual scholars—writing for publication. And we ended up with about 50 scholars in four countries participating over, over this time not all of them have stayed with us or vice versa. So it's turned into an enormous project, and I can talk a little bit more about how it got that way but it's enabled us to trace scholars publishing over a long period of time.

**KL:** Okay, that sounds really fascinating. I’m wondering if you can tell us a little bit about the origin story of that. I love hearing how people get into the kind of research that they're focused on.

**MJC:** Sure. Well Teresa and I were both independently, in our own countries, doing research for our PhDs and in the United States, and she and the UK, we both been interested in how immigrant and multilingual students approached academic writing in higher education. And when I finished my PhD in 2000, I was really fortunate to be hired at the Open University where she works and we shared an office and we started throwing around some ideas to apply for seed funding project that the university was offering. And we had become aware of this emerging pressure on multilingual scholars to write for publication in English, so we designed a one-year study to start exploring it. And we, through various connections, involved scholars in Spain, Hungary and Slovakia. And then later we added Portugal. So we really started out with a one-year seed project, which were still working on 17 years later.

**KL:** I love how that happens. So, I'm curious, you know, given that this is such a long-term project for you. What is it that keeps you engaged in this work? You know, what are the kinds of things the strands that are kind of running through this that are fascinating to you?

MJC: Yeah, that's a great question. Well, the original framing question was partly because this was the year 2001, we framed it as “understanding the practices of knowledge production and exchange in the global academic market place in the 21st century.” So we actually, obviously we're not planning to study the whole century—we didn't realize we'd be studying quite so much of a century. We, I think for one, we both come out of a background in applied linguistics and education studies that highly we highly value ethnographic research, and so in contrast to a lot of research on writing—academic writing—that looks at students text, looks at mistakes, looks at how students don't know things, and how do they learn things. We really wanted to understand what are people actually doing what are their perspectives on it? And so that kind of open-ended research question I think is almost continually generative if you allow yourself to remain open to it. So we followed different strands of the research as they've become salient, for example, we developed an interest as we realized the importance of policies either at the institutional department level, institutional level, government level, and then more recently the kind of pressure—and a lot of countries with this global race to be the top 100 universities—the role of publishing in university rankings, the growing dominance of journal indexes, like the social science index and social sciences citation index. The strand of, sort of, what do scholars do let us or the open framing question of what do scholars do, and what do they think about it has really led us into looking at a lot of different aspects of the phenomenon. And I think because we weren't looking at it from a deficit perspective, we weren't asking what our scholars doing wrong or what do scholars need to learn? We were just really looking at what are they doing? And what do they think about what they're doing? And what do they think about the pressure? And the other thing we had no way of knowing was how much these pressures were going to be growing and expanding, so we, in some ways, we're just fortunate to catch this wave. Some research has started on this topic within the previous 10 years or so, but since we have been involved in it, the field has really mushroomed and people are really looking at it from a lot of different contexts.

So I think there are ebbs and flows probably to most research question and we've both done other projects, as well kind of in our, you know, related but different projects, but this one has really persisted. I think we've reached the point where most of the descriptive research in this field not—I shouldn’t say most of it has been done—but a lot of descriptive research has been done. So I'm not sure how many more studies we need to show that scholars in X Y or Z new country are also facing these pressures. But so the questions I think become more complex as a field involves and maybe more difficult to investigate.

**KL:** Okay, so I'm really curious from this research, what are you finding as being some of the key challenges that multilingual scholars are facing?

**MJC:** Yeah, so that question is the framing that question is fascinating because we're working on an article about sort of the lore and and the realities of publishing for multilingual scholars. I mean when we think about challenges we often think about what is hard for people to accomplish? In education, we always think, we often think about that in terms of what our people not do incorrectly? So, clearly when you write in a language that's not your native language, you're going to have certain challenges that are linguistic in nature. But what we found is that most of the scholars in our study are not having manuscripts rejected because they're using the wrong prepositions or the wrong verb tenses. They're really much more deeply-seated issues, and one distinction that needs to be made is that multilingual scholars, like all scholars, have a continuum of experience. So there's novice scholars, there's very experienced scholars. And one thing we've been really clear to distinguish is that many of our participants were highly accomplished scholars in their own fields in their own countries, and often in multiple languages. So what they need to learn is what are the practice social practices of publishing in English? What native-speaking let's say graduate students need to learn and also I can tell you that native English speakers are not necessarily better writers than students or scholars who use English as an additional language. So there's a lot of complex strands that get interwoven and in even trying to answer that question, but I can't answer it in terms of—and the other thing I should say is that we've been studying scholars who don't live in contexts where English is the dominant language. There are thousands of globally mobile scholars who are living in Anglophone countries. And so for many of them the so-called challenges, they might face are very different than for somebody living in Slovakia, for example.

So a major challenge is just having access to resources that many of us who work in countries, like the United States or the United Kingdom, take for granted. I mean I have access to one of the research libraries in the world. If they don't have something they get it for me—I don't pay a penny. In a lot of countries, the libraries can't get stuff, they can't afford journal subscriptions, they don't have books and what they have is very limited. So for anybody who wants to get published you have to have access to the journal that you want to publish in. And there's been research that shows that people who are outside of, you know, the kind of Anglophone center mainstream, they will know about this plague ship journals in their field, but they won't know about the whole raft of other journals that are available or they won't know about the more specialized journals that would actually be more interested in their work than the flagship Journal might be. And this has been well-documented by other people in our field. So resources, library resources funding for conference travel, which you know, a lot of university administrators think conference travel is just kind of like academics on vacation, but really conferences are where we make connections with other scholars, it's where we see the most recent research, it's where a lot of things get done a lot of work gets done, and increasingly academic publishing is being done by international collaborations that the percentage of journal articles that are published only by people in one country is going down. So going to conferences is a really crucial way to be part of academic research and to forge academic networks.

And then there is also manuscript preparation. Teresa has written and published in Spanish and giving presentations in Spanish. Well, I speak Spanish pretty well, but I've never forced myself to do that level. It is challenging to write in another language, so who can help with helping people understand the generic genre conventions of particular journal articles, the phrasings, checking grammar that kind of thing. that does help but at that is not what gets you published or not. So the idea, for example, that we might have machine translation of ultimately help people get published to me highly, highly unlikely.

So a real challenge that is located outside of the writers and outside of their contexts, has to do with the ideologies in the attitudes of the gatekeepers who are reviewing their papers. So when manuscripts come in, the editors, the reviewers—and one thing we've seen and we published about is because one big chunk of our data participants gave us their reviews from journals and the editors correspondent. So we have a pretty robust database of stuff that most people don't see. And what we've analyzed is that there are, in the responses from the gatekeepers, clear indications not just that they want sort of standard English to be used, but sometimes also that they feel that research coming from other parts of the world is of less inherent value or is some locality of the scholars when they publish a study that was conducted in Spain or a study that was conducted in Budapest will evoke comments like, you know, “why is it important to know what happens in Budapest?” Well, you know, if I do a study in Rochester, nobody questions why I would do a study in a city of 350,000 people, but a major capital, you know. So there are some real people are very comfortable in many cases expressing these really strong biases that have no foundation. So how scholars can cope with that is very troubling to figure out because it's not really it's not it's nothing they can change is something we have to change.

**KL:** So this is something I'm really curious about, MJ, because I'm currently on an editorial team for an international journal and we constantly are looking for authors from all over the world to be contributing. And we run into some of these issues that you're describing where we do publish the journal in English, and it can be a little bit challenging to have multilingual scholars come and who English is not their first language, and I'm curious, what are your thoughts on kind of whose job is it to kind of help to nurture those scholars into a place where the content is considered to be publishable? And I'm thinking primarily from that kind of grammatical standpoint. The content is obviously valuable, but it may not be at the kind of academic standard that were considering for English to be appropriate for journal publication. What are your thoughts on that? I mean, is it something that journals should be taking on in terms of mentoring scholars or providing additional support in this way.

**MJC:** Well, I think they should and certain journals in our field of applied linguistics have tried to set up mentoring programs. I think the challenge there is that unless you have compensation for people to work as mentors, and maybe even if you do, you know—so many of us are already doing so much mentoring whether it's of our own students or as journal reviewers and editors. There are increasingly the publishers websites are pushing scholars to use their editorial services and to actually have—I did a smaller study in Chile when I had a Fulbright there four years ago and scholars were telling me that there's a checkbox when you submit a paper that says “I have” or “I have not used Elsevier,” whoever whichever publisher. It has used their editing services and these scholars felt like they're in implicitly being pressured to pay for these services to use them so that their manuscripts are evaluated in a more positive light. Our research shows that that doesn't necessarily the in the editors—they are sometimes called “authors editors” who work on those texts—if they don't come out of the disciplinary area of the scholar, they are really limited in the depth of the improvements that they can suggest. What we've seen is we have a term in our analysis called “literacy broker,” which are scholars who work with the writers, whether as collaborators, or as just basically supporters, who helped them to go very deeply into understanding what the journals looking for, and you know helped craft manuscripts in the direction, so it's much deeper than looking at superficial language issues.

You know these things involve. You've probably seen how do you frame an article? What kinds of evidence are considered to be appropriate? How do you cite the research literature? How do you situate your paper in conversation with the journal journals ongoing conversations? I think there are things that journals could do. I mean some journals are working to make them, some publishers are providing discounted subscriptions for scholars or libraries in certain areas of the world. So that's one thing that journal editors and boards could try to make sure that their journal itself is actually available. More and more journals, I think, are having at least some of their content be open access. I think that's really important because one of the biggest problems is that people don't have access to the journals that they're submitting to. One possibility would be to have yet to use editorial boards to kind of team up with authors that are have content that you really want to publish but need some help with the manuscript. Unfortunately our current publishing model where already journal reviewers are not compensated, journal editors are minimally compensated or their institutions may or may not give them release time. I was just having conversation with a colleague about this. You know, so much of this we are already doing kind of on our service part of our jobs, but I think if you know, when you think about the huge cost of journals and the exorbitant profits that most journal publishers are making it seems hard for me to believe that they couldn't funnel some of that money back into the journals to subsidize some of this work.

**MJC:** Well, I know MJ that we are just scratching the surface of this. So we're going to take a brief break when we come back. We're going to learn a little bit more about MJ's longitudinal research back in a moment.
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**KL:** MJ, one of the things that really kind of fascinated me about your work is that you have these longitudinal projects and this is something that obviously takes quite a bit of a commitment. So, can you start by telling us a little bit about kind of the topic or the content of these projects that you're working on that are a little bit more longitudinal?

**MJC:** Sure. Well both of my longitudinal projects, or three if you include the one in Chile, are focusing on publishing and. Publishing is a longitudinal activity, so one thing that graduate students are often amazed at is how long it takes to get something published. So, you know, unless you're incredibly lucky, it can take two or three years for a paper from from the beginning to the end. And it can often take much longer. And so one of the things that we've seen in our study in Europe is just how much scholars—and we know this ourselves—will pick up and put down pieces of work and how much interweaving there is across pieces and sometimes repurposing pieces. And so it's really important to design the study. Well, I shouldn't be so quite—we didn't exactly design the study that way, but we quickly learned that longitudinal lenses were important for understanding the phenomenon. I think is a safe thing to say.

**KL:** So I am curious about the design what are some of the kind of pieces of data that you're collecting here. What was the the design choices that you had to make along the way?

**MJC:** Sure, what we as I mentioned before we're both really committed to ethnographic work. This is not sort of pure ethnography in the anthropological sense where we were embedded in the [*indiscernible*]fascinating, but we went into the initial three research sites of Spain, Hungary and Slovakia through connections that we had in Psychology and education departments and basically invited people to meet with us and then invited people as a group and then invited people to participate as in individuals. And over time, we reached about 50 participants. So with each participant, every time we would visit this site, we would do into an interview asking them—the

first one was a kind of literacy history interview asking them about their writing experiences, learning English, the kind of writing that they do, what their research is about. And then over time as we went back we focused our interviews on specific text that they were producing and we tried to map out how these texts were evolving, and their processes of submitting these texts to publisher to journal published journals to get published. And, as I mentioned the getting there, editor's letters, their reviews, correspondence. They had with collaborators multiple drafts of their papers—in some cases we have something like 15 drafts of a paper. Ancillary data like calls for papers, all kind of slides of presentations that might have been the original nub of an article. And then we branched out and we did some interviews of librarians and different institutions. We started to collect policy documents. We started to collect information about the educational system in each country and its history, the role of English, those kinds of things. So really trying to contextualize the production of individual articles in in kind of expanding circles of understanding of the local context; the department, the institution, the country in the region, etc.

**KL:** So for people who are listening to those who may not be kind of more qualitative researchers, this probably sounds a little bit overwhelming. I'm wondering if you can talk about how do you go about kind of organizing these different data pieces? And also how do you start the process of you know, actually analyzing them?

**MJC:** Mhmm. Well I would say even for qualitative researchers this probably sounds overwhelming. I don't think anybody in their right mind would design a project this big with two researchers in two countries with very little funding, but that's what we got. That when we started the project because we did have some funding, we had a research assistant and we were in the same institution. So we created a database where we could just put, you know, all of the documents that we were gathering if we had them—at the beginning they weren't all electronic, so we would scan them—but eventually everything became electronic. So one of the tasks was developing a labeling system so that each version of a paper, well to say where did each paper come from? So the author, co-authors, this the institution or the city, and the country, and then some keywords for—just so we'd have a label for each document—and try to make labels that would help us distinguish between different drafts of a document which was not always easy. We set up different folders for the text that scholars were writing, for the correspondence about the text, for policies all the things that I just mentioned. We just set up different folders on a database at one point a couple different times we've done some analyses using databases like Access. People these days are more likely to use NVivo, or whatever it's evolved into now, you know, qualitative software programs. We never did that and we eventually reach the point where to go back and put all of our data into NVivo would have been a lifetime's work. To start analyzing the data, we really started with kind of grounded theory, printing out transcripts, reading transcripts of interviews multiple. So for the interview data, reading the transcripts of the interviews multiple times, starting to develop codes and categories and themes, starting to notice patterns across the interviews. I mean one thing participants would sometimes ask us when we would go back to the sides was how their writing compared with people's writing and other sites, and we just had to say “this isn't what we're doing, we're not doing a study comparing mistakes,” for example, that Hungarian speakers are making compared with Spanish speakers.

I would say we did a lot of intuitive data analysis not very, it was rigorous but not very codified in the sense of having, you know, when I have used NVivo or worked with students using NVivo where, you know, you can you can quickly apply codes across multiple data sets. I would say we were working in a much lower tech version of that. And the other thing is, you know, we got to know our participants as people. So of the 50 participants that we had at the maximum point, we probably have stayed in touch with 30 of them or 30 of them who really kind of actively producing publications, and also interested in staying in touch with us. So we even a couple of years ago interviewed a set of women academics for paper we were working on gender and academic publishing, and now of course we have Zoom or Skype. But we had we had many years where that was between email and electronic technology like Zoom or Skype or what they said we could stay and many of them have been willing to continue to give us their time. So we have with some some participants something like 14 or 15 interviews.

**KL:** That is an incredible data set. So I'm really curious about you know, as you’ve kind of learned to work with these projects over time that are more longitudinal. What are some of the considerations to keep in mind to have these projects be effective, you know, people are kind of listening to this and they're thinking about doing a project like this, what's what are some of the pieces of advice that you might give them about how to do this well?

**MJC:** Well, some of it I think is advice that I give to my doctoral students about doing, which they only only only work qualitatively so I mostly only have students who were qualitatively, but that you really need to get engaged with your data right away. So as soon as you do—if your student and you probably don't have funding to get someone else to transcribe your interviews—sit down and transcribe it right away, start really the analytic process right away. It can be tempting when you're busy, which we all are, to say, “Oh, I'll collect, I'll do all my interviews and then I'll start to analyze that” or “I'll do all my classroom observations and then I'll start to analyze it.” But because your brain is already working as soon as you're in the site, you really want to capture what's going on to the extent possible. And I think you know, there's a tension a kind of going back and forth between trusting your intuitions about things that come up and really grounding those in a rigorous data analysis.

I think the other thing is this kind of project management that we had to learn over time. You know, I tell my students create tables that where you're documenting how many how many observations you made how many interviews you have labeling backing up, you know we all lose data, and I mean you were saying you haven't had problems so far, but I have, you know, what on the old tapes before digital audio tapes, audio recorders one whole blank side of an interview with a participant and, you know, you can't get that back. So, if you're doing digital now—we're all doing digital audio recording—I always now have my phone going with a digital audio recorder. You know, you want you want duplicity duplication—not duplicity— duplication in your data collection, but also in your storage. You want to make sure that right away you transfer things to whatever secure Storage Space you're using. I mean, these are just kind of like text book recommendations and things that you might tell your Institutional Review Board you're going to do, but if you don't do them, you create so many problems for yourself.

I think the other thing is, you know, when you're working in a team or with a partner you have an opportunity for a kind of natural analytic memoing in process, but I think it's also important to be keeping a researchers journal and writing down your thoughts as they're emerging. You know, if you're taking a shower or walking your dog, or rereading data. And I think another another thing that students often don't realize is, your findings always have to be connected back to the research literature. Your findings don't exist in a vacuum. So as you start to see a particular theme emerging, that's a moment to go back and say, “Oh who has anybody, who if anybody has written on this topic before?” because you can invest a lot of time thinking you've come up with something fantastic that might just be confirming what somebody else has already found, but if you find what they've written about early enough it can help inform how you are framing the findings that you're developing.

**KL:** So, MJ, you've mentioned your research partner. I wondering if you can talk about that process of finding someone to work with especially over a longer period of time. How are you developing that relationship? And not just kind of sharing the load of the work, but it's a it's a long time to engage in that kind of partnership with someone else around this kind of project.

**MJC:** It is the longest relationship I've ever had with anyone aside from my family [*laughs*]. It's very much a real relationship. I think it's important when you're looking to collaborate to not just fall into it. I mean, we fell into it through our research interest in through being collaborators, but or being colleagues, but from the beginning we made a clear agreement that we would always co-author our publications from this project and there were moments when one or the other of us might have felt that that was slightly unfair or slightly inconvenient. We have we come from different cultures, we have different personalities, we have had plenty of tensions, but I think in the ends you have to you know, you have to be equally committed to a project. I'm embarking on co-authoring a book on academic writing with five PhD students, and I've made it really clear with them from the outset that if they don't contribute equally, the order of authorship is not going to be—right now they’re alphabetical—but that can change because I think people have to be really committed to a project on the same to the same extent that their collaborators are or they or they won't get the credit. I mean inevitably somebody has a something that might get in the way but if consistently your collaborator is not pulling their weight then there are going to be problems. There's some research some advice out there about you know, there's some checklist of things to things to think about when you're entering a collaboration. I think like any relationship it's just highly unpredictable. We've been working together for a long time. We had lots of tensions. I mean we had lots of times when things weren't going well, but I think if you're committed to the work and in our case we are gathered so much data, we couldn't really imagine abandoning ship, that you just kind of find ways to work through it.

**KL:** So MJ, I'm curious over this period of time you've mentioned a couple of times ethnography and really being drawn to it, what are you learning about some of the methods that you're using, you know as your kind of diving deeper into them through these longitudinal studies?

**MJC**: Well I think one thing that's really interesting in doing long-term work on in one major area is that it becomes more and more difficult to enter a research site without preconceptions.

**KL:** Hmm

**MJC:** And I found this. I did I did a publishing workshop once with for a colleague's university in Mexico and got permission to do some interviews with scholars down there, and had them transcribed, and was looking at the interviews and I don't know if it was just my lack of imagination or burnout or whatever, but I just couldn't find anything new in those interviews. I just couldn't see anything, and it may have been that not knowing the context well enough, I didn't frame the interviews to get interesting answers. I just couldn't get anything out of it. But then when I went to Chile for my Fulbright a few years ago, I understood that because I was there and I was there for a few months, I had a better chance to really look at the context that the political context the pressures of the government on scholars. Basically what's happening there at the moment. So I think that's one thing.

And then another thing is which is always true with qualitative research, what you find is often not what you're looking for and that can make a lot of people very uncomfortable. And I learned that really the hard way because my own dissertation question was so poorly worded and had such embedded assumptions that I never found what I was looking for. And so I've realized from an early point in my career that you almost—apart from the example I just gave you with my Mexico interviews—you almost always can learn something from your data, but it may not be what you were looking for. So I have a study of engineers writing for publication. I started out with a multilingual scholar lens, but most of the findings that have turned out to be interesting are really not related to people using English as an additional language. So that sends you down new bodies of literature to learn, which is very time-consuming. You know, my publications from these different projects have come out and very erratic ways, and I'm pretty far behind on the publication's from Chile and even the engineering published publications, but I think different findings, and the crafting of different findings, kind of have their moment in academics career, depending on what you're doing what else you're doing and how many projects you get yourself involved in.

**KL:** Well, MJ. This has been so interesting to hear about your work with multilingual Scholars and your work with longitudinal methodologies. Thank you so much for taking the time to come on the show today and share a little bit more about your work.

**MJC:** Well, thank you very much. It's been a pleasure.

**KL:** Thanks also to our listeners for joining us for this episode of “Research in Action.” I'm Katie Linder and we'll be back next week with another episode.
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# Bonus Clip:

**KL:** In this bonus clip for episode 152 of the “Research in Action” podcast, Dr. Mary Jane Curry discusses how her research fits into the bigger picture of her larger career. Take a listen.

MJ, I’m curious if you can talk a little bit about now that you look back over your kind of larger career trajectory, what is this research? Where does it fit? What is it meant to you in terms of kind of the bigger picture of your larger research career?

**MJC:** Well, I think one thing it's taught me is that following what's interesting and intriguing, even if it might seem a little bit off the wall, can be really productive and generative and that can be a way to forge an academic identity that is a little bit more distinct. The flip side of that may be that it's harder to feel like you belong in particular departments or research strands.

We've often been figuring trying to figure out if our research is part of applied linguistics, or English for academic purposes, or second language writing, or research policy. There's all kinds of different potential homes for the research, but it our research really I think in many ways just sort of is out there.

Although there is a group of growing group of people working on it. But I work in a school of education. I work in a department that mostly focuses on K-12 education. And so I arrived at this topic from getting into second language writing coming out of the field of teaching English is a second language. My colleagues and my department of my school have been very supportive of my work, but I've sometimes felt that I'm kind of outside what many of them are focusing on.

And, again, for funding purposes this is not been a topic that's been highly fundable. We had some funding in the UK. I have had no success getting funding for this work in the US and so a lot of its just happened on the back of conference funding from my school, or as I said before the electronic means of communication. So, you know, I don't wouldn't encourage people to be so cynical that they only choose research topics that are hot topics in the funding world, but depending on what you want to do with your career, funding can be an important consideration.

**KL:** So when you think about this and kind of some of these challenges that you faced what is made doing this research worth it for you?

**MJC:** The impact that this research has had on scholars around the world has sometimes actually taking my breath away. I mean I have been invited to do keynotes and conference at conferences in Columbia and Brazil and all kinds of countries. I've been able to travel to a lot of places, and so many multilingual Scholars will come to me and say “thank you for the work that you and Teresa are doing to bring our issues to the public gaze and too problematize and critique this pressure to publish in English.” There's so many mythologies about how English is the global language, even in Academia that English is a global language, that people can translate their work. There's all kinds of myths out there, in the real world and in the academic world, and the scholars who are living this day-to-day they know that they're take they have twice as much work on their plates as we have. If they want to publish their work in their local context and in English many of them are not giving up publishing in their local language because they're committed to developing their local culture of research and practice.

So I think the gratitude from scholars in different countries, and even from students who have read the work as part of their own work, I was really not—never in a million years would've expected that.

**KL:** Well, thank you for sharing a little bit more about your impact of your work on you and on others.

**MJC:** Thank you very much.

**KL:** You've just heard a bonus clip from episode 152 of the “Research in Action” podcast with Dr. Mary Jane Curry discussing how her research fits into the bigger picture of her larger career. Thanks for listening.