Postprint

Academics in the semi-periphery: translation and linguistic strategies on the rocky road to publishing in English

Mattea Cussel
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain

Judith Raigal-Aran
Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain

Oriol Barranco
Centre d'Estudis Sociològics sobre la Vida Quotidiana i el Treball (QUIT) – Institut d'Estudis del Treball (IET), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain

Abstract
Publishing in English is now essential for securing tenure and promotion in the social sciences and humanities in Spain, as academic performance is largely evaluated by number of publications in journals indexed in Journal Citation Reports (JCR) or Scimago Journal Rank (SJR). This relatively new situation has forced academics with varying levels of English to dedicate significant time, effort and money to obtaining publishable texts. This article investigates academic translation in terms of widespread and invisible translation and editing practices into English, providing a different perspective from previous studies of the transnational circulation of knowledge. Based on semi-structured interviews with scholars from sociology and translation studies, it reflects on their strategies, choices and preferences for how their texts should be translated or edited, as well as the relationships and routines they develop with their trusted language professionals. All the interviewees expressed a preference for assimilatory strategies or, in other words, the assimilation of their texts into standard or 'native' academic English, which should be seen as a means to covet the prestige unfairly reserved for Anglophone scholars. One of the key contributions of this article is to move beyond the popular notion of epistemicide, exploring through empirical detail the linguistic, methodological and structural issues that these semi-peripheral academics highlight in relation to publishing in the lingua franca for global academia.

Introduction

In Spain, it was desirable to publish in English in the social sciences and humanities 15 years ago, whereas today it is essential for securing tenure and promotion and obtaining research funding. This has put academics at Spanish universities in a position where they must dedicate significant time, effort and money to having texts translated into English or edited or writing directly in a second language. However, despite the increasing dominance of English in scientific communication, surprisingly little is known about the actual challenges that academics at Spanish universities face and the strategies they adopt to publish in English. The first section of this article will consider how academic translation and central/peripheral hierarchies in the global production and circulation of knowledge have been addressed. A shift in perspective will be proposed: from transnational studies of scholars and their works in new contexts to the widespread and invisible translation of journal articles into English. It will also be established that there is a need to pay more attention to the role of translation and linguistic strategies in decolonizing knowledge if the latter is to be done in such a way that pays heed to the multiplicity of languages, standpoints and voices. However, in this respect, it will be argued that the popular notion of *epistemicide* is unsuitable for characterising the translation of academic texts in the semi-periphery (see Bennett, 2007).

The subsequent sections will present the results from semi-structured interviews conducted with scholars from sociology and translation studies departments in Spain. The goal is to investigate the various strategies they adopt to publish texts in English and the terms on which they participate in the highly unequal space of global academia. The analysis will consider the choices they make and the tasks they perform to produce publishable texts, bringing to light the extra work they do behind the scenes. Similarly, the relationships they develop with translators or editors will be explored to draw attention to the way in which they depend on trusted professionals whose intervention is mostly invisible. Their motivations for publishing in English and their views of the academic lingua franca and international journals will also be analyzed. The general preference they express for assimilatory strategies (Bielsa, 2022) when it comes to how their texts should be translated, edited or written in English will be examined in relation to their position in the semi-periphery of the academic field. Finally, the nature of the challenges they encounter as a result of having to produce research texts in English will be explored under the categories of linguistic, methodological and structural. Focusing on the nature of these issues will provide a more nuanced picture beyond radical claims of epistemicide.

Reframing academic translation practices and flows in global academia

Reflection on the scope and effects of translating research into English as an everyday practice among peripheral and semi-peripheral academics is still in its infancy. It is a delicate topic as from the center not being able to write directly in English and requiring the services of a translator may appear as a sign of inferiority; the practice of writing in English, perhaps with the assistance of a proofreader in the case of scholars whose first language is not English, may appear as the norm. However, if we consider peripheral or semi-peripheral experiences where levels of English may be lower or the need to be proficient in English is fairly new, the issue of translation must be tackled.

In a seminal piece on the circulation of knowledge, Pierre Bourdieu argues that academic texts circulate without their contexts as a host of agents import them into new national fields where they are used as fuel for ongoing intellectual debates (Bourdieu, [1990] 2002). This transnational framing of academic translation can be observed in

recent research in translation studies which examines how scholars and their works travel to new national contexts with the help of agents who, under certain sociocultural and political conditions, transform their significance and uses. Examples include Franz Fanon in Ireland (Batchelor & Harding, 2017) or Hannah Arendt in Italy (Schögler, 2019). However, absent in Bourdieu – who was writing at a time when national fields still dominated academia – and in these subsequent studies is what is now a key issue for the circulation of knowledge: widespread translation practices into English and for international audiences of research texts by academics whose first language is not English. In the era of publish in English or perish, it remains true that it is difficult for a text to carry all its context on its back, but it has also become true that many texts are now circulating without an additional context: their context *of translation*. Bourdieu had book translation in mind. Yet, if we consider translated journal articles, these texts often appear in international journals as if they were not translations at all; they pass as originals (Károly, 2022).

These widespread and invisible academic translation practices seem to have fallen off the radar. In a recent monograph, Annemarie Law and John Mol shed light on the value of non-English linguistic repertoires that multilingual scholars could potentially mobilize as research tools (Law & Mol, 2020). However, when dealing with the imperative to read and write in English in today's academic world, they suggest that translations are 'few and far between – waiting to be translated is likely to take forever' (2020: 267). Translations are more ubiquitous and certainly faster than Law and Mol seem to realize. As opposed to the time factor, Raewyn Connell refers to the cost factor as a barrier to the work of researchers who write in languages other than English reaching international audiences (Connell, 2007: 219). This is no doubt true, but the price of having academic texts translated into English or proofread does not always prohibit their circulation, it merely creates a cost that some academics and not others must bear. With respect to both these obstacles, the time and the cost of translation, blanket statements cannot be made as there are clearly differences among the experiences of academics in a single regional area such as Europe (Lillis & Curry, 2010). While Spain, the national context considered in this article, is in Europe, and Spanish is a major global language, Spanish academia does not occupy a central or Northern position in the global context. This conditions the struggles that arise in response to the onslaught of global, marketized academia. For example, in Sweden struggles relate to whether English or Swedish are spoken in highly internationalized university spaces (Salö, 2020) or the adoption of different investment strategies regarding the choice to publish in English or Swedish (Salö, 2017), whereas the issue of language proficiency in English is minor.

Johan Heilbron's approach to the sociology of translation (1999) has given rise to the widely accepted view that translations into English are minimal, while translations from English into other languages dominate global flows. Although his model of the unevenness of exchange in book translation flows can be productively rejigged in relation to academic translation in order to explore the widespread and invisible translation *into* English that this article spotlights. In Heilbron's model, he reveals how the role of translation varies in relation to the position of language groups within the world system. Central countries export books for translation, while in peripheral or semi-peripheral countries, translated books make up a larger share of national book production. However, if we apply this cultural world-system to academic texts (both books and journal articles) in a semi-peripheral country like Spain, it can be argued that improved reading skills in English reduces the demand for translation *from* English or, in other words, inward translation flows. At the same time, the need to publish in English increases the demand for translation of (mostly) journal articles *into* English or, in other words, outward

translation flows. While this reverses the relationship between centrality and the direction of translation flows – *into* as opposed to *out of* English – it has a similar effect on Spanish academic publishing as the one that Heilbron highlights regarding Dutch literary publishing due to imports of books translated from English: production in the local languages is reduced.

At first sight, it is positive that flows should swell in the other direction as research by semi-peripheral scholars crosses borders to international audiences. However, this cannot be celebrated without considering the relationship between peripheral or semi-peripheral status and the roles these academics are allowed to play, which is now a major topic in ongoing debates in the social sciences regarding the need to dismantle hierarchies in the global production of knowledge. Connell has famously stated that theory is conceived in the metropole, whereas data to test or examples that are made to fit theory is the province of peripheral researchers (Connell, 2007). The exotic periphery is expected to write local social experiences through the texts of the center that lay false claims to universality, producing what Walter Mignolo calls cultural case studies (Mignolo, 2009). According to Sujata Patel, the intellectual culture of Northern social sciences is the model that the rest of the world is obliged to follow, though in unequal conditions as the former has significantly greater control over resources and infrastructure through which it ensures its power and reproduction (Patel, 2014). As part of a movement to decolonize sociology, Julian Go insists that it is vital to address both social inequality – demographic diversity among academics – and epistemic inequality – which standpoints are superior and become key to disciplinary construction and which are inferior and marginalized (Go, 2017). In Gurminder K. Bhambra's connected sociologies, she promotes more plural selections and interpretations of knowledge and engagement with different voices to reassess what is known and ultimately arrive at new thinking: 'no understanding remains unchanged by connection' (Bhambra, 2014: 5).

These scholars, among many others, illustrate a gamut of issues that emerge at the intersection of knowledge production and circulation and structural inequalities on a global scale. Nevertheless, one issue that is still thirsty for attention is language multiplicity and the practicalities of how different standpoints and voices can actually be engaged with. If everyone does not write directly in the academic lingua franca, yet everyone must publish in English, then translation, whether of thoughts or concepts or entire texts or studies, must form part of decolonizing or connecting knowledges globally. However, translation tends to receive no more than a cursory glance in Southern theory and decolonizing approaches, giving the impression that the differences which translation mediates and the transformations it enacts are trivial. This is striking considering that language is one of the key materials of social scientists; it is through words and phrases that meaningful and precise accounts of the social world are sought (De Swaan, 2004). For this reason, this article will examine the translation and linguistic strategies that semi-peripheral academics pursue on the rocky road to publishing in English.

The encounter between different academic discourses and the effects of translation have been addressed in Karen Bennett's research on the effects of the transition in Southern European universities from a patronage or institutional service system to one based on publishing metrics and meritocracy (Bennett, 2007, 2013, 2015). In an empirical study of scholars in the humanities in Portugal, a precursor to the study in this article, Bennett argues that knowledge in Portugal and Spain is configured differently from that in English and embedded with an alternative world view (Bennett, 2007). According to her, since Portuguese and Spanish academic discourses are perceived as incomprehensible by Anglophone readers or unsuitable for international journals, this leads to the daily 'destruction and reconstruction of the entire infrastructure' of

Portuguese and Spanish research texts through translation into English or 'epistemicide' (2007: 155).

The term epistemicide was initially coined by Boaventura de Sousa Santos who argues that the systematic displacement of epistemologies of the South functions through 'abyssal thinking' or the way in which modern western science monopolizes the distinction between true and false, invisibilizing other cognitive experiences and excluding coexistence with them (de Sousa Santos, 2010: 30-31). Epistemicide is, according to Santos, part of the European colonial project and its construction of imperialist knowledge, the effects of which persist today through the ways in which epistemologies and subjects are hierarchized. Nonetheless, in Bennett, epistemicide becomes a concept to refer to the dominance of the rationalist, fact-based positivist paradigm in academic English, while the Portuguese and Spanish knowledge that has been 'destroyed' and 'reconstructed' receives relatively little attention. What is more, epistemicide has lost some of its contents: the catastrophe that is colonization (see Connell, 2007: 46) is absent in the application of epistemicide to Southern European academic discourses (and how could it be present given Portugal and Spain's role in the European colonial project?). Thus, the key function of the initial coining of epistemicide and many of its subsequent uses[1] has disappeared: to critique colonization and decolonize.

We suspect that comparing the linguistic destruction of academic discourses through translation with the widespread dispossession of ways of doing, thinking, life, and land is not a strong analogy, making the popular notion of epistemicide unsuitable for characterizing the translation of academic texts in the semi-periphery. Bennett herself has expressed reservations regarding her initial exclamatory use of epistemicide (Bennett, 2022) and Joshua Price has noted that the term must be used with caution (Price, 2021). Furthermore, Santos's coining now too has a complicated legacy. Nirmal Puwar highlights the irony that Santos has become the global ambassador of epistemologies of the South, or Connell the global translator of Southern theory, putting two privileged white scholars in the limelight as they argue for more visibility for non-privileged, non-white scholars (Puwar, 2020). This suggests that there is a continuing need to actually pass the microphone to scholars who are not at center, which is what the following sections will do.

Context of study, methodology and description of participants

In Spain, university and government bodies have increasingly implemented quantitative metrics to assess academic performance and impact through accreditation systems that provide access to tenure-track positions or six-yearly evaluations. This means that research productivity is primarily evaluated by number of publications in journals indexed in JCR or SJR,[2] as has been the growing trend elsewhere (Putnam, 2009). Fifteen years ago, academics in Spanish social sciences and humanities were under less pressure to publish in international journals (Moreno, 2010), while the imperative to do so is now felt across the board. As a result, researchers who did not use to publish extensively and certainly not in English are now under great pressure to do both. At Spanish universities, the language of communication among scholars is generally Spanish or one of the co-official languages, such as Catalan in the case of the co-authors of this article, and sometimes English in more internationalized spaces. This means that most teaching and talking is occurring in a language that is different from published research outputs.

In this empirical research, a qualitative case study research strategy is adopted (Yin, 2012, 2014). The two cases are the social sciences and the humanities, with

sociology representing the social sciences and translation studies representing the humanities. There are two justifications for having selected these disciplines. The first is that both are valid options for representing the social sciences and the humanities (respectively), just as other disciplines in these areas would have been equally valid. However, the second justification, which made these two disciplines preferable over others, was our ease of access to sociologists and translation scholars. This is because the co-authors of this article are from sociology or translation studies departments. Being in contact with research groups from these two disciplines also meant that the academics we invited to participate were colleagues or peers. This generated trust, which facilitated the acceptance on the part of the latter to become our research subjects.

The data was collected through 17 qualitative semi-structured interviews with academics from the above-mentioned disciplines. The interviews were mostly conducted online, with the exception of a few that were in-person. The duration was approximately one hour, and they were carried out in 2022. The language of the interviews was Catalan. The sample of academics that we interviewed was created on the basis of two criteria. First, they needed to be academics from one of the two chosen disciplines who had commissioned translations of their academic texts into English. Second, the sample was balanced, with 9 academics from translation studies and 8 from sociology and a varied gender representation with 11 women and 6 men. In addition, academics from three different age ranges were included: 35-50, 50-65 and >65 (see Table 1). The goal was to have broad representation of academics who, purportedly, had experienced differing pressures to publish in English and/or at different times throughout their career. It was presumed that the older generation would have come under less pressure and, as a result, published less in English. Regarding the intermediate generation, it was supposed that they had experienced an increase in the pressure to publish in English. Finally, the younger generation must have experienced or are currently experiencing the need to publish in English as a prerequisite for securing tenure.

The interviews were analyzed using qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014), including an analysis of the content of what the interviewees say, explain and show, without entering into a deeper analysis of their forms of argumentation, categories, conceptual structures, or syntaxis as in several types of discourse analysis (see, for example, Van Dijk, 1997; and a recent revision in Hjelm, 2021). We followed a fundamentally inductive logic, gradually developing the analytical categories and codes throughout the process.

Pseudonym	Discipline	Age	Level of English
Guillem	Sociology	50-65	High
Íngrid	Sociology	35-50	High
Joan	Sociology	>65	Low
Josep Lluís	Sociology	50-65	Low
Lluïsa	Sociology	35-50	Medium
Marc	Sociology	>35	High

Pere	Sociology	35-50	High
Sergi	Sociology	50-65	High
Anna	Translation	50-65	High
Blanca	Translation	35-50	High
Carmen	Translation	35-50	High
Clara	Translation	35-50	High
Eulàlia	Translation	50-65	Medium
Josep	Translation	>65	Medium
Mariona	Translation	35-50	Medium
Montse	Translation	35-50	High
Sílvia	Translation	35-50	High

Table 1. Overview of participants

The level of English took the respondents' self-assessments into account, but it was also determined according to a rubric created for this research: *High* is when they can revise a text in English and propose their own linguistic solutions. *Intermediate* is when they can evaluate the quality of a translation but are unable to confidently propose their own solutions. *Low* is when they cannot evaluate the quality or propose solutions due to a lack of familiarly with the language. It is unsurprising that the two participants with a low level of English come from the older and intermediate generations and that most of the younger generation have a high level. However, it should be noted that a high level of English does not necessarily imply that they have the language proficiency to write an academic text directly in English. The rubric relates more to their ability to make linguistic judgements when carrying out review tasks on translated or edited texts.

The value of a lingua franca: prestige and discrimination

This section will provide a detailed view of how the researchers describe their motivations for publishing in English and how they evaluate the academic lingua franca and international journals. Publishing in English and in some cases publishing the majority of their research output in English is driven by a dose of desire and a double dose of pragmatism. Most of the interviewees agree that a common language is necessary to facilitate communication and collaboration among scholars from different parts of the world. Using English as a lingua franca allows them to reach an international audience and exchange knowledge and ideas more effectively. Some interviewees also noted that there is limited literature in Catalan or Spanish on their specific research areas, making publishing in English essential to be able to participate in relevant debates.

Sílvia: *És el llenguatge universal i tots ens comuniquem amb l'anglès. Per exemple ara m'interessen molt uns temes i són en alemany. L'alemany era la meva quarta llengua, però el tinc ben rovellat. I realment ho estic intentant, però jo no puc conèixer tot el que aquestes persones fan amb alemany.* (It's the universal language and we all communicate in English. For example, now I'm really interested in some topics and they're in German. German was my fourth language, but it's gotten really rusty. And I'm really trying, but I can't know everything these people do in German.)[3]

The prospect of engaging with a broader audience is, however, not the only factor. It came as no surprise that the prestige of Anglophone academic journals is a prime motivator. While they *want* to publish in a lingua franca to participate in transnational scholarly conversations, they *need* to publish in English to receive positive performance evaluations. Thus, the preference of the interviewees for English over their first languages, Catalan and Spanish, does not stem from a disinterest in the latter – indeed, one of the interviewees referred to not publishing in Catalan as a painful decision – rather, it relates to the fact that there are more journals indexed in JCR and SJR in English and articles published in these journals attract more citations.

Eulàlia: *És un requisit perquè tu et poses a mirar el llistat de revistes indexades i dius 'vaig a veure les que hi ha en català'. No trobes pràcticament res. Vaig a veure les que hi ha en castellà. Són molt poques. I clar la majoria són en anglès.* (It's a requirement because you start looking at the list of indexed journals and you say, 'I'll check the ones in Catalan'. And you find practically nothing. 'I'll check the ones in Spanish'. There are very few. And, of course, the majority are in English.)

While publishing in a lingua franca is attractive to them because of the prospects of knowledge sharing with researchers from various linguistic or cultural backgrounds, once it becomes a requirement it turns into more of a compulsory exercise in self-promotion.

In relation to the monopoly that Anglophone journals have on prestige and the need to publish in English, the interviewees employed words such as dictatorship, dominance, imperialism, imposition, injustice, and tyranny. In general, these academics feel that, in comparison with those who write in English as a first language (or who are near-native), they must dedicate additional time, effort and money. The negative connotations this process has for them relate to the sense that they compete under tougher conditions. The arduous business of article submission and publication is drawn out by the extra time needed for translation or editing and revision, not to mention the costs, which as stated above, sometimes come out of their own pocket. Several interviewees also described feelings of discrimination during their dealings with journals, having received disrespectful or unpleasant responses. Among the sociologists interviewed, there was a generally held view that journals based in the United Kingdom, as opposed to the United States, were more demanding and restrictive in terms of language use and more willing to use this factor as grounds for rejection.

Lluïsa: *La meva experiència amb revistes British és a vegades de falta de respecte bastant monumental i a vegades ha tingut a veure també o s'ha exercit com a argument la qualitat de l'escriptura en anglès, no? Llavors crec que els British, bueno, en el món britànic diguéssim mmm hi ha com certa subestimació de tot text que identifiquen que ve d'una persona que no és nativa lingüística anglesa.* (My experience with British journals has sometimes been one of a pretty monumental lack of respect and sometimes it's had to do with the quality of the writing in English or that's been used as an argument, right? So, I think that the British, well, in the British world let's say mmm, there's a kind of

underestimation of any text that they identify as being by someone who is not a native English speaker.)

> Eulàlia: *Però jo crec que hi ha una certa tendència per part dels revisors anglòfons que si veuen el nom d'autors no anglòfons, ja surten amb la coletilla, tot i que se suposa que la revisió és cega. No sé si és molt cega.* (But I think there's a certain tendency among Anglophone peer reviewers that if they see the name of non-Anglophone authors they jump on it, even though the review process is supposed to be blind. I don't know if it's actually blind.)

A non-Anglophone name being related to an article rejection would contravene the rules of blind peer review; however, that some of these researchers harbor such suspicions hammers home that they do not perceive the game as fair.

While the question set focused on written texts, some interviewees also wished to highlight the difficulties they experience when communicating their research orally at international conferences, and their inferior position in relation to presenters whose first language is English. Feelings of discrimination also arise in this respect, as some suggested that not having English as a first language limits one's chances of being a keynote speaker or, on the contrary, having English as a first language bestows prestige regardless of merit.

In response to our questions on the degree of awareness at academic journals regarding the difficulties faced by researchers whose first language is not English, some interviewees expressed the belief that profit and impact factor are journals' primary concerns. While most of the interviewees think that journals know that these difficulties exist, they state that the latter are generally unwilling or unable to provide practical solutions. One interviewee pointed out that the only solution offered by journals is a commercial one: to provide translation and editing services at a cost to authors. Others noted that evidence of non-native English becomes a means to cull articles among a sea of submissions. However, as noted above, perceptions of journals varied depending on the journal or research area, with less negative evaluations of journals based in non-Anglophone countries or with more culturally diverse editorial boards. This is in line with Goyanes and Demeter's (2020) recent finding that nationally diverse editorial boards are more likely to accept more diverse articles in terms of the country of origin of both the first author and the data collected. In general, however, most of the interviewees view the Anglophone world as lacking understanding or appreciation of language diversity.

> Anna: *Tenim aquesta diversitat, no entenen, no s'entén. Jo crec que no s'entén per part del món anglòfon perquè realment les llengües no és la seva prioritat. Perquè no han tingut cap necessitat de parlar més llengües, no li troben una riquesa i l'altre, l'altre factor, és a les ciències que ens han arrossegat a tots.* (We have this diversity, they don't understand, it's not understood. I think it's not understood by the Anglophone world because languages are not really their priority. Because they haven't had the need to speak more languages. They don't find richness in them and the other, the other factor is that in the sciences, they've dragged us all along.)

In this sense, journals are not necessarily seen as being at fault, but rather as being a symptom of the dominance of Anglophone monolingualism. They maintain the status quo by failing to be sympathetic towards or support language diversity.

Despite the clear need to publish in English, a significant number of interviewees also publish in Catalan or Spanish, as well as in other languages, such as French or Italian, on rare occasions. This coincides with other empirical research which has found that multilingual scholars still contribute to non-English language research communities

through 'parallel publishing' in languages other than English (Beigel, 2014; Curry & Lillis, 2019). They tend to publish academic books in Catalan or Spanish and, when it comes to articles, it depends on the journal. Researchers in translation studies referred to journals that accept articles in English and other languages. The motivation behind this type of publication is often dissemination or activism in defense of these languages as languages of investigation. Some interviewees suggested that when the scope of their research is local, they opt to publish in Catalan or Spanish, sometimes in parallel with English, in an effort to make their research findings available to a local audience, achieve greater social impact and give back to the community, as found in previous research (López-Navarro et al, 2015). In the case of several interviewees from sociology, they also referred to publications other than books and articles, such as reports, that they write in Catalan or Spanish for more general audiences beyond the walls of academia. The issue with this parallel publishing is that it is increasingly devalued and, as such, the return on investment, to borrow the metaphor one interviewee used, is lower.

Strategies for publishing in English

The academics we interviewed adopt three different strategies for publishing in English: translation, editing and writing directly in English. *Translation* involves the author or co-authors writing a text in Catalan or Spanish and then having it translated by another person. *Editing* involves writing a text in English and then having the language, structure and genre-specific conventions revised (to varying extents). Finally, *writing directly in English* involves submitting a text in English to a journal or publisher and only seeking linguistic revision at the request of the editor. In most cases, the interviewees hire professional translators or proofreaders and, on some occasions, especially for shorter texts, ask close colleagues for help. In the case of co-authorships, sometimes the authors with higher levels of English assist the other members of the team. In other cases, one co-author may write in Catalan or Spanish and the other may write in English and they send a bilingual text to be both translated and edited. The cost of translation or editing is high with respect to the funds at researchers' disposal for these purposes,[4] which come from university departments, research budgets (if a funded research project has been granted) or one's own salary. In the case of help from a close colleague, no or little payment is made as this is understood as a favor within the logic of reciprocity. If a coauthor does the translating or editing, no payment is made as this forms part of the dynamic of collaboration within the research team.

The adoption of three different strategies came as a surprise as our initial research design focused on translation; however, we found more cases of editing than we had expected and a few cases of writing directly in English, which we had not expected at all. In addition, we underestimated the fact that different strategies are used at different times for different reasons. The two interviewees from the older and intermediate generations whose level of English is low always opt for translation. The rest of the researchers with intermediate and high levels of English adopt a combination of translation and editing, switching from one to the other over time or oscillating between them. Two of them also employ a third strategy, writing directly in English, though not always, and this frequently involves subsequent requests for linguistic revision.

Following different strategies over the years and changes in strategy relate to increasing knowledge of English for research and publication purposes (Curry & Lillis, 2019). For example, several interviewees initially required translation and then switched to editing as, after some experiences with translation, they felt they had become more

proficient in the conventions for social science or humanities texts in English. The choice of translation or editing (or writing directly in English in the case of two interviewees) often depends on the following factors: a) available funds and b) the extra time and effort that they can or want to spend writing in English since writing in Catalan or Spanish is much easier and faster for all the interview participants. Many choose translation if they have available funds, preferring this option as it requires less time and effort. On the other hand, they take the cheaper option of editing when they cannot afford or do not want to pay for translation. In some cases, they also take an additional factor into account: c) the type of publication. Most choose editing if they are going to submit to a publication that they believe is less strict regarding linguistic quality, such as conference proceedings, book chapters (depending on the publisher) or articles for journals not based in Anglophone countries. Conversely, they see translation as preferable when aiming to publish in prestigious journals or those which are more finicky in terms of language use. This is because they think that they obtain higher quality texts through translation (when it is done to their liking) as when writing in Catalan or Spanish they can develop nuances and explanations in a more sophisticated and thorough fashion.

The interviewees contact translators and editors through four main channels: 1) friendship or acquaintance networks, 2) university language services, 3) translation agencies, and 4) academic networks, namely through one's department, research group or colleagues. In general, they see the latter channel as yielding the best results. Most of the interviewees prefer professional translators or editors who are experts in academic texts and, in some cases, who have expertise in their particular disciplines – the latter was the case among the sociologists. They did not necessarily have this preference all along, but rather it is the outcome of negative experiences in the past. Having detected what they saw as translation mistakes, such as misuse of terminology or genre and stylistic conventions, or the failure to understand the intention or comprehend the meaning of the text, they started to develop a sense of what they expect in a translator or editor. On other occasions, it was the journal or publisher who informed them that their text needed linguistic revision. In fact, almost all the interviewees have had direct or indirect experiences of journal editors requiring them to have their text proofread by a native speaker. On the contrary, all the interviewees have also had positive experiences, the key to which is being able to count on someone who has specialized knowledge of terminology and conventions and the capacity to fully comprehend the text.

They tend to hire on a regular basis the professionals with whom they have had positive experiences; in fact, some of them refer to these professionals as 'my' translator or 'my' proofreader. In some cases, within a research group the members hire the same one or two translators or editors with whom they develop personal relationships. In general, the interviewees see them as valuable resources on which they depend, so much so that it can be a cause of concern when their trusted professionals are unavailable, as is the prospect of them retiring or even passing away.

The work involved in the translation and editing process is not only selecting a professional and commissioning the service; on the whole, the interviewees perform a host of other tasks as well. They communicate with the translator or editor, providing instructions on how to translate terminology, parts of the text to be left as-is, submissions guidelines, etc. Some scholars provide a glossary of key terms; others put them in English, either directly or in parenthesis next to the word in Catalan or Spanish. They also respond to any doubts or questions the translator or editor may have throughout the process. Once they have an initial version of the translated or edited text, they read through it to check the accuracy and consistency of the terminology and interpretation, as well as to monitor any potential errors that might have crept in. In some cases, this leads to discussions

regarding certain textual decisions, as well as, in the case of translation, a shared search for translation solutions to trickier concepts, phrases or passages. These review tasks are smoother when working with one's trusted translator or editor. This is because over the course of several commissions, both actors become familiar with each other's work style and they build habits of communication and coordination that, on subsequent occasions, do not need to be discussed or agreed upon, but merely repeated. Some of the interviewees indicate that their trusted professionals have become very familiar with their voice or the key terms in their discipline, such that they no longer need to negotiate these matters. In general, the interviewees greatly appreciate having a second pair of eyes. In this sense, the translators or editors sometimes also revise the clarity of the message or strength of the arguments, indicating certain fragments that are imprecise, confusing or contradictory.

Such dependence on translators or editors and the personal and effective working relationships with them stands in contrast to a general practice of not crediting them for their labor. In the case of book translations, many of the interviewees explain that the translator's name is mentioned. However, when it comes to publications in academic journals, only two of the interviewees have, on occasion, credited the translator or editor, and this appeared in the acknowledgement section. A third interviewee reported having offered to include the translator's name, but the latter declined. Our questions regarding acknowledgement made some of the researchers reflect, some for the first time, on what is a routine practice of not crediting the translator in journal publishing. Thinking out loud, some of the sociologists described the implication of this being that translation is treated as merely technical or instrumental. Some of the interviewees seemed to realize that there is something wrong with this practice.

> Montse: *Ara em fas pensar que potser li podria preguntar si vol que ho faci. Però en principi en les revistes no t'ho deixen posar [. . .]. Una altra cosa és que tu puguis posar-ho en els agraïments, que això també seria una bona opció.* (Now you've made me think that maybe I could ask him if he wants me to do it. But, in theory, journals don't let you put it. [. . .] Another thing is that you can put it in the acknowledgements, which would also be a good option.)

However, on the whole, the interviewees did not see the responsibility for acknowledgement as individual, but rather referred to following the formatting guidelines of academic journals and simply doing the done thing.

Translation by assimilation

Through the translation and editing process, the researchers we interviewed do not only want to obtain a text in English; really what they want is a publishable text in English. This section will explore their preferences for how their texts should be translated or edited and the factors that shape them. The majority of the interviewees expressed the expectation that the translators or editors of their work should adopt what Esperança Bielsa conceives as an assimilatory translation strategy. Assimilatory translation seeks to fit cultural and linguistic difference to available conventions in the translating culture, thus constructing an image of unmediated access to the other which obscures that translation has taken place (Bielsa, 2022: 105). Assimilation is rule-following in that it applies existing solutions or equivalences to linguistic difference, making it effective at communicating clearly ascertainable ideas. It does away with heterogenous or complex elements once and for all, making translated texts readily understandable. Such a

translation strategy does the opposite to the recommendation in the *Guidelines for the Translation of Social Science Texts*: 'The translation needs to be comprehensible, but need not read as if it were written by a social scientist in the target culture' (Heim & Tymowski, 2006: 8). These guidelines were written for commissioning editors, not self-commissioning authors, and they are decidedly non-assimilatory. However, the team that put them together were not thinking about the widespread and invisible translation practices that this article addresses. The failure to credit translators, as found in the section above, is a sign of assimilation as the labor of the translator is hidden, as is the translated nature of the text.

The researchers we interviewed from translation studies were particularly in favor of translators or editors producing conventional English texts that obscure translation and eliminate traces of cultural or linguistic difference. The sociologists have similar preferences, though more implicitly, as they tended to stress terminology and comprehension, but they had not reflected on the nature of a good translation, nor are they aware of debates over the politics of translation. One interviewee from translation studies explained:

> Josep: *És a dir bàsicament és això que no es noti que ho ha escrit un català perquè si no ens ho revisessin es nota. Bàsicament volem això: un anglès estàndard estàndard a dintre del món acadèmic, però mentalment és això i això es desplega en tot el que et deia que si temps verbals, que si passives, que si possessius, que si britànic o americà, que si totes aquestes coses, no? I voldríem la desaparició del traductor i corrector [riu]. Que no es noti que hi és.* (In other words, it's basically that it shouldn't be obvious that it's been written by a Catalan because if we don't have it checked, it'll be obvious. Basically, we want this: a standard English that is standard within the academic world, but mentally it's this and this is shown in everything I was telling you about verb tenses, passives, possessives, British or American, all these things, right? And we would like the translator and editor to disappear [laughs] so that you don't even realize they're there [emphasis added].)

In the view of this interviewee, the translator or editor should intervene, though in ways undetectable by readers, to turn the researcher's language into standard academic English – or more specifically, native English, as the text should not appear to have been written by a Catalan scholar. In other words, they should make the research of a non-Anglophone scholar appear as though it had been authored by an Anglophone scholar. Other interviewees from translation studies offered similar descriptions of what is for them a high-quality translation:

> Montse: *Que no reprodueixi l'estil retòric del castellà, sinó que estilísticament sigui doncs un text que sembli escrit en anglès i en aquest sentit doncs aquesta persona doncs ho fa molt bé.* (That it doesn't replicate the rhetorical style of Spanish, but rather that stylistically it's, well, a text that seems to be written in English and in that respect this person does it very well.)

> Eulàlia: *Una bona traducció seria aquella que tu llegeixes en la llengua meta sense que en cap moment facis un salt de dir ai això . . . això no flueix.* (A good translation would be one that you read in the target language and at no point do you squirm and say oh that . . . That doesn't flow.)

Essentially, these academics want their research to be published in fluent English without any lexical, syntactical or rhetorical interferences from Catalan or Spanish. Nevertheless, assimilatory translation is contrary to positions in translation studies in favor of being

able to register the voice (Hermans, 1996) or intervention (Venuti, 2008) of translators or engage with the decisions with which they are faced during the translation process (Bielsa, 2022). It would appear, from this albeit small sample of researchers, that such positions, of which they must be aware, have either been rejected, perhaps as theoretically acceptable but practically untenable, or at least they have not taken hold in their preferences for how their own texts should be translated.

The way in which most of the interviewees from both disciplines describe their writing process, whether writing for translation or editing, indicates that they all want to obtain texts that follow dominant styles in Anglophone academia. This means that assimilatory dynamics are at work from a very early stage. As mentioned above, when writing for translation, some interviewees often put English terminology in parenthesis or entire fragments directly in English. One interviewee stated that he almost unconsciously structures the text as if it were written in English. When pressed as to why, he replied:

> Marc: *Sí, no ho sé, és a dir m'he acostumat a escriure així i em surt més fàcil potser. O crec que també pel lector pot ser més fàcil de llegir i d'entendre.* (Yes, I don't know, I mean I've gotten used to writing like that and maybe it's easier for me. Or I think it's also easier for the audience to read and understand.)

This interviewee was not alone in suggesting that extensive exposure to English writing styles has influenced the way he writes in Catalan or Spanish (including even when not writing for translation or editing). When writing in English for editing, many of the interviewees explained that they adopt a simpler and more conventional style, using brief, more direct and ordered sentences with less subordinate clauses. This form of writing English reflects how the interviewees perceive the English language in comparison with Catalan or Spanish, which generally have more complex syntactical structures, elaborate rhetoric and leniency toward ambiguity.[5] Comparative descriptions among the languages were commonly along the lines of:

> Lluïsa: *Doncs frases molt curtes o sigui [riu] unes estructures molt simples i molt bé i bueno pues molt de subjecte verb i complement, no? Intentant bueno pues perquè la llengua anglesa és una llengua més simple a l'hora de tenir estructures, intentar evitar subordinades.* (Well, very short sentences or in other words [laughs] very simple structures and well and a lot of subject, verb and complement, right? Trying, well, because English is a simpler language when it comes to structures, trying to avoid subordinate clauses).

> Clara: *A veure, has de fer servir més passiva en anglès que en català. Has de ser més assertiva en anglès que en català.* (You have to use more passives in English than in Catalan. You have to be more assertive in English than in Catalan.)

At times the comments give the impression that to communicate ideas in English, expression must be simplified. The cause of simplification could be the supposed succinct nature of English; it could also be that academics writing in English as a second language put grammatical correctness over expressive complexity, as one interviewee noted; or it may also relate more broadly to the genre conventions of the journal article, as a couple of other interviewees expressed. Moreover, the simplification of expression could be the result of the excessive standardization of rhetorical practices in international academic publishing, which, as Anna Mauranen warned (see Mauranen, 1993), stifles the potential to be innovative or creative. This is evident in the way in which several of the interviewees referred to stylistic possibilities such as writing in passive voice, using linking words or keeping it simple as if they were hard and fast rules. While the interviewees refer to what

they perceive as the nature of English in general, their desire to be assimilated to Anglophone scholars involves a very specific type of academic English: a pragmatic, time and cost-effective variant of English for academic purposes (Strevens, 1988).[6]

An exception to the general adoption of an assimilatory strategy relates to multilingual research materials and citation practices. To our surprise, the academics we interviewed tend to cite whichever works they deem relevant regardless of language. In their experience, journals do not take issue with this, other than sometimes requesting translations of titles. With that said, several interviewees limit references in Catalan, Spanish or other languages. This is because they want to ensure that their research appears to be in dialogue with international academic debates. They fear that too much engagement with the literature in other languages is 'uninternational.' Several interviewees also indicated that when citing materials in languages other than English or Spanish, such as the work of Bourdieu, they reference the English translation even if they have personally read the Spanish translation. It was also clear that much of what the interviewees read and cite is in English anyway, such that how to incorporate research in other languages is not always an issue. For example, one interviewee pointed out that research by local academics is increasingly in English. Hence, while there is evidence of more tolerance of heterogenous elements in citation practices, which is not a mark of assimilation, this is still coupled with the pressure to appear Anglophone or, to borrow the image used by two interviewees, to pass their research through an international sieve.

A second exception to assimilation relates to personal voice and style. Several established academics in translation studies with high levels of English were concerned with maintaining their own seal of authorship. One interviewee explained that she avoids a standardized form of English:

> Anna: *És a dir jo crec que quan em llegeixo els meus textos en anglès, m'hi veig en la meva veu. M'explico? No és una veu estandarditzada diguem-ne. M'hi veig una mica. Jo per mi és important sentir la meva veu quan publico en anglès perquè no m'interessa que no se senti una miqueta, els girs o les frases de vegades que les faig una mica llargues.* (I mean, I think that when I read my texts in English, I can recognize myself in the voice. Do you know what I mean? It's not a standardized voice, let's say. I see myself a little. For me, it's important to be able to hear my voice when I publish in English because I don't want it not to be heard a little bit, the turns or the sentences, sometimes I make them a little bit long.)

This preference is in line with Suresh Canagarajah, who promotes the pluralization of academic writing in English through codemeshing or the combination of rule-following with deviant practice, such that multilingual scholars can leave traces of their own voice and values (Canagarajah, 2013). This interviewee is strategic in her codemeshing as she chooses journals that are more tolerant of multilingualism, which are more plentiful in translation studies than sociology. Similarly, another interviewee stated:

> Blanca: *A veure jo prefereixo treballar amb gent que no et toca gaire el text, o sigui que et fa lo imprescindible.* (I prefer to work with people who don't touch your text too much, I mean, who only do the essential.)

This interviewee added that she feels strange if her texts are proofread in such a way that she can no longer hear her own expression. The preferences of these researchers are a minor trend, but they are proof that it is possible to strategically opt out of assimilation and stress cultural differences and personal style in academic writing. However, the ability to do must vary depending on the academic rank, level of English, discipline, and journal.

Likewise, the overall preference for assimilation into a standardized form of native academic English cannot be divorced from the fact that these researchers have learnt from experience that their texts are judged according to a model of good writing that is built on these features: fluency and standardization. Deviation from this prized model becomes for them synonymous with failing to meet the expectations of readers and, importantly, powerful readers like journal editors and peer reviewers. Desire to be assimilated must be interpreted in relation to the pressure to publish in a second language over which they do not have autonomous command and their semi-peripheral position in global academia. As such, they are less likely to risk drawing attention to the fact of having to depend on translators or editors – a sign of inferiority – nor do they necessarily have the language proficiency to codemesh. Hence, pursuing an assimilatory strategy gives them the chance to covet the prestige that is unfairly reserved for Anglophone researchers, thus temporarily escaping the semi-periphery. Many migrants throughout history have made a similar call when faced with minoritization in a new land.

Linguistic, methodological and structural issues beyond epistemicide

This final section will delve into the issue of how the academics we interviewed perceive the difficulties that arise during the process of having their research translated or edited for Anglophone audiences. Given the conclusion of epistemicide in Bennett's study (Bennett, 2007), we had expected the interviewees to refer to epistemological difficulties. However, our question on this matter, as well as another regarding what they contribute as Catalan or Spanish academics to international scholarly debates, seemed to take them aback. They did not have a strong sense of their contribution being somehow uniquely or foundationally Catalan or Spanish, seeing their approach as more within the bounds of a discipline, as opposed to their home culture or first language. Their surprise or confusion suggests that our interview guide too hastily assumed a defining relationship between their research and their national location or linguistic identity. Puwar observes this form of overdetermination in Southern Theory, suggesting that scholars risk becoming 'ethnographic trophies of display' (Puwar, 2020). In terms of structure, several interviewees stated that a journal article or scientific text are practically genres, and their norms are no different in English, Catalan or Spanish. Others referred to having to conceptually or methodologically tailor research for specific journals.

Clutching for an answer to our somewhat perplexing questions, a number of interviewees mentioned the lack of vocabulary in Catalan or Spanish for key concepts in English, rather than translation problems regarding words they think with (see Law & Mol, 2020) in Catalan or Spanish.

> Ingrid: *Hi ha molts conceptes que fins i tot em passa al revés, que per escriure o pensar en castellà com em ve la frase, el concepte en anglès.* (There are many concepts where I even find it happens the other way round, that when I write or think in Spanish the phrase, the concept comes to me in English.)

A couple of other interviewees pointed out that concepts from Latin American sociology like Orlando Fals Borda's *Investigación-Acción participativa* (participatory action research) do not cause problems as they have been translated and are well-known in English. There were also mentions of the importance of French thinkers in the sociological tradition. All in all, when searching for epistemological issues, we found linguistic ones, some of which have been solved or partially solved thanks to translation. What is more, we found issues mostly in the other direction (from English) or from other

languages (French). Regarding national traditions in sociology or translation studies, the majority of the interviewees gave the impression that they did not rely on a conceptual apparatus that has been developed in the context of Spain. One of the sociologists explained:

> Guillem: *Però en català o en castellà tampoc tinc la sensació de que ostres aquest concepte si no l'expliques com s'havia definit no te'n sortiràs perquè tampoc és que hi hagi un bagatge tan fort.* (But in Catalan or Spanish I don't have the feeling that, gosh, this concept if you don't explain it according to how it was defined you won't get anywhere because it's not like there's a really strong body of knowledge.)

This recalls Patel's argument that dependence on dominant intellectual traditions can have the effect of infantilizing social scientific cultures in Non-Atlantic areas, encouraging brain drain and ultimately the reinforcement of intellectual dependency (Patel, 2014). Though the interviewees did not overtly refer to epistemological difficulties, the need to constantly read and publish in English, along with the prevalence of Anglophone (or Francophone) concepts or methods leaves less room to explore, valorize and propagate peripheralized intellectual traditions.

In addition to certain linguistic issues, many of the interviewees from sociology referred to methodological issues regarding the translation into English of their qualitative research. When using direct quotes from research participants to illustrate an idea or let the voice of the person speak for itself, they see translation as undermining the whole point as it adds a layer of interpretation. It is precisely the social nature of direct quotes that make them thorny to translate; their recreation in a new linguistic situation removes them from their initial context, situating them elsewhere, far from the lifeworld of the research subject. Presenting analyses of verbatim quotes is undermined by the fact that in translation their social detail may be impoverished or assimilated. Not being able to use the subject's original language is complicated further by the fact that sometimes there is a double layer of translation as some interviewees translate the materials from Catalan into Spanish so that translators can then translate them into English. This crucial issue deserves much more attention as it is common practice to include English translations of direct quotes without their original wording. This can be confusing if various participants in the same study speak in different languages, as there is no way of recovering this difference, and it can give the uncanny feeling of knowing that another language was there and now gone.

On top of linguistic and methodological issues, the interviewees discussed structural issues regarding their position as Southern European researchers in global academia. One interviewee suggests that when he publishes internationally, he is aware of speaking from the periphery to the center and that case studies about Barcelona are interesting from the U.S. perspective because they are ethnic or reveal what occurs outside, in the periphery. This relates to the feeling of another interviewee that research in Spanish is local and not universal. Both these statements coincide with Mignolo's suggestion that doing sociology in Spanish (or Portuguese, Arabic, Mandarin, Bengali or Akan) decreases your chances of being read and situates your work as 'local sociology' (Mignolo, 2009: 166). In the eyes of many of the interviewees, research in English has a prerogative not only on the prestigious, but also on the universal and the scientific. These views match up with previous studies in which it has been found that semi-peripheral scholars must walk a fine line as the perceived ethnicity or localness of their research can define its meaning and value from the perspective of the center, but it also leaves them open to the charge of parochialism (see Flowerdew, 2001; Lillis & Curry, 2006). Another interviewee mentioned that the research she produces on very local phenomena is

sometimes dismissed by peer reviewers due to its lack of generalizability. However, the measuring stick of generalizability is not pointed in the same way at researchers in the center. For example, in an empirical comparative study, it was found that article titles from the global North are more likely than those from the global South to omit references to the name of the country where the study was conducted, providing a misleading impression of generalizability (Torres & Alburez-Gutierrez, 2022). This has serious epistemological implications as it reveals possible shortcomings in terms of which actors can apply this measure and to which social experiences it can be applied.

Not all is a dog's life, though, on the rocky road to English. The blessing in disguise for these semi-peripheral academics who are acutely aware of where they stand in global academia is that they cannot fall into the trap of tacit universalism. They are in no position to overlook that their research is socially situated, that it is produced in a specific place, and that when it moves to another, some ingrained context disintegrates. Among the interviewees, there was a general understanding that when publishing in English, the audience will not necessarily understand certain nuances or references to the local context, such as political parties, trade unions, the legal and education systems, etc. They do not remove this local context, as an assimilatory translation strategy would, because this would make their research difficult to understand, if not incomprehensible. Instead, they make it explicit, reflecting on the nature of what they know, by whom it is known and how to explain it to others.

> Joan: *I també t'obliga a anar pensant: no puc donar per fet, de vegades donem per fet coses perquè aquí són de coneixement comú, però no podem donar per fet que és de coneixement comú, a vegades no saben coses que per nosaltres poden ser molt òbvies.* (It also forces you to think, I can't take things for granted, sometimes we take things for granted because here they're common knowledge, but we can't take for granted what is common knowledge, sometimes they don't know things that to us may be very obvious.)

Through these additional steps, scholars consider how to make their research speak to those who are unfamiliar with its surroundings. They reflect on from whence and to whom they speak as a matter of course. This enriching exercise of having to think about the given knowledge that must be explained to a non-local audience leads to solutions such as adding descriptive information or footnotes. The academics are not sentimental about linguistic obstacles; rather, they exhibit a practical attitude towards explaining 'the peculiarities of one society in terms of another' (De Swaan, 2004).

Ultimately, based on the empirical evidence from the interviews, this section has painted a much more complex picture than 'epistemicide' would allow. While Anglophone concepts and methods dominate, these semi-peripheral researchers are less tied to their national traditions and languages than we expected. To a large extent, they perceive the disciplines in which they engage and the scientific texts they write as international. Rather than protesting the killing of 'their knowledge,' this section has relied not on emotion but on facts; examining the specifics of the linguistic, methodological and structural issues that they describe, which is an excellent starting point for devising solutions for a practical way forward.

Conclusion

This article has explored the widespread and invisible translation and editing practices of academic texts into English in the semi-peripheral context of Spanish universities. The empirical study has found that the majority of the sociologists and translation scholars we

interviewed adopt a combination of two strategies to obtain publishable texts in English: translation or editing. The translation or editing process requires a significant amount of time, effort and money, while also bringing these scholars into contact with language professionals, with whom they often develop personal relationships and effective work routines. Despite this, most of the interviewees do not credit their trusted translators or editors in articles published in international journals. While they see themselves as simply doing the done thing, the interview situation brought them to reflect on the ethics of this common practice of non-acknowledgement and, in the case of the sociologists, the nature of translation beyond a technical task. All the interviewees expressed a preference for assimilatory linguistic strategies or, in other words, the assimilation of their research texts into standard academic English such that they appear the same as those written by Anglophone scholars. This desire to be assimilated should be understood in the context of their efforts to navigate global academia, a space in which they feel they are competing in unfair conditions.

One of the key contributions of this article has been to move beyond the popular notion of epistemicide in order to delve into the specifics of the linguistic, methodological and structural issues that semi-peripheral academics experience when publishing in English and their epistemological consequences. Based on the empirical evidence, linguistic issues arise in relation to the dominance of Anglophone (and Francophone, to a lesser extent) conceptual apparatuses. This suggests that many thinking tools are increasingly in English from the beginning, which stunts knowledge and growth of other scholarly traditions and languages, reinforcing their supposed inferiority and lack of prestige. Regarding methodology, this study has highlighted the need to devise new practices for citing direct quotes in qualitative research. Currently, direct quotes in other languages are magically presented in English. Nonetheless, access is needed to the original wording and its valuable social information, and the fact of translation should be visible. Finally, a flip side has been found to the structural issue of being aware that one is positioned towards the periphery and that one's research could be perceived as ethnic or local: identifying as a matter of course which knowledge is common to whom and learning how to speak to others about one's society.

References

Batchelor K, Harding SA (eds) (2017) *Translating Frantz Fanon across continents and languages*. New York: Routledge.

Beigel F (2014) Publishing from the Periphery: Structural Heterogeneity and Segmented Circuits. The Evaluation of Scientific Publications for Tenure in Argentina's CONICET. *Current sociology* 62(5): 743–765.

Bennett K (2007) Epistemicide!: The tale of a predatory discourse. *Translator* 13(2): 151–169. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799236

Bennett K (2013) English as a lingua franca in academia: Combating Epistemicide through Translator Training. *Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 7(2): 169–193. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2013.10798850

Bennett K (2015) Towards an epistemological monoculture: Mechanisms of epistemicide in European research publication. In: Plo R and Peréz-Llantada C (eds) *English as a scientific and research language: Debates and discourses*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 9–35.

Bennett K (2022) Keynote: Translating knowledge in the translingual paradigm: beyond LF and epistemicide. *Translation and Society International Workshop Series: Translating Academia*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 3 June 2022.

Bhambra GK (2014) *Connected Sociologies*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bielsa E (2022) *A Translational Sociology: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Politics and Society*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Bourdieu P (2002 ([1990]) Les conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 145 (décembre): 3–8.

Canagarajah S (2013) *Translingual Practice: Global English and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Connell R (2007) *Southern Theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Curry MJ, Lillis T (2019) Unpacking the lore on multilingual scholars publishing in english: A discussion paper. *Publications* 7(2): 1–14. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7020027

De Sousa Santos B (2010) *Descolonizar el saber, reinventar el poder*. Montevideo: Ediciones Trilce.

De Swaan A (2004) English in the social sciences. In: Drenth PJD and Schroots JJF (eds) *ALLEA Biennial Yearbook 2004. Critical Topics in Science and Scholarship.* Amsterdam: Allea, pp. 135–146. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110869484.71

Flowerdew J (2001) Attitudes of Journal Editors to Nonnative Speaker Contributions. *TESOL Quarterly* 35(1): 121–150. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3587862

Go J (2017) Decolonizing Sociology: Epistemic Inequality and Sociological Thought. *Social Problems* 64: 194–199. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx002

Goyanes M, Demeter M (2020) How the Geographic Diversity of Editorial Boards Affects What is Published in JCR-Ranked Communication Journals. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 97(4): 1123–1148.

Heilbron J (1999) Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural

World-System. *European Journal of Social Theory* 2(4): 429–444.

Heim MH, Tymowski AW (2006) *Guidelines for the Translation of Social Science Texts*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies.

Hermans T (1996) The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative. *Target* 8(1): 23–48.

Hjelm T (2021) Discourse Analysis. In: S Engler & M Stausberg (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion* (2nd ed.), Abington: Routledge, pp. 229–244.

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

Jorge A, De Frutos R (2016) La evaluación de la investigación universitaria en España. *Chasqui. Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicación* 133: 159–172.

Károly K (2022) Translating Academic Texts. In: Malmkjær (ed) *The Cambridge Handbook of Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 340–362. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108616119.018

Law J, Mol A (2020) Words to think with: An introduction. *Sociological Review* 68(2): 263–282. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120905452

Lillis T, Curry MJ (2006) Professional Academic Writing by Multilingual Scholars: Interactions With Literacy Brokers in the Production of English-Medium Texts. *Written Communication* 23(1): 3–35.

Lillis T, Curry MJ (2010) *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

López-Navarro I, Moreno AI, Burgess S, Sachdev I and Rey-Rocha J (2015) Publicar en inglés o en castellano: Un marco teórico para el estudio de las motivaciones de los investigadores. *Revista Española de Documentación Científica* 21(381): 22–25.

Mauranen A (1993) Cultural Differences in Academic Discourse - Problems of a Linguistic and Cultural Minority. In: *The Competent Intercultural Communicator. AFinLa Yearbook 1993*, pp. 157–174.

Mayring P (2014) *Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Klagenfurt: Beltz.

Mignolo WD (2009) Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society* 26(7–8): 159–181.

Moreno AI (2010) Researching into English for research publication purposes from an applied intercultural perspective. In: Ruiz-Garrido MF, Palmer JC and Fortanet-Gómez I (eds) *English for professional and academic purposes*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 59–73.

Patel S (2014) Is There a "South" Perspective to Urban Studies. In: Parnell S and Oldfield S (eds) *The Routledge Handbook on Cities of the Global South*. London: Routledge, pp. 37–47.

Politzer-Ahles S, Holliday JJ, Girolamo T, Spychalska M & Berkson KH (2016) Is linguistic injustice a myth? A response to Hyland. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 34: 3–8. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.09.003

Price JM (2021) Translation as epistemicide: conceptual limits and possibilities. *Palimpsestes. Revue de Traduction* 35: 143–155.

Price JM (2023) *Translation and epistemicide: racialization of languages in the Americas*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Putnam LL (2009) Symbolic capital and academic fields: An alternative discourse on journal rankings. *Management Communication Quarterly* 23(1): 127–134.

Puwar N (2020). Puzzlement of a déjà vu: Illuminaries of the global South. *Sociological Review* 68(3): 540–556. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026119890254

Salö L (2017) *The Sociolinguistics of Academic Publishing*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Salö L (2020) The spatial logic of linguistic practice: Bourdieusian inroads into language and internationalization in academe. *Language in Society* 51(1): 119–141. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404520000743

Salö L, Norrman G (2022) Skill, dwelling, and the education of attention. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies* 16: 35–47. Available at: https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.114663

Schögler RY (2019) *Circulation of Academic Thought: Rethinking Translation in the Academic Field*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Soler J (2022) Linguistic injustice in academic publishing in English: Limitations and ways forward in the debate. *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes* 2(2): 160–171.

Strevens P (1988) ESP after twenty years: A re-appraisal. In: Tickoo ML (ed) *ESP: State of the art*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Torres AFC, Alburez-Gutierrez D (2022) North and South: Naming practices and the hidden dimension of global disparities in knowledge production. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 119(10). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2119373119

Van Dijk TA (1997) The study of discourse. In: Van Dijk TA (ed) *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London; Thousand Oaks, CA; New Delhi: SAGE, pp. 1–34.

Vázquez R (2011) Translation as Erasure: Thoughts on Modernity's Epistemic

Violence. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 24(1): 27–44. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6443.2011.01387.x

Venuti L (2008) *The Tranlator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2nd ed). Abingdon: Routledge.

Yin RK (2012) Case study methods. In: Cooper H, Camic PM, Long DL, Panter AT, Rindskopf D and Sher KJ (eds) *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, pp. 141–155.

Yin, RK (2014) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods (Applied Social Research Methods)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

---

[1] Such as Rolando Vázquez's research on translation as erasure, a process through which European modernity imposes and expands its epistemic limits (Vázquez, 2011) or *Translation and Epistemicide* (Price, 2023) in which Price explores translation as an instrument of imperialism and epistemic imposition through which the superiority of Eurocentric knowledge is forged.

[2] On this issue see, for example, Jorge and De Frutos (2016).

[3] The direct quotes from the interviews have been translated into English by the coauthors.

[4] At the time of writing, translation services from respected translators or university language services in Spain usually cost between €0.10 and €0.17 per word, while editing services ranged from €0.04 to €0.065 per word. Hence, on average the total cost of a 7000-word document (including tax) would be approximately €1100 for translation and €465 for editing.

[5] The results in this respect mirror those in Bennett's study in which the majority of the respondents held views of English as 'succinct, logical and linear' and purposefully adapted their writing to this form of discourse when preparing texts for publication in English (Bennett, 2007).

[6] While the native/non-native speaker distinction was clear to the research subjects, 'native' is actually a fuzzy concept. There is an ongoing debate regarding linguistic injustice (Hyland, 2016; Politzer-Ahles et. al., 2016; Soler, 2022) precisely because English for academic purposes is a special type of language in which all users must hone their skills. Salö & Norrman suggest that this occurs through dwelling, attentive education and experience in socially situated environments and subject to varying constraints (Salö & Norrman, 2022). This process, however, is necessarily more intensive for someone who has a greater distance to travel, such as a second-language speaker. In addition, travelling that distance has epistemological consequences as it often means less attentive education in the scholarly texts and traditions of one's first language or the language of the university system within which one works.