

# RETROSPECTIVE INTERVIEW WITH YSW'S PAST AND PRESENT EDITORS

Lexi Stewart | York College of Pennsylvania

Laurie Grobman: Co-Founder and Editor from  
2003–2009, Penn State Berks

Jane Greer: Editor from 2010–2015, University of Missouri, Kansas City

Doug Downs: Editor from 2015–2020, Montana State University

Gabriel Cutrufello: Editor from 2020–current, York College of Pennsylvania

Kim Fahle Peck: Editor from 2020–current, York College of Pennsylvania

Emily Murphy Cope: Editor from 2020–current,  
York College of Pennsylvania

With Volume 20, *Young Scholars in Writing* celebrates its 20th anniversary. For this special celebration, we gathered the past and present editors from *YSW*'s history to discuss the growth and experiences of the journal over the years. The group interview captured below outlines the reflections of our editors on each of their unique experiences while leading *YSW*. We hope this conversation highlights the importance of undergraduate research and journals such as *YSW* that provide a platform for these researchers to share their work.

Lexi Stewart, *YSW*'s spring 2020 editorial intern, facilitated this conversation while she was a third-year student at York College of Pennsylvania. The group interview was conducted on Zoom on April 9, 2022.

**Lexi Stewart** (Spring 2022 Intern): In 2003, the first editor's introduction described *Young*

*Scholars in Writing* as “an academic journal written for and by college students involved in rhetoric and composition scholarship.” How did this definition and focus on working with student researchers and writing studies develop? What was the origin of the journal at Penn State Berks? And does it seem that this original mission has changed over the years?

**Laurie Grobman** (Co-Founder, Editor from 2003–2009): My goodness, that was 20 years ago. I do remember that I got wind of the *Oswald Review*, which was and still is a journal of undergraduate research in English, mainly literature, and I thought: “This is so cool.” Since I was teaching in our Professional Writing program at the time, I was mostly teaching upper-level rhetoric, not as much literature. So I spoke with Candace Spigelman, my late friend, and we were lucky because we had a flexible administration. We went out to lunch with our division head to express our

interest. We told him what we needed, and he said, “go for it.” By 2003, I had been at Penn State Berks for four or five years, so I was already mentoring undergraduate research and I was excited for it, and so was Candace.

**Doug Downs** (Editor from 2015–2020): I don’t think we’ve wanted to shift that focus, so I hope that it hasn’t [shifted].

**Grobman:** It’s interesting because I remember the more difficult definition and conversation was around the word “young” and what to call these emerging scholars.

**Downs:** That came back at the very end of my editorship during some of my research. There was actually feedback from some of the prior authors that “young” was a word that was problematic for them too. I don’t know what the better choice would have been, but once the brand was established, it’s hard to move away from it. So I agree, Laurie, that it’s problematic but there’s not an obviously better term.

**Kim Fahle Peck** (Editor from 2020–current): I will add: we did get an email in the last cycle from someone who was a non-traditional student who asked about that title and if they were eligible. So I think that is a part of it, of how do we capture that idea of new voices?

**Emily Murphy Cope** (Editor from 2020–current): Laurie, I wondered if you would say a little bit more about when you first envisioned *Young Scholars*. Did you plan for it to be a national or international journal, or were you starting it at an institutional level?

**Grobman:** No, it started as [a journal for] anyone, any students in rhetoric and composition anywhere. I’m not sure that at that point we were particularly good at international marketing, but we always intended it for anyone, any student in the field or working in the field [...] At the time, Candace and I had submissions coming by actual mail. I opened this envelope from Kate Stewart who had written an essay on women’s rhetoric in diaries from the 1800s, and I was just like, “Oh my god.” And Candace and I were like, “Look at what this student is doing. We have to meet Jane [Greer].”

**Stewart:** *Young Scholars in Writing* has now had a home at four different institutions—after Penn State Berks, the University of Missouri, Kansas City; then Montana State University; and now York College of Pennsylvania. How did subsequent editors first learn about *YSW*? And what made them want to bring it to their institution?

**Jane Greer** (Editor from 2010–2015): Since Kansas City was the first home after Penn State Berks, I’ll jump in. I remember seeing this call for papers for undergraduate submissions. That semester, I had taught this course on girls in print culture for the first time and had taken my students into the archive. I had a lot of students who had done amazing work, so I asked if anybody wanted to submit their work. Kate was one of the students who said “yeah,” so we did a couple more revisions, then sent her paper off, and that’s how I connected with Laurie. After a couple of issues, and after Candace passed, [Laurie] was looking for people to help a bit. I don’t think we were called

FAEs [Faculty Advisory Editors] at that point, but I helped mentor a couple students with their manuscripts. I don't exactly remember, Laurie, how it came up, but I remember being on the phone with you and you asking if I could take it to [Kansas City].

**Grobman:** What I recall is that Doug and Jane were really helpful when Candace died, and I did it myself—that whole second volume. I might have done the third year by myself, and then, at some point, I or someone else suggested an editorial board. I was mentoring every single student through there, because Candace and I shared the first volume. I don't think we had FAEs until we created this board, and Jane and Doug were very involved. It was after the fifth year that I [ran the journal], and I needed to do something else, so I talked with Jane about it. The last year it was housed at [Penn State] Berks, but Jane was officially the editor.

**Greer:** I was actually a guest editor for volume seven. Then you, I think wisely, just gave it a look over at the end to make sure I hadn't wandered off into dangerous territory. That also gave me time to get [the University of Missouri, Kansas City] on board, and it was lucky timing. Then after six years or so, I was like, "It's time for me to move on and do some other things." So, looking at the editorial board and who was active and committed, Doug was clearly the best candidate to take [YSW] to Montana State. So we started this conversation, and Doug took it.

**Downs:** That was fortunate timing for me as well, because I had been tenured for a couple of

years. And Jane gave me enough notice because it took a long time to get the various [campus] offices on board. In terms of my interest, in the same way that Laurie and Jane have talked about how your heart is in it, especially with the First Year Spotlight, there was more and more investment in the journal for its own work and as a source of energy and research focus. I liked the idea that we're a STEM institution here at Montana State, so I liked the idea of having the journal at MSU to help my institution and [schools] across the state more broadly understand that this is what undergraduate research can look like when it's not engineering and natural sciences. That was too good an opportunity to pass up.

So I did my five years, and when I got to the end, my institution was making rumblings regarding funding, and even if I had the energy to do the journal, I wasn't sure I had the energy to wrangle additional funding. So I started turning to various colleagues, and I really thought that it would go to another existing board member. The timing didn't work for any of them, and I believe it was Jane who said, "York College is such a powerhouse right now. Why don't you talk to those folks?" Particularly with the Naylor [Workshop on Undergraduate Research], you know. I was so very grateful when talking with Emily and Gabriel that the answer came back "we are curious, we would love to hear more."

**Gabriel Cutrufello** (Editor from 2021–current): I remember being aware of that through the Naylor. I know Jane and I talked about it even in passing a couple of times, and then,

Doug, it was *The Naylor Report's* symposium year that was the first time you and I met face to face. Dominic [DelliCarpini] had mentioned it to me as they were looking for a home. It would make a lot of sense because the Naylor was already there. I still can't believe that you were doing all of this by yourself or [that] anybody does this by themselves. At first I was scared by the idea, but then Emily and Kim and everybody else have been really wonderful.

**Cope:** All three of us were pretty green, but we assembled a huge team, and that's how we've made it work. We told Dominic we would do it, but that he should be the publisher. Gabe, Kim, and I are all highly organized people, so the three of us work pretty well together. Then we also brought on Travis Kurowski, who is one of our creative writing colleagues and specializes in literary publications as an area of research. So we're a team of five people plus interns.

**Peck:** I was brand new to York College that year and attended the Naylor symposium, so I was really thrilled to be asked to be involved. I had known about the journal through Writing Center research because there are several essays from *Young Scholars* that were featured in the *Oxford Guide*. So I knew about all of the great work that was happening, and I was in the right place at the right time to get involved.

**Cope:** We had also just implemented a new vertical research curriculum in our [Professional Writing] major, so we were very interested in undergraduate research on the teaching side of

things. It was a good and timely fit for us for lots of reasons.

**Greer:** One thing that interested me that I want to note is—Gabe, when you were talking, you said you were scared or nervous when you took it over. I so clearly remember hanging up the phone after talking to Laurie when I had agreed to take it and being like, “Holy crap, if I don't figure this out, it's going to be really bad.” I think that speaks to the power and importance of the journal. I think that sense of weight is important and is about the commitment people have to bringing forward undergraduate voices in our field, so it was interesting to hear that in a couple places.

**Downs:** [On that new-editor feeling of questioning what we just signed up for,] In the immortal words of Socrates: “I drank what?”

**Cutrufello:** Yeah, it's always been a wonderful journal and an institution in the field, and I was like, “Are we really going to do this?” We've done two volumes now, and even though you do a year to get the volume together, it feels bizarre. Everything related to *Young Scholars* is moving at warp speed while the rest of my life moves at normal speed. Before you know it, it's September and [the edited volume is] due in December.

**Greer:** I remember when the deadline for the journal was June 30th. I would be giddy those last two weeks when the submissions really rolled in because it felt like a present every time I opened my inbox.

**Cope:** Kim gave us the update yesterday during our editorial meeting. She was comparing numbers this year to the same time last year.

**Peck:** I was a little nervous, and then I found that 60% of the submissions had come in the week leading up to the deadline. That was a big question for us as editors coming in because it was a pretty big change we made when we decided to have an April deadline instead of a June deadline. There was a lot of discussion about that and a lot was driven by our infrastructure. So at least for me, I was very nervous about how that was going to go, and so far it's gone okay. I think that's one of the challenges, too, with switching editorial teams—you have different constraints based on your institutional context and you have to balance that with the needs of the journal.

**Cutrufello:** Don't forget that we made that change, and then COVID hit. So not only did those add a big change with our first volume, but we were trying to integrate the line editing as a class space for our editing course. Actually, Volume 18 had the first round of edits done by Mike Zerbe's class, and we were doing all of that during COVID.

**Stewart:** A seemingly unique feature of the peer review process at *Young Scholars in Writing* in the world of academic scholarship and undergraduate research is the use of Faculty Advisory Editors, or FAEs, academics who mentor student researchers through the editorial process. *YSW* got its first faculty editorial board in 2008, with each member functioning as an FAE. Where did this idea of an

FAE come from, and what has the process of recruiting and using FAEs been like for each editor/editorial team over the years?

**Grobman:** I'm certain it was that I couldn't do it alone anymore—and Jane had helped me a lot—so I wanted to make it official. I'm surprised it's that late because that would have been Volume 6. It might have been more relaxed and informal when we first started.

**Downs:** I did remember it as being the fourth year as well, around '05 when your call went out.

**Grobman:** I got some really great people who wanted to be involved. It really arose from need, and then it was very smooth to get people involved. I put out a call and the right number of people showed up.

**Downs:** Jane and Laurie, do you remember in one of the early meetings at *Cs* where we were trying to figure out what to call the role? I don't know that any of us really loved [the term "FAE."].

**Grobman:** We must have wanted "editors" so that there was more authority than an advisor.

**Greer:** I remember when recruiting new board members, one thing that became obvious to me was a need to have FAEs who could handle the kind of submissions they were getting. When I was thinking about board members, that was always a piece of it. The other thing, and I think this is a challenge within every institution in our field, is making sure that our board is diverse. I remember that coming up as

a challenge when I was editing, and I think it's a systemic challenge. The third piece from my experiences inviting new board members is explaining that this is not an honorary position. In talking to people I've adopted the term "a worker bee board." These are people who want to do the doing, and that may be different than some other editorial boards that meet once a year and provide some kind of broad level oversight for a publication.

**Downs:** My first three or so years that I was editing, I had a slow learning curve on exactly the things you're talking about. The first couple years, I just assumed people would keep doing the work if they said they would. I didn't understand the variability among them and how some people couldn't have enough given to them, and then other people would try but couldn't really help. One of my challenges was I was too hands-off in my first few years. The same with that diverse composition—I just thought it would solve itself, and it didn't. I got better the last couple years at going out and making direct requests to people. By my turn, we also had available people who had contributed as undergraduates. During my last couple of years, I wound up recruiting four or five, and that helped a lot because not only do you get the perspective of someone who's willing to work, but to have had positive experiences from the other side of the project? That was awesome.

**Cope:** One of the changes that we've made is we've reduced the number of graduate students on the board because of our concern about their time. We also want to make sure that

they have enough publications under their belt to be confident in terms of mentoring. We haven't asked anyone to leave the board; we just haven't accepted new graduate students on the board. We've also taken opportunities when we've gotten manuscripts that aren't a good fit for anyone on our board to go and recruit new people. So our approach is: when we need a new FAE or someone to meet a particular need, then we reach out to the special interest groups and tell them, "We need you." So we talk about those exact issues regularly.

**Peck:** Some of our conversations have been thinking about how formalized we want this process to be. We haven't moved on or solved these things, but they are definitely conversations we've had, and they're really tied to this question Jane brought up about diversity of the board. As the current board, that's still something we're grappling with.

**Downs:** It's not just FAEs, and I think it's not just *Young Scholars*. The challenge is supporting scholars of color getting involved in mentoring because of the press of academic and daily life. I think we have real color line problems in the field, and probably more than our field, with offering that support and openings.

**Cope:** We've been keeping an eye on the masthead and where our authors are from. We're starting to see a little more of a mixture of universities, not only R1s or elite universities, but it still leans that way. That's where faculty have the time and where special courses can exist, so we're seeing that in other ways, too.

**Stewart:** *Young Scholars in Writing* has been adding genres over the course of its issues, with Comment and Response pieces introduced in 2005, First Year Spotlights introduced in 2008, and Methodological Reflections introduced in 2021. Why were these new genres added to the journal? What function were they providing?

**Grobman:** Comment and Response was the first that was added, probably because I had a few students in my upper-level courses who weren't doing the big research projects. The Comment and Response was a good way to enter the discourse but not have to spend months on it. It was also because we're trying to get faculty to use the journals in classes as course texts. Were you the one who started it, Doug?

**Downs:** Yeah, I did a fair amount, although you were receptive to it. Shannon Carter and I were the first editors on Comment and Response. I had come up [from] a graduate student to an early faculty member working to teach first-year students research as inquiry. During my PhD at University of Utah, the writing program was about trying to teach academic argument, this notion of contribution to an ongoing conversation. So I had that sense coming out of graduate school about how you can't convincingly talk to first-year students about [argument as contribution to conversation] if you can't show them instances of contributing and participating in that conversation. It took the arrival of more content-oriented approaches to first-year writing that would have students working in writing studies. So Shannon and I were looking and saying we were going to see more [first-year student contributions] and

that they should have a venue. When I brought it up to you, Laurie, and to the board, there was a good amount of excitement for [a First-Year Spotlight section]. Laurie had a very wise recognition that we couldn't feed it into the regular FAE stream because of the variance, so Laurie asked Shannon and me to manage the section and divert those submissions to us.

**Grobman:** If I'm correct, you got rid of it? Do you still have it?

**Peck:** We have [the First-Year Spotlight section], but unlike what was just described, we didn't separate it, so it goes through the same process to connect with an FAE. For us, it's more of a publication category in terms of the final product versus a different approach. This current call for papers, we didn't include it as a separate category because we were finding a lot of submissions as First-Year Spotlights that were not research-based or in writing studies, so there was confusion about the First-Year Spotlight category. Instead, in the call for papers we said we're accepting research including that by first year students and asked to indicate if you are a first-year student.

**Grobman:** I think it's important to have that space for first-year students who are studying writing, and it's unfortunate that so many students are not studying writing in first-year writing. I'm glad to hear that you still have it, but are your expectations the same as for other pieces?

**Cope:** Absolutely.

**Downs:** It doesn't surprise me to hear Kim and Emily saying [that their expectations for First-Year Spotlight articles are similar all other articles] because one of the arcs that we've seen over the years is that submissions for the spotlight kept looking closer and closer to the submissions we received in the upper division. That may have something to do with the evolution of first-year instruction itself, but I wasn't surprised to hear that—looking at the submission stream—you're seeing you can integrate them.

**Cope:** This conversation is really interesting. I entered the field in 2006 when I started a master's degree in English. When I started at [University of] Tennessee, they already had a first-year writing program that was inquiry-based, so I never knew the field before that was a common approach. Now, "writing about writing" is a more focused version of inquiry about writing. I find it fascinating that there was a time when that kind of inquiry wasn't as common.

**Grobman:** From the start, we did have the [First Year] Spotlight section be about writing. We often had to turn away submissions, and decide if it was within the scope, so I'm not surprised you were still getting submissions that weren't about writing.

**Peck:** I'll jump in about the Methodological Reflection. This was one of the genres that we brought in and it really came out of the Naylor Symposium. Emily and I were both in a working group that looked at methods in undergraduate research and writing studies, and

one of the conversations we had was thinking about what methods end up getting showcased in our publications. We did a quick, informal look at *Young Scholars* and saw an overrepresentation of rhetorical or textual based work, so we wanted to try to open up space for research, particularly empirical research that was in progress. We wanted to have undergraduates share their experiences and focus on the kind of methods they were using. One of our goals as an editorial team was to think about *Young Scholars in Writing* as a teaching resource and about ways we could continue to build that legacy, and we felt like that genre could contribute because it's a different experience for undergraduates. That was as defined as we had the genre, and a lot came from the first volume we had, Volume 18. We had two submissions that were accepted as Methodological Reflections, and we figured out with the writers what the genre was and what it looks like. We've seen two distinct schools of thought in how they're working. One of them is more of a narrative reflection of the experience of being a researcher as an undergraduate, and then on the other side, we've had more focused discussion of particular methods and spotlight that as a way to approach particular kinds of research. We've only had [this genre] in two volumes, so we'll see where that grows, but that's where the genre came from.

**Cope:** That new genre has been an ongoing conversations among the three of us, because initially we were in very different places on what we were looking for. Some of us were very comfortable with the narrative, while some of us (mainly me) were not.



**Grobman:** Doug, I believe in your *Naylor Report* chapter it suggested that meta narratives about the research could be an important new way to circulate information on undergraduate research in writing studies. Maybe you're going to end up with another new genre, one that will be more methodological like Emily wants and one that's more reflective of the whole experience.

**Peck:** This is where the blog for *Young Scholars* has come from: trying to have that space for reflection and showing who these writers are. Emily, I think it was your Digital Writing class that pointed out and suggested to us that a focus on the actual people involved in the journal is what would make this more salient for undergraduates. It's showing the real people involved in this and what their experiences were. We've had some great interns who have been able to take the blog and showcase the writers, FAEs, and parts of the process.

**Cope:** Yeah, and the opportunity for my Digital Writing students to do interviews and produce digital content is a perfect learning experience. It gets important work done for *Young Scholars*, and is one reason why this has been a good fit for York College. It's why future editors should take it, too, because it's been a wonderful client-based type of writing for students.

**Stewart:** In the June 2021 article by Doug Downs, "Spanning Student Networks: Designing Undergraduate Research Journal Websites to Foster Student-Student Mentoring," he discusses the YSW website and states, "The current editors are finding ways to 'stretch' the platform to

incorporate greater humanization, including prominent author photos and 'feature posts' on authors." How has this "stretch" been put into action to allow the website to be more functional in expanding *Young Scholars's* network or to generally improve on the site over time?

**Cutrufello:** I can start. The idea was really Emily and Kim trying to make it work with me and Travis, because of some of the limitations of the platform. We're still using PKP's [The Public Knowledge Project] journal hosting, and they have a lot of limitations with the templates that they have. Getting the issue set up is a good two days.

**Cope:** We don't use that anymore except to publish it.

**Cutrufello:** With Google Drive and shared files you're able to track editing much better. PKP is kind of clunky compared to cloud-driven solutions at this point, so it's just when we are ready to publish the whole thing online.

**Downs:** I feel you 1,000% on that. I could never get my mind around using the announcements feature the way you guys have figured out how to use it for the blog. I'm glad you all have figured that out.

**Cutrufello:** But even with that, there's nothing in the system that lets me change the email notification. I can't make it more informative or useful for the receivers. But now, we pay for [youngscholarsinwriting.org](http://youngscholarsinwriting.org), [youngscholarsinwriting.com](http://youngscholarsinwriting.com), and [youngscholarsinwriting.net](http://youngscholarsinwriting.net), so it's a standalone hosted site name. There is a lot more flexibility, and that's going to make it a lot more portable now. It was challenging

getting everything moved over here from Doug, but now all we have to do is hand it off and it's good to go.

**Cope:** Getting back to the question, we've really tried to include more photos of people, and we're trying to use social media more consistently. Again, it helps that we have interns, so it works for us because we need those projects for our students and we have the infrastructure to do that. We're still trying to figure out how to do more of that.

**Cutrufello:** As an interesting side note, the original idea to start including more pictures of the authors actually came out of a usability review that one of your classes did, Emily. So we actually had students review the site as is, and that was a recommendation that came from her students.

**Downs:** That surprised me in my research for the article. There's a section that does comparison across various journal websites in our field, and there is no Holy Grail at all. You've got your choices of kinds of bad in what journal sites do, and the particular flavor of bad just depends on what a given publisher imagines its purposes as. Nobody has figured this out yet.

**Cutrufello:** I will say, because we're still using OJS [Open Journal Systems] and PKP, the journal is listed in the MLA bibliographies. The templates are a bit clunky but the trade-off is that it becomes a lot more accessible to undergraduate researchers and to their faculty members.

**Stewart:** What are some of your hopes for the future of undergraduate research and *Young Scholars in Writing*?

**Grobman:** I hope it's still going when I retire, which may be soon. I just hope that it keeps going, and that there [are] generations of faculty who love it and love undergraduate research that think it's important and exciting.

**Cutrufello:** I would agree with that, Laurie. I think for me—and it's really heartening, Emily, to hear what you were saying about graduate school—the idea that the field is starting to seriously consider how we teach, train, or mentor graduate students so they themselves become mentors of undergraduate research is really what I see as the future. A goal of mine is making the journal attractive and not as overwhelming as a project for the next institution to take on. Making it sustainable for the future.

**Peck:** I have to add [making the journal] portable to my goals. Part of this is trying to have it be so that there are pieces of the journal that make it so it's not so institutionally specific in terms of needing that infrastructure. That way when a new team comes in with a vision we're not restricted to people that have the strong institutional infrastructure to be able to do that. Sustainability, but also portability is tied into that.

**Grobman:** Are you still doing print?

**Cutrufello:** We are, but actually one of the things we did starting this year is ask everyone on the mail list if they still wanted to have a

print edition. I emailed the entire list and said to let us know if they did, and to give us updated information or to let us know if they're fine with digital. So we only mailed about 85. All of the authors received two copies of the print edition each, but this allowed us to take those savings on the print cost and make the newest print issue in full color, and put out a much higher quality artifact so it looks more like what's online.

**Greer:** This may be a little bit of a different direction in terms of hopes for the future, but I think we continue to have more work to do in terms of diversity in undergraduate research and making sure that we have submissions from all kinds of scholars, from community colleges to R1s, from non-selective institutions to selective, people of all races, genders, identities, everything. The one fear that I have for undergraduate research, and I hope *Young Scholars* can be a place where we work against this, is hyper-professionalization. I don't want it to turn to where an undergraduate student [needs to] have a publication if they want to go to graduate school.

**Cope:** I agree, and I hope to see more research about that. There's not enough empirical research about the consequences of engaging in undergraduate research in our field.

**Cutrufello:** I completely agree, Emily. I think it's an interesting thing to think about. You want to maintain editorial standards and it is a research-driven journal. But you're right, it's not just about pumping out the next group of PhD candidates.

**Downs:** Thinking again about if *YSW* has a challenge for the next decade, it is inventing one of the first academic journals in our field to figure out how to publish activist research that doesn't look like scholarship but happens in a scholarly journal. It's an impossible idea because it's almost oxymoronic, but we've got to be thinking about if there isn't a model for this stuff. And yes, we have this sense of what scholarship looks like, but I think what's coming isn't going to look like scholarship. So how are we going to get ourselves comfortable with it, and how do you make the standards? As far as I can tell from talking to Laurie, when Laurie and Candace invented *Young Scholars* their absolute model was what the best scholarly journals in our field were doing. I think if we want to make *Young Scholars* live out its full potential, we almost have to flip from that and ask what our students can show us along these lines of activist research that would make us the model that the rest of the field looks at? I don't know what that's going to be, but I think it's the question.

**Cope:** We've talked about that a lot as a board because we are invested in methods and think that there's something of value that we're giving people when we give them particular empirical methods. So if we say "everything is research," then we might not give them anything valuable. [...] There's a lot of hope that undergraduate research is going to "disrupt" research. Well, isn't that a lot of pressure to put on people who've never had a chance to design a survey before?

**Downs:** I think that lays out exactly one of the main challenges.

**Cope:** One of the things that we were very struck by this year was that although we are a more traditional looking journal, the *topoi* that these scholars are investigating are activist. They're pushing and looking at things that I don't see in every journal, and so I think

that they're already doing a lot of that work challenging the field by what they choose to research.

**Downs:** What we're applying the methods to, what makes sense to people to ask about, is a huge piece of it. When the methods don't help you answer new questions, how do you evolve the methods or add to them?