Chapter 14
What shapes everyday translanguaging? Insights from a global mental health project in Northern Uganda

Jane Andrews, Richard Fay and Ross White

Abstract

Keywords

_____

Jane Andrews
Department of Education and Childhood, University of West of England, Bristol, UK
email: Jane.AndrewsEDU@uwe.ac.uk

Richard Fay
School of Environment, Education and Development, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
email: richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk

Ross White
Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, University of Liverpool, Liverpool,   UK
email: Ross.White@liverpool.ac.uk

14.1 Introduction

The origins of the concept of *translanguaging* lie in educational settings, in particular, in Cem Williams' (1996) Welsh term *trawsieithu* describing the purposeful moving between Welsh and English in classroom speech and writing. The concept has retained an educational remit, e.g. Blackledge and Creese (2010) use the term to account for flexible uses of heritage languages and English within complementary schooling in England; and the authors in García and Kleyn (2016)'s edited volume reflect upon the purposeful embrace of translanguaging with emergent bilinguals in New York schools. However, it is now noted that the translanguaging concept is also being applied more widely (García & Li Wei, 2014). Thus, the term has broadened out include what is, for many people, in many contexts, countries, and communities, part of everyday communicative functioning in personal and professional lives. As we will discuss shortly, there are also a number of other terms referring to the same or similar linguistic phenomena and these include our preferred term, translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2013) as discussed below.

Our chapter contributes to this broadened application of the concept by exploring the everyday fieldwork practices of a team of Global Mental Health (GMH) researchers collaborating with applied linguists.[1] As part of this broadening move, rather than describe the translingual practice we observed within this fieldwork, our focus here is on what might have shaped that translingual practice. To this end, in this chapter as informed by ecological theory (e.g. Bateson, 1972; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Stelma & Fay, 2014), we introduce a theoretical frame which enables us to consider possible contextual, personal, disciplinary, methodological, and other influences on researchers' and research participants' translingual practices.

We begin the chapter by exploring recent discussions and definitions of translanguaging and associated terms, including the multilingual tu*rn* (Conteh & Meier, 2014) and translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2013). Next, having introduced our ecological thinking, we use it to consider why specific translingual practices might have emerged in the GMH fieldwork in question. We conclude with a discussion of the potential benefits (for this GMH case study and beyond) of using an ecological lens to understand the shaping influences on translingual practice. Finally, we explore potential implications for research teams, and those with whom they work, in settings where resources from multiple languages are likely to be in play.

---

[1] The fieldwork team consisted of: the project leader (RW); a clinical psychologist from a Uganda university (RK); and an applied linguist (RF) and a linguistically-inclined creative artist (KF) from the broader project. Further applied linguistics support in making sense of the translanguaging aspects of the fieldwork was provided by JA. The authorship of this chapter reflects the translanguaging focus subsequently added but the authors gratefully acknowledge the fieldwork roles of all concerned in enabling such a focus to develop.

14.2 Translanguaging in Research

Before beginning our discussion of the GMH project, we now set out three key influences on our writing and thinking in relation to the concepts of translanguaging in research and in everyday professional practice, namely: 1) explorations and definitions of translanguaging and related terms; 2) findings from studies on translanguaging in contexts beyond education; and 3) findings from studies focusing upon translanguaging in research teams.

14.2.1 Defining Translanguaging

Otheguy, García, and Reid (2015: 283) define translanguaging as "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages". This quotation highlights the socially-constructed nature of what we refer to as a language, and this point is valuable in considering translanguaging in contexts and countries where many languages are shared by speakers. Later in their discussion, Otheguy et al. (2015: 292) refer to "social and locational constraints" on choices made to deploy particular linguistic resources in particular contexts. This provides a reminder that language use is shaped by the local and global influences around it. It also invites us to view tranlanguaging practices ecologically (as we do in this chapter).

Otheguy et al. (2015: 299) focus on how speakers use their full repertoire of language resources in interactions at times they deem this to be appropriate. The authors contrast this with a perspective on language use which demands separation of languages in particular tasks and contexts, with educational assessment being one such context. The authors state that learners are being disadvantaged by being directed to use just one of their languages in an educational assessment. The idea of disadvantage, being caused by assumptions that one language will serve a particular communicative purpose well, is one which may have resonance beyond the world of educational assessment. This point alerts us to a tension between the model of languages in use (a separation model rather than a more fluid translanguaging model) in the field of practice (educational assessment) and the 'everyday' model of languages in use by speakers as they interact spontaneously in their lives.

14.2.1 Translanguaging as expression of identity

As noted earlier and as indicated in the coverage in this volume, translanguaging is a concept which is documented in many contexts of communication, using different media. Canagarajah (2013), speaking of what he terms translingual practice, draws upon instances of translanguaging in music, e.g. the rapping of M.I.A. as she moves between London slang to the Tamil used within her family and community in London. Canagarajah uses such examples to support his case that translanguaging is a phenomenon that is prevalent in what he terms "cosmopolitan relationships" and that it is used consciously for the purpose of expressing aspects of personal identities. In a similar way, Li Wei's (2011, p. 1223) use of what he terms a methodological "moment analysis" to explore adolescents' uses of their linguistic resources in playful ways which also express their identity positions. Although these moves between languages are playful and spontaneous, they are also, Li Wei (2011, 1222) notes, "spur of the moment actions that are *semiotically highly significant* [our italics]". These instances of translanguaging suggest to us that understanding the positionings made by those interacting through speech (speaking, singing, rapping) is important for any entering into the discursive space. We now move on to exploring prior research into translanguaging and uses of linguistic resources in research teams.

14.2.3 Translanguaging in Everyday Practice in Research Teams

In contrast to the contexts discussed above, a subset of researchers, often working as linguistic ethnographers[2] or as sociolinguists have reflected on what could be called everyday translanguaging as part of their research practice. Given the similarities between our focus in this chapter and this area of translanguaging in research teams, we now consider three such projects. Firstly, Androulakis (2013) analyses the "emerging" multilingual practices in a large team of researchers working in Greece in the context of language education for adult immigrants from countries including Albania, Pakistan and Romania. In this case, the team consisted of academic researchers and 'linguistic mediators' who worked with both researchers and researcher participants. Androulakis describes how, as part of an emerging and responsive research design, the project became "more multilingual than planned" and an outcome of this was that the team needed to be aware of, and reactive to, power asymmetries arising. The study illustrates how, when researching complex and fluid contexts with high levels of mobility, researchers need to be responsive to linguistic repertoires amongst

---

[2] e.g. see http://www.uklef.net/

research participants, researchers and mediators. Unexpected, interpersonal issues relating to perceptions of power within the team then needed attention.

Jones, Martin Jones, and Bhatt (2000, p. 197) report on a "three way, translingual dialogue" as researchers engaged with each other and then with research participants in relation to multilingual fieldwork observations, diary entries and diary-based interviews. Discussion about data and research involved moving fluidly between the languages of the speakers in the research and the language for (co)constructing meanings for reporting the research in speech and writing. As such, a translanguaging approach to research practice could be said to have been in play.

A third study which offers insights into the everyday functioning of research teams who engage in discussions which display translanguaging in action comes from Creese and Blackledge (2012) who explore team research processes in a study of complementary schooling in England. Multilingual researchers engaged with each other in team meetings often "mediating" data gathered in a specific language for the benefit of the other team members, in a similar manner to that reported in Androulakis (2013). Such mediation is reported to have often moved beyond conveying linguistic meanings to communicating cultural practices and positionings in the contexts and communities of the study. In addition, the communication around the meanings attributed to the research encounters moved across spoken and written modes: from recorded observations of languages used in naturalistic settings, via transcriptions and translations of the data to discussion and mediation of meanings in research team meetings using a common language which was different to those used in the research settings. These three brief examples show us that while sociolinguists and applied linguists research language in use and translanguaging as a phenomenon in real world settings, the interactions about the research in research teams can be, in themselves, be conceptualised as acts of translanguaging.

14.3 An Ecological Frame for Understanding Translingual Practice

We now move to the ecologically-informed lens we use to consider the everyday, professional (i.e. researcher) translingual practice evident in the GMH fieldwork. Drawing variously on earlier ecological thinking (e.g. Bateson, 1972, Barker, 1968, Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Gibson, 1979), Stelma and colleagues recognise the ecological interdependence of, or mutual relationship between, between an individual (or group) and their environment (Gibson, 1979; Reed, 1996; Stelma & Fay, 2014, p 518). It is that mutuality which determines an individual's action possibilities (or affordances for action) in the world. More precisely, we can say that action possibilities are shaped by individuals' perception of the world.

Although much of an individual's action in the world is spontaneous and, hence, an individual may perceive the affordances in their environment with limited or no conscious consideration, nonetheless, this ecological perspective assumes that the human drive to action is inherently purposeful (Tomasello, Carpenter, Call, Behne, & Moll, 2005; Papadopoulou, 2012). Thus, sooner or later, those actions in the world will be shaped by the individual's more deliberate perception of possible affordances in their environment. For Stelma and colleagues, drawing on the work of Young, DePalma, and Garrett (2002), such deliberate perception can be understood using the concept of intentionality. In turn, intentionality, following Dennett (1987) and Malle, Moses and Baldwin (2001), can be understood akin to the ordinary, folk psychological meaning of 'being purposeful'. Stelma and colleagues suggest that this concept of intentionality is central in an ecological understanding of individuals' ongoing activity. For our current purposes, we can say that the translingual practices observable in the GMH fieldwork will have been shaped by the researchers' more deliberate perception of possible linguistic affordances in their environment, and that the emergence of these practices can be understood in relation to the intentionalities of the researchers involved.

As inspired by Stelma and colleagues' ecological perspective on researcher development (e.g. Stelma, 2011; Stelma & Fay, 2014; Stelma, Fay, & Zhou, 2013; Fay & Stelma, 2016), the large project within which the GMH fieldwork was located[3], used the concept of intentionality in order to understand the informed and purposeful decisions that researchers might make regarding the linguistic aspects of their study (Holmes, Fay, Andrews, & Attia, 2013, 2016). More recently, we have used the GMH project to support the proposal that researcher education should embrace a more plurilingual approach to language in research (Andrews, Fay, & White, forthcoming).

However, in this chapter, our ecological focus is less on the researcher (and their researcher education experiences and development), and more on the complexities of the everyday translingual practice occurring within the fieldwork. Therefore, although building on the above ecological work, our focus is now on the concept of shaping influences, which has its roots in Urie Bronfenbrenner's bio-ecological perspectives on human development (e.g. Bronfenbrenner, 1979). In particular, we will consider the possible contextual, personal, disciplinary, methodological, and other influences on the translingual practice we observed in the fieldwork.

Bringing this together, we are concerned with: the ecological interdependence of, or mutual relationship between, between fieldwork researchers and the fieldwork environments; the research action possibilities available to such researchers; the shaping influences upon their perception of

---

[3] *Researching Multilingually at the Borders of Language, the Law, the Body and the State* (funded by the UK AHRC, AH/L006936/1). www.researching-multilingually-at-borders.com

action possibilities (perceptions made tangible, for example, through researcher reflections on their research thinking and practice); the purposeful, rather than spontaneous, nature of those researcher perceived possibilities for action; and the competing intentionalities shaping these perceptions of action possibilities. This means that we are concerned with the shaping influences on the everyday translingual practice, which took place within the research team. Such shaping influences can, we believe, be elucidated through the researchers' thinking and their reflections upon the linguistic aspects of their research as it was planned and as it developed in the field.

14.4. GMH Fieldwork in Lira (northern Uganda)

Uganda is a linguistically complex and diverse society which could provide many contexts for research into everyday translanguaging. Our focus lies less with these everyday social contexts in themselves and more with the translingual practices that emerged in research activity, which took place in proximity to such contexts in the Lira region of northern Uganda. Further, the GMH research activities themselves did not focused on translanguaging. However, as the researchers reflected on their emerging fieldwork experiences, the translingual practices they noted not only challenged some of the linguistic aspects of the methodological assumptions the project, they also prompted further reflection on why these particular translingual practices emerged as they did, and why they did so despite the carefully planned linguistic parameters for the project.

The project was designed and led by a clinical psychologist (RW) and explicitly framed as GMH-focused research (White, Jain, Orr, & Read, 2016). It aimed to better understand:

1) what happens when emotional distress crosses borders of geography, language, beliefs and practices; and
2) how these various borders impact on the relevance and validity of psychosocial interventions aimed at reducing this distress.

The Lira region of northern Uganda was seen as an appropriate context for exploring such questions given the many years of war experienced by the region with resulting trauma and disruption still being experienced by many local people. In the above research aims, the focus on language was consolidated through the involvement of language specialists (i.e. RF and KF, see footnote 1) in the Lira fieldwork. Thus, our current translingual practice focus developed as a consequence of language was being foregrounded and problematised in what was primarily GMH-focused research. This foregrounding and problematising of language represents a shaping influence on the fieldwork,

thus, over and above the specific GMH research agenda, the research team intentionally perceived action possibilities within the fieldwork which were linguistic in character.

For the fieldwork phase of this project, the core team of researchers worked with a group of local research assistants who were located in, or otherwise identified with, the Lira region. In addition to other languages, including English (the language in which the project was originally described in funding applications and so on), all the researchers were speakers of Lango, the language providing an important marker of local identity. Thus, the project intentionally recruited research assistants competent in the language seen to be the language linked to the context concerned. As we will explain shortly, this linguistic rationale was important given the project's adoption of the DIME (Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation) methodology.[4] In turn, this intentional adoption of the DIME approach represents a further shaping influence on the translingual practices of the fieldwork in that the linguistic ideology underpinning the DIME methodology shaped the researchers' perceived possibilities for research action.

The DIME approach for developing and evaluating psychosocial interventions for mental health difficulties in low and middle-income countries (LMICs) recognises, and seeks to address, the potential ineffectiveness, inappropriacy, and epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2009) arising when diagnostic measures and interventions developed in the High Income Countries (HICs) of the Global North (e.g. the UK) are transported, with little regard for methodological appropriacy (Holliday, 1994), to the LMICs of the Global South (e.g. Uganda). Thus, the DIME methodology builds on GMH's desire for psychosocial action appropriate for the social context concerned.

For our current purposes, it is important to note that the DIME approach challenges the often-held English-first approach towards mental health interventions. Instead, it locates most of the research activity in the local language with the intention that local understandings (of psychological well-being) are foregrounded and discussed in their own right. For the project in question, Lango (the language) and Lira (the region) were inextricably linked and the team's desire to foreground local understandings of well-being was linked to the Lango-articulation of them by locals associated with the Lira region. Whilst these understandings of language and context demonstrate the DIME methodological challenge to the typically Global North, English-medium approach to mental health, they are ideologically based on an essentially monocultural, monolingual view of context and of

---

[4]See http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/center-for-refugee-and-disaster-response/response_service/AMHR/dime/index.html.

.

'local' understandings of well-being. Thus, the researchers' thinking about language matters in the field was shaped by the foregrounding of language in the research design but also shaped, or indeed constrained, by the ideology of the particular methodology adopted for the fieldwork.

This consequences of the DIME challenge to an English-first, Global North approach are particularly evident in the first phase of the DIME approach which involves the rapid elicitation of local understandings of problems (affecting well-being) and identification of existing sources of support for them, local understandings elicited in (what is taken to be) the local language of the local population (understood to be culturally-homogeneous). Thus, in the planning for the Lira fieldwork, as coherent with the DIME methodology, the research design for the main fieldwork stages involved Lango-speaking local research assistants interacting with Lango-speaking local research participants as supported by training (involving both English and Lango) and doing so as supported by instruments originally produced in English but translated in advance into Lango.

Whilst all data generation and analysis were meant to be in Lango, once in the field, it quickly transpired that this intention was problematic and ran counter to the linguistic resources the research assistants and the participants used naturally in their interactions. For example, research assistants were expected to take verbatim written notes of participants' accounts in Lango, but quite a number of them were more comfortable in English literacy practices than they were in Lango ones. This was perhaps not surprising given that much of their education had been in and through English. This and other examples not only generated many language-oriented researcher reflections during the fieldwork as the challenges of operationalising the DIME approach became apparent, it also foregrounded the use within the research team of the researchers' diverse linguistic resources and their translingual practices with these resources. It also foregrounded the use within the wider social setting (as evident in the interactions with research participants) of individuals' diverse linguistic resources and their translingual practices with them.

14.5 Translanguaging in the Fieldwork

As already mentioned, the Lira-based fieldwork involved a core team of four researchers and a wider team of local researchers. Inspired to do so by the creative artist in their midst, the core team maintained a collective video-diary in addition to their individual fieldnotes and researcher journals. The project leader also maintained a public-facing blog[5] (from which all data extracts in this section are drawn). As our purpose in this chapter is less with the translingual practices evident in the fieldwork as linguistic phenomena in their own right and more with our reflections on what may

---

[5] https://rosswhiteblog.wordpress.com

have shaped these practices, in this section, we discuss five possible influences, which may have shaped the researchers' perceived possibilities for action and their intentional activities vis-à-vis language. First, however, we begin with some insights captured in the above fieldwork texts regarding the translingual practice that developed 1) within the fieldwork team, and 2) as the DIME methodology was operationalised in the field.

14.5.1 Translingual Practice within the Team

As viewed from afar and in advance, the fieldwork phase of this project could easily have involved an English-medium core plus fieldwork featuring translation between English and Lango, and vice versa. Given the short period of fieldwork concerned (two weeks only), this reliance on translation (rather than investment by the core team in Lango language learning) seemed to make sense.

However, the communication that emerged within the fieldwork team involved linguistic elements taken from English, Lango, Acholi, Luganda, Kiswahili, and German, amongst others. Whilst English dominated overall, and Lango was foregrounded in the fieldwork interviews and related data management and analysis, the interactional meshing of other linguistic elements took place, we argue, with little regard for the defined boundaries of the named languages. In this sense, we view the team's communication as translingual practice. How did this come to pass?

As the four members of the core project team travelled north from Kampala to Lira, and as "… rural Uganda streamed by our windows and the red earth lining the road stretched out in front of us, we also practised some Lango words [RW blog entry, 30th March]".

Prior to this, the three-UK-based researchers had had no previous contact with this language and the playfulness with which they now engaged with the Lango lexicon was shaped by the Lango-English/English-Lango dictionary acquired in advance. This had been sourced by RF as part of a DIME-motivated embrace of the local language and desire to dislodge English as the only and main language of communication. Such playful beginnings in turn enabled important interactions between this core team and the wider team of local research assistants (excerpt 1):

Excerpt 1

> "Throughout the day we provided opportunities for the attendees to express themselves in the local Lango language. A key word that very much resonated with the events of today was 'Gen' which means 'Trust'. We are all acutely aware of the trust that people have to have in themselves, each other and the research process for projects such as this to come together and be completed. [30th March]".

Further, having applied linguists in the team made RW more confident in also engaging with Lango (excerpt 2):

Excerpt 2

"RF has got great use out of his Lango dictionary so far on this trip, and has been very keen to engage with the team in Lango if and when he can. I have been trying out some words and phrases too, the team have been very patient and forgiving of our attempts. [31st March]".

Whilst out for a morning jog, he (RW) observed (excerpt 3):

Excerpt 3

"As we ran past the throngs of children who were making their journey to school, I had the chance to practice some of my Lango greetings. The children responded to my efforts with warm-hearted giggles. [2nd April 2015]".

Further, he (RW) noted (excerpt 4):

Excerpt 4

"I also have to concede that having RF and KF in the team has increased the amount of Lango that I have been able to pick up [3rd April]".

The willingness of the core team to invest in the Lango was well-received by the wider team (excerpt 5):

Excerpt 5

"RF and KF spent time this afternoon chatting with [one of the research supervisors] about the history, culture and language of the Lango people. I joined them just as they were gleaning information from [her] about words and phrases that can be used to establish some basic conversations in Lango …It is great to see how enthusiastically the local people engage with us about the Lango language. They are clearly delighted that we are keen to engage with them about this and learn what we can …[1st April]".

The core team's engagement with the local community was enriched not just by a translingual practice dimension but also by a culturally-respectful multimodality. For example, when visiting a girls' secondary school, having been introduced to one class (excerpt 6):

Excerpt 6

"… we shared some thoughts with the members of the class who were curious about these visitors from the UK. KF did a great job of teaching the girls some basic German phrases. RF (who had thankfully brought his tin whistle on the trip) proceeded to invite the girls to accompany him with their singing as he played the Ugandan national anthem. A brave move that worked out wonderfully. RF has been trying to perfect the tune all week, and he picked a great time to absolutely nail it. The girls

stood proud and straight as they sang the words of the anthem – taken aback that this stranger should know the tune. It was a very special moment. The anthem complete, we bid the girls farewell (in the Lango language) and left the classroom; sounds of giggled excitement ringing in our ears [7th April]".

The team's engagement with Lango (and other local languages) was not restricted to playful, interactional areas, but also to areas more directly concerned with mental well-being and the project focus. Thus, RW blogs how he (excerpt 7):

Excerpt 7

"… used the time waiting for the supervisors to return to complete the checking of the interview recordings to ask … the research team about the Lango words that are used to describe elevated levels of distress. I was careful not to introduce terminology that is routinely used in the UK to describe and categorise complex mental health problems. 'Awingi' is a word that is used to describe strange behavior, or as X puts it, someone's 'wires not being right'. Links were made by the group between this term and bipolar disorder. …It was an enlightening conversation that only got to the tip of the proverbial iceberg. There has been much to learn on this trip, and there will be much more to learn about in future visits [8th April]".

Thus, through such translingual practices, not only were crucial relationships created and developed, but also language-oriented insights into well-being in the Lira-region were gained. This outcome was significantly shaped, we argue, by the presence of applied linguists in the team. Here, we find support for our earlier proposal (Andrews, Fay & White, forthcoming) that research teams , across disciplines and not just within language-oriented ones, would benefit from a foregrounding of language and a more fluid approach to it in their research activities. Further, the translingual practice that emerged within the team was also shaped methodologically, by the DIME-encouragement to embrace insights articulated through the local language. This is where we now turn our attention.

14.5.2 Translingal Practice as the DIME Methodology was Operationalised

The DIME methodology that the team adopted is prescriptive about language matters such as when the local language should be used exclusively. The reasons for such prescriptiveness, i.e. the desire to challenge the Global North, Anglo-centric tendencies within mental health interventions and research), are ones we applaud, but, as discussed earlier, when this ideology-shaped approach to language-in-research was operationalised in the field, certain challenges arose.

In spite of RW's efforts to maintain the DIME methodology in full regarding languages, what resulted, at least in part, was project communication in which Lango and English were used more flexibly, along with linguistic resources drawn from Acholi, Luganda, Kiswahili and perhaps other languages. Thus, notwithstanding the shaping influence of the DIME methodology vis-à-vis

language, the team used linguistic resources appropriate for them and their informants and did so without always following the language boundaries reified through the DIME methodology. In this sense, we view the team's methodology-based communication as translingual practice to some extent. How did this emerge?

Throughout the fieldwork, the researchers reflected on the DIME methodology including a frequent reconsideration of its language ideology. For example, in a blog entry early in the fieldwork, RW noted (excerpt 8):

Excerpt 8

> "It was great to have RF's input on the important role that the interplay between the two main languages used in the research group (i.e. English and Lango) will potentially have on the process that we are undertaking. It has been great to chat with him about the methodology we are using and how it makes allowances for this interplay in important ways, whilst perhaps also introducing a certain degree of rigidity to these issues also e.g. stipulating that the process of translation should only occur at the very end of the process. Some of the research assistants raised the possibility that some of the participants might actually be more keen to report the problems that they face in the English language than in Lango… It will be interesting to track this in the coming days [31st March 2015]".

Here, the influence of an applied linguistics perspective is evident, and once this kind of language-focused methodological reflection became habitualised, RW frequently returned to this aspect of the DIME operationalisation (excerpt 9):

Excerpt 9

> The project and its interesting mix of training offered in English, and research materials and interviews delivered in Lango has certainly got me reflecting on the subtleties of language. I find myself making maximum effort to maintain consistency with the words that I use to convey instructions in English. Although, all of the research team identify as having English as a 2nd Language, I invite a Lango speaker … to translate and repeat the instructions. I note how conscious I am of not engaging in a process of 're-interpreting' the guidance provided in the English–language and the manual and the verbal instructions that I am giving the research team. This is a key point of reflection for me – issues of interpretation are not unique to the movement between languages but can also be an issue within language (particularly when moving between written text and spoken word) [1st April]".

As this process of operationalising DIME developed, and the more nuanced understandings regarding English and its relationship to other languages in this context developed, RW noted that (excerpt 10):

Excerpt 10

> "Discussions with both RF and KF have also allowed me to reflect critically on the methodology that we have been employing and sharpened my awareness around the points in the process where the use of English language training has juxtaposed with the use of Lango in the delivery of interviews and the recording of associated information [3rd April]".

Further (excerpt 11):

Excerpt 11

"The interviewing pairs were instructed on how to collate and process the material that they had gathered through the interviews. We made steady progress through the day. All the material was in Lango and it was an interesting experience to be in the midst of numerous Lango conversations about the Lango-language data that made little or no sense to me. This was entirely in keeping with the guidance accompanying the methodology that we are using [4th April]".

Gradually, the DIME-informed assumption about a one-to-one relationship between a location (i.e. Lira) and a language (i.e. Lango) was problematised, often through critical moments such as the following which occurred when the team visited a university college nearby and (excerpt 11):

Excerpt 11

"… the principal provided more information about the ethnic make-up of Uganda. It seems that there are over 50 ethnic groups, of which the Buganda are the biggest (representing approximately a third of the population). The Buganda people are concentrated mainly in central Uganda, and are less numerous here in the North. It seems that English serves as a unifying language that can cut across the ethnic differences. In the past Kiswahili was promoted as a language that could unify the nation. This would have the benefit of facilitating cooperation with Kiswahili speaking East African neighbours such as Kenya, Tanzania etc. However, Kiswahili was resisted by large numbers of people in Uganda as it was traditionally associated with less educated people. Luganda is the most widely spoken indigenous language spoken in Uganda, but its potential use as a National language is resisted by some ethnic groups because it is so closely associated with the Buganda. It is important to note that the school that we visited yesterday and the University we visited today only teach students using English. This highlights the challenges that health professionals might have being taught in a language that is not necessarily the first language of the people that they subsequently treat. I think this serves to highlight the ecological validity and potential utility of the research that we are conducting [8th April]".

14.5.3 Possible shaping influences on translingual practice in the field

The above discussion of some of the fieldwork data exemplifies the rich seam of reflective insights concerning language in the research team and about the translingual practices which emerged within this team and about what may have shaped them. Thus, there were disciplinary influences at work: whilst the home discipline of clinical psychology can be critiqued as Anglo-centric, the particular GMH stance involved challenged this linguistic starting point. Further, the applied linguistics disciplinary concerns foregrounded and problematized language in ways less likely in a GMH-only project. Here, the value of a multi-/inter-disciplinary ways of research collaboration begins to be fleshed out.

The GMH challenge to Anglo-centricity was methodologically operationalised through the adoption of the DIME methodology. In turn, the team came to realise that, whilst the DIME methodology was laudable in many ways, it also embedded a somewhat naïve view of language and context, one that only minimally attended to the linguistic complexities of Uganda and the Lira region (i.e. the contextual shaping influence), and one which did not embrace the ways in which the individuals involved would make full use of their linguistic resources in ways which did not follow the neat boundaries of named languages. The team's realisation of this emerged through their collaborative reflective practices, once again reinforcing the value and significant shaping influence of interdisciplinarity. The interdisciplinary impetus was, in turn, shaped by the larger *Researching Multilingually* (see footnote 3) project within which this GMH project was located.

Finally, the translingual practices that emerged were both individually and socially driven in that particular individuals, with particular relationships with language and with languaging, were involved and interacted with each other. Thus, RW's initial linguistic caution arising from his perception of himself as not being a language specialist was modified through interaction with the seemingly effortless multilingualism of RK and the playful 'have a go' linguistic habits of RF and KF. Thus, RW was motivated to also have a go as encouraged by colleagues who did not reinforce the sense of language being a specialist pursuit but rather being something to be playfully embraced.

15.6. Some Concluding Observations

Based on the above discussion, we believe that the translanguaging concept – or, as we prefer, the translingual practice formulation - has the potential to deepen our understandings of how language operates in multi-/inter-disciplinary research beyond traditional disciplines of applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, language and education studies. We base this claim on our exploration of the researchers' experiences of the core team – including a clinical psychologist (RW) and an applied linguist (RF) – as they operationalised a clinical intervention approach which recommended practice privileging one local language. While the DIME methodology recognised that the use of a global language, originating in the northern hemisphere, such as English may be problematic in terms of reach and inclusivity, it maintained a model of language in use which proposed one language for one context which was clearly inappropriate in a multilingual society such as is found in Uganda. Such a model has recently been referred to as "monolanguaging" in Gramling's (2016) recent, critical text on the origins of monolingualism). As such the concept of translanguaging could be, we suggest, a valuable one for both researchers and practitioners (e.g. mental health

practitioners) as they plan their work in contexts where people are likely to have access to many linguistic resources and have strong preferences for when and how they make use of those resources.

Our next contribution to the exploration of translanguaging offered in this chapter is to situate its use within ecological theorising. This has allowed us not just to consider the phenomenon of translanguaging itself, for example, who uses which languages, when and how. It has prompted us to locate translanguaging within a nested series of personal, local, national, and international contexts. The examples of language choices noted by the researchers in the GMH project would be less well understood if the local and national contexts and practices of English-medium education experienced by the health practitioners in Uganda were not factored into a developing understanding of the uses of translanguaging documented in the fieldwork. We suggest that considering the ecological framing of any translanguaging episodes will enrich the work of researchers and practitioners who have a focus on language and those who are mainly situated in other disciplines but who recognise the impact of language in their work in research and/or practice.

By broadening out the consideration of translanguaging to include the ecological framing surrounding its occurrence and by applying it to research studies and practice in disciplines beyond sociolinguistics and applied linguistics we suggest that the recommendation made by Lawson and Sayers (2016) to ensure that research outcomes as well as conventional academic outputs can be achieved.

References

Andrews, J., Fay, R., & White, R. Forthcoming. From linguistic preparation to developing a translingual orientation – possible implications of plurilingualism for researcher education. In J. Choi, S. Ollerhead, & M. French (Eds.), *Plurilingualism in learning and teaching: complexities across contexts.* London: Routledge.

Androulakis, G. (2013). Researching language needs using 'insiders': mediated trilingualism and other issues of power asymmetries. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 368-384.

Barker, R. G. (1968). *Ecological psychology: concepts and methods for studying the environment of human behavior*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: a critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge.

Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: opportunities and challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2012). Voice and meaning-making in team ethnography. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *43*(3), 306-324.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *35*, 20-35.

Dennett, D. (1987). *The intentional stance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fay, R., & Stelma, J. (2016). Criticality, intentionality and intercultural action. In M. Dasli & A. Diaz (Eds.), *The critical turn in language and intercultural communication pedagogy: theory, research and practice* (pp.120-146). London: Routledge.

Fricker, M. (2009). *Epistemic injustice: power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.) (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students. Learning from classroom moments.* Abingdon: Routlegde.

García, O., and Li Wei, (2014). *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gibson, J.J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Gramling, D. (2016). *The invention of monolingualism*. London: Bloomsbury.

Holliday, A.R. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J., & Attia, M. (2013). Researching multilingually: new theoretical and methodological directions, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 285-299.

Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J., & Attia, M. (2016). How to research multilingually: possibilities and complexities. In Zhu Hua (Ed.), *Research methods in intercultural communication: a practical guide* (pp.88-102). London: Wiley.

Jones, K.E., Martin Jones, M., & Bhatt, A. (2000). Constructing a critical dialogic approach to research on multilingual literacy: participant diaries and diary interviews. In M. Martin Jones & K. E. Jones (Eds.), *Multilingual literacies: reading and writing in different worlds* (pp.319-351). Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Lawson, R., & Sayers, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Sociolinguistic research: application and impact*. London: Routledge.

Li Wei, (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1222-1235.

Li Wei (2014). Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary school classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children, *Classroom Discourse*, 5/2 158-175.

Malle, B. F., Moses, L. J., & Baldwin, D. A. (Eds.). (2001). *Intentions and intentionality: foundations of social cognition*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *6*(3), 281-307.

Papadopoulou, M. (2012). The ecology of role play: intentionality and cultural evolution. *British Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 575-592.

Reed, E.S. (1996). *Encountering the world: towards an ecological psychology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stelma, J. (2011). An ecological model of developing researcher competence: the case of software technology in doctoral research. *Instructional Science, 39*(3), 367-385.

Stelma, J., & Fay, R. (2014). Intentionality and developing researcher competence on a UK master's course: an ecological perspective on research education. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(4), 517-533.

Stelma, J., Fay, R., & Zhou, X. (2013). Developing intentionality and researching multilingually: an ecological and methodological perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 300-315.

Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M., Call, J., Behne, T., & Moll, H. (2005). Understanding and sharing intentions: the origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *28*, 675-735.

White, R., Jain, S., Orr, D.M.R., & Read, U. (Eds.). (2016). *The Palgrave handbook of sociocultural perspectives on global mental health*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, and C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: taking stock* (pp. 39–78). Llangefni: Canolfan Astudiaethau Iaith.

Young, M.F., DePalma, A., & Garrett, S. (2002). Situations, interaction, process and affordances: an ecological psychological perspective. *Instructional Science*. *30*(1), 47-63.

Short author biographies

Jane Andrews - an Associate Professor of Education at the University of the West of England, UK specialising in linguistic diversity amongst learners of all ages. (jane.andrewsEDU@uwe.ac.uk)

Richard Fay – Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Manchester, UK specialising in TESOL and Intercultural Communication/Education. (richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk)

Ross White - Reader in Clinical Psychology at the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, University of Liverpool, UK, specialising in Global Mental Health. (ross.white@liverpool.ac.uk)

From 2014-17, Jane, Richard and Ross were collaborating co-investigators in the AHRC-funded *Researching Multilingually at the Borders of Language, the Body, Law and the State* project. In particular, Ross was the lead researcher for Ugandan case study providing the contexts for the chapter, and Jane and Richard were part of the researching multilingually hub which provided support to, and developed insights into researching multilingually with, the project's case studies.