From linguistic preparation to developing a translingual orientation – possible implications of plurilingualism for researcher education

(Jane Andrews, Richard Fay and Ross White)[1]

1.   Introduction

In this chapter, we bring together a) some lines of literature-based thinking resonant with the focus of this volume, in particular Kubota's (2014) reframings of pluri-/multi-lingualism, and b) some researcher reflections on a case study rich in linguistic insights re researcher praxis. In this, our purpose is to consider how researcher education vis-à-vis language might support research that is undertaken multilingually. Bringing these ideas together also enables us to foreground an important move in our thinking about the linguistic aspects of researcher education; namely, the move from considering researchers' linguistic preparation for fieldwork to focusing on their development of what we, following Canagarajah's (2013) work, term a 'translingual orientation' (explored in detail in Section 3).

With regard to a) above, we begin by reviewing how applied researchers have prepared themselves to engage with participants in linguistically-diverse contexts (e.g. Tremlett, 2009; Gibb & Danero-Iglesias, 2017) and then consider how recent, reframed thinking about linguistic diversity - e.g. translanguaging (Blackledge & Creese, 2010), moving from considering languages to 'linguistic resources' (Heller, 2012) and translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2013) - may offer valuable insights for such applied researchers as they design their studies, consult diverse literatures, carry out fieldwork, undertake data analysis and interpretation, and (re)present their work in written and/or oral form. These two areas of literature inform the two areas of our researcher education proposals, i.e. linguistic preparation and the development of a translingual orientation.

With regard to b) above, our discussion has its roots in a body of research activity - specifically, a small network project and a large grant[2] - which focused on what we term "researching multilingually" (RM) (Holmes et al, 2013, 2016). To this end, we briefly introduce these projects before presenting the interdisciplinary *Translating Distress* (TD) case study located in the second, larger of the projects. Researcher reflections – from and on the Uganda-based fieldwork component of the TD case study - complete the coverage of what has informed our researcher education proposals.

We conclude the chapter by arguing that one way in which researcher education might become more attentive to the pluri-/multi-lingual turn would be through its contribution to the development of a translingual researcher orientation. We see this as being of value to researchers across disciplines rather than for those studies where languages might traditionally be considered as part of a researcher's toolkit (i.e. in disciplines such as linguistic ethnography, anthropology, translation studies).

---

[1] jane.andrewsEDU@uwe.ac.uk; richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk; ross.white@liverpool.ac.uk

[2] *Researching Multilingually* (network) [AH/J005037/1]; *Researching Multilingually at the Borders of Language, the Body, Law and the State* project (large grant) [AH/L006936/1] www.researching-multilingually-at-borders.com

2. Linguistic preparation for research

Using the term 'linguistic preparation' (Fay et al, 2015), we have previously reviewed the argument – found within distinctive academic disciplines (e.g. anthropology) and areas of professional practice and study (e.g. study abroad) - that a period of time spent in a foreign language environment needs to be prepared for with appropriate language (and intercultural) learning experiences.

For the discipline of anthropology, Tremlett (2009) notes that, while language learning has been central to researchers' engagements in fieldwork, little has been published on the processes of developing linguistic competence. Rather, it seems to be assumed that, because linguistic preparation has occurred, the linguistic competence of the researcher for the particular fieldwork site concerned will successfully facilitate the research and writings based on it. Extending Tremlett's work, Gibb and Danero-Iglesias (2017) note the "silence" surrounding the impact of ethnographers' developing knowledge of languages on their research processes. Earlier, but relatedly, in reflections on the experience of fieldwork undertaken collaboratively with interpreters in the North American Arctic, the ethnomusicologist Beaudry (1997) concluded that she under-appreciated the significance of relationships mediated through languages and cultures prior to engaging in her fieldwork.

Issues of cross-cultural communication and linguistic diversity have also been problematised by scholars (e.g. Hsin-Chun Tsai et al, 2004; Watson, 2011) in health-based disciplines (including counselling). Watson (2011: 25) notes how "rarely addressed" are: issues of multilingualism, including counsellors' own community language learning to support their work with their clients; and consideration of effective ways of collaboration between counsellors and interpreters. Hsin-Chun Tsai et al (2004: 17) warn that, in health research, a lack of available "well trained bilingual and bicultural" staff has meant that some ethnic groups have remained under-studied. While not dismissing the "logistic and analytic challenges" of working across languages and cultural groups, they alert us to the fact that training and preparation needs for health researchers has not been sufficiently attended to.

To summarise, this brief consideration of studies from an illustrative range of disciplines (anthropology and health) reveals the value attached to linguistic preparatory work for everyone researching, collaborating and working in contexts characterised by the linguistically-diverse resources available. However, the extent to which this preparatory work is supported by well-conceptualised training courses and activities appears to be variable. Further, the anthropology-focused writings on how researchers-as-language-learners might prepare themselves for an intensive fieldwork period immersed in a particular linguistic and cultural context can be critiqued for the assumptions being made about distinctive languages used in predictable and stable ways in predictable locations. The health writing about research-practitioners-as-language-and-culture-mediators can be similarly critiqued. Such assumptions about language and languages stand in contrast to those, for example, of Kubota (2014) on the pluri-/multi-lingual turn and Heller (2012) on circulating people and circulating languages. It is to these reframed understandings that we now turn.

3.   Moving towards a translingual orientation in research

Bearing in mind the above critiques, we are drawn to Heller's (2012: 31) image of the ways in which people in the contemporary global context make use of a set of "circulating, constructible and deconstructible resources" including languages. This way of conceptualising language suggests to us that preparing researchers for linguistic diversity in their applied research may not be straightforward, and may involve something other than (considerable investment in) the learning of a particular language associated with a particular context and the people in it.

In sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and linguistic ethnography, researchers report on their generation of research insights into multilingualism-in-context and demonstrate their critical awareness of their own uses of language within their research. The ways in which they do so can inform the suggested move from contextually oversimplified linguistic preparation for researchers to the development of a more nuanced understanding of the language-work. For example, Giampapa (2012), on her use of linguistic ethnography, reflects on her assumptions about her potential insider identity in relation to her heritage and those of her research participants, all Italian-Canadians. She reports on her under-estimation - an echo here of the above-mentioned reflections by Beaudry - of the impact of the positionings attributed to her by her research participants, as revealed through their questions to her such as "where are you from?" (2012:102). By way of a second example, in the context of a transnational language, Sámi, in northern Europe, Pietikäinen reports that adult Sami speakers have concerns about the opportunities and motivation for their children to develop and use their indigenous language due to media influences and tourism demands, amongst other pressures. As a researcher who shared the languages of the adults and children in the research context, in the Finnish side of Samiland, Pietikäinen did not need to prepare as such to enter this linguistically-diverse field of study. However, with a linguistic ethnographic framing and an intention to study an endangered language, Pietikäinen chose to approach her research participants predominantly through the visual medium of photography. Meanings about multilingualism in this context were thus generated non-verbally rather than solely using the majority language, Finnish, to generate understandings about an endangered language, Sami.

Alternative perspectives on understanding linguistic diversity in contemporary life come from sociolinguists and applied linguists of language within the global context of migratory flows (Appadurai, 1990, cited in Block, 2012: 51). Examples include Conteh and Meier (2015) who discuss the 'multilingual turn' in language education and Blackledge and Creese (2010) who explore children in complementary schools using their languages flexibly and translanguaging together, moving between shared languages and thereby constructing and performing identities. In this chapter, given our concern for researcher education which acknowledges linguistic complexity and fluidity, we focus on Canagarajah's (2013) use of the umbrella term of a translingual orientation. Whereas he applies a translingual orientation to the challenges of designing language pedagogy in contemporary contexts, we argue that the concept can also underpin our proposal that researcher education more effectively attends to the linguistic diversity that researchers engage with, and are part of, in the field.

For Canagarajah (2013), translingual practice is prevalent in cosmopolitan contexts and it has a purpose beyond achieving daily transactions through languages, thereby bringing in expressions of identity through language. In a similar vein to Heller (2012), and Gardner and Martin-Jones (2012), Canagarajah refers to languages as *resources* which are used purposefully by language users in a flexible way as they express who they are to those with whom they seek to develop relationships. To construct his case for conceptualising languages in use in this way, Canagarajah (2013: 3) analyses a song by Sri Lankan hip hop artist M.I.A., who draws upon on her heritage, experiences and beliefs to rap in a way that uses languages to express her "sociocultural in-betweenness". For Canagarajah, the implication of translingual practice for language learners is that they need to develop "co-operative dispositions and performative competence for cosmopolitan relationships" (2013: 202). The suggestion is that these dispositions will take language education away from a focus on developing linguistic competence in one or more bounded languages but rather will serve to prepare language learners for more flexible uses of languages in a range of contexts.

Turning now to researcher education, we suggest that by adopting a translingual orientation, researchers could be better prepared for a fluid, contextualised use of languages in their fieldwork. This translingual orientation could open up the researcher to dynamic uses of languages (Cangarajah 2013:8) which are responsive to socially situated communications. This could involve a researcher in translanguaging for the purpose of expressing solidarity with their research participants or conveying an aspect of their identity through their linguistic or other semiotic resources.

In the next section, we set out some ideas we have explored in two funded research projects which have had a focus on what we have named "researching multilingually" (Holmes et al, 2013, 2016). We thereby connect the proposal of a translingual orientation for researchers to the wider enterprise of researching multilingually.

4.   Researching multilingually

The objective of the research network project mentioned earlier was the sharing of researcher experiences in order to better understand 'researching multilingually' (RM) which we defined as:

> [the ways in which] researchers conceptualise, understand, and make choices about generating, analysing, interpreting and reporting data when more than one language is involved – and the complex negotiated relationships between researcher and researched as they engaged with one another in multilingual sites. (Holmes et al, 2013: 297)

To this end, we analysed researcher reflections (from a range of disciplinary backgrounds) on their RM experiences noting what triggered their awareness of the possibilities for undertaking research in this way, and what informed decisions they made in designing and carrying out such research. We learned that multilingual research practice could be applied in all stages of the research process, from engagement with literatures published in a range of languages, to designing studies with attentiveness to the negotiated uses of language by all participants, and with transparency about the handling of linguistic

diversity in the processing, analysing, and (re)-presentation of data. However, we also saw that, due to a combination of factors – including the global status of English in academia and research dissemination – researchers might not always make use of their own linguistic resources or those available in their contexts of study, meaning that RM possibilities might not always be taken up where they could be.

From this network project, we identified a prototypical trajectory of developing RM praxis. Thus, researchers, having experienced a triggering moment when they realise that RM is potentially an important dimension to their work (a), might systematically inform themselves about the RM possibilities and complexities (b), and consequently, might be more transparent and purposeful – on which we will say more shortly - in their decision-making about the design of their study and its operationalisation (c). This trajectory has implications for our researcher education proposals, not least because it is such researcher education which might provide the trigger needed for the informed decision-making at the heart of RM praxis. With regard to the connections between b) and c), we argued - as informed by recent ecological understandings of researcher thinking (Fay & Stelma, 2016; Stelma & Fay, 2014; and Stelma, Fay & Zhou, 2014) which focus on the concept of intentionality (akin to the ordinary meaning of 'being purposeful') - that, in order to develop a purposeful sense of what RM might mean for them and their work, researchers need to consider all aspects of their linguistic engagement at all stages of their research (including engaging with written texts), and do so prior to, as well as during, their research process.

Researchers might become more informed about the possibilities for, and complexities of, undertaking their research multilingually by considering: i) research spaces (spatiality); and ii) researcher relationships (relationality). As derived from Davcheva and Fay (2012), our thinking about the spatiality domain involves these four spaces: the researched space (i.e. the linguistic resources available in the phenomenon/context being researched); the research space (i.e. the linguistic resources available in the researcher's home, e.g. in the field and at their desk); the researcher (collaborative) space (i.e. the linguistic resources available through those with whom the researcher works); and the research (re)-presentation space (i.e. the linguistic parameters in place regarding how the research is (re)-presented and disseminated). The relationality domain concerns researchers and the relationships they develop with all those associated with their study, including participants, interpreters, translators, co-researchers, transcribers, gatekeepers and others.

The second project mentioned above - a three-year, interdisciplinary, arts-based project which followed on the network project - had two overarching aims: (1) to research interpreting, translation and multilingual practices in challenging contexts; and (2) while doing so, to evaluate appropriate research methods (traditional and arts based) and develop theoretical approaches for this type of academic exploration. Within this project, there were five case studies, each located in different disciplinary homes (e.g. anthropology, law), focused on particular contexts (e.g. Glasgow, Gaza, Bulgaria), and each concerned with particular research questions. Taken as a set, these case studies sought to contribute to the overall aims of better understanding what it means to be researching multilingually and – bringing in

a new discourse and particular type of context - to language and be languaged (see Phipps, 2011 for a discussion of "languaging") especially in contexts of pain and pressure. We were part of a separate RM Hub which was charged with supporting, working with and learning from the five case studies vis-à-vis RM praxis. The Hub's disciplinary homes lie in language education, applied linguistics, education, and intercultural communication.

This project, and especially the researcher reflections for one case study within it, has prompted us to extend and re-frame our earlier RM thinking. Whereas previously we argued for informed researcher thinking and action regarding the RM possibilities and complexities, we did so largely as framed in non-critical multilingual terms. Thus, we spoke of researchers using their "multiple languages" and of "deciding when to translate from one language to another". Implicit in this discourse was the assumption that the linguistic preparation researchers might usefully undertake was to be understood from a perspective of separate linguistic systems mediated through translation and interpretation. The large project, through its over-arching discourse (e.g. "What does it mean to language and be languaged?" and "What are the implications for researchers of the languaged nature of human experience?") required us to problematise the "language" element in RM (and in researcher thinking about, and preparation for, RM). This discourse in itself encouraged a move from thinking about RM through the lens of 'languages in research' to the more nuanced lens, one resonating with the ideas discussed in the literature (see Section 2 above), i.e. the lens of 'languaging (in) research'. In the next section, we explore how this discourse-prompt for our developing thinking was also underpinned by the researcher experiences of RM that the project enabled.

5.   The *Translating Distress* case study

Translating Distress (TD), one of the five case studies within the large RM at Borders project, sought 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. It was led by a researcher (hereafter, RW) specialising in the practice-oriented discipline of Global Mental Health (GMH). One fieldwork site within this case study - the one we focus on specifically in this chapter - was in Uganda. It was explicitly located within a GMH research paradigm but, as part of the interdisciplinary ethos and ways of working of the large RM at Borders project, it also involved an applied linguist/educationalist (i.e. RF) from the project's RM Hub. This emergent interdisciplinary collaboration combined with the theorising (discussed above) to stimulate our reframed thinking about linguistic preparation and our valuing of a researcher translingual orientation. The following discussion of the fieldwork is voiced by RF and it focuses primarily on RW's public-facing blog reflections.[3] These blog entries were, in part, shaped by the daily video-diary that the research team collectively maintained. This reflective dimension of the fieldwork

---

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

was encouraged not only by the overall project brief but also by RF's addition of a specific language-oriented research focus during the GMH-based fieldwork.

The fieldwork took place in the Lira region of northern Uganda, an area in which the local people have experienced major trauma and disruption during many years of war involving the so-called Lord's Resistance Army. The research involved a small team of researchers (from the Universities of Glasgow and Manchester in the UK, and Makerere University in Uganda) working with a larger team of 'local' research assistants, i.e. researchers located in, or who otherwise identified with, the Lira region, and who spoke, amongst other languages, Lango, the language closely associated within the Langi people who predominate in this region. The fieldwork methodology followed the DIME (Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation) approach[4] for developing and evaluating psychosocial interventions for mental health difficulties in low and middle-income countries (LMICs). This approach can be seen as recognition of, and as a response to, the ineffectiveness, inappropriacy, and epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2009) potentially 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). That the applied-research field of GMH is aware of these dangers, and that, through fieldwork methodologies such as DIME, it is addressing them, is something we appreciate; and, thus, the language-oriented reflections reported here should be seen as a strengthening of this GMH endeavor rather a critique of it per se.

Notwithstanding the way in which the DIME methodology represents an operationalisation of GMH's desire for psychosocial action appropriate for the social context concerned, the understanding of 'language and context' embedded in this methodology is one of separate linguistic systems (with communication between them mediated through translation and interpreting). Thus, the first phase of the DIME approach 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 (understood as culturally-homogeneous) local population. For the Lira fieldwork, following the lead provided by the DIME approach, the research team assumed that Lango was the local language and, accordingly, in advance translated all the English-medium data-generation instruments into this language.

However, Uganda (including the Lira region) is a context – or, better, set of linguistically and culturally overlapping but also differentiated contexts - characterised by great linguistic diversity, and also by significant fluidity. English is the main medium of education in general as well as being the language through which most mental health professional development takes place. Therefore, it cannot simply be seen as an external language closely associated to the hegemonic epistemic flows from the Global North (even though it is the language of the DIME research manual and of the training for the local team of research assistants). Methodologically, all data collection and analysis was supposed to be

---

[4] See http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/center-for-refugee-and-disaster-response/response_service/AMHR/ (retrieved March 1st 2017)

conducted in Lango. However, while the research assistants were tasked with taking verbatim written notes of participants' accounts, not all of them were comfortable in Lango literacy practices as their education had been in and through English. The research assistants each possessed diverse linguistic resources above and beyond English and Lango. Therefore, Lango cannot simply be seen as <u>the</u> local language, the one in which, from a DIME perspective, the local understandings of distress and support for it were naturalistically verbalized and therefore best for research purposes. It is for such reasons that this case study generated so many language-oriented researcher reflections during the fieldwork.

6.   Researcher reflections

Given his language educator professional status and applied linguistics researcher home, it is perhaps not surprising that, when RF discovered a month beforehand that he would be part of the fieldwork team, he would consider – in a spirit of purposefully preparing for RM fieldwork - how best to linguistically prepare for this two-week trip to Uganda and Lira in particular. Nor is it surprising, given his central role in the RM area of research activity, that his considerations followed, in many ways, the prototypical trajectory of researchers' developing RM praxis which we discussed above. Thus, in his fieldwork journal, he notes down some of Uganda and Lira's linguistic complexities (i.e. informed thinking), and, as based on an initial appreciation of the contextual complexities, he wonders (in an exercise of transparent decision-making) which linguistic resources might usefully be added to those in English – those in Kiswahili? Luganda? Lango? Acholi? Underlying this choice lies a clear sense of purposefulness – was it reasonable that such late-in-the-day linguistic preparation (whether in Lango, Luganda, or Kiswahili etc) for such a short-lived immersion in a fieldwork site be available for direct research purposes or, more likely, for the relational aspects supporting the research? Acting on this informed thinking, he sourced a *Lango-English: English-Lango* dictionary (as well as unsuccessfully trying to find other Lango learning resources). This proved to be an invaluable linguistic preparation tool for him and the rest of the research team (for all of whom Lango was a largely or completely unfamiliar language). But it also proved to be an essential support for the translingual practice evident in interactions with the local research assistants (and with other people that the research team interacted with in Lira), interactions through which the relationship-building on which the fieldwork rested.

Whilst it might be that RW's involvement in the large RM project was in itself a trigger for his focus on the linguistic element in his research, it also seems that RF's investment in linguistic preparation for, and action in, the fieldwork was also a prompt for his own increased language work: "[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 […] I also have to concede that having RF and LM in the team has increased the amount of Lango that I have been able to pick up" (blog entries, 31st March and 3rd April 2015). He also reflects on the value of an interdisciplinary collaboration – including the presence of a language-foregrounding colleague:

Discussions with both RF and LM 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. (blog entry, 3rd April 2015)

As the fieldwork progressed, and linguistic insights from it were reflected upon in the interdisciplinary dialogues within the team, RW reports on the sharpening of his language-attentive review of the DIME methodology and its operationalisation:

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 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 research assistants raised the possibility that some of the participants might actually be more keen to report the problems they face in English [rather] than in Lango …. It will be interesting to track this in coming days. (blog entry, 31st March, 2015

Further:

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 a maximum effort to maintain consistency with the words that I use to convey instructions in English. Although all of the team identify as having English as a second language, I invite a Lango speaker (X) to translate and repeat the instructions. I note how conscious I am of not engaging in the process of 're-interpreting' the guidance given 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). (blog entry, 1st April, 2015) .

In their tentative use of Lango, the team might be seen as realising the simplistic view of separate linguistic systems which both the DIME methodology and the traditions of linguistic preparation encouraged. However, if that were the starting point, RW's blog entries also reveal his growing appreciation of the linguistic diversity of the context, and of the linguistic interplay between often English-medium education and GMH professional thinking and the use of local languages for expressing mental well-being:

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 [having been] 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. [blog entry, 8th April, 2015]

He had already invested significant thought in the DIME methodology but, again as prompted by the collaborative and interdisciplinary team assembled in Lira, this was given added purpose: "There is potential for uncertainty in terms of how well, or not, the methodology we are using might bear fruit in

this context … although the DIME (Diagnosis, Implementation, Methodology, and Evaluation) approach was developed by work that was led by Prof Paul Bolton (John Hopkins University) and colleagues in field trials that [were] completed in part in Uganda, this is the first time that this research team has engaged with this particular methodology" (blog entry 31st March, 2015).

These researcher reflections – both RW's and RF's – are illustrative of the ways in which, once a language attentiveness has been triggered, researchers (including these like RW in disciplines and professions where language is not especially foregrounded) can inform their decision-making and reflect on the purposefulness of the micro-decisions of their research design operationalisation whilst becoming increasingly sensitive to the linguistic complexities of the contexts in which they are working. As they do so, we can not only see some aspects of a possible researcher trajectory RM but also see engagement with the challenge of linguistic preparation and the developing appreciation of the complex translingual work of value in the field.

7.   Discussion

The above fieldwork reflections challenged our thinking about researcher education for linguistic diversity in several ways. Our previous work in the Researching Multilingually network project and the papers we refer to in our brief literature review in this chapter indicate to us that more thinking and planning relating to languages in research will always be invaluable. However, from the TD case study in Uganda, we have recognised that developing an understanding of the particular context will be essential in determining the nature of the researcher linguistic preparation which will support the research. The fluidity of languages in use in differing contexts and moments of interaction during the fieldwork in Lira demonstrated an overlapping use of languages which, we argue, mirrors the concept of translingual practice as set out by Canagarajah (2013). Given that each context for research will have its own particularities, it will be impossible and inappropriate to prescribe a curriculum for linguistic preparation for research. Instead, we propose that supporting researchers in developing a translingual orientation which is open to researchers themselves and their research participants and collaborators using languages flexibly according to the contexts and decisions regarding expression of identities, will be an important contribution. This means that a definition of linguistic preparation as conceptualised through the development of a translingual orientation may cover the following features (informed by concepts of spatiality (Davcheva & Fay, 2013) and relationality (Holmes, et al, 2013) outlined in Section 4 and set out again below):

a) The researched space: Researchers find out about which languages tend to be used, for which purposes, in the country, region and community where the research will take place;

b) The research space: Researchers consider the most appropriate resources which may inform their research, bearing in mind such resources may exist in different languages. Researchers may also

find research informants, prior to engaging in fieldwork, who may have linguistic resources which differ from the researcher's own;

c) Researcher collaborative space: Researchers consider how they will document their research processes (e.g. the language of fieldnotes), how they will engage with their collaborators (e.g. the language of discussion with interpreters, other researchers);

d) Research representation space: Researchers reflect on how they report their research, taking into account how they are representing their research participants, and the norms and expectations of their audiences, their academic discipline.

As indicated above, the proposed definition of achieving linguistic preparation through developing a translingual orientation is seen by the authors as a component of what we have discussed previously as researching multilingually. Spaces, relationships and expressions of identity through language, influence language choices in everyday life and also, by extension, research contexts. We argue, therefore, that researching multilingually is in operation throughout a research project and that developing a translingual orientation can be considered an important aspect of that process.

Our thinking in this chapter has been greatly stimulated by discussions across disciplinary and professional borders and we suggest that developing researcher praxis in complex and fluid multilingual contexts can be supported by insights from a range of sources. This observation could also contribute to our focus on researcher education in linguistically diverse contexts. Researchers may benefit from engaging with the practices of each other's traditions and the ways in which researchers can develop a translingual orientation appropriate to the context of their study can be shared to the benefit of other researchers.

8.   Concluding thoughts

In this chapter we have reviewed the ways in which pluri-/multi-lingual communication, which is commonplace around the world, might be used to inform the distinctive language education context of researchers learning about how they engage multilingually with research collaborators, sources and participants in their specified research fields. We have drawn upon the work of Canagarajah (2013) and his concept of translingual practice being both a flexible use of shared languages and also an expression of identity as seen in cosmopolitan relationships. We propose that, for researchers preparing to work with people and ideas in linguistically diverse contexts, broadly defined, raising awareness of, and developing skills in, having a 'translingual orientation' will be valuable.

In the researcher reflections presented in this chapter we recognise that these researchers have developed their understanding of their own disciplinary expectations of languaging in the research context as well as the fluid uses of languages by their participants and collaborators in the specific context of the study. We propose that researcher education programmes could do more to bring to the

surface the linguistic and cultural diversity which could be at play in many research sites and studies. We also suggest that this way of thinking points to the need for a developing research agenda which could progress simultaneously across disciplines which promote in social research in contexts of linguistic diversity. If such an agenda were implemented, then the outcomes, namely, case studies of contextualized and discipline specific research in which researchers document and reflect on and evaluate their engagement with the concept of developing a translingual orientation would provide a valuable resource for the research community. Our contribution to the focus for this book, is, therefore, that discussions of plurilingualism in learning and teaching can helpfully be applied to the distinctive case of the learning and teaching of researchers preparing for fieldwork in real world contexts.

References

Appadurai, A. (1990) Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy in Public Culture (2) 2: 1-24

Beaudry, N. (1997). The challenges of human relations in ethnographic enquiry: examples from Arctic and Subartic fieldwork. In G.F. Barz and T.J. Cooley (Eds.), *Shadows in the field: new perspectives for fieldwork in ethnomusicology* (pp.83-83). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Block, D. (2012) Unpicking agency in sociolinguistic research with migrants in Gardner, S., and Martin-Jones, M. (2012). *Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography*. London: Routledge. (47-60)

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

Conteh, J., and Meier, G. (2015). *The multilingual turn in languages education: opportunities and challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Davcheva, L., and Fay, R. (2012). An examination of the research and researcher aspects of multilingually researching one language (Ladino) through fieldwork in another (Bulgarian) and analysis and presentation in a third (English). Paper presented at the 1st AHRC Researching Multilingually seminar, hosted by Durham University, 28th-29th March 2012.

Fay, R., Andrews, J., Holmes, P., and Attia. M. (2015). Revisiting linguistic preparation: some new directions arising from researching multilingually. Paper presented at the BAAL Annual Meeting, hosted by Aston University, 3rd-5th September, 2015.

Fay, R., and Stelma, J. (2016). Criticality, intentionality and intercultural action. In M. Dasli and 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; ethics and the power of knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, S., and Martin-Jones, M. (2012). *Multilingualism discourse and ethnography*. London: Routledge.

Giampapa, F. (2012) Authenticity, legitimacy and power: Critical ethnography and identity politics in Gardner, S., and Martin-Jones, M. (2012). *Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography*. London: Routledge.

Gibb, R., and Danero Iglesias, J. (2017). Breaking the silence (again): on language learning and levels of fluency in ethnographic research. *Sociological Review*, **00**: 1-17.

Heller, M. (2012). Rethinking sociolinguistic ethnography: From community and identity to process and practice. In S. Gardner and M. Martin-Jones (Eds.) (2012), *Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography*. London: Routledge.

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

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

Hsin-Chun Tsai, J., Choe, J.H., Mu Chen Lim, J., Acorda, E., Chan, N. L., Taylor, V., and Tu, S-P. (2004) Developing culturally competent health knowledge: Issues of data analysis of crosscultural, cross-language qualitative research in *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, **3**(4): 16-27.

Kubota, R. (2014). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory and neoliberal multiculturalism: complicities and implications for Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-22. doi: 10.1093/applin/amu045

Phipps, A. (2011). Travelling languages? Land, languaging and translation in *Language and Intercultural Communication* 11:4 364-376

Pietikänen, S. (2012) Experiences and expressions of multilingualism: Visual ethnography and discourse analysis in research with Sami children in In S. Gardner and M. Martin-Jones (Eds.) (2012), *Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography*. London: Routledge.

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

Tremlett, A. (2009). Claims of 'knowing' in ethnography: realising anti-essentialism through a critical reflection on language acquisition in fieldwork. *Graduate Journal of Social Science*, **6**(3): 63-85.

Watson, V. (2011) Training for multicultural therapy: the challenge and the experience. In C. Lago (Ed.), *The handbook of transcultural counselling and psychotherapy* (17-29). Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Open University Press.