An ethic for researching multilingually in transnational, multilingual, multidisiplinary research teams

Prue Holmes and Taha Rajab

Working in a multilingual, multinational, and multidisciplinary project invites questions concerning the role of languages among the researchers, participants and stakeholders involved in the project. In this chapter, we attempt to explore how colleagues in the network project understood the role of their own linguistic resources, and those of others included in their research: for example, decisions about using multiple languages in literature searches and reviews; linguistic decisions in the field when working with the multiple languages of participants and other stakeholders; in collaborations within the research team; and in producing academic and stakeholder outputs. In previous work, Holmes and colleagues had come to realise that decisions concerning how researchers draw on their linguistic resources in their research are largely made tacitly; or decisions may be shaped by structural and linguistic hegemonies, often in ways that go uncontested or cannot be contested, in the contexts where the research is produced, or later, where it is to be published (Holmes et al., 2013; Andrews et al., 2020; Holmes et al., 2022). Furthermore, Meyer Pitton and Schedel (2022, in press) comment that decisions about language choice and publication within research teams are rarely discussed.

In this chapter, we draw on the experiences of the researchers who were part of our transnational network to explore processes of researching multilingually in an attempt to uncover researchers' perspectives on these matters. Our aim is to provide an ethical stance towards multilingual researcher practices in a multilingual network of researchers, who in this case, are working in contexts of conflict, forced migration, economic marginalisation, and occupation. First, we discuss the research context and chapter aims, followed by our research method. We then present the researchers' responses (the languages in the project, and participants' experiences of drawing on multiple linguistic resources during various phases of the project. We finish with conclusions and recommendations to other researchers on incorporating an ethic of researching multilingually in their work.

Research context and aims

Within the research network, researchers sought to develop critical intercultural pedagogies that that drew on the creative arts and new materialism to explore notions of exclusion and displacement resulting from conflict and other protracted crises, with a focus on language, culture, and heritage (see the Introduction in this volume for an overview of our research and approach). The researchers at universities in Brazil, Columbia, Palestine, Turkey, and the United Kingdom (UK) engaged students with one another and with refugee and migrant youth who had experienced exclusion and disruption to education. As the research was focused generally on matters of language and intercultural communication in conditions of conflict, forced migration, economic marginalisation, and occupation, we were particularly interested in the role of languages in realising the project, and the extent to which the structural and linguistic hegemonies—whether covert, overt or unobserved—influenced how researchers employed their own, and others', linguistic resources in their research.

Our aims are to make explicit: (i) the choices and decisions researchers faced in using and adapting their own linguistic resources in shaping their research in the field; (ii) the opportunities for researchers and participants to realise and employ their linguistic resources in the research context; and (iii) the linguistic decisions researchers made in preparing their research for publication (the case studies in this volume). In drawing on researchers' post-narrative reflections to explore this researcher praxis, we hope to improve understanding of researcher methods and processes within the above-mentioned contexts and in transnational, multlingual, multidisciplinary teams.

Concerning the first aim, researchers in the network each developed a case study grounded in critical pedagogy and the creative arts (broadly addressing matters of culture, language, identity, heritage and representation). They brought students in higher education together with refugee and migrant youths who face conflict, marginalisation, and occupation, and whose opportunities for education may be limited; they aimed to give voice to the participants to develop intercultural dialogue, and foster participation and encourage a sense of social justice in young people. Processses of languaging and translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2018; Li Wei, 2018) (see the Introduction for a discussion of these terms) were important as translational tools and in facilitating intercultural communication and dialogue.

Regarding the second and third aims, researchers faced decisions about how to use and adapt their own linguistic resources in shaping and realising their project, and when engaging with participants. The possibilities, opportunities, and challenges of researching multilingually that they perceived in developing and undertaking their case study research, and in co-collaborations within the researcher network, we hope, will contribute to the construction of an ethic of researching multilingually for other researcher networks working in similar geopolitical contexts.

At the conclusion of the 'Translating Cultures' thematic research cluster in 2019 (within the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK), the Theme Fellow, Professor Charles Forsdick argued for research that is multidisciplinary to address the global issues humanity faces, and with that, the need for more attention to languages in the research process (Kamali et al., 2019). This call is further echoed in Phipps' (2019, pp. 5-11) 'manifesto' for researching multilingually, where she states the need for deference to a different set of practices, knowledges, and approaches where local, decolonial, and decentred ways of working, thinking, and speaking are prioritised, thus giving voice and breath to the oppressed, marginalised, and displaced. Central to this call is the emphasis on methods that acknowledge indigenous and local languages, values, and perspectives. Following Cannella and Lincoln (2018) and Smith (1999/2012), we argue that an ethical researcher praxis concerning languages must foreground local, indigenous ways of communicating. Like Phipps (2019), we acknowledge the need to improvise and devise to accommodate both linguistic and nonlingustic forms of expression (e.g., in music, photography, walk-alongs, and other creative artistic forms). Despite these statements of good intent, whether researchers across multiple disciplines (as in this researcher network) place similar values on languages in the research process, and whether this vision is shared, needs deeper investigation.

Languages in the project, languaging, translanguaging

From the start, the project leader (Holmes) alerted the named researchers in the project (Al-Masri, Corbett, Furat, Moskal, Peña Dix) to the focus of the project: to develop critical intercultural pedagogies that recognised hegemonies concerning language, representation, culture, and heritage, particularly in contexts of conflict in the global South. Guilherme (in this volume) describes the importance of a multilingual stance in academic networks, where researchers need to be aware of the variety of linguistic repertoires in play, and the resultant conceptual complexity in intercultural communication that may emerge. She highlights the dangers of relying on colonial languages and powerful languages such as World Englishes, which risk overlooking the nuances and complexities of meaning, especially where participants and stakeholders may be working in other (e.g., indigenous and local) languages. Phipps (2019) speaks of the tensions between elite and grassroots multilingualism. The former, in our case study, applies to multilingual academics and the students (including international students) who have linguistic capital in the powerful colonial languages and especially in English (Bourdieu, 2000); and the latter addresses the local and indigenous languages of those marginalised or excluded from education and with whom we wanted to engage, and with whom we wanted our students to communicate through our critical intercultural pedagogies.

Given that our research was focused in conflict zones in low to middle income countries (as defined by the Organisation for Economic and Co-operative Development [OECD. 2021]), as researchers, it seemed important to us to be aware of the linguistic hegemonies in place that prioritise the use of certain (e.g., world and colonial) languages over others in education, even when such languages may be used by the minority over the local and indigenous languages spoken by the majority (Liddicoat & Curnow, 2014; Phillipson, 1992). Furthermore, the opportunity to explore English language ideologies and the hegemony of English in education and research seemed important in undertaking research that is ethically inclusive of other languages present (see Liddicoat, 2019). And given our commitment to researching multilingually, as researchers, how were we attentive to our own (multiple) linguistic resources in shaping the research? To this end, Gramling (2016, p. 208) argues that "human speakers are always less and more than monolingual", but structural reasons may require them to use the dominant language, despite other linguistic repertoires they may have. In developing an ethic of researching multilingually, we also wanted to resist the structural determinants of knowledge production that rely disproportionately on approaches and knowledge established and endorsed in the Anglophone world, where English is the *de facto* language of communication. We wanted to foreground other languages, and other ways of understanding communication as part of our researcher praxis.

To achieve this aim, we wanted to acknowledge individuals' linguistic repertoires and linguistic selves, and the ways in which speakers extend bilingual and plurilingual practices to include translanguaging, that is, how they use languages nonverbally, creatively, performatively, and symbolically in communication and meaning making (Canagarajah, 2013; 2018; Li Wei, 2018). We also wanted to recognise that communication is an embodied way of being and dwelling in the world that engages with the spiritual, emotional, and empathetic ways in which people make sense of and communicate their shared lived experience in intercultural communication—referred to as ‘languaging’ (Phipps, 2011; 2019). To acknowledge and mobilise the linguistic repertoires of the researchers, and the international, migrant, refugee students and others excluded from education we decided not to use official translators, and opted for creative arts methods in our work that facilitated translanguaging and languaging (Frimberger, 2016; Harvey et al., 2019). In the second project team meeting, three months after the start, Holmes presented a workshop on researching multilingually to inform researchers of the concept and encourage them to apply the ideas and methods in their case study praxis and publications. The extent to which these ideas were fully understood and implemented within our project are explored later, but first, we describe our methods for this exploration.

Method of data collection and analysis

Data came from later reflections of the researchers who participated in the network project ‘Building an intercultural pedagogy for Higher Education in conditions of conflict and protracted crisis: Language, culture, identity’ (BIPHEC). Our research approach is inspired by Schön’s (1984) reflection-on-action, where researchers are invited to reflect on their experiences during their research, and then what they would do differently in the future. Schön argued that this retrospective contemplation of practice and action, enables individuals to uncover their knowledge used in a particular situation, and analyse and interpret the information they recalled, which in turn, may lead to new theoretical perspectives to inform future action.

The research was undertaken in the following universities—Istanbul and Sakarya Universities in Turkey; the University of Los Andes in Bogota, Colombia; the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte in Natal, Brazil; the Islamic University of Gaza in Palestine; and Durham University in the UK. Thirteen researchers were actively involved in developing the case studies (six initially, as named researchers, seven joined later as participating researchers). Nine of these 13 researchers responded to our emailed questionnaire, providing their reflections. Four of the responses came from the two universities in Turkey; two from Brazil; one from Columbia; and two from the UK. No responses were received from the two Gaza researchers.

The questionnaire included 10 open-ended questions. The first set of questions (#1 to #8) explored how researchers drew on their own linguistic resources and those of their participants (students, refugee and migrant youths, and other community stakeholders) in their case study research. The questions explored the role of languages at the preplanning stage; using literature in other languages; languages present and employed in the research site among the participants; decisions about using languages in the analysis, writing up, and dissemination; and language hegemonies present in the research context. The second set of questions (#9 to #11) focused on researchers' multilingual experiences within the research network, including suggestions for future practice.

Drawing on researchers' reflections, and guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach, we read, organised, and categorised researchers' responses into different emerging codes and themes, guided by the aims stated above. The researchers gave their permission to include their reflections in this chapter when responding to the questionnaire.

Languages in the case study research contexts

While the researchers and participants in each research site had several home languages (including the languages of international students) our respondents reported that the the following languages were used: in Turkey, at Istanbul—Turkish, Kurdish, Arabic, Syriac, and English; at Sakarya—Turkish and Arabic (the specific languages of the refugees were not identified); in Colombia—English and Spanish; in Brazil—Brazilian Portuguese and English; in the UK—Arabic, English, and Syriac.

The table below describes the linguistic features of the five case study sites; the respondents and their disciplinary homes, the languages used by the researchers, and the languages used in the case study sites among the researchers and participants. Although the Gaza team did not respond to our questionnaire, we include the project in which they participated to clarify the range of languages involved. Corbett, a project co-investigator, provided academic support to the researchers in the Colombia and the Brazil/Gaza case study sites.

Table 1. Languages spoken in the five case study sites

Country & university of case study	Researchers (& their research discipline)	Languages used by researchers	Languages used in case study site
Turkey University of Istanbul,	Zisan Furat (Theology and Political Science) Zeynep Özde Ateşok	Arabic (spoken by Furat), English, Turkish	Arabic, English, Kurdish, Syriac, Turkish

Istanbul	(Sociology)		
Turkey Sakarya University, Sakarya	Ali Faruk Yaylaci (Sociology) Filiz Göktuna Yaylaci (Sociology)	English, Turkish	Arabic, English Turkish
Colombia University of Los Andes, Bogota	Beatriz Peña Dix (Applied linguistics)	English, Spanish,	English, Spanish
Brazil Federal University of the North-east, Natal; Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine	Bruno de Lima (Applied linguistics)	Brazilian Portuguese, English	Brazilian Portuguese, English; Arabic (in Gaza)
United Kingdom Durham University, Durham	Prue Holmes (Applied Linguistics & Education) Taha Rajab (Applied Linguistics & Education)	English (Prue Holmes) English & Arabic (Taha Rajab)	Arabic, English, Syriac

In Turkey, at Sakarya, the case study involved Turkish and Syrian refugees (the latter being classified as international students in Turkey) to collaborate in participatory photography to explore experiences of campus life. The two respondents initially assumed that participants would be competent in speaking the host language, Turkish. However, despite varying degrees of (in)competence, the respondents described the willingness of the home and international (forced migrant) students to communicate, which meant that there was a degree of unanticipated Turkish/Syriac translanguaging involved in making the participatory photography and resultant *exposé* a success. The outcomes of this research were then written up in English.

By contrast, the researchers at Istanbul University considered from the outset their own linguistic incompetence with respect to their Arabic-speaking, Syrian refugee and Syrian international student participants as they engaged Turkish students and Syrian refugees in intercultural understanding and communication through shared religious songs. Ateşok reflected: “I was the only researcher who cannot speak Arabic in the research team which made me realise my limitations once again”. To accommodate this linguistic asymmetry and the associated power relations, the researchers decided to include a Syrian, Arabic-speaking researcher in the team; they also deliberately chose the Faculty of Theology as the research location, where the instructors, who also participated in the case study, spoke Arabic. We discuss the implications of this decision later.

In Colombia, Peña Dix worked with preservice English language teachers to develop intercultural English language resources (a “toolbox”), a set of drama activities inspired by Boal’s (1979) ‘Theatre of the Oppressed’ for teachers in their local communities. She envisaged that both English and Spanish would be present, and therefore, favoured a participatory or emancipatory approach in line with the network project that foregrounded co-construction and collaboration. Aware that participants might feel “uncomfortable” or “classified/evaluated by their proficiency” (Peña Dix), she gave them linguistic agency to choose English or Spanish. One group of trainees chose to develop a dramatic sketch involving local Sign language, the basics of which one of the students then had to learn in order to perform. The group produced a video in which translanguaging was evident in the simultaneous English/Sign performance with subtitles in Spanish.

In Brazil, students worked with their Gazan counterparts to exchange creative writing and flash fiction texts, and engage in online communication about situations of marginalisation, multiple types of exclusion, and conflict. As both groups of students were studying English, the research team assumed that English would be the lingua franca of communication. The students had Brazilian Portuguese and Arabic respectively as their home languages so English was the lingua franca.

In the UK, the researchers invited newly-settled, refugee youths from Iraq and Syria to engage in creative arts workshop activities with postgraduate students to share narratives of identity, belonging, and education. The research team envisaged that Arabic would therefore be the language of communication for the refugee youths; however, two female Christian Iraqi refugees also spoke Syriac. The student participants, mostly international students with a good level of English, came from diverse linguistic backgrounds—Amazigh, Arabic, Chinese, English, Kurdish, Polish, Spanish and Italian. Among the researchers, only Holmes, coming from New Zealand, had English as her home language; Rajab’s home language was Arabic, and Moskal’s was Polish.

Language practices concerning literature reviews

At the first project meeting, Holmes, as project leader encouraged co-researchers to use literature from their own disciplines and linguistic homes, and not only literature published in English, when writing up their case studies, and to consider the role of languages in their research. This call was reiterated in subsequent meetings (two face-to-face in Bogota and Durham, and two interim online) and again at the ‘Researching Multlingually’ presentation in Bogota.

Regarding the literature, both research teams in Turkey drew extensively on research published in Turkish to support their case study analysis as their research, in various ways, explored sociological understandings of internationalisation in Turkish universities, in particular around Turkey’s refugee crisis. In Colombia, Peña Dix stated that critical intercultural pedagogy and its related topics (interculturality) in English language education (her disciplinary home) are not well established as a field of study. Although she attempted to locate literature in Spanish, she mostly used literature in English, including the work of Boal (1979) and Freire (1970) (both originally published in Portuguese). In Brazil, de Lima (an English language educationalist) described providing translations of Portuguese Brazilian into English for the literature review, a practice he did uncritically, stemming from his doctoral researcher training in Brazil. In the UK, the literature base was English as the focus of the research was on refugee engagement in UK higher education. Rajab reflected that there may have been useful literature in Arabic on refugee educational experiences within Anglophone contexts, but the matter went undiscussed and so the team did not explore it.

Language practices concerning fieldwork

In terms of the fieldwork, at Sakarya, the researchers assumed that Turkish, the lingua franca, would be the language of communication, even though non-Turkish students came from Arabic and other Turkmen-speaking countries (e.g., Afghanistan). The team’s description of how the participants in their study collaborated illustrates the power of participant translation and translanguaging in a research project:

> Speaking [in] different languages and understanding them in a common language was also an important experience. This situation showed us that even if there are language barriers, communication will be established somehow. Participants, who worked in groups for photo shooting and exhibition preparations, translated each other's expressions and communicated. (Göktuna, Yaylaci and Yaylaci)

At Istanbul, acknowledging the ethical linguistic practices in multilingual research sites of preparing research documents in the languages of the participants (Warriner and Bigelow, 2017), the researchers prepared bilingual ethics documents (Consent Form and Information Sheet) in both Arabic and Turkish. Concerning written documents generated during the workshops (e.g., lyrics, reflections, and log books), the language choice was left to the participants. The team observed that even the students who had not expressed any difficulty in Turkish preferred to proceed with Arabic language when writing and speaking, so some interviews were conducted in Arabic. All the data were then translated to Turkish. The researchers did not discuss matters concerning issues around translation, and did not consider presenting data in its original form, instead translating everything into English for their case study. While the researchers took care to include the voices of their refugee participants in their published work, and resist rendering them as voiceless (Chatty, 2016), by including their languages they may have avoided a different form of voicelessness, resulting from multiple processes of translation—first, from Arabic into Turkish, and then again, into English. The process of implicit, multiple translation renders invisible that part of the participants' identity that is associated with Arabic.

In Colombia, data were gathered in both Spanish and English. Peña Dix used Spanish to ensure effective and transparent communication regarding project expectations, and to avoid feelings of discomfort. The students preferred to use Spanish to understand and articulate theoretical concepts related to intercultural communication and critical pedagogy, and to communicate feelings, expectations, and impressions. However, in discussions about the employment of English in dramatic sketches that evoked powerful feelings around the experience and effects of conflict, the participants argued that the use of a foreign language could be a valuable means of *distancing* subjects from disturbing emotions, and thus was a means of addressing potentially traumatic topics in class. In their reflexive journals, entries reflecting on the self as a "teacher" and "mediator" were in Spanish; opinion-based narratives and feelings on the experiences of the three workshops were expressed in Spanish. The activities for the toolbox were composed in English. In general, the focus groups and post-project interviews were in Spanish.

In Brazil, De Lima encouraged the students to use detailed descriptions in English to explain cultural issues to their counterparts in Gaza, thus enriching their language learning. While English improvement and the development of intercultural competence were goals for some students, Corbett highlights the political nature of using English as the lingua franca:

> [Some students] used English as a medium for global communication, in the sense that it offered a global audience for a local set of grievances. (Corbett)

On reflection, Corbett thought that both he and the researchers could have taken more opportunities to explore the plurilingual nature of communication across the two research sites.

At Durham, the three workshops used creative arts approaches to lessen reliance on language-based communication, In keeping with the project network's goals not to use professional interpreters and to work collaboratively, the researchers emphasised the value of translanguaging, languaging, and spontaneous translation among the group. As some of the refugees had minimal English, Rajab and the three students who had Arabic as their home language translated when necessary in the workshops, e.g., in welcoming participants, explaining the rationale/approach of activities, giving initial instructions, and detailing the outcomes, e.g., when visiting places in the University during the walk-along, or to fill the gaps and keep the communication flowing in "awkward silent moments" (Rajab). Some of the students showed cultural and linguistic sensitivity by using welcoming phrases in Arabic to break the ice and help the refugee youths feel welcome. Ethics forms were translated into Arabic for the refugee youths. Some informal interviews were conducted in Arabic, and Rajab translated some sections into English for publication. The data analysis was undertaken by the third team member (Moskal) whose home language is Polish, and assisted by Rajab. Given the context and the focus of the project, this aspect of Moskal's linguistic identity was not made visible in the project development or outcomes, though, in retrospect, ways might have been devised to acknowledge it.

The outcomes here suggest that research teams worked conscientiously in their field sites to accommodate a range of the multiple languages spoken by project researchers and participants, an accommodation which may have been a result of the emphasis placed on these matters in project meetings, and in discussions about preparing research materials, along with the creative arts/new materialist praxis shared by the case studies. As researchers' reflections suggest, decisions about handling multiple languages in the research site tended to be influenced by the research context, their disciplinary home, but also the research aims and methods within the project.

Analysing and representing linguistic and non-linguistic data

The BIPHEC project was underpinned by new materialist/creative arts and creative writing approaches that allowed for the exploration of intercultural communication and experiences of belonging and inclusion in education, and notions of identity (Frimberger, 2016; Kay & Phipps, 2014). Therefore, how to handle both the linguistic and non-linguistic (creative arts) data—in terms of analysis and representation—was challenging for researchers. Thus, researchers tended to make on-the-spot decisions in their teams and according to their own local goals and within the broad aims of the project.

At Istanbul, the lyrics of the religious songs drafted by the Syrian participants challenged the team: Furat explained the difficulty in fully understanding and ascribing meaning to the song lyrics, given the “outstanding flexibility for linguistic ‘games’ in the Arabic language” (Furat). Even though educated in Modern Standard Arabic and having lived in Arabic speaking countries, she was overcome by this challenge, and in the end, contacted a native Arabic speaker of Syrian dialect for help.

At Sakarya, the research team’s creative focus was visual (participant photography) rather than text-based. Within their project, translanguaging, languaging, and translation support from participants all supported the intercultural communication:

> Everyone tried to understand each other. . . . The foreign participants who knew Turkish well translated the incomprehensible words. Thus, the records were in Turkish. In addition, participatory photography helped to the participants to understand better each other. They tried to understand their [the other’s] language. (Göktuna Yaylaci and Yaylaci)

In Brazil, the researchers wanted the students to exchange creative texts and to dialogue online about experiences of marginalisation, exclusion and conflict, and to examine these texts to identify the linguistic elements that revealed insights into exclusion and marginalisation. While Brazilian Portuguese and Arabic might have been used ‘behind the scenes’ in workshops and classes leading to the participants’ online exchanges, the exchanges themselves were in English. With hindsight, the researchers reflected that more visibility might have been given to the home languages as an aspect of participants’ linguistic identity, especially as the count of ‘views’ and ‘likes’ given to the posts indicated that participants were actively interested in discovering more about the everyday lived reality of their telecollaborative partners.

At Durham, the researchers faced the challenge of trying to keep everyone engaged during the workshops, and to ensure that the refugee youths did not feel excluded or bored, and enjoyed being together with the local students. Proficiency in different languages was only one of the factors that contributed to participants' engagement: others were clearly levels of maturity and experience (i.e. those who were still at school versus those who had left), confidence, and personal aspirations to undertake higher education.

These unexpected and unplanned-for non-linguistic dimensions of our case study work suggest the need for researcher openness and flexibility around what constitutes "data". The researchers were alert to the embodied, contextual, emotional and performative expressions of intercultural communication. Given the range of disciplinary homes of the researchers, it could not be assumed that they were all aware of new materialist concepts and methods, including languaging and translanguaging. And yet, their responses show a sensitivity to emergent intercultural communication experiences in their research sites.

Writing up the case studies

An important part of any project is academic publication. Despite critiques regarding the position of English as the prestigious scholarly language of publication (Curry & Lillis, 2017; Wilson, 2022), and the subsequent loss associated with language development, expression of and recourse to knowledges in other languages (e.g., Gramling, 2016; Manathunga et al., 2020), English remains a powerful language and prestige marker in academia. The responses from the researchers in the network below, who do not have English as their home language, reveal the complexity and variety of approaches taken in preparing their research for publication.

In Istanbul, Furat and Ateşok, having decided to present their data in English, encountered the challenge of "transiting [translating] the data into English, not because of the linguistic differences between the languages but particularly because of the limit/lessness of interpretability of a daily spoken language".

At Sakarya, all the linguistic data (some of which was originally in Syriac) was first presented in Turkish, and then translated into English. Similarly, the text was written first in Turkish, due to the researchers being more fluent in Turkish; the text for the case study was then translated into English. Göktuna, Yaylaci and Yaylaci explained: "We did not see any problems with the linguistic dimensions. We dealt with the language issue in relation to the problems experienced in the context of communication".

At Bogota, Peña Dix, an English language teacher with a doctorate from Durham University, where she had encountered issues of researching multilingually, assumed that she would write her chapter in English since the output would be produced by an 'international' press. Her disciplinary experience meant that she was sympathetic to a 'researching multilingually' approach throughout the project; she therefore included participants' testimonies in Spanish, and cited some concepts in Spanish and then explained them in English. The important drama activities undertaken by the students (for the toolbox) appear as words on a flat page, losing thecreative, emotional rendering of the students' performances. As noted above, some of those performances were video-recorded and post-produced with subtitles, so that English, Sign, and Spanish were all present simultaneously.

In Brazil, the research that was shared with researchers was prepared in English. De Lima explained that the choice to use English was "a tacit decision considering the privilege the language has in the scientific field and the possibility to reach a bigger audience with multiple linguistic and cultural origins."

In the UK, the assumed language was English, despite Holmes being the only 'native' speaker of English among the researchers and participants. Rajab explained that the research team were part of the English academic context, were accustomed to using English, and therefore all participants assumed that the write up would be in English. Accordingly, Moskal and Rajab, who prepared and drafted the findings from the three workshop activities for the case study, presented everything in English.

These responses demonstrate a near compulsion to adhere to English academic norms regarding writing up for publication. As the case studies in this volume show (Chapters 2 to 6), only Peña Dix's chapter includes bilingual data. Her choice here may have been influenced by her attendance at the researching multilingually seminar presented at the Bogota meeting, by her awareness (as an applied linguist) of the salience of these matters, and because she was working as a lone researcher and could make her own decisions.

Although Holmes tried to include discussions of researching multilingually in meetings, these findings indicate the importance of shared meetings among the project team, and the need for sufficient time together to discuss the inclusion of multiple languages when developing the literature review and writing up findings. Perhaps researchers' apparent resistance to present multilingual data in their writing up may align more to researcher identity and disciplinary homes, along with the affordance of being a researcher in an international project where researchers have the opportunity to upskill and develop their academic English competence. Furthermore, there is institutional pressure globally for scholars in ‘international’ universities to publish in English in quality presses and journals, irrespective of their discipline or home language. However, a ‘researching multilingually’ stance provides a focus to value multilingualism throughout the research process, and as the researchers’ testimonies indicate, the project offered opportunities for all to learn from one another.

While Holmes was keen to encourage a researching multilingually ethic and practice among co-researchers, one of Corbett’s roles was to support some of the the early and mid-career researchers on the project in writing up their research. As an experienced editor, he describes the challenges presented to academics, who are speakers of other languages, regarding publishing in English:

> One perpetual question [I have], as an editor of non-English chapters and articles, is how much ‘polishing’ one should do in order to meet international publication norms. As a journal/book editor in the past, I have come to be quite interventionist, but there is a legitimate debate to be had on how much intervention an editor should attempt. The result is often a ‘smoothing over’ of the authors’ local Englishes into a homogenous prose style that belies the diversity of contributions. On the one hand, this entails a loss of individual identity, but on the other hand, this loss of identity can be viewed as a desirable suppression of certain aspects of the individual voice in the service of maintaining the discourse style of the academic community. My own feeling is that Anglophone community norms should be maintained in a professional publication and my experience is that NNS [‘non-native’ speaker] authors also submit to this view. But there is always a tension. (Corbett)

Thus, Corbett’s choice to adopt a pragmatic approach in streamlining the chapters for publication caused him to reflect on his multiple academic identities in this project. In the end, he reconciled his concern for the loss of writers’ individual voices over the need to conform to native- speakerism and support them in developing professional norms where publishing is concerned.

Addressing linguistic hegemonies

Languages are not positioned neutrally, and structural determinants—language policies and preferences in higher education, publishing norms in academia, and national language dominance over local and indigenous languages—all constrain the opportunities available for multilingualism in research and researcher praxis (Martin-Jones & Martin, 2017). We were interested to know how co-researchers experienced language hegemonies and hierarchies implicitly and explicitly within the network and their case studies. Corbett highlighted the dilemma:

> The question is always whether the choice of a particular language facilitates and empowers or excludes and disempowers. Sometimes, however, it does both and one needs to find compensatory support for anyone who is disadvantaged. (Corbett)

For example, the research team at Istanbul noticed that linguistic hegemonies were present at all stages of their case study research (as illustrated in their previous responses). In Colombia, it was manifest in the reliance on English research literature which has implications for language teacher education. Peña Dix commented that English language teachers from the public sector have neither the skills for reading research published in English, nor the possibility of accessing international journals. She highlighted the importance of publishing in Spanish in open-access journals and in the local context to help inform and aid dissemination. By contrast, Corbett described the richness of the research literature in Portuguese that does not necessarily gain recognition by the Anglophone community, and that more interaction would be useful and enriching.

De Lima was sensitive to the hegemony of English in the Natal-Gaza collaboration with coresearchers and students. He explained:

> As a researcher, I decided to accept the texts as they were, a production by people who have another linguistic/cultural background, instead of looking for or trying to correct grammar mistakes and typos. (De Lima)

The Durham case study, contextualised in a prestigious Anglophone university, exposed the privilege of having linguistic competence in English among the researchers and international student participants. While the creative arts activities lessened the reliance on language, the refugee youths were keen to communicate in English to improve their opportunities for education and entry into UK society. Within the project and among the research team, English appeared to be the expected medium in researcher and student communication. As it turned out, having four speakers of Arabic helped to lessen the reliance on English, and resulted in much communication taking place in Arabic. Holmes self-critically reflected on her role as lead researcher in the Durham team regarding missed opportunities in handling the multilingual aspects of their case study:

> I somehow imagined a utopia of languaging and translanguaging, so that we—researchers, students in higher education, invited young refugees from outside the university—would all come to share something and therefore know one another better. While this was partly the case, we could have planned more carefully about how to capture communication in Arabic so that it entered our case study. The absence of Arabic in our case study signifies the absence, erasure even, of the identities and voices of Arabic speaking participants (the young refugee people). This outcome may also be linked to the co-writing experience among the three researchers in preparing and writing up our case study, and assumptions regarding English in academic outputs. By dividing up tasks within the chapter, different colleagues wrote up the findings from the workshop (the site of multilinguality). And the fact that the findings were presented in English may be linked to colleagues' assumptions that a research output, produced in a UK university, and for publication in book written and published by Routledge would, without question, be written in English.

While the researchers' assumptions seem fair, the erasure of refugee voices in the Durham case study, manifested in absence of multlingual data, parallels the experience of the Istanbul researchers: despite their difficulties in rendering translations of religious songs in Arabic into English, they did not consider simply including the original Arabic version.

By contrast, the Sakarya team downplayed such hegemony. By drawing on Freire's (1974) understanding of dialogue and by taking a translanguaging stance, they felt that translation was voluntary, spontaneous, and part of the natural flow of intercultural communication. Participants were not "forced" to speak any one language. They concluded: "There was no hierarchical separation". Yet, the extent to which such hierarchies may have been experienced or felt by the participants was not explored, leaving unanswered questions about how local students may have positioned refugee participants, especially those who had accented Turkish, or insufficient Turkish to express their feelings and experiences of being on campus. The rationale for taking a creative arts stance in the project—in this case study, participant photography—was important in addressing potential linguistic hegemonies and finding the "compensatory support" Corbett highlighted above.

Aside from de Lima, the researchers appeared to acquiesce in the role of English within the network as it is the language of academia. Yet, while the researchers and participants were doing their work in Arabic, Portuguese, Spanish, and Turkish, and no doubt in other languages that have not been included in the researchers' reflections, little of this linguistic labour and the challenges it brings was a topic of discussion in face-to-face and online meetings: English appeared to be the unquestioned lingua franca. In a more positive light, the project offered multilingual and intercultural opportunities and benefits, as well as challenges, and these are explored further in the next section.

Lived-experiences working in a multilingual research group

In many ways, the researchers' answers to the questionnaire elucidate some assumptions about working in a multilingual research group and the intercultural learning it engenders.

De Lima appreciated the "remarkable journey" of working with members of such a diverse group, both professionally and academically: sharing ideas, networking with experienced researchers, bridging institutional collaborations, triggering other research ideas, and opening doors for other research projects. He also highlighted the intercultural nature of the experience: "it gave researchers the chance to be in contact with cultures they knew of mostly through the means of communication, not from individuals representing—to some extent—that culture" (De Lima).

The Istanbul team had had previous experience of working in a multicultural/multilingual research group, but through participating in the network , they came to realise and appreciate that intercultural communication, where different languages are mobilised, is a socially constructed process, which requires effort and ability:

> The variety of the linguistic experiences among the group members proved [to] me [that] the categories in our minds are shaped mainly by the language group we belong to and we are accustomed to communicate with. As a researcher working mainly on educational policy changes in the late 19th century in the Eurasian zone, and particularly in the periphery of Ottoman State, I was used to switching between languages in their written/formal forms. However, BIPHEC revealed the fact that doing the same in contemporary spoken languages requires extra effort and specific abilities as every person reconstructs its language frame through his or her own experiences. (Furat)

Peña Dix described how working in a multilingual, intercultural team enabled her to reflect on her research role and her developing understanding of qualitative research:

> I learnt on the level of risk taking and level of tolerance to uncertainty in the different CSs [case studies] as they progressed. I felt sometimes anxious on the direction my CS was taking, and how everything would unfold. . . . I observed my Co-Is were maybe more patient and waiting to see "how things would develop as a whole". Maybe my view of research was narrow at some points, and I was awaiting for the project to have a clear beginning, development and end when the truth of qualitative research is not that. International meetings definitely helped me understand and experience the reality of networking, and how can we enrich knowledge by in-situ experiences and "witnessing" the CSs' reality. Individual/collective feedback and the questions that arose in the meetings were valuable to check CS developments and advances. . . . [It] was important to follow up and get feedback. (Peña Dix)

While we, as authors, have both been part of much larger international projects, the challenges presented by a small, organic, emergent network situated in conflict zones in the global South, and over a short 1-year period raises its own challenges as evidenced here. Corbett provides a sober understanding of the challenges, highlighting the learning gained from the experience:

> I truly believe that the support was appropriately given. The process of decision-making was as democratic as possible, considering the multiplicity of people and languages involved in the cases and the complexity to arrange all the exchanges. Even the constraints dealt with in each case study can be taken as research findings and help in future investigations and projects.

Conclusions

In this chapter, we have sought to document and understand processes of researching multilingually, drawing on the perspectives of researchers in a multilingual, multinational, multidisciplinary research network. Our aim was to highlight the value of articulating an explicit ethic for researching multilingually when undertaking research that attends to 'epistemologies of the South' (Santos, 2016), and that foregrounds the voices of the researched in conflict zones. In concluding, we offer recommendations for future international research teams who intend to adopt a researching multilingually ethic in an effort to decolonise multilingualism.

Our analysis indicates an awareness in incorporating a ‘researching multilingually’ methodology among the researchers into their research design and fieldwork: in part due to the aims of the research network project, but especially to the deep reflexivity of the researchers, who were open to linguistic diversity, the cultural sensitivities around conflict and forced migration, and the associated loss of home and language. They made decisions throughout the research process to accommodate the various languages in the research site, while also acknowledging their own linguistic capabilities. The ‘researching multilingually’ framework also aligns well with creative arts methods grounded in new materialism (Barad, 2006; Frimberger, 2016, Harvey et al., 2019) and critical pedagogy (Freire, 1974). Researchers and research participants reported using their multiple linguistic resources in spontaneous translation, and drew on their performative repertoires through translanguaging and languaging in intercultural communication. The ‘researching multilingually’ perspective encouraged researchers to recognise the creative, unexpected and embodied aspects of intercultural encounters that emerge when one language is no longer the focus of the researcher’s gaze. In addition, a ‘researching multingually’ ethic enabled them to be attentive to the languages in their research design and fieldwork, alerting them to the possibility of decentering dominant languages, and thus, give voice to refugee, migrant, marginalised, economically disadvantaged people who have been displaced due to conflict and other protracted crises (Phipps, 2019), and educationally disadvantaged in the process.

However, as well as in some of the case studies where the plurality of participants’ languages might have, at times, been more explicitly acknowledged, the researchers’ responses suggest two key areas where ‘researching multilingually’ processes could have been further developed: in the communication within the network, and in publishing.

First, researchers’ multilingual voices were insufficiently audible in the research network. In practice, English as the lingua franca appeared to be respected, accepted, and rarely contested. Yet, at least one researcher’s response revealed a lesser confidence in using English, suggesting the need for alertness to the other languages in circulation in the team, and the need for a continuous discussion on implementing linguistically democratic ways of working, especially when researchers may not be in language-focused disciplines. For example, the four researchers from Turkey (three sociologists and one theologian) spoke Turkish, the majority language, but this language was largely silent in the network.

Second, the researching multilingually framework appeared to be less successfully applied at the writing up and publication stages, and English (as the *de facto* language of prestige scholarly publication) prevailed. Despite the good intentions of the project leader, the researchers (apart from Peña Dix) did not include multilingual data. Thus, the voices of the young people, to whom we wanted to reach out, are larging missing in the case study chapters in this volume. Given concerns for refugees being rendered voiceless in research (Chatty, 2016; Kalocsányiová & Shatnawi, 2022), future research networks, especially those working in contexts of conflict and forced migration, need to be more attentive to the inclusion of multilingual data in publications and other disseminated work to fully understand experiences associated with loss of language, culture, heritage.

Finally, our study suggests the need for a more intentional discussion within project teams concerning how to handle multiple languages at all stages of the research. In a multidisciplinary project, this is crucial as the researchers, located in diverse disciplines, may not share the same understandings of the role of their linguistic resources, and those of their participants, in the research process. The ‘researching multilingually’ framework helped to foreground the rationale for a multilingual ethic and how it might be implemented. On the other hand, unshared understanding may have been a consequence of the organic and situated nature of the network: the project’s broad geographical distance and different time zones; limited face-to-face meetings; limited funding (one of the reasons why not all researchers could attend all the meetings); short time frame (of one year); lack of sustained contact among members; and occupation (Al-Masri was not permitted to leave Gaza).

Corbett reflects on why a ‘researching multilingually’ ethic matters, particularly in contexts of conflict, forced migration, economic marginalisation, and occupation:

> Researching multilingually provides more chances for fair, democratic research processes as the languages involved are validated, made visible, and considered equally important in different stages of the research. Diversity of participants and researchers are celebrated through analysis of the roles of languages. (Corbett)

We finish with some key recommendations to future researchers when undertaking research in multilingual, multinational, multidisciplinary research networks:

- Ensure the rationale for using multiple languages in all levels and stages of the research project, and especially from its inception, is understood by all researchers;
- Diversify researcher praxis by attending to and valuing local epistemologies, to

prioritise local and indigenous ways of knowing and speaking, whether artistically, creatively, performatively, or in words;

- Consider new materialist approaches, translanguaging, and languaging that recognise non-linguistic forms of communication and facilitate intercultural communication when languages are unshared;
- Involve all researchers in decisions regarding languages in the research process, including how the use their own linguistic resources; together, develop shared and clearly articulated goals around researching multilingually;
- Resist the hegemony of English, or any one language, to ensure all researcher, participant, and other stakeholder voices are heard, and in the languages they speak;
- Encourage researchers to approach researching multilingually reflexively. This means that at every stage of the project, in every meeting, and in planning and undertaking fieldwork, researchers account for their linguistic resources, choices, and decisions (and record them in a researcher journal) to show the complexity, ethics, and care in accounting for languages in the research process and among participants in order to demonstrate a linguistic justice. Allocate time at every meeting to discuss how marginalised languages are prioritised and given space throughout the research process.
- Foster an ethic of publishing multilingually which gives life to the granulations of the way peoples name their worlds (Phipps, 2019).

Acknowledgement

We thank the nine researchers participating in our BIPHEC project who made this chapter possible by sharing their perspectives on researching multilingually through their responses to the questionnaire. The respondents were Zeynep Özde Ateşok, John Corbett, Beatriz Peña Dix, Ayşe Zişan Furat, Bruno de Lima, Ali Faruk Yaylaci, and Filiz Göktuna Yaylaci. We authors (Holmes and Rajab) also responded and these are also included in the discussion. All responses are presented in their original form.

References

Andrews, J., Holmes, P., Fay, R., & Dawson, S. (2020). Researching multilingually in

Applied Linguistics. In H. Rose and J. McKinley (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 76-86). London: Routledge.

BIPHEC (2021). Building an intercultural pedagogy for Higher Education in conditions of conflict and protracted crisis: language, culture, identity. Retrieved on 17 July 2021 from https://biphec.wordpress.com/

Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the oppressed*. Pluto Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge: Polity.

Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 31-54.

Cannella, G. & Lincoln, Y. (2018). Ethics, research regulations, and critical social science. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 83-96). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chatty, D. (2016). Refugee voices: Exploring the border zones between states and state bureaucracies. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees, 32*(1), 3-6.

Curry, M.-J. & Lillis, T. (Eds.) (2017). *Global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Frimberger, K. (2016). Towards a well-being focussed language pedagogy: Enabling arts-based, multilingual learning spaces for young people with refugee backgrounds. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 24*(2), 285-299.

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

Guilherme, M. (this volume). Glocademics in action: Intercultural responsibility in conditions of conflict and crises.

Harvey, L., McCormick, B., & Vanden, K. (2019). Becoming at the boundaries of language: Dramatic enquiry for intercultural learning in UK higher education. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 19*(6), 451-470.

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. Reynolds, J., Ganassin, S. (2022). *The politics of researching multilingually*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kalocsányiová, E., & Shatnawi, M. (2022, in press). Transcribing (multilingual) voices: From fieldwork to publication. In In P. Holmes, J. Reynolds, and G. Ganassin (Eds.), *The politics of researching multilingually* (pp. ??). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kamali, L., Forsdick, C., & Dutton, H. (2019). *Translating cultures theme: Final report*. University of Liverpool. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/43033031/Translating_Cultures_Theme_Final_Report

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 9-30.

Liddicoat, A.J., & Curnow, T.J. (2014). Students' home languages and the struggle for space in the curriculum. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 11*(3), 273-288.

Manathunga, C., Bunda, T., Singh, M., Qu, J. (2020). Indigenizing the higher degree research space. In K. Trimmer, D., Hoven, and P. Keskitalo (Eds), *Indigenous postgraduate education: Intercultural perspectives* (pp. 89-103). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Martin-Jones, M. & Martin, D. (2017). *Researching multilingualism: Critical and ethnographic perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Meyer Pitton, L. & Schedel, L. (2022, in press). The (Hidden) Politics of Language Choice in Research on Multilingualism: Moments of (Dis)Empowerment. In P. Holmes, J. Reynolds, and G. Ganassin (Eds.), *The politics of researching multilingually* (pp. ??). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2021). DAC List of ODA Recipients. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/daclist.htm

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Phipps, A. (2019). *Decolonising multilingualism. Struggles to decreate*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Phipps, A., & Kay, R. (2014). Editorial: Languages in migratory settings: Place, politics and aesthetics. *Language and intercultural Communication, 14*(3), 273-286.

Santos, B. S. (2016). *Epistemologies of the South*: *Justice against Epistemicide*. London and New York: Routledge

Schön, D. (1984). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Smith, L.T. (2012). *Decolonising methodologies*. London: Zed Books.

Warriner, D. & Bigelow. M. (Eds.) (2019). *Critical reflections on research methods: Power and equity in complex multilingual contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Wilson, A. (in press, 2022). Publish or perish, *publier ou périr?* How research publication language choice is shaped among linguistics early career researchers in France. In P. Holmes, J. Reynolds, and G. Ganassin (Eds.), *The politics of researching multilingually* (pp. ??). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.