Navigating languages and interculturality in the research process: The ethics and positionality of the researcher and the researched

In language and intercultural communication, the critical turn has been most evident in critical linguistic ethnography which seeks to investigate situated language use in order to understand the dynamics of social and cultural production in everyday activity (e.g., Blommaert, 2013; Martin-Jones, Blackledge, & Creese, 2014; Pennycook, 2010; Rampton, Maybin, & Roberts, 2014); and in intercultural languages education and pedagogies, where learners (and their teachers) seek to resist essentialist understandings of the other and take action against all types of injustice (Crosbie, 2014; Diaz, 2013; Guilherme, 2002; Levine & Phipps, 2011). Given that most social research nowadays is multilingual, and given the inextricable links between language, identity, and culture, multilingual research also implies intercultural research. Therefore, the critical turn invites investigation of how researchers draw on linguistic resources (their own and others') in these multilingual contexts, how they negotiate intercultural relationships and communication in the research site, and the ethical processes such a multilingual, intercultural focus entails. These aspects of the research process have important implications for the trustworthiness and transferability of the research outcomes.

In this chapter I take up these themes and explore the links between multilingual and intercultural research—that is, what it means to research multilingually and interculturally. The intercultural turn in the 21st century, as highlighted by Dasli (2011; see also Díaz and Dasli, this volume) invokes an investigation of many inter-related, but also contradictory, notions. Several questions emerge: Which languages are in play? Who is using them? Which languages do researchers and participants have access to through their own multi-/monolingual resources? How do researchers position themselves in relation to these languages? How do researchers understand their own interculturality and communicative processes vis-à-vis the research/researched (see, for example, Alexander et al. (2014)? What are the ethical implications of language choices, and of intercultural communication and intercultural relationships emerging from these choices, in undertaking any research?

Researchers bring their own language skills and experiences—their *linguistic resources* (most likely in varying degrees of multilinguality)—to a research project; and they must balance their own assumptions, worldview and contextual knowledge—their *interculturality*—with the social, cultural, political, and institutional context of the research, and the epistemological tradition within which they are researching. These aspects must be negotiated throughout the research process: from

initial research conceptualisation, planning and focus, to deciding what languages to include in the literature review, how language considerations influence methodological choices, ethically identifying and working with participants, data collection and analysis concerns, writing up, and (re)presenting the research (to participants, stakeholders, and the wider social and academic community). The research context (in its broad sense, as highlighted above), the expectations of the research funder and/or supervisor, the wider community, and the participants themselves—all require further consideration where languages and the nature of intercultural relationships are concerned. This situation, therefore, invites careful attention to ethical and methodological consideration of the languages at play, and the position of the researcher vis-à-vis these language resources and opportunities.

How researchers draw on their linguistic resources is being investigated through a research agenda under the umbrella term "researching multilingually"[1], which refers to the process and practice of using, or accounting for the use of, more than one language in all stages of the research process: from the initial design of the project, to engaging with different literatures, to developing the methodology and considering all possible ethical issues, to generating and analyzing the data, to issues of representation and reflexivity when writing up and publishing (Holmes, Fay, Andrews, & Attia, 2013; 2016). In this chapter I build on this agenda, investigating how researchers engage multilingually and interculturally—in terms of building relationships, making ethical and responsible decisions as they negotiate with the research/researched, and the power relationships entailed. I begin by outlining some key tenets of current critical qualitative social science research. I then discuss these in relation to my own multilingual and intercultural researcher experiences (reflecting on my own doctoral researcher experience and doctoral supervision). Finally, I offer implications for researchers regarding researcher practice concerning ethics, multilingual opportunities, and intercultural communication when researching multilingually and interculturally.

The critical turn in researching multilingually/researching interculturally

Foregrounding the role of languages invites different considerations about the role of ethics in a research project. Yet, institutional practices in universities, regulations by institutional review boards, and research expectations from governments (e.g., in the emphasis paid to evidence-based

---

[1] See the AHRC-funded "Researching Multilingually" (AH1/J005037/1) project under the "Translating Cultures" theme (see http://researchingmultilingually.com/) and the follow-on AHRC-funded large grant "Researching Multilingually at the Borders of Language, the Body, Law, and the State" (see http://researching-multilingually-at-borders.com/ (AH/L006936/1).

outcomes and outputs) prioritise a utilitarian approach to research. Many of the research traditions found in Anglo-universities, emanating from philosophies of autonomy and self-control that emerged and flourished in Enlightenment thinking, have resulted in hegemonic practices that have been normalised, codified and are resistant to change or negotiation. Christians (2011) notes how the Enlightenment project has resulted in sets of principles, or codes of ethics, which he describes as "illogical" and "stale" (p. 66) and which have been adopted by professional and academic associations to ensure "value-free" social science.

The first principle concerns informed consent. Punch (1998) reflects that strictly applying rules about hiding research participants' identities may restrain and restrict research that may not be problematic. The second concerns deception. Bulmer (2008) points out that there are situations where it is not always possible to be completely open to all participants. For example, the British Association of Applied Linguistics (2015), in its policy on good practice in research, states that if "linguists do not want informants to alter their usual style of speech, and anticipate they might do so if they know the purpose of the study, it may be defensible to tell them the general purpose of the research without revealing specific objectives".

Third, privacy and confidentiality are supposed to be assured; however, achieving this, via pseudonyms and disguised locations, is often impossible. For example, Attia (Attia & Edge, 2016, in press) found that when sharing her doctoral research findings with her participants—teachers of Arabic she was researching in Cairo to establish their attitudes to using technology in their teaching—the teachers preferred to have their names used in the research, rather than be referred to as "Teacher X" or "Teacher Y". Since they could all recognise one another in the data, anonymising their presence seemed, to them, absurd.

This finding leads to Christians' (2011) final point: that research aims to produce "accurate" data, which is achieved through principles of internal and external validity, and is explicated normatively through a set of methodological operations to produce a "value-neutral" social science. Christians argues that these processes are incongruent in critical qualitative social science research in that they deny emotionality and intuition and an "ethics of caring" grounded in "concrete particularities" (Denzin, 1997, p. 273, cited in Christians, 2011, p. 68), thus reducing humans to subjects and denying the collaborative human endeavour. Attia's (Attia & Edge, 2015) researcher experiences are testimony to this view. Such a utilitarian, efficient, and value-neutral approach to research has resulted in the ethical approval process becoming a streamlined, slick affair—a "tick the box" or "fill in the gaps" exercise—a process adopted now in many Anglo universities to commodify and simplify ethical procedures.

Christians (2011) argues that this noncontextual, nonsituational model ignores the "situatedness of power relations associated with gender, sexual orientation, class, ethnicity, race, and nationality" (cited in Denzin, 1997, p. 272). It is also hierarchical (demonstrating a scientist-subject positioning), and glosses over the way the researcher is embedded in the research site and research culture. Instead, Christians calls for a feminist communitarian approach that locates people in a "noncompetitive, nonhierarchical relationship to the larger moral universe" (Denzin, 1989, p. 158, cited in Christians, 2011, p. 70). He argues for a collaborative and participatory approach to research and research participants, where participants are given a role and forum to activate the research and agenda; thus, the community—through practices of neighbourliness and shared governance— become the knowledge producers and policymakers: the researcher has responsibility to those s/he studies, bringing into play participatory democracy, identity (realised in interaction with others), and its associated moral agency of promise-keeping and recognition and ethical treatment of others.

Christians' critique of normalised conventions concerning what constitutes "good" research, and his call for a collaborative and participatory approach foregrounds the importance of ethical dialogue and human relationships, including power relations, as researchers and researched collaborate in a joint endeavour of sustaining and supporting one another and acknowledging human solidarity as they co-construct the research. The critique also highlights the need for methodologies that resist normative, Cartesian, Enlightenment embodiment, approaches found in critical, "red", and indigenous methodologies which recognise the role of Southern, indigenous, and peripheral perspectives in social theory (e.g., Connell, 2007; hooks, 2003; Smith, 2012). Such researchers challenge colonial ("Northern") understandings of "knowledge" as it is constructed and claimed in the "scholarship" of the global North which often misrepresents and essentialises indigenous and marginalised people, simultaneously denying their identities and voices (Bishop, 2005). Similar resistance can be found in "Eastern" approaches to intercultural communication research theory (e.g., Miike, 2007; Shi-xu, 2009).

However, central to these theoretical debates, and usually absent from them, is the role of languages and intercultural communication in the research process, for example, how languages are deployed by all stakeholders, and the nature of communication in that deployment. I now turn to three important aspects on this matter: what constitutes ethical dialogue; relationships and power; and the contributions of indigenous approaches in foregrounding languages and intercultural communication.

Ethical (multilingual) dialogue

Communicators engaging in (multilingual) dialogue exhibit a willingness to listen "for" the emergent, the unexpected, or what Buber called the "in-between", where dialogue identifies the attitudes with which participants approach each other, the ways they talk and act, the consequences of their meeting, and the context within which they meet (Buber, 1958). Buber calls this an "I-Thou" combination which signals the preeminence of social relations—which are reciprocal and interpersonal. Dialogue is central. Through dialogue power is unmasked and engaged through the solidarity that is constructed within and between the researched-researcher team (Christians, 2011). Power relations are diverse and often asymmetrical, and exist among people in their daily interactions—through the interrelated processes of language, everyday talk, and nonverbal communication (Allen, 2004). Power relations also operate as speakers invoke certain languages and (un)intentionally deny others. Researchers must act as (multilingual) power brokers to engage in ethical dialogue with all stakeholders.

This situation points to the need for the coproduction of knowledge through multivocality, (multilingualism) and inclusiveness, where both researchers and researched have the ability to ask questions (in multiple languages) and assist in gathering and validating data, and where the researched are the primary audience to whom the findings are addressed (in and through languages they understand) (Chuang, 2003; Collier, Hegde, Lee, Nakayama, & Yep, 2002). Such multivocality, of necessity, requires recognition of multilingual power relations, as I have highlighted in my added parentheses: whose languages are prioritised; how do all stakeholders in the research mobilise their language resources in authentic communication? Through dialogic communication researchers construct relationships of mutual trust and honesty with the researched, a process that requires understanding of shared and unshared realities, and recognition of similarities as well as differences.

Multilingual relationships and power

Chuang (2003) argues that differences may not be strictly cultural, but rather, impacted by personality, power relations, socialization of gender roles, and distinctions between in- and out-groups and their members. While it is unlikely that such differences can ever be removed in the research context, they must be worked at: thus, relationships between researchers and researched ought to be based on reciprocity, intimacy, and vulnerability, not on domination; in this sense, power is relational, and characterised by mutuality rather than sovereignty. Like Christians (2011), Chuang (2003) highlights the inappropriateness of Cartesian, linear, and logical reasoning in studying (cultural) others who may position themselves differently. For example, within broadly Asian- or Confucian-influenced contexts, Miike (2007) highlights the importance of relational communication—which may include careful facework (face giving, face saving, acknowledgement),

5

acts of generosity and gift giving that serve to cultivate a bind or obligation between giver and receiver (*guanxi*), and respect based on positionality. These aspects of relational communication lay the foundations for relationship building and future ties and reciprocity. Miike also highlights the importance of observing and maintaining harmony in communication within these relationships. As discussed above, "Northern" methodologies often fail to account for culturally-other ways of valuing personhood, faith, and ethical communication among people of different cultural and religious belief systems (Collier, 2003). In this sense, Christians (2011) argues that researchers must try to engage the same moral space as the people they study in order to illuminate how communities, and the people within them, flourish.

However, none of these theorists discuss how languages are deployed in such research contexts, or what linguistic resources researchers are drawing on to ensure equal possibilities for participation, and respect for mutuality and reciprocity, simultaneously acknowledging that individuals may freely choose how they participate and to what extent. Researchers have an ethical responsibility here. They must continue to examine their language practices to ensure that those who are marginalised by dominant and world languages can speak for themselves, or be spoken for by others (mediators, interpreters, co-participants) in processes that involve flexible multilingualism (Ganassin & Holmes, 2013). For example, Ganassin and 16 co-researchers researched the cultural practices of 68 women speaking more than 25 languages who were immigrants, asylum seekers, or refugees in their community in a city in the north of England. Their life experiences of displacement across different countries and social contexts, often where they had little linguistic knowledge or capital, had exposed them to the experience of either being translated or translating for someone else. Together, the participants and researchers used different languages and communication strategies flexibly to co-construct meaning, for example:

> A woman from Afghanistan, Farsi speaking and reasonably fluent in English, expressed demonstrable pride in helping the researchers by explaining concepts and translating when necessary for an Iranian participant struggling with English (and that no one else could understand). These flexible language skills and communicative processes sustained the fluidity of the conversations and created a climate where all participants could feel comfortable in communicating. (Ganassin & Holmes, 2013, p. 349)

The researchers drew on their own multilingual and flexible language skills, linguistic families, language strategies (such as paraphrasis), and supportive relationships to co-construct meaning and encourage participation. By accommodating both researchers' and participants' linguistic repertoires and asymmetric linguistic competences, the researchers empowered these potentially

vulnerable and marginalized women, enabling them to voice themselves and draw on their funds of knowledge (González 2005). The researchers understood the dangers of normative multilingualism, where the marginalised remain muted, misrepresented and misunderstood. Thus, in this situation Krog (2011, p. 384) calls on funding bodies and project leading agencies, the institutional drivers of research, to adapt and change the standards of the majority. Only then, Krog argues, can the marginalized enter "our own discourses in their own genres and their own terms" (p. 384).

Indigenous approaches and languages in intercultural research

While critical social science research perspectives embrace all of the above categories, indigenous and Southern theories/methodologies (e.g., Connell, 2007; Smith, 2012) have been even more strident in advocating for all voices to be heard, notably, voices that are marginalised and unauthorised. They are also sensitive to the ways in which governments legitimise dominant language regimes while marginalising or ignoring indigenous and minority languages in society (May, 2011). Researchers undertaking critical interpretive research are likely to be caught up in such regimes and must seek alternative ways of engaging those who are linguistically excluded or marginalised. Critical indigenous methodologies seek to address such injustices through research processes that demonstrate an ethical and reciprocal relationship between researcher and researched. They acknowledge marginalised people and "recognize the need to avoid forms of representation that maintain power in traditional locations" (Cannella & Lincoln, 2011, p. 82). According to Cannella and Lincoln, this also includes *the examination of privilege created by language in research practices* (my italics).

Such methodologies function as pedagogies of hope (Freire, 1972; 1976; hooks, 2003), and show a concern for indigenous sovereignty and the dehumanising and oppressive effects of colonisation— on both the colonisers and colonised. Where indigenous communities are concerned, Denzin, Lincoln and Smith (2008, p. 569) advocate a non-Occidental approach to interpretive research: indigenous communities seek a "set of ethical principles that are feminist, caring, communitarian, holistic, respectful, mutual (rather than power imbalanced), sacred, and ecologically sound". This includes a "speaking back" by reintroducing indigenous practices and education through indigenous languages (Smith, 2005). As Krog (2011) proclaims:

> [The marginalised] have a universal right to impart information and ideas through any
> media [*and any language—my addition*] and regardless of frontiers, and we have a duty
> to listen and understand them through engaging in new acts of becoming (p. 384).

This speaking back is also evidenced in the use Ahmed's (2014) adoption of the Islamic pedagogy *halaqah* as a critical indigenous research methodology used to enable Muslim mother-teachers to reflect on how they, as holistic Islamic educators, were developing a critical indigenous education to meet the needs of Muslim children in the United Kingdom. *Halaqah* is "a spiritual circle-time . . . conducted purely orally with students and teacher sitting in a circle on the floor" (p. 567). The format of *halaqah* can vary: it may be transmission-based teacher-led, or dialogic/student-led, or a collaborative group effort. Ahmed argues that the use of this Islamic indigenous methodology "enabled participants to articulate themselves within their own epistemological and ontological context and engage in critical reflection within an Islamic paradigm" (p. 561).

Therefore, researchers must reflect on the complex interplay of people involved throughout all stages of the research, and importantly, how the language(s) they speak—and do not speak—shape their communication, involvement and participation with all stakeholders. These processes must be undertaken with full consideration of the emergent ethical issues in order to ensure the trustworthiness of their research outcomes. The growing body of research on critical indigenous methodologies (e.g., Denzin, Lincoln, and Smith, 2008) speaks to these concerns.

Next, I reflect on the various approaches and issues discussed thus far in some reflective and reflexive accounts of my own researcher experiences, drawn from my doctoral research undertaken nearly 20 years ago, which until recently had been unexplored.

Researcher reflections of researching multilingually/researching interculturally

My doctoral research explored the intercultural communication experiences of 13 international and permanent resident ethnic Chinese students who were studying in a New Zealand university. The processes of researching multilingually and researching interculturally were not strongly represented in my consciousness or researcher toolkit then. I worked by intuition and a sense of purposefulness: that is, I had research questions I wanted to answer, and a report to produce that would be awarded a doctoral degree by a degree-granting institution. But my research also had a critical purpose, based on my previous research and professional experiences: to understand these Chinese students' experiences in order to improve their conditions as members of the academic and broader social community. As part of the third and final ethnographic interview, and after 18 months in the field, I asked the participants how they felt about engaging in the research and with me as researcher. I did not include their reflections in my doctoral thesis as, at the time, they did not seem important to the study. However, on being invited recently to write a chapter on reflexivity in language and

intercultural education (see Holmes, 2014)[2], I realised the importance of their reflections to that topic so I revisited this aspect in those transcripts. I present here some excerpts from that publication as they resonate with the themes and concepts discussed so far in this chapter. They include relationship building and trust, power and positioning, participants' ethical concerns about the data, and language.

Relationship building and trust. My experiences of living and working with Chinese people (briefly, as a student of Chinese language and teacher of English in China, an English-language teacher trainer in Hong Kong, and tutor in a New Zealand university) made me aware of the importance of building trust with my participants in order to gather authentic data, especially given my minimal knowledge of Chinese. The Chinese students explain their understanding of developing trust by coming to know the other through communication, shared similarities and meeting points:

> I don't think there [is much] difference in our culture[s], but I feel much better and better when I communicate with you. Yeah, I mean, much more comfortable. When I first talk with you, probably because of my language problem, probably we don't know each other, you know, but today you can understand, get a far insight of my thought. You understand me now, to some extent. It's getting better and better (LJ, male postgraduate student).

Other participants expressed that building trust and developing an interpersonal relationship over a period of time was important in self-protection against emotional harm:

> The more we talk, the more I can . . . know your personality. The most important thing is the personality, so I know you will not do some harm to me and so I can trust you. (KZ, male post-graduate student)

> So like slowly, your influence, that I don't need to be afraid of you. . . . When I first came here [for the interview] I don't trust you. (WK, male undergraduate)

And YR spoke more in terms of reciprocity between researcher and research: "I think the research should be act as friends to the person being research[ed]. That's one thing, and show concern for him or her. Once you get trust from him or from her you can get the information" (YR, female post-graduate).

For me, the researcher, building this trust was important from the start in order to ensure the trustworthiness of the research. Thus, activities like supporting them with their studies, inviting

---

[2] A more detailed discussion and analysis of reflexivity in the research process, and an account of my reflexive positioning in relation to the research and these participants, can be found in this publication.

them to my house for a meal, taking them to the beach, being invited to their houses, and sharing special events (e.g., the arrival of a newborn) were important in coming to know and understand the participants. The knowledge that emerges from the research is thus the result of each participant's unique experience, constructed in communication with the researcher. It is the researcher's task to come to know and understand the participant's experience, via critical reflection on and inspection of the unfolding communication. As Altheide and Johnson remind us, this knowledge is incomplete, implicit and often tacit:

> Our subjects always know more than they can tell us, usually even more than they allow us to see; likewise, we often know far more than we can articulate . . . [T]he key issue is not to capture the informant's voice, but to elucidate the experience that is implicated by the subjects in the context of their activities as they perform them, as they are understood by the ethnographer. (2011, p. 592)

Power and positioning. As a doctoral student with my own office and computer (a status marker then), I was perceived by the participants as hierarchically superior to them. Other status markers which they ascribed to me included being a mother, older, and the professional status of teacher. So my intercultural contact and communication with them was important in negotiating these markers. In coming to know these students during the fieldwork and beyond, some of them became my friends (as in the case of SX, who became my bridge partner at the local Bridge Club). SX explained how I encouraged his engagement in the research, which resulted in his growing interest and commitment:

> At first, when you talked with me and I think, oh, you are a lecturer or you, I mean, you've got a high position, and I, yeah, I should I mean to follow you at every aspect. But gradually, gradually, something has been changed and now, I mean, I know what's what I say. At first I think I'm just a passive, passive role, and finally, I know actually both of us are . . . creating, yeah. So it's different. (SX, male postgraduate student)

Here SX demonstrates a post-research, critical self-awareness of his own agency in the shaping and emergence of the research data.

Participants' ethical concerns about the data. As part of a process of member checking, I returned each transcript to the respective interviewees. However, in the course of the fieldwork, two of the postgraduate participants expressed an interest, or concern even, in helping me with the accuracy of my understandings and interpretations. For example, one participant expressed his desire to check

my interpretation and representation of Chinese culture in my write up. He hedges carefully in order not to offend:

> I'm quite interested in what you are thinking and doing and also I am . . . I want to give you some help . . . Although you stayed in China or in Hong Kong for some, for a few years, but maybe I think you're not very well understand. You're not well understand about the culture in China, but I think the understanding of the culture is quite important in your research. So I think if I know what you are thinking and you are doing, maybe something I know, maybe you are not right, so I can tell you. (KZ, male postgraduate student)

KZ reported that he had read Western authors' interpretations of Chinese values and culture: "they don't really understand some simple things". While in the initial stages my supervisors had endorsed my ability to undertake the study (based on my professional and study experiences), KZ's candid evaluation suggests that he did not necessarily endorse the authority they had ascribed to me.

Ethical issues around anonymity also appeared. For example, one participant signalled a concern that I did not report his/her political positioning at the time of the Tiananmen Square situation in 1989. By contrast, AS, a female undergraduate student, valued my research because it enabled her to find out how other international students experienced their intercultural sojourn. She acknowledged the political nature of the research—that it gave participants the opportunity to voice their experiences of internationalisation and student mobility. The daily pressure and constraints of academic study often silenced their expression of their deeper feelings about intercultural experience.

These processes shed light on Copland and Creese's (2015) finding that ethical issues must be resolved within the "contextual realities and mutual understandings" of those involved (p. 176). The processes I employed and the feedback participants gave, indicated how they perceived the research as a political endeavour—where their voices are heard and represented, and where the construction and representation of the research are truly co-collaborative (Collier, 2005). However, in my post-researcher reflection (Holmes, 2014), I questioned whether I had sufficiently called on participants' voices and their positionings throughout the fieldwork, analysis and write-up.

Language. As argued earlier, an ethical approach to researcher praxis must embody the role of languages in the research process. The language of the research was English. I uncritically adopted English as it was my first language and the language of the institution in which the participants were studying and communicating. To some extent my life experience of learning languages, including very elementary Mandarin (written and spoken) and living among Chinese (in China and Hong Kong)

helped to inform my understanding of the participants. While I was aware that many of them spoke regional and local dialects and other languages, I did not explore how these multiple languages may have impacted their communication in New Zealand with other Chinese and non-Chinese people. Nor did I ask participants how they made sense of their interview experiences with me, other participants, family, and friends. What possibilities may have arisen if I had considered the multilingual nature of the research? What if I had privileged focus groups, rather than one-to-one interviews, where participants might have supported one another through their shared other languages, as Ganassin and colleagues had done in their research (Ganassin & Holmes, 2013). While these issues and challenges in conducting research with participants who do not share the first language of the researcher are central in my current "researching multilingually" work, they went undiscussed in my thesis at that time. The university had a multilingual faculty and many international students, all of whom did not have English as their first language. The university also had a bilingual policy of permitting submission of student work for examination in both English and Maori. Yet, then, my supervisors (English monolinguals) and I failed to acknowledge this linguistic tension.

Building an ethic of "researching multilingually" and "researching interculturally"

These reflections lead me to conclude that an ethical approach to languages, and how researchers mobilise and choose to navigate with and through languages in the research process, is an important aspect of any researcher praxis (understood as how researchers theorise, employ methodologies, make choices, and take action in all stages of the research process). Inevitably, when languages are invoked, so too is intercultural communication, that is, how individuals in the research context communicate with one another through shared and unshared languages and through a complex negotiation of identities and roles.

Foregrounding (intercultural) communication invokes a further set of issues. These include i) the relationships (inevitably underpinned by power and positioning) shared among all stakeholders involved in the research; ii) the values and motivations of those initiating, undertaking and evaluating the research; and iii) the research sites, e.g., the context of the research with its participants, interpreters (possibly) and gatekeepers, and second, the receiving sites which include community engagement, publication, or examination in the case of doctoral research; and finally, iv) the in-between and often unexplored spaces—the silences, interruptions, and apprehensions— invoked in the minds of researchers and research participants as the research unfolds. Researchers must also draw on their (intercultural) communicative resources as they shape, and are shaped by, the research endeavour. As my reflections above show, these entail building trust, prioritising ethical

practices and making ethical choices, acknowledging agency (their own, their participants', and the other stakeholders in the research), and handling the power/powerlessness that this agency entails. Thus, research, in whatever discipline or field, involves researching multilingually, and this process inevitably marshals the concept of intercultural communication.

An ethic of researching multilingually and researching interculturally calls into focus a number of considerations. Cannella and Lincoln (2011, p. 83) identify four categories worthy of further reflection. Within these four categories I introduce and discuss the place and role of languages and intercultural communication that each calls into being.

1. Expose the diversity of realities. Individuals' realities are governed by their worldviews, and the languages they use to express such worldviews and engage with those who may not share this reality. In critical intercultural research, the researcher's work is often focused on bringing injustices of the oppressed to the fore. Thus, in drawing on an ethic of researching multilingually, researchers need to foreground languages at each stage of the research process: their own and those of the participants. However, they must also acknowledge the languages of those who are funding, or examining (in the case of higher education degrees) the research. Funders, examiners, and examining bodies are frequently in positions of power in society or in research institutions, and institutional and societal forces often require that they measure good research according to the Enlightenment principles described earlier. Thus, a challenge, or opportunity, emerges for researchers to resist ethnocentric and monolingual approaches that privilege certain languages in conceptualising, undertaking, representing and disseminating the research. Such resistance is ever more important as the geopolitics of publishing in English takes hold. Therefore, researchers must ask of themselves: What languages are spoken in the research site? What linguistic resources do I have as a researcher to call these into being? Will I need interpreters or language mediators? Who will they be and what is their positioning vis-à-vis the researcher, the researched, and the research context (i.e., are the interpreters "insiders" who are trusted by both researcher and participants, or are they "outsiders", or viewed as agents of the regime by the researched)?[3]

2. Engage with the webs of interaction that construct problems in ways that lead to power/privilege for particular groups. State regimes reinforce the positioning of languages and worldviews through their state-governed bureaucracies (e.g., departments of education which control and construct curricula and assessment systems that likely disadvantage the children of the less powerful minorities). Similarly, "Western" universities align with research councils and funding agencies to set

---

[3] Answers to some of these questions are explored in Holmes et al. (2013; 2016, in press).

rules of conduct for research through policies on ethics, although associations are increasingly providing more specific guidelines for ethical conduct and language practices that acknowledge such differentials (e.g., British Association of Applied Linguistics (2015)).

Researchers who are researching multilingually and interculturally in a critical manner should resist monolingual regimes by confronting and negotiating with them, e.g., with ethics committees in universities and funding bodies, to ensure that languages are represented in published research reports and theses. Project leaders, principal investigators and research supervisors can and should play an important role here in interrogating monolingual approaches to research.

3. Reposition problems and decisions toward social justice. This requires a movement away from a monolingual and ethnocentric approach to languages and cultural (and other) diversities. Grambling's (2015) emerging work on the concept of monolingualism illustrates the impossibility of claiming a monolingual identity as people are exposed to multiple languages daily, whether on the Internet, via the media, or in their communities. Such exposure already summons into being individuals' unacknowledged, and often, unavowed multilingual experiences and repertoires.

4. Join in solidarity with the traditionally oppressed to create new ways of functioning. This category requires researchers to immerse themselves in the research site, to come to know and understand the lived realities and experiences on a daily basis of those they are researching. Prolonged engagement in the field, in the way that ethnographers work, is a starting point. What kind of linguistic preparation is required for this (see Fay, Andrews, Holmes, Attia, 2015)? What knowledge of the languages, or language families, of the group(s) of people being investigated is required? What knowledge of the community/ies and the people who reside within them is required? How do researchers draw on their linguistic resources and intercultural experiences and knowledge to build trust with the researched and the researched communities?

To these four categories, I add a fifth which concerns reflexivity and intersubjectivity: expose the diverse linguistic and cultural realities of all those involved in the research context to ensure multivocality and inclusiveness. This fifth category also requires researchers to subjectively interrogate their own positioning, that is, they must reflexively acknowledge their own relationship to and with the research topic and context. Thus, researchers must be open to uncertainty, the fluidity of the research site, and be aware of and engage with their reflexive insights if they are to align themselves with the oppressed, and move to reclaim multiple knowledges that challenge the dominant worldview (Cannella & Lincoln, 2011). This includes examining how languages are used in the research process.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued for a research ethic in the research process and context that foregrounds the importance of languages in human relations, dialogue among all participants, and researcher positioning. Central to all of this is the recognition and role of languages and how they are brought into being by all concerned as researchers "join with," and "learn from" rather than "speak for" or "intervene into" (Cannella & Lincoln, 2011, p. 83), the lived experience of others. Cannella and Lincoln argue that "voices from the margins demonstrate the range of knowledges, perspectives, languages, and ways of being that should become foundational to our actions, that should become a new center" (p. 83). Thus, it is time for an ethical approach in critical qualitative (social science) research that prioritises the role of languages in research plans and projects such that language regimes are disembodied from their structural and institutional standards and regulations so that all voices can be heard.

What is an ethical purpose of research then? Canella and Lincoln (2007) ask researchers to consider three key questions as they construct their research project and resultant publications: "How are forms of exclusion being produced? Is transformative and liberatory research possible that also examines its own will to emancipate? … How does the practice of research reinscribe our own privilege?" (p. 321). These questions are crucial to countering the interconnected structures of the dominant (and often noncritical) research community, and the institutions and modernist forms of government that support such research. However, Shklarov (2007) confirms that such situated ethical understandings may not conform to established institutional practices. For example, politically, governmental bodies are calling for evidence-based research, and institutionally, ethics bodies stipulate the rules for human enquiry via codes of ethics that include informed consent, simplistic principles for avoiding deception, rules about managing privacy and confidentiality, and a quest for accuracy. Often overlooked in these bureaucratic practices is the importance of and need for an ethic of researching multilingually.

The researcher's role in this task is paramount. The researcher has the capability to question the powerful and dominant ideologies of received understandings of research praxis and dissemination, by subverting and transforming them to privilege multiple languages in all phases of the research. Shklarov (2007) highlights the researcher's double role as both the translator and interpreter who can mediate between different linguist worlds, identify areas of methodological concern, and develop higher levels of ethical sensitivity. The researcher, who also works collaboratively alongside people in the research context (whether they are traditionally marginalised or not) has the capacity to draw on processes of flexible multilingualism and make strategic use of the multilingual skills

naturally present in the research context, and in doing so, accommodate participants' and researchers' asymmetric multilingual practices (Ganassin & Holmes, 2013). Thus, involving the voices of all the actors and ensuring multiple linguistic forms of representation of the research, the researcher can ensure an ethical researcher praxis that is collaborative, multilingual, and intercultural. Only through such inclusivity can research outcomes seriously question societal, institutional, policy-based and structural practices that maintain the dominant knowledges and ideologies of the powerful, and perpetuate social injustices towards the oppressed.

Acknowledgements

References

Ahmed, S. (2014). Exploring *halaqah* as research method: A tentative approach to developing Islamic research principles within a critical "indigenous" framework. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27*(5), 561-583.

Alexander, K., Arasaratnam, L., Avant-Mier, R., Durham, A., Flores, L., Leeds-Hurwitz, W., Mendoza, L., Oetzel, J., Osland, J., Tsuda, Y., Jing Yin & Halualani, R. (2014). Defining and communicating what "intercultural" and "intercultural communication" means to us. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 7*(1), 14-37.

Allen, B. (2004). *Difference matters: Communicating social identity*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press

Altheide, D.L., & Johnson, J.M. (2011). Reflections on interpretive adequacy in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 581-594). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Attia, M., & Edge, J. (in press). Be(com)ing a reflexive researcher: A developmental approach to qualitative research methodology. In S. A. Mirhosseini (ed.). *Qualitative research in language education.* New York: Springer Publishing.

Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Māori approach to creating knowledge. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 109-135). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

British Association of Applied Linguistics (2015). Recommendations on good practice in applied linguistics. Retrieved from http://www.baal.org.uk/dox/goodpractice_full.pdf

Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (2nd ed.; R.G. Smith, Trans.). New York: Scribner's.

Bulmer, M. (2008). The ethics of social research. In N. Gilbert (Ed.), *Researching social life* (3rd ed., pp. 145-161). London: Sage.

Cannella, G.S., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2007). Predatory vs. dialogic ethics: Constructing an illusion or ethical practice as the core of research methods. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*(3), 315-335.

Cannella, G.S., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). Ethics, research regulations and critical social science. In N. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage handbook of qualitative research (4th ed., pp. 81-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Christians, C.G. (2011). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 61-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chuang, R. (2003). A postmodern critique of cross-cultural and intercultural communication research: Contesting essentialism, positivist dualism, and Eurocentricity. In W. Starosta and G-M. Chen (Eds.), Ferment in the intercultural field: Axiology/value/praxis (pp. 24-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collier, M.-J. (2005). Theorizing cultural identification: Critical updates and continuing evolution. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 235-256). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collier, M.-J., Nakayama, T., & Yep, G. (2002). Dialogue on the edges: Ferment in communication and culture. In M.J. Collier (Ed.), *Transforming communication about culture: Critical new directions* (pp. 219-280). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data*. London: Sage.

Crosbie, V. (2014). Capabilities for intercultural dialogue, *Language and Intercultural Communication, 14*(1), 91-107.

Diaz, A., (2013). *Developing critical languaculture pedagogies in higher education: Theory and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dasli, M. (2011). Reviving the 'moments': From cultural awareness and cross-cultural mediation to critical intercultural language pedagogy. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 19*(1), 21-39.

Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y., & Smith, L.T. (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Fay, R., Andrews, J., Holmes, P. & Attia, M. (2015). Revisiting linguistic preparation: Some new directions arising from researching multilingually. Paper presented at "Breaking New Theory", British Association of Applied Linguistics (BAAL) Annual Meeting, 3-5 September, 2015, Aston University, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M.B. Ramos, trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1976). *Education, the practice of freedom*. London: Writers' and Readers' Publishing Cooperative.

Ganassin, S., & Holmes, P. (2013). Multilingual research practices in community research: The case of migrant/refugee women in North-East England. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 342–356.

González, N. (2005). Beyond culture: The hybridity of funds of knowledge. In N. González, L.C. Mall, and C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms* (pp. 29–46). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grambling, D. (2015). What is monolingualism? Symposium on "*Researching Multilnigually at the Borders of Language, the Body, Law and the State*", 8-10 June, University of Brussels, Brussels, Belgium.

Guilherme, M. (2002). *Critical citizens for an intercultural world: Foreign language education as cultural politics.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Holmes, P. (2014). Researching Chinese students' intercultural communication experiences in higher education: Researcher and participant reflexivity. In J. Byrd-Clarke and F. Dervin (Eds.), *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education: Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality* (pp. 100-118). New York: Routledge.

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

Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J., & Attia, M. (2016, in press). How to research multilingually: Possibilities and complexities. In H. Zhu (Ed.) *Research methods in intercultural communication*. London: Wiley.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.

Krog, A. (2011). In the name of human rights: I say (how) you (should) speak (before I listen). In N. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage handbook of qualitative research (4th ed., pp. 381-385). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Levine, H., & Phipps, A. (Eds.) (2011). *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy*. Cengage Heinle: Boston. ISBN 9780495800071.

Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (Eds.) (2012). *Routledge handbook of multilingualism.* London, Routledge.

May, S. (2011). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Miike, Y. (2007). An Asiacentric reflection of Eurocentric bias in communication theory. *Communication Monographs, 74*(2), 272-278.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice.* Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge.

Punch, M. (1998). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 156-184). Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.

Rampton, B., Maybin, J., & Roberts, C. (2014). Methodological foundations in linguistic ethnography. (Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies, No. 125). Retrieved from King's College, London, website: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/education/research/ldc/publications/workingpapers/the-papers/WP125-Rampton-Maybin-Roberts-2014-Methodological-foundations-in-linguistic-ethnography.pdf

Shi-xu. (2009). Reconstructing Eastern paradigms of discourse studies. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 4*(1), 29-48.

Shklarov, S (2007). Double vision uncertainty: The bilingual researcher and the ethics of cross-language research. *Qualitative Heath Research, 17*(4), 529-538.

Smith, L.T. (2005). Building a research agenda for indigenous epistemologies and education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 36*(1), 93-95.

Smith, L.T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books.