How to do research multilingually: Possibilities and complexities

(Prue Holmes, Richard Fay, Jane Andrews and Mariam Attia)

Summary

This chapter aims to develop researchers' awareness and understanding of the process of researching multilingually—where they must use, or account for the use of, more than one language in the research process. We provide a conceptual framework that guides researchers in: 1) realising that using more than one language is possible; 2) considering the interconnecting possibilities and complexities of researching multilingually, e.g. being reflexive and reflective, considering the spaces of the research, and the relationships entailed in the research context; and 3) becoming purposeful about the decisions they make in all phases of the research process, e.g. 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 analysing the data, to issues of representation and reflexivity when writing up and publishing. The chapter draws on examples from the authors' AHRC-funded network project Researching Multilingually (AHJ005037/1).

Key words

Researching multilingually (RM-ly) - the process and practice of using, or accounting for the use of, more than one language in the research process, e.g. 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 analysing the data, to issues of representation and reflexivity when writing up and publishing.

Developing researcher competence - the ongoing process of becoming more confident and assured when making research(er) decisions as appropriate for particular studies and contexts and for those involved in them.

Researcher purposefulness - the informed and intentional research(er) thinking and decision-making which results from an awareness and thorough consideration of the possibilities for and complexities of all aspects of the research process (including RM-ly).

Research spaces – the multilingual aspects of the project, e.g. the research phenonmenon (the "what"), the context of the research (the "where"), the linguistic resources of the researcher (the "who"), the representational possibilities (the language(s) of dissemination, the "for where" or "for whom").

Research relationships – who are the people in the whole research project, e.g. researcher(s), supervisors, participants, translators, interpreters, transcribers, editors, and funders, and how do their

relationships influence language choices within all phases of the project (from design to (re)presentation and publication).

Index terms
competence, data analysis, data generation, doctoral thesis, ethics, interpreters, publishing, reporting, researching multilingually, translators,

Introduction

In our increasingly inter-connected world, there are many, often under-discussed, possibilities for using more than one language in a research project, and there are also many, often under-explored, complexities in doing so. Although the use of more than one language is a common practice in some linguistically-oriented fields (e.g. Foreign Language Education, Area Studies, Translation Studies, Intercultural Communication, Crosscultural Pragmatics, and Multilingualism Studies), such possibilities may exist, we would argue, in any and all fields of research. These wider possibilities pose a challenge to the increasing, but often inequitable, use of English as the dominant language of much international dissemination of research.

Multilingual research possibilities commonly arise in the work of multicultural and multilingual research teams (see Woodin in this volume), but for the single researcher, too, more than one language might be used in all and any of the stages of a research project - from designing the project, to addressing ethical responsibilities, to engaging with existing scholarship and writing literature reviews, to developing the methodology and the tools and instruments used in collecting/generating data and then analysing it, to writing up and representing the research (and those involved in it) to wider audiences, to maintaining a reflective and reflexive stance throughout the project, and so on.

All of these possibilities are invoked by our terms "researching multilingually" (RM-ly) and "RM-ly practice" (Holmes, Fay, Andrews & Attia, 2013). Further, as we speak of the "possibilities for" and the "complexities of" RM-ly, we are suggesting that there is more than one way of researching multilingually. Accordingly, researchers need to consider all these possibilities and complexities. Having done so, they can make informed decisions and demonstrate what we term "researcher purposefulness" (or more technically, "researcher intentionality", see Stelma & Fay, 2014; Stelma, Fay & Zhou, 2013) in their RM-ly practice.

Insights on RM-ly

To date, little guidance on RM-ly practice is available (whether in English or in other languages) in the research manuals. Nor does it seem to feature much, if at all, in research(er) training programmes. Furthermore, the conventions of research texts (e.g. journal articles, doctoral theses) do not often provide researchers with space and encouragement to make transparent their RM-ly practice and the purposeful choices underpinning it.

However, some published studies do discuss issues of direct relevance for our RM-ly concern. For example, Magyar and Robinson-Pant (2011) note how research supervisors in UK contexts may discourage the use of literature published in other languages, and they can be critical of writing styles that do not conform to Anglo-centric academic conventions. Insights are also emerging on power negotiations in research, and the acknowledgement of the roles of differing perspectives, histories and contexts among interviewers, interpreters, and translators, for example, on their linguistic choices in research projects (Chen, 2011; Kitchen, 2013; Pant-Robinson & Wolf, 2014; Pavlenko, 2005; Temple, 2008; Temple & Edwards, 2002).

This chapter is informed by insights arising from a recent RM-ly networking project http://researchingmultilingually.com (see Holmes, Fay, Andrews & Attia, 2013) in which researchers from a range of disciplines reported how they became aware of the RM-ly possibilities and reflected

on the issues arising their RM-ly practice. We conceptualise their processes of developing researcher competence vis-à-vis RM-ly practice in three parts (realisation, consideration, informed and purposeful decision-making). First, we report on various ways in which researchers have reflected on the trigger through which they became aware of RM-ly possibilities (*Realisation*). Then, we present aspects of RM-ly practice which we find helpful when considering what the RM-ly possibilities and complexities might look like—namely: reflective and reflexive; spatial; and relational aspects (*Consideration*). Finally, we present three case studies in which researchers reflect on their RM-ly practice and issues arising in it (*Informed and purposeful decision-making*).

Developing Researcher Competence (vis-à-vis RM-ly Practice)

Our model for this process has three parts as follows:

1	*Realisation*—often triggered by a particular conversation in the research process (e.g. during supervision)—that multilingual possibilities and complexities merit attention …. prompting …
2	*Consideration*—bearing in mind the reflexive and reflective, spatial, and relational aspects of the research—of the possibilities for, and the complexities of, RM-ly practice in research activities …. leading to …
3	*Informed and purposeful decision-making*, e.g., by researchers, about, for example: i) research design—planning, designing, implementing, monitoring and fine-tuning (e.g., responding to unexpected contingencies) their research and its multilingual dimensions; and ii) (re)presentation—the production of research texts (e.g. theses, articles) which are also shaped by purposeful decisions regarding multilingual possibilities; and e.g., by supervisors, by: (iii) purposefully questioning the researcher's research design and representation decisions.

Figure 1. The Three-Part Process of Developing Researcher Competence
vis-à-vis Researching Multilingually Practice

The above three-part conceptualisation could easily suggest that researcher development (vis-à-vis RM-ly practice) is essentially a step-by-step, linear process. However, , the researcher development process is more organic, varied and complex than that. To exemplify this process we draw on the researcher development profiles recorded for the RM-ly project. Unless indicated otherwise, all quotations and paraphrases in the discussions below are taken, with the consent of the researchers concerned, from the Researching Multilingually website researcher profiles and/or presentations: http://researchingmultingually.com.

(1) Realisation—becoming aware of RM-ly possibilities

For some researchers, their own linguistic abilities felt valuable from the outset of their research: "*I knew all the way that being fluent in a number of languages could broaden my research horizon*" (Victor). For others, that value became more apparent when they moved abroad to undertake postgraduate research studies and the linguistic aspects of their experience became more marked (Fenia). But for some researchers, the "study abroad" research space might not seem so open to this valued multilingual dimension: "*It was not until my doctoral studies … that I realised how hard I had been trying to develop my academic self monolingually in another language* [English] *while ignoring the value of my mother tongue and its enriching implications for me as a researcher*" (Xiaowei). Similarly:

> *I first realised that I could, in the sense of having the permission to, conduct my doctoral research multilingually when* [my supervisor] *explained the way in which I could handle my*

multilingual data. Being permitted to present the data in its original language within the thesis surprised me to the extent of not believing it at first. [Parneet]

In the above quotations, the trigger for raised awareness of RM-ly possibilities is the doctoral supervision process, and in the RM-ly network project, it became clear that this doctoral site provided awareness-raising potential for supervisors as well as students. Within the doctoral experience, the researchers in our project report particular triggers for becoming more aware of the RM-ly potential. Fieldwork experiences provide one such trigger. Thus, for Ayesha, it was when she "*struggled with* [a] *huge amount of data … some of which was in English, some in Urdu and some in* [a] *mixture of both*" that she became aware of RM-ly complexities and greatly concerned with "*how to present the data so that the meaning of what is being said is not lost*".

Reflective Prompts:
Are you aware of the RM-ly possibilities of your research project? If so, how did you become aware?
What triggered your interest in this area of research practice?

---

(2) Consideration—of RM-ly possibilities and complexities

For this part of the process, researchers need, first, to consider a range of general RM-ly issues, and second, to thoroughly think through the RM-ly possibilities and complexities of their own research attributes, preferences, project and context. In the discussion below, we expand on the general issues by summarising the many insights we gained through the RM-ly network project (see a fuller discussion of these in Holmes, Fay, Andrews & Attia (2013: 292-295). Then, we turn to the more specific area of consideration, where we suggest that researchers can—as managed through reflective and reflexive habits—consider the interconnecting multilingual possibilities in the spaces in which their research happens (i.e. the *spatial*) and in the relationships their research involves (i.e. the *relational*).

(a) Some general considerations
From the RM-ly network project we became aware of many possibilities for and complexities of RM-ly practice. These insights included the RM-ly possibilities and complexities of:
- working cross-culturally with ethical guidelines and other institutional documentation (see Olga's case study below);
- engaging with literature in more than one language, and in languages other than English;
- studying within often monolingually-oriented universities such as English-medium universities in, for example, the United Kingdom;
- deciding where to present data not in the language used to report the study (e.g. in the main body of the text? In footnotes? In the appendices?);
- negotiating how to perform appropriate academic and researcher identities (e.g. whether to use 'I') when researching across languages and cultures;
- being transparent about the multilingual research processes used throughout the study;
- deciding which language(s) to use when building rapport with researcher colleagues and participants;
- deciding which language(s) to use when generating data;
- deciding which language(s) to use when analysing data;
- working with translators and interpreters;

- negotiating the geo-politics of particular languages in particular research contexts and of English as the dominant language of international research dissemination; and
- deciding which languages to use in representing the research in theses, journal articles, reports and other forms of dissemination.

Underlying the above issues is a clear indication that RM-ly possibilities and complexities exist in each and every stage of the research process.

(b) The reflective and reflexive aspect

Engaging in constant reflection is central to understanding and improving practice and to supporting researcher continuous development (Schön, 1991). As researchers make multilingual decisions, they are invited to critically reflect on their research undertaking and deeply analyse their conceptual and methodological stances. Reflective accounts, in the form of journals for example, are often used to complement other sources of data such as interviews or observations; thereby enriching the entire research process (Borg 2001; Burgess, 1981). In addition to engaging in careful observation and examination of their practice, researchers are in constant interaction with their work. So, as they reach out to shape their reseach, the experience of that reaches back to shape them. Reflexivity can therefore be understood as this mutually-shaping interaction between the researcher and the research (Edge, 2011 and Dervin, in this volume).

Earlier literature (e.g. Magyar & Robinson-Pant, 2011; Temple & Edwards, 2002) has emphasised the key role of reflection and reflexivity in research studies where more than one language is involved. In this chapter, we have noted the triggering role of doctoral supervision discussions but, for that trigger to lead the researcher towards a systematic exploration of the RM-ly possibilities and complexities, the researcher needs to be in the habit of reflecting (on the process and progress of their research) and being reflexive (considering their shaping influence on the research and its influence on them). Thus, as was her habit, Parneet's reflections record how, only after a further tutorial confirming RM-ly possibilities, she "*set foot on beginning to understand* [her] *experience of engaging in multilingual research*". She also explained that while investigating her context, she was open to what she could learn from the stories her participants offered her, and thereby engage in bidirectional reflexive interactions.

Thus, an off-the-cuff comment from Parneet's supervisor regarding language issues only became a trigger because Parneet was in the habit of keeping a reflective journal of her doctoral supervisions; through her reflection on her supervisor's comment, a moment of realisation dawned. A similar point could be made about Xiaowei's reflections on her supervisor's questioning. For Xiaowei, the questions asked by her supervisor may have provided the push, but it was only through her reflective and reflexive writing that she articulated how these questions had pushed her to notice "*so many things to which I had been blind, such as relevant literature written in Mandarin, similar research studies undertaken in Mandarin with unique methodological insights and the potential of richer interpretations of the data when drawing on different linguistic resources*".

> **Reflective Prompts:**
> *Are you in the habit of maintaining reflective records about the (e.g. linguistic aspects of the) progress and process of your research and the triggers for further thinking that occur along the way? How do you do this?*
> *Are you in the habit of considering your shaping influence (e.g. re language choices) on the research, and its influence on your thinking*

(c) The spatial aspect

Leah Davcheva and Richard Fay (2012) mapped the multilingual possibilities and complexities of their research project—which involved researching one language (Ladino) through fieldwork in another (Bulgarian) and analysis and presentation in a third (English)—in terms of four "spaces". We draw on these four spaces from Davcheva and Fay's research to give examples of how participants in our network project presentation use these spaces in their own research:

i)   the <u>researched</u> phenomenon, i.e. what is being researched (the "what"), e.g. for Ayesha (mentioned above), the focus was on the classroom practices of English language teachers in Pakistan;

ii)   the <u>research</u> context (the "where"), e.g. for Xiaowei (mentioned above), her research "home" was the English-medium UK university where her doctorate was being supervised;

iii) the <u>researcher</u> linguistic resources (the "who"), e.g. for Parneet (mentioned above), her multilingualism in languages spoken in both northern and southern India enabled her to be flexible about which languages to use when interviewing street-connected children from different parts of the country; and

iv)   the <u>representational</u> possibilities, i.e. dissemination in English only and/or (an)other language(s) (the "for where" and/or "for whom"), e.g. to date, Leah and Richard's work has been presented and published in Bulgarian, English, German and Spanish.

> **Reflective Prompt:**
> *What RM-ly possibilities and complexities can you map out using these four "spaces" as a frame of reference?*

(d) The relational aspect

Researchers rarely work alone. In carrying out their research projects they work with a range of people in various roles. In doing so they must establish multiple relationships with, for example, supervisors, participants, translators, interpreters, transcribers, editors, and funders. Research processes and outcomes are shaped importantly by the ways in which these relationships are managed interpersonally and linguistically, and by decisions about which languages are privileged within and across these relationships, and for what purposes. So, our second aspect concerns *relationality*, i.e. who is involved in the research, what are the relationships between them, what functions and/or purposes do these relationships have, and how are these relationships negotiated and managed.

Jane Andrews' (2013) research exemplifies this relational aspect. When Jane began collaborating with a community interpreter (in order to engage in conversations about children's learning with parents from linguistically diverse backgrounds), she realised that "*the specific challenges [arose] from engaging in research where shared language(s) and cultural understandings cannot be taken for granted*". This realisation raised for her "*many interesting questions … in terms of the relationship between research participants and researcher and between interpreter and researcher*". These included areas such as the extent to which an interpreter should be considered an additional researcher in the research encounter. This then raises questions regarding the need to brief interpreters about the wider goals of the research, including them in processes of analysis and writing, and the potential costs such involvements entail.

The importance of relationship building and developing trust between researcher and participants is also evidenced in Prue's research (in English) with Chinese international students who had English as an additional language (Holmes, 2014). As one of the participants reflected in the final interview after 18 months of fieldwork, "*Initial data might not be very accurate… we were getting the right answers for you*". The participants used complex cognitive and affective processes to describe their intercultural communication experiences in English: e.g. perceptions and emotional experiences; the researcher-researched relationship, which included deference to the researcher in some instances and participant agency in others; presentational strategies of the self; and face strategies. They were also negotiating the meaning of the interview questions vis-à-vis the research topic and aims, and the importance and significance of their own narratives and responses in meeting these aims. To facilitate participants' responses in the interview context, Prue allowed them to preview the open-ended interview questions a few days before the interview.

> **Reflective Prompts:**
> *Who is involved in your research (i.e., in all stages and aspects of it)?*
> *What are their linguistic resources? What are yours?*
> *Which languages might be used for which parts of your research? Who decides? What difference does this make?*

(3) Informed and purposeful decision-making – three case studies

To exemplify the third aspect of RM-ly practice—informed and purposeful decision-making—we draw on three case studies. In each we exemplify aspects of developing researcher awareness and purposefulness of RM-ly concerning research design (the planning, designing, implementing, monitoring and fine-tuning of the multilingual dimensions of the research) and (re)presentation (the writing up of research). The first case study (Sara) deals with issues of data generation as the researcher engages with multilingual data sets in the analysis and writing up stages. The second (Olga) discusses the negotiation of ethical norms associated with gaining access to research sites and eliciting informed consent. The third (Ana) explores complexities arising when both the researcher and participants are fluent in the languages of the research, and the implications for data representation.

Case Study 1: Sara and colleagues	RM-ly Focus—Data Generation

Sara is a United Kingdom (UK)-based doctoral researcher who feels she is always translating herself from her first language (Italian). Her RM-ly development was a result of "*making a virtue out of necessity*". Her research foregrounds the complexities of generating data when researchers and participants speak multiple languages, and, in most cases, do not have English (the language of the research project) as their first language.

Sara was a (paid) researcher in a project which sought to understand the cultural participation and attitudes to diversity and foreignness among 68 immigrant/refugee/asylum-seeking women in a city in the north-east of England (see Ganassin & Holmes, 2013 for further details of the RM-ly aspects of this project). The study was designed in English by native-speaker UK researchers, but the data generation was conducted by 17 researchers, largely volunteers, who were mostly multilingual. Among the participants and researchers more than 25 languages were spoken.

Through their planning for the data generation processes, the researchers shared an ethical concern about representing all voices in order to avoid cultural and linguistic domination by themselves or any particular participants. Thus, acknowledging the multiple languages at play was important in addressing questions of representation, and of who speaks for whom. They also planned to conduct the focus groups in cultural spaces where the participants felt a sense of belonging.

However, the linguistic diversity and asymmetry among the participants made planning the focus groups difficult and also seemed to affect the confidence of some women in participating. To engage participants, the researchers tried to use simple but meaningful language in designing and asking questions, and rephrase sentences when participants appeared not to understand. They drew on the multilingual resources present in the group and the women's relationships with one another to provide peer support. They joined in the interpretation as the women spoke for one another in multiple languages. Some participants "whispered" words/phrases in one language to another participant who would translate. However, some conversations (e.g. those in Dari and Farsi) were not translated for several reasons: the focus group recordings were inaudible due to the multiple languages and speakers present, the researchers lacked knowledge of some of the languages, and the project did not have resources to pay for translators/interpreters. Such conversations were thus absent in the data. These linguistic asymmetries raised important concerns about the authenticity of the emergent data. Furthermore, the researchers questioned the extent to which they were constructing the data themselves through their language support to participants.

The focus group discussions were translated and transcribed into English. Sara translated into English the words and phrases that the participants had translated into French during the focus groups. As Sara was involved in the analysis, she did not believe it was necessary to include French words in the transcription. In her post-research reflection, Sara noted that the multilingual complexity of the data was an unrecognised aspect of the data generation, transcription, translation and analysis. She also realised the importance of "flexible multilingualism", (as illustrated in the researchers' and participants' data generation strategies described above) in the project design and its operationalisation. Flexible multilingualism draws upon, or makes strategic use of, the multilingual skills naturally present in the research context, and in doing so, accommodates participants', and researchers', asymmetric multilingual practices (Ganassin & Holmes, 2013). Although the research team were aware of and had discussed the implications of the multilingual nature of the research, they had not foreseen the degree of complexity, or the consequences for the authenticity and trustworthiness of the research outcomes, so crucial among this marginalised, vulnerable, and disadvantaged group of women.

> **Reflective Prompts:**
> *How do you deal with the multiple languages at play when you are generating, and analysing, the data for your project? Who speaks for whom, when, where, and why and in what language(s)? How do you use the multiple languages in the writing up ((re)presentation) of your data?*

Case Study 2: Olga	RM-ly Focus—Negotiating Access and Informed Consent

In her doctoral research, Olga sought to use multiple sources and informants to investigate her area of study into the processes of national identity construction experienced by children in schools in

northern Cyprus, a self-declared state also known as the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). As a multilingual researcher with some knowledge of Turkish, Olga gathered paper-based sources such as documents relating to the curriculum, textbooks and materials portraying images relevant to analysis of the construction of identity. The study also made use of observations of teaching, interviews and focus groups with children and adults in education settings. Throughout the study data sources were in either of the two languages of the study: Turkish or English. In this brief account of Olga's research processes, two issues are highlighted for consideration:

a) negotiating differing norms relating to ethical processes such as gaining access to research sites and informed consent; and
b) engaging with multilingual data sets both in the analysis stage and in the writing stage.

Doctoral students in any given context will have their studies governed by their institution's academic regulations and by discipline specific guidelines e.g. the British Educational Research Association Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2011). Such regulations and guidelines inevitably reflect norms and expectations of that institution regarding the conduct of research. By conducting her research in a national and institutional setting that differed from the context in which she was registered as a student for her studies, Olga encountered some distinctive challenges relating to research norms and approaches to multilingual data which are discussed here.

Gaining access to research settings (in this case schools) and then requesting informed consent from groups and individuals is explored in detail in the research methods literature and potential clashes between norms surrounding these processes are also explored (e.g. Honana et al., 2013). Holliday's (1999) work delineating "small" cultures and "large" cultures could be valuable here in helping us to understand the differences between ways of embarking on a process of gaining access and informed consent in one context as opposed to another (the one used for educational researchers in northern Cyprus and the one used in the UK higher education institution where Olga was registered as a doctoral student). Ways of conducting educational research in one UK higher education institution and in schools in northern Cyprus were governed by differing regulations, and consequently, the linguistic and other resources used to enact access and consent processes were noted by Olga as being quite different. This meant that Olga needed to keep in mind the expectations of these two "small cultures" to ensure that she conformed to the spirit of gaining access and informed consent in an ethical manner, and also, that she obtained the documentation needed to demonstrate she had done this so her doctoral study evidenced her ethical practice.

The mediating role played by Olga in negotiating consent in keeping with the expectations of two different small cultural contexts is mirrored by her role in considering how to handle her bilingual data set. The data set needed to be explored by Olga with support from her supervisory team, so questions were raised here about how and when the team would see the data from a language they did not share (Turkish). In addition, Olga was concerned to provide readers of the completed thesis with access to the full data set (not just a version translated into English) to ensure they could appreciate the nature of this data. An example of this concern is seen in the nature of the Turkish language letter granting access to schools which included both text and an official stamp confirming access.

By reflecting at each stage of the research process on the choices to be made and implications that might ensue (i.e. illustrating the "consideration" part of the process of developing researcher competence in RM-ly practice in Fig. 1 above), Olga reached some principled decisions on how to progress with her research project (i.e. the "informed, purposeful decision-making" in Fig. 1 above).

Her approach involve continued dialogues with her supervisors about her data and keeping the needs of new readers in mind by making use of the space in a thesis to ensure data in all languages was available. Although this approach was not straight forward, in the words of Olga, the goal was reached which was that, as a researcher, she was doing justice to her data and her participants in representing their experiences in their full richness.

> **Reflective Prompts:**
> *How might you ensure that readers of your research get a full sense of the research encounter? Will you provide multilingual data sets to readers?*

Case Study 3: Ana[1]	RM-ly Focus – Data Representation

It could be assumed that considering RM-ly issues might only be a concern for researchers who do not share the languages of their research participants. Ana's doctoral study illustrates the point that while multilingual researchers may be able to engage with their participants in shared languages and analyse their data in the language in which it was generated, the processes of consideration and informed, purposeful decision-making are still significant.

Ana's doctoral study highlights the challenges faced by multilingual researchers who are fluent in the languages used in the study and in the language required by the academic institution awarding the doctorate. Ana's research participants were British students of Italian and Italian students of English and the context was that of language learning experiences during university study abroad trips. Particular attention is given here to the choices Ana faced in relation to her dual role as both researcher and translator of her data, her sense of responsibility towards her participants when representing their interactions as data in English and Italian, and the way in which she was drawn into a process of defining her conceptualisation of translation in the context of her study.

Ana's study looked at cross-cultural adaptation as documented through students' participation in online communication on social networks such as Facebook, using what has been named a "lifestream" approach (see Eric Freeman & David Gelernter: http://cs-www.cs.yale.edu/homes/freeman/lifestreams.html). The study involved an analysis of data from social network posts in two languages. The participants' online interactions moved rapidly between English and Italian and Ana found that how she represented this data required careful consideration. Ana noted that she needed skills beyond being a mere "technical" translator of her own data, and she needed to consider how to convey the nuances within students' lexical choices as they expressed their feelings about adapting to a new culture. Ana explained her desire as a researcher to return to her translations of her data to ensure they were "*polished*".

Ana's sustained work on achieving a faithful representation of her participants' meanings came from her awareness of the needs of readers of her thesis who could not be assumed to be fluent readers of Italian. An outcome of this process was the decision Ana made to present her data in English translation (where necessary, i.e. where participants code-switched between English and Italian) in the main text of her thesis, but to make use of footnotes for the "original" or bilingual text. In different academic contexts such a decision may be constrained or permitted by regulations associated with the context of writing. UK higher education institutions tend to require doctoral theses to fall within a

---

[1] For more on this case, see Ana Beaven's presentation (Bristol, April 2012) on the project website.

specified word limit and as such the inclusion of data sets in the original language and the language of assessment (Italian and English, respectively, in this case) may have implications for the extent to which this approach can be used systematically. However Ana's intention to show the original versions of her data set fit well into a thorough and transparent research process which readers can gain access to.

Ana's reflections provide insight into the following areas:

a)   the complexities involved in researching multilingually in terms of the roles required of the researcher as both researcher and data translator (*realisation, consideration*);
b)   the attention needed to be paid to the potential readers of the research so they can gain access to the nuances available to the researcher-translator (*informed, purposeful decision-making*); and
c)   the need for the researcher to engage in understanding their translation processes as being part of the analysis and not merely a technical stage of the research (*realisation*).

> **Reflective Prompts:**
> *How will you represent the nuances of translated multilingual data in your writing? How will you reflect data which move between languages?*

Conclusion

Given that researching is inevitably a multilingual endeavour, and that researchers are faced with political considerations about which language(s) to (re)present and/or publish their work in, developing an RM-ly dimension to research is both inevitable and imperative. In this chapter we have presented a framework for researching multilingually that attempts to address this complex situation. We offer a 3-part process of realisation, consideration, and informed and purposeful decision-making—organic, varied and complex—that is illustrative of RM-ly practice. By drawing on examples from our "Reseearching Multilingually" network project, and through three illustrative case studies of RM-ly in the field, we have hopefully opened up your own thinking about the multilingual aspects of your research project. Finally, we hope that the prompts may trigger you to reflect on the possibilities and complexities of your own RM-ly practice. In turn, these realisations will build your confidence in making informed choices about RM-ly practice and enable you to make your RM-ly practice transparent in the writing up of your own research project.

Acknowledgements

References

Andrews, J. (2013). "It's a very difficult question, isn't it?" Researcher, interpreter and research participant negotiating meanings in an education research interview. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* **23**(3): 316-328.

Borg, S. (2001). The research journal: A tool for promoting and understanding researcher development. *Language Teaching Research*, **5**(2), 156-177.

Burgess, R. (1981). Keeping a research diary. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, **11**(1): 75-83.

Chen, S.-H. (2011). Power relations between the researcher and the researched: an analysis of native and nonnative ethnographic interviews. *Field Methods*, **23**(1): 119–35.

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

Edge, J. (2011). *The reflexive teacher educator in TESOL*. New York: Routledge.

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.

Holliday, A.R. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, **20**(2): 237-64.

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 and multimodality in language education: Rethinking multilingualism and interculurality in accelerating complex and transnational spaces (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.

Honana, E., Hamida, M. O., Alhamdana, B., Phommalangsya, P., & Lingard, B. (2013). Ethical issues in cross-cultural research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, **36**(4): 386-399.

Kitchen, M. C. (2013). Methods in focus group interviews in cross-cultural settings. *Qualitative Research Journal*, **13**(3): 265 – 277.

Magyar, A., & Robinson-Pant, A. (2011). Special issue on university internationalisation – towards transformative change in higher education. Internationalising doctoral research: Developing theoretical perspectives on practice. *Teachers and Teaching*, **17**(6): 663–76.

Pant-Robinson, A., & Wolf, A. (2014). Researching across languages and cultures. *Centre for Applied Research in Education Working Paper, No 1*, May.

Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilngualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schön, D. (1991). *The reflective practitioner*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

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

Stelma, J., Fay, R., & Zhou, X. (2013). Developing intentionality and researching multilingually: An ecological and methodological perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, **23**(3): 300-115.

Temple, B. (2008). Narrative analysis of written texts: reflexivity in cross language research. *Qualitative Research*, **8**(3): 355-365.

Temple, B., & Edwards, R. (2002). Interpreters/translators and cross-language research: Reflexivity and border crossings. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, **1**(1): 1–12.

Further Reading and Resources

The following special issue showcases six selected case studies from the AHRC-funded "Researching Multilingually" project:

Andrews, J., Holmes, P. & Fay, R. (eds.) (2013). *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* **23**(3) - Special Issue on "Researching Multilingually".

The "Researching Multilingually" website http://researchingmultilingually.com/ offers a comprehensive resource for researchers, including 35 presentations and more than 50 profiles in which researchers from diverse disciplines report how they became aware of RM-ly possibilities, outline their RM-ly practice and reflect on RM-ly issues arising in their projects.

The AHRC large-grant project, "Researching Multilingually at the Borders of Language, the Body, Law, and the State" http://researching-multilingually-at-borders.com/ (AH/L006936/1) led by Alison Phipps (The University of Glasgow) is underpinned by our own RM-ly research. Further examples of (developing) RM-ly work can be found there and in the case studies associated with this project.

Biographical notes

Prue Holmes (PI), Richard Fay, Jane Andrews, and Mariam Attia were all researchers on the AHRC-funded "Researching Multilingually" project on which this chapter draws. They are also researchers within the Researching Multilingually and Translating Cultures hub within the current AHRC-funded project "Researching Multilingually at the Borders of Language, the Body, Law and the State" led by Alison Phipps (http://researching-multilingually-at-borders.com/?page_id=46).

Prue Holmes is Reader in the School of Education at Durham University. She leads the MA programme on Intercultural Communication and Education, and supervises doctoral students in this area. RM-ly is an important aspect of their research and her supervisory role with them.

Richard Fay is a lecturer in Education (TESOL and Intercultural Communication) at the Manchester Institute of Education. He is a co-ordinator for the PhD in Education which comprises an international, and culturally and linguistically diverse community of researchers. He is also leader of the MA in Intercultural Communication and the Manchester Global Award.

Jane Andrews is Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of the West of England. She teaches on education and early childhood studies undergraduate programmes, jointly leads the professional doctorate in Education (EdD), and supervises doctoral students in areas of language and education.

Mariam Attia is Research Associate at the School of Education, Durham University, where she combines her commitment to researcher development with her exploration of the processes of researching multilingually. Her research interests cover the areas of reflective practice, teacher development, and non-judgemental discourse in professional interaction.