Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmmm20

Methodological implications of participant and researcher multilingualism: making language dynamics visible

Louise Rolland, Hannah M. King & Pernelle Lorette

To cite this article: Louise Rolland, Hannah M. King & Pernelle Lorette (2023) Methodological implications of participant and researcher multilingualism: making language dynamics visible, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 44:8, 645-656, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2023.2224774

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2224774

Published online: 21 Aug 2023.

JOURNAL OF MULTILINGUAL AND MULTICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
2023, VOL. 44, NO. 8, 645–656
https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2224774

Methodological implications of participant and researcher multilingualism: making language dynamics visible

Louise Rolland [a], Hannah M. King [a,b] and Pernelle Lorette [c]

[a]Department of Languages, Cultures and Applied Linguistics, Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK; [b]Languages, Guildhall School of Business and Law, London Metropolitan University, London, UK; [c]Department of Psycholinguistics, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany

ABSTRACT

Language can impact the research process in complex ways. This special issue (SI) brings together seven contributions which discuss the methodological implications of researching in a multilingual world, where researchers and/or research participants are likely to know more than one language. The papers examine the relationship between researchers' language ideologies and actual practices with multilingual participants, teams or projects, from a range of theoretical and methodological perspectives. The SI also considers positionality, including how researchers feel – and are perceived – when working in one or more first languages (L1), a later learned language (LX), or a language outside of their linguistic repertoire (L0). It provides practical examples of the stages of researching multilingually, focusing on key decisions that researchers make over the course of their projects, which are seldom made visible in research reports. We argue that linguistic reflexivity is an essential practice, through which researchers make informed language-related choices and continually reflect on the role of language(s) throughout their research projects. These illustrative accounts, from various geographic contexts, offer lessons from experience – distilled as questions and principles – to guide researchers in applied linguistics and beyond as they embark on the multifaceted journey of researching multilingually.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 10 May 2023
Accepted 8 June 2023

KEYWORDS
Linguistic repertoires; researching multilingually; linguistic reflexivity; methodology; language ideology; linguistic positionality

MANENO MUHIMU
malimbikizo ya kiisimu; kutafiti kiwingilugha; urejelevu wa kiisimu; methodolojia; mtazamo kuhusu lugha; unafasi wa kiisimu

Tafsiri za kimethodolojia za wingilugha wa watafiti na watoataarifa: kubainisha mienendo ya lugha

IKISIRI

Lugha inaweza kuathiri mchakato wa utafiti kwa namna changamani. Toleo hili maalumu linaleta makala saba zinazojadili tafsiri ya kimethodolojia ya kufanya utafiti katika mazingira ya wingilugha; ambamo watafiti au washiriki wanamudu zaidi ya lugha moja. Makala zinachunguza uhusiano baina ya mitazamo ya watafiti kuhusu lugha na matumizi halisi ya lugha kwa washiriki, timu au miradi inayohusisha wingilugha, katika mitazamo mbalimbali ya kinadharia na kimethodolojia. Toleo hili maalumu pia linajadili unafasi, ikijumuisha watafiti wanavyojisikia – na pia wanavyochukuliwa – wanapofanya utafiti katika lugha ya kwanza (L1) moja au zaidi, lugha iliyojifunzwa baadae (LX), au lugha wasiyoifahamu (L0). Linatoa mifano hatua kwa hatua katika utekelezaji wa utafiti kiwingilugha, likizingatia maamuzi

CONTACT Louise Rolland lrolla01@mail.bbk.ac.uk @LRolland_multi

muhimu yahusuyo lugha ambayo huzingatiwa na watafiti katika utekelezaji wa tafiti zao, ambayo ni nadra kuchapishwa katika makala za tafiti. Hoja yetu ni kwamba urejelevu wa kiisimu ni njia muhimu, ambayo kwayo watafiti hufanya chaguzi maridhawa na huendelea kufanya tafakuri kuhusu dhima ya lugha katika kipindi chote cha miradi ya ya utafiti. Masimulizi haya fafanuzi, yatokayo katika miktadha tofauti ya kijiografia, yanatoa mafunzo yatokanayo na uzoefu halisi – unaoletwa kama maswali na kanuni – kwa lengo la kuwapa mwongozo watafiti katika isimu tumizi na katika nyanja nyingine katika safari msambao ya kutafiti kwa wingilugha.

Introduction

When research meets the multilingual world: a journey

This special issue (SI) was born from encounters with multilingualism and our efforts to navigate and account for individuals' linguistic repertoires (Busch 2012; 2017) – our own and those of our research participants – within our respective research methodologies. For example, while preparing to conduct (and later code) a multilingual interview, Louise Rolland was unsure how to adapt the monolingual process which was outlined in research method texts. Discussions with Hannah King and Pernelle Lorette led to the realisation that each of us was encountering methodological challenges related to *researching multilingually* (Holmes et al. 2016), which were overlooked in core textbooks, even though multilingualism is a characteristic of many research projects across fields of study. While Rolland was dealing with bilingual data generated in two first languages (L1s), one of which had become her dominant and academic language, King was researching in a later learned language (LX), and Lorette was conducting research with users of a language outside of her linguistic repertoire (L0).

We shared our distinctive perspectives (working in an L1, LX or L0) and implications for methodology within our respective projects in a 2019 seminar entitled 'When research meets the multilingual world: methodological implications of language repertoires', hosted by University College London's Department of Culture, Communication and Media. With the help of a discussant, we encouraged students and scholars to reflect on their own relationships with the language(s) of their research contexts and participants, as well as the challenges of collecting, analysing and representing data from multilingual contexts.

Gradually, we realised that reflecting on and evaluating the implications of practical choices about language use in research was not a concern for emerging researchers alone, but rather part of the practice of reflexivity which needs to be carried out by all researchers. This linguistic dimension to reflexivity serves as a lens to address the complexities and affordances of researching multilingually. As a result, the present SI provides a diverse collection of accounts which make visible the language dynamics resulting from speakers with differing linguistic repertoires coming into contact within research contexts. In this introduction, we first outline the rationale and aim of the SI, before discussing the themes which run through the seven contributions: examining the choices we make – and offer – regarding research language(s); reflecting on linguistic positionality; and supplying practical examples and guidance. Next, the papers are introduced individually. We conclude with a call for further attention to the role played by language(s) in shaping research projects, particularly in applied linguistics.

Rationale and aim of the special issue

Linguistic and cultural diversity within research settings and participant-researcher relationships tend to be overlooked, yet each person involved brings their own unique language profile, or linguistic repertoire (Busch 2012; 2017; Gumperz 1964), to the work. In social sciences and applied linguistics, the *multilingual turn* (May 2013) has sought to shift the focus from monolingualcentred approaches to acknowledging multilingualism (see Sugiharto 2015, for a critique), while the *reflexive turn* (Consoli and Ganassin 2023; Lumsden 2019; Pillow 2003) invites researchers to be conscious of how their positionalities may impact the research process, paying particular attention to researcher-participant relationships and examining the dynamic power relations between individuals and institutions.

Both of these 'turns' are reflected in the practice of *researching multilingually* (Andrews et al. 2020; Holmes et al. 2013; 2016). Defined as 'the process and practice of using, or accounting for the use of, more than one language in the research process' (Holmes et al. 2016, 101), it encourages reflexivity in relation to the multiple facets of multilingualism within research, with the aim of making informed decisions. Separately, Alejandro (2021) has used the term *linguistic reflexivity*[1] to describe the practice of researchers reflecting on their own language use and its impact on knowledge production, from a predominantly monolingual perspective (e.g. examining patterns of word use). We propose to use this term from a multilingual perspective, defining linguistic reflexivity as a researcher's reflexivity towards the language(s) used (or not used) by all those present in the research process – participants and researchers included. Although reflexivity is part of the framework of researching multilingually, we suggest that the term *linguistic reflexivity* can add value by foregrounding language concerns within reflexive approaches to research, potentially reaching an interdisciplinary audience. Moreover, despite its intersection with factors such as race and ethnicity (Garrett Delavan, Valdez, and Freire 2017), linguistic positionality is less recognised than other positionalities (Cormier 2018) and could potentially garner more attention if researchers adopted the term linguistic reflexivity to denote a legitimate subfield. Accounts of (what we call) linguistic reflexivity are argued for and featured in recent volumes such as the *Politics of Researching Multilingually* (Holmes, Reynolds, and Ganassin 2022) and *Reflexivity in Applied Linguistics (*Consoli and Ganassin 2023), in cross-cultural research (Liamputtong 2008), ethnographic accounts (Giampapa and Lamoureux 2011; Martin-Jones and Martin 2017), and interdisciplinary work (Cormier 2018; Dewaele et al. 2023; Rolland, Dewaele, and Costa 2020*)*.

This recognition of the need to consider the implications of language use has been supported by findings from different disciplines. Applied and psycholinguistic studies have identified that language choices influence how multilinguals express themselves (Dewaele 2013) and that multilinguals' experiences are recalled and told differently in different languages (Pavlenko 2007), since the chosen languages have implications for memory (Marian and Kaushanskaya 2004; Schrauf 2000), emotionality (Dewaele 2013; Pavlenko 2005; Thoma, Lorette, and Krautz 2022) and identity (Koven 1998; Nyamekye, Anani, and Kuttin 2023). Indeed, the manner of acquisition and domains of language use (Grosjean 2008) can lead to a complex set of associations and multicompetencies for users.

Sociolinguistics also recognises that individuals are bound by socio-historical norms, language ideologies and interactional contexts (e.g. Blackledge and Pavlenko 2001), which are further complicated by transnational research settings (e.g. De Fina 2016). Recent debates around 'named languages' and 'translanguaging' (e.g. Li Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015; Wei and García 2022) have helped to bring the need to acknowledge and explore fluid and creative language use, particularly by multilinguals (Blackledge and Creese 2010; Li Wei and Hua 2013), to the fore.

It is therefore surprising that this awareness of dynamic linguistic practices and multilingual repertoires has not typically been extended to researchers and the research process itself (Holmes et al. 2013; 2016; Mann 2011; Pavlenko 2007). One explanation may be a reluctance to explore the complexity which unfolds from doing so (Phipps 2013). When researchers interact with research subjects – or their research team – in a particular language or languages, the various social, historical and personal associations of their linguistic repertoires are brought into play for each interlocutor, influencing the research relationships and the data generation process. We argue that it is an ethical imperative for researchers to reflect on language dynamics, since decisions to include or exclude specific languages in the research particularly impact power relations between researchers and participants (Phipps 2013; 2019; Rolland, Dewaele, and Costa 2020; Schembri and Jahić Jašić 2022). Despite a growing body of work highlighting relevant aspects (e.g. Consoli and Ganassin 2023; Holmes, Reynolds, and Ganassin 2022; Martin-Jones and Martin 2017), the literature on research methods still offers insufficient practical guidance and tools on how to manage the research process amid the complexity of intersecting repertoires.

The goal of this SI is therefore to make visible the practices of researchers who encounter multilingualism within their work, with a focus on methodology. Indeed, the principle of researching multilingually is operationalised in projects through methodological approaches and decisions, which are seldom made explicit in research reports. The SI displays a broad range of ways in which multilingualism may be present in the research process, highlighting the argument that nearly all research is multilingual in some way.

The seven contributions illustrate different scenarios in which a participant's language repertoire intersects and interacts with that of the researcher(s). Moreover, the researcher's relationship to the languages used in their research is addressed. Specifically, the SI highlights the empirical and conceptual implications of researching in an L0, an L1 (which may only be used in certain domains), or an LX that is confidently used or still being learned, as well as working in more than one language. The papers consider a multiplicity of languages for both researcher and researched and are set in geographical contexts ranging from the Global South (China, India, Botswana, Tanzania, and Zambia) to the Global North (England and Wales), some of which are nationally heterogeneous and others which encompass research participants from across the globe. Researcher geographies are also far-reaching, from the Americas to Europe and Africa. Furthermore, the contributions cover a range of research conditions: from conducting work alone with limited resources, to working within a large research team. Methodologies span experimental research, ethnographic work and applied or sociolinguistic perspectives, while the methodological considerations are grounded in both qualitative and quantitative data. These projects and approaches complement one another, offering insight into navigating language choices, positionalities and insider/outsider dynamics, and proposing reflective questions as well as guiding principles to help inform multilingual research.

A reflexive gaze on language choices, linguistic positionality, and practicalities

This section will explore shared and overlapping themes within the SI, focusing on language choices, positionality, and practical guidance, with linguistic reflexivity emerging as an overarching essential for conducting multilingual research responsibly.

Language choices

Following the SI goal of highlighting intersections of linguistic repertoires, the question of language choice throughout the research process is salient across many of the papers. Authors provide descriptions of, and discussions around, whether the power to make these choices lies with researchers and/or participants, with some additionally showing how gatekeepers, funders, and other team members may be involved. Examples of negotiating language choices before and within interviews are explored, with reflections on the implications of such choices for both power relations and the ecological validity of the data. These varied accounts illustrate how decisions were made throughout the research life-cycle, helping to address the gap identified by Meyer Pitton and Schedel (2022, 308), that '(dis)empowering effects of language choices regarding the research design, communication and the researchers' positionality are less frequently thematised' in the literature than the choices made during data collection, analysis, and reporting.

A key point made across articles is that language choice is seldom the singular act of choosing a language for the research: other languages, even when not spoken or understood by the researcher or research team, require consideration. Conversely, embracing multilingualism within a research setting and with individual research participants does not mean that researchers need to be fluent in all participant languages. Like Andrews et al. (2020, 231), who recommend a 'translingual mindset', many of the articles in this issue argue for linguistic flexibility from the outset. This approach acknowledges the varied linguistic repertoires (Busch 2017), lived experiences and resources, of both researchers and participants.

In addition, these contributions seek to move beyond a deficit view, which academics may adopt regarding their own linguistic capabilities (Gordon 2023), towards acknowledging linguistic incompetence (Phipps 2013) and considering insecurities around proficiency. In particular, the articles discuss researcher insecurity stemming not only from prevalent native speaker ideologies but also from the overlooked issue of environmental attrition of a researcher's L1, as well as the impact of monolingual educational and academic practices on emerging researchers.

This SI also identifies monolingual ideologies and argues for further awareness of the different forms which multilingualism takes, including across modalities. Several contributors adopt a 'translanguaging stance' (Gordon 2023, 274), which values all interlocutors' resources for communication and facilitates fluid practices in research design and data collection. Thus, multilinguals are viewed holistically with their full linguistic repertoires acknowledged (Grosjean 2008), and given the freedom to express and represent themselves multilingually, arguably boosting the ecological validity of the project. Such inclusive perspectives begin to answer the call to decolonise multilingual research (Phipps 2019). An overarching argument for participant choice wherever possible is made, with multilingual orientation essential and a translanguaging stance recommended by some.

Positionality and insider–outsider dynamics

Issues of researcher and participant positionality are put front and centre in the SI, which includes articles featuring: statements of linguistic positionality, accounts of the tension between the linguistic agency of participants and researchers, and discussions of who may legitimately generate knowledge within multilingual contexts. Among the other aspects of linguistic positionality discussed here, an important theme is how linguistic repertoires and choices contributed to researchers being variously viewed – by themselves and others – as insiders or outsiders in relation to participants. The examples demonstrate how either status can be viewed positively or negatively, depending on the context. Furthermore, the SI illustrates how linguistic incompetence, whilst posing practical challenges and being a potential marker of outsiderness, may at the same time give the researcher an unprecedented perspective on the context under investigation. For instance, participants may articulate their reality in more detail for the researcher if they perceive a lack of linguistic knowledge and infer from this a gap in cultural knowledge.

This multi-dimensional interaction between language, culture and identity (Ochs 1993), coupled with the linguistic and cultural heterogeneity of any context, leads to a fluid and dynamic positionality of the researcher, which can shift from insider to outsider depending on the layer being explored. Just as Dwyer and Buckle (2009) challenge the insider–outsider dichotomy, the contributions to this SI explore the complexity and richness of 'the space between' (60) insiderness and outsiderness, acknowledging both belonging and otherness. Examples of researcher-as-participant in transnational and learner contexts in particular highlight the complexity of linguistic and cultural membership within diverse groups, as well as the need to consider additional relationships when researchers are part of the group being studied. Ultimately, since linguistic repertoires represent 'a complex ensemble of dispositions that reflect intersubjective (bodily and emotional) language experiences superimposed on one another along the life axis' (Busch 2016, 892), researcher positionality is shown to be multilayered and contextual.

Practicalities and guidance

Linguistically reflexive practices prompt the researcher to make purposeful decisions specific to researching multilingually (Holmes et al. 2016; Stelma, Fay, and Zhou 2013). For instance, awareness of one's positionality may help identify a need to draw on additional resources. Collaborative research is described in several papers as a means to expand researcher repertoires according to the research context. This may involve working with local teams, which brings the complexities of managing an international project. Key action points are proposed to help navigate such research settings. Another approach outlined in the SI includes partnering with 'research brokers', who enable access to specific linguistic or cultural contexts in an appropriate way. While collaborative research may enable more equitable, nuanced, and plurisubjective ways to produce knowledge, the contributions also illustrate how they are bound to challenges related to researching across languages, nationalities, and disciplines.

The SI also examines how, in the course of collecting, analysing and reporting data, decisions must be made about how and when to accommodate and represent researchers' and participants' multilingualism. Regarding data collection, contributions set out practicalities such as what might be included in an interview language policy and what form a bilingual interview guide might take in order to best facilitate the researcher's ability to move between languages (e.g. during an interview in which more than one language is shared). Turning to the process of transcription, transcriber (and by extension, translator) ideologies are shown to be a point of contention (see also Bucholtz 2000, on politics of transcription). One contribution highlights the challenge of encountering ideologies of standardisation when seeking external help with transcription. Elsewhere, normative approaches are revealed within the representation of scripts, especially non-Roman. The context-dependent nature of making multilingual and translingual practices visible in transcriptions is also discussed.

Moreover, the SI attempts to be transparent about how multilingual research projects may be constrained by institutional and material practicalities such as: (the lack of) budgets for translation, expectations for representing specific linguistic views or varieties, the logistical and legal challenges of collaborative research across countries and funding bodies, access to literature in various languages, supervisors' (or other stakeholders') linguistic repertoires, the language of academic examinations, and room for both original and translated multilingual data in research outputs. While these factors are often out of our control, as a small step, an editorial decision was made for this SI to give space to relevant languages by including a translation of the title, abstract and keywords. We hope that this will contribute to normalising such practices across disciplines, but especially in applied linguistics.

Finally, the articles showcase how to do reflexivity in practice. They provide examples of how researchers developed their intentionality around researching multilingually (Stelma, Fay, and Zhou 2013) – often captured in research journal entries or detailed field notes – as well as showcasing retrospective analyses (Holmes 2014) of how principles were applied and experienced, for example by using researcher vignettes. Practically, the articles offer a variety of frameworks, guiding principles and reflexive questions for other researchers to use as a starting point to examine the role of languages within their own research projects and to find ways to navigate the practicalities of multilingual research.

Outline of contributions

The contributions in this SI propose that researchers harness language and multilingualism as tools for conducting research. Becoming aware of the value of linguistic repertoires within the research process opens the door to practising intentionality and linguistic reflexivity. As the following papers demonstrate, this has the potential to increase the trustworthiness of the research, immerse the researcher in the participants' realities, aid in the decolonisation of research and research processes, and/or establish a more nuanced perspective on the research topic and participants.

Pernelle Lorette (2023) examines the impact of her linguistic incompetence in relation to the Chinese context on the research process and outcomes. She discusses the challenges and benefits of positionality in a quantitative-driven research project and invites other quantitative social researchers to embrace the reflexive turn that has mainly remained confined to the qualitative realm. Her postpositivist argument emerges from an investigation of Chinese and non-Chinese speakers' perceptions of emotions expressed in Mandarin and she defines herself as an L0 researcher – i.e. one who is unfamiliar with Chinese languages and culture(s). Reflecting on her positionality, she identifies knowledge gaps arising from unfamiliarity with the cultures, languages, and members of the investigated community and illustrates ways to (partially) resolve these difficulties. A key strategy presented is to involve 'knowledgeable collaborators', i.e. people who are more familiar with the research context. This contributes to decentring the research practice, by moving beyond the individual subjectivity of the researcher.

Also identifying advantages of outsider positioning, Charlotte Selleck and Elisabeth Barakos (2023) examine how their linguistic profiles influence their respective research projects investigating Welsh-English bilingualism in Wales. Exploring bilingualism in education and business, they provide reflexive accounts from a critical-sociolinguistic perspective on their self- and socially-perceived sense of legitimacy to conduct research in bilingual Wales, discussing, in particular, the impact of not mastering Welsh. Both authors highlight how gatekeepers of institutions and businesses signalled expectations of data collection in the minority language and positioned the researchers as outsiders. As a result, Selleck creatively developed 'ethnographic chats' (Selleck 2017) to allow participants to share their views in English or Welsh without her being present, and collaborated with a linguistic and cultural broker. Throughout, English takes on various ideological roles, being considered less appropriate yet also neutral for Barakos as a non-British researcher, and inappropriate (by gatekeepers) but also neutral (for some schoolchildren) for Selleck, who is British. The authors call for further reflexive accounts from researchers working in minority language contexts.

Showcasing a collaborative endeavour on a much larger scale, Colin Reilly and his colleagues (2023) provide a critical reflection of their ethnographic work within a geographically distributed, international, and multilingual research team. Their project – which examined language and literacy practices, and translanguaging pedagogies in Botswana, Tanzania, and Zambia – follows three principles: researching multilingually, collaboratively and responsively (Costley & Reilly, 2021). The authors analyse vignettes from members of the research team, which reflect on and evaluate the realities of researching multilingually. Whilst researching multilingually is welcomed as inclusive and empowering, challenges such as the task of presenting the data in translation are identified. Moreover, although multilingual interactions were typical when communicating within country teams, international team meetings and research products such as reports were observed to have defaulted to English. This highlights the ongoing struggles to challenge the hegemony of English within collaborations. The team's insights are distilled into a series of key action points which underpin the principles of researching multilingually, collaboratively and responsively. Together, these form a framework which acts as a practical guide for researchers. In particular, it demonstrates how multilingualism can be conceptualised as part of the research methodology and the importance of (collective) reflection.

Shifting to a focus on language choices, Louise Rolland (2023) uses her account of a bilingual French-English interview about language practices in psychotherapy to propose that researchers articulate an interview language policy when working with multilingual participants. She emphasises the importance of giving participants linguistic agency wherever possible, describes how the question of interview language and usage was discussed with an interviewee at the outset, and how her own linguistic insecurity as an attriter was evidenced in the interaction as competing with her multilingual orientation as a researcher. She offers several reflections on the practicalities of planning and enacting a (potentially) multilingual interview, such as what to consider when preparing and piloting a multilingual interview guide, and how to approach code-switching within an interview. Rolland highlights challenges such as how researching in another L1, which is no longer the researcher's academic language, can lead to unease, and how the default practice of having separate language versions of an interview guide is at odds with the fluidity of a truly multilingual exchange. She argues that finding ways to research multilingually is not only an ethical commitment but part of striving for ecological validity in data collection.

Linguistic insecurities are also present in the work of Hannah M. King (2023) as she draws on her experiences as an LX speaker of Spanish conducting research in a Spanish language space. She explores the complexities that arise as a result of intersecting languages, language varieties, and cultures within a single research context. Drawing on data from a central London Spanish language group where she is a *participant-researcher*, her focus is on linguistically diverse communities and socialisation in transnational settings. The study demonstrates the fluidity of the notion of insiderness and outsiderness in increasingly common heterogeneous groups, where the researcher cannot be perceived as an 'insider' by every participant given the variety of backgrounds. Through a consideration of three 'challenges' that she faced, King demonstrates that an ethnographic lens is powerful for understanding localised interactions that cross linguistic and cultural boundaries, particularly when the language competencies of researcher and participants vary. Further, she highlights the benefits of a shared multilingual or multicultural orientation when researching multilingually, moving beyond traditional assumptions that an L1 should be shared or prioritised.

Featuring a language group with very different linguistic practices, Nuria Polo-Pérez and Prue Holmes (2023) demonstrate the use of translanguaging by the researcher within an ethnographic project (see also Polo-Pérez 2023) and discuss the implications for multilingual data generation and presentation. Specifically, they investigate multilingual socialisation within language cafés (LCs) – spaces where multilinguals meet informally to socialise and learn. Polo-Pérez participated in two such cafés as both researcher and language learner in Northern England. Data excerpts show that translanguaging was the norm in conversations featuring Spanish, French, Arabic, and English. As both a language learner and an L1 speaker of Spanish, Polo-Pérez's own language practices were fluid as she responded to the topics discussed and to her interlocutors. The authors describe how the translingual ethos of the LCs, as well as the positionality of the interviewer as a native speaker, teacher, and *researcher-as-participant*, influenced the co-construction of interview data. The authors reflect on the 'intelligent transcription' method, arguing for researchers to consider the level of transcription necessary for their research aims, while acknowledging the need to make visible the multilingual nature of the interview interaction.

Adopting translanguaging principles in a very different context, Virginia L. Grover (2023) advocates for awareness and visibility of how language ideologies affect the research process. In her self-reflexive paper, we witness the researcher's developing awareness of her hitherto monolingual orientation as she analyses observations from ethnographic field notes taken in India during a project on intergenerational multilingual practices. The discourse analysis of some excerpts highlights her own confusion at transliterations of English words in Gujarati script in the Indian linguistic landscape, exposing expectations – stemming from a Western, academic background – that named-language varieties have a one-to-one correspondence with a script or writing system. The paper tracks the researcher's developing epistemological and ontological awareness as she progresses from struggling to understand the rationale of what she observes to articulating questions about ideologies and ultimately examining the impact of researcher ideologies on transcription, coding and framing of research questions. Grover then offers a series of questions to help scholars consider how their ideologies might permeate their work, encouraging them to reflect for instance on how they conceptualise language or what categories or practices they foreground in their research questions.

A call for linguistic reflexivity and transparent practices

The seven papers of this SI collectively illustrate how linguistic (and cultural) reflexivity is an essential practice at all stages of research planning, execution, and dissemination. The varied, multi-disciplinary contributions shine a spotlight on the work of recognising the myriad multilingualisms which researchers – or research teams – and participants bring to their projects. Sharing language(s) and/or trying to communicate across different linguistic backgrounds is at the heart of human interactions. It follows that research findings greatly gain in richness and value when attention is given to how language impacts data generation and analysis. Indeed, a researcher's linguistic positionality and decisions made from the outset of a research project carry implications for which voices are captured and how. Rather than obscuring any difficulties we encounter or limitations we perceive, there is value in taking responsibility and being transparent. '[T]he 'humanness' embedded within our inquiries could be represented more fully and clearly if we openly acknowledged the complexities that characterise our research journeys from start to finish' (Consoli and Ganassin 2023, 2). Thus, with this SI, we encourage all scholars to engage in candid discussions about the realities of researching as part of a multilingual world, and to apply the rich insights about multilingualism which have been generated within the field of applied linguistics to their ways of working. We suggest expanding the terminology available to researchers to discuss these aspects by adopting the term *linguistic reflexivity*, thus making the linguistic dimension of reflexivity more explicit and potentially reaching a broader audience. Finally, by making visible the language dynamics within research endeavours, sharing relevant principles, guiding questions and methodologies, as well as highlighting the need for additional resources, we hope to provide tools for leading and reporting research in a way that is inclusive of researcher and participant multilingualisms.

Note

1. We note that there are other uses of the term, such as to denote the reflexive properties of language (e.g. see Lucy 1993; Taylor 2000), which are outside the scope of this discussion.

Acknowledgments

Our warmest thanks go to Jean-Marc Dewaele, who supervised us as doctoral students, encouraged us to form a strong peer network, and continues to be an outstanding mentor and supporter of our academic endeavours, both collective and individual. We would also like to thank Tian Gan for her thought-provoking contributions as a discussant for our panel at University College London. We are very grateful for the opportunity to highlight the special ix's content in Swahili, one of the many languages used in Reilly et al.'s contribution. Many thanks to Gastor Mapunda and Hannah Gibson for supplying us with translations for the title, abstract and keywords. We are proud to have worked with all 16 (co-)authors of the papers in this SI, and thank you for rising to the challenges of the SI process. Special thanks go to everyone who participated in the peer review process for the SI articles, whose questions and comments undoubtedly improved the submissions. Our final thanks go to John Edwards for stepping in as guest General Editor to avoid any conflict of interest.

Dedication

This Special Issue is dedicated to the memory of Agnès Marchessou, a beloved friend and colleague, who shared a concern for multilingualism and social justice, which was highlighted in her work on marginalised youth language in Alsace, France.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

Hannah M. King received support from Birkbeck University of London, in the form of a School of Social Sciences, History and Philosophy Research Scholarship.

ORCID

Louise Rolland http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9814-2685
Hannah M. King http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5084-4901
Pernelle Lorette http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6695-5254

References

Alejandro, A. 2021. "How to Problematise Categories: Building the Methodological Toolbox for Linguistic Reflexivity." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 20:1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211055572

Andrews, J., P. Holmes, R. Fay, and S. Dawson. 2020. "Researching Multilingually in Applied Linguistics." In *Routledge Handbook of Research in Applied Linguistics*, edited by J. McKinley and K. Rose, 76–86. Abingdon: Routledge.

Blackledge, A., and A. Creese. 2010. *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Blackledge, A., and A. Pavlenko. 2001. "Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5 (3): 243–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069010050030101

Bucholtz, M. 2000. "The Politics of Transcription." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (10): 1439–1465. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00094-6

Busch, B. 2012. "The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited." *Applied Linguistics* 33 (5): 503–523. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams056

Busch, B. 2016. "Regaining a Place from Which to Speak and be Heard: In Search of a Response to the "Violence of Voicelessness"." *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 49:317–330. https://doi.org/10.5842/49-0-675

Busch, B. 2017. "Expanding the Notion of the Linguistic Repertoire: On the Concept of Spracherleben – The Lived Experience of Language." *Applied Linguistics*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv030.

Consoli, S., and S. Ganassin. 2023. *Reflexivity in Applied Linguistics. Opportunities, Challenges, and Suggestions*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge.

Cormier, G. 2018. "The Language Variable in Educational Research: An Exploration of Researcher Positionality, Translation, and Interpretation." *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* 41 (3): 328–341. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2017.1307335

Costley, T., and C. Reilly. 2021. "Methodological Principles for Researching Multilingually: Reflections on Linguistic Ethnography." *TESOL Quarterly* 55 (3): 1035–1047. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3037

De Fina, A. 2016. "Linguistic Practices and Transnational Identities." In *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity*, edited by S. Preece, 163–178. London: Routledge.

Dewaele, J.-M. 2013. *Emotions in Multiple Languages*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dewaele, J.-M., L. Rolland, S. Cook, and B. Costa. 2023. "Mixed Methods When Researching Sensitive Topics." In *Supporting Research in Counselling and Psychotherapy. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Research*, edited by S. Bager-Charleson and A. McBeath, 247–266. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dwyer, S. C., and J. L. Buckle. 2009. "The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 8 (1): 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800105

Garrett Delavan, M., V. E. Valdez, and J. A. Freire. 2017. "Language as Whose Resource?: When Global Economics Usurp the Local Equity Potentials of Dual Language Education." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 11 (2): 86–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1204890

Giampapa, F., and S. A. Lamoureux. 2011. "Voices from the Field: Identity, Language, and Power in Multilingual Research Settings." *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 10 (3): 127–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2011.585301

Gordon, R. K. 2023. "Translanguaging Pedagogy as Methodology: Leveraging the Linguistic and Cultural Repertoires of Researchers and Participants to Mutually Construct Meaning and Build Rapport." In *The Politics of Researching Multilingually*, edited by P. Holmes, J. Reynolds, and S. Ganassin, 267–286. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Grosjean, F. 2008. *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grover, V. L. 2023. "From Monolingual Mindset to Plurilingual Ethos: Challenging Perspectives on Language(s)." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2196983

Gumperz, J. J. 1964. "Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities." *American Anthropologist* 66 (6_PART2): 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00100

Holmes, P. 2014. "Researching Chinese Students' Intercultural Communication Experiences in Higher Education: Researcher and Participant Reflexivity." In *Reflexivity in Language and Intercultural Education*, edited by Byrd Clark, J. S, and F. Dervin, 100–118. New York: Routledge.

Holmes, P., R. Fay, J. Andrews, and M. Attia. 2013. "Researching Multilingually: New Theoretical and Methodological Directions." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23 (3): 285–299. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12038

Holmes, P., R. Fay, J. Andrews, and M. Attia. 2016. "How to Research Multilingually: Possibilities and Complexities." In *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication*, edited by Zhu Hua, 88–102. London: Wiley.

Holmes, P., J. Reynolds, and S. Ganassin. 2022. *The Politics of Researching Multilingually*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

King, H. M. 2023. "Complex Intersections of Language and Culture: The Importance of an Ethnographic Lens for Research Within Transnational Communities." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2195385.

Koven, M. 1998. "Two Languages in the Self/The Self in Two Languages: French Portuguese Verbal Enactments and Experiences of Self in Narrative Discourse." *Ethos (Berkeley, Calif.)* 26 (4): 410–455. https://doi.org/10.1525/eth.1998.26.4.410

Liamputtong, P. 2008. "Doing Research in a Cross-Cultural Context: Methodological and Ethical Challenges." In *Doing Cross-Cultural Research: Ethical and Methodological Perspectives*, Vol. 34, edited by P. Liamputtong, 3–20. Dordrecht: Springer.

Lorette, P. 2023. "Opportunities and Challenges of Positionality in Quantitative Research: Overcoming Linguistic and Cultural 'Knowledge Gaps' Thanks to 'Knowledgeable Collaborators'." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2195383.

Lucy, J. A. 1993. "Reflexive Language and the Human Disciplines." *Reflexive Language. Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, 9–32. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511621031.003

Lumsden, K. 2019. *Reflexivity: Theory, Method, and Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Mann, S. 2011. "A Critical Review of Qualitative Interviews." *Applied Linguistics* 32 (1): 6–24. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq043

Marian, V., and M. Kaushanskaya. 2004. "Self-construal and Emotion in Bicultural Bilinguals." *Journal of Memory and Language* 51 (2): 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2004.04.003

Martin-Jones, M., and D. Martin. 2017. *Researching Multilingualism: Critical and Ethnographic Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.

May, S. 2013. *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*. New York: Routledge.

Nyamekye, E., G. Anani, and G. Kuttin. 2023. "Language Choice and Identity Construction among Bilinguals at the University of Cape Coast, Ghana." *Language Matters*, 1–18.

Ochs, E. 1993. "Constructing Social Identity: A Language Socialization Perspective." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26 (3): 287–306. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2603_3

Otheguy, R., O. García, and W. Reid. 2015. "Clarifying Translanguaging and Deconstructing Named Languages: A Perspective from Linguistics." *Applied Linguistics Review* 6 (3): 281–307. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014

Pavlenko, A. 2005. *Emotions and Multilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pavlenko, A. 2007. "Autobiographic Narratives as Data in Applied Linguistics." *Applied Linguistics* 28 (2): 163–188. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm008

Phipps, A. 2013. "Linguistic Incompetence: Giving an Account of Researching Multilingually." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23 (3): 329–341. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12042

Phipps, A. 2019. *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pillow, W. 2003. "Confession, Catharsis, or Cure? Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 16 (2): 175–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000060635

Pitton, Meyer, and L. S. Schedel. 2022. "The (Hidden) Politics of Language Choice in Research on Multilingualism: Moments of (Dis) Empowerment." In *The Politics of Researching Multilingually*, edited by P. Holmes, J. Reynolds, and S. Ganassin, 307–326. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Polo-Pérez, N. 2023. "Researching Language Cafés: Engaging the Researcher's Authentic Multilingual Self." In *Reflexivity in Applied Linguistics*, edited by S. Consoli and S. Ganassin, 115–133. Abingdon: Routledge.

Polo-Pérez, N., and P. Holmes. 2023. "Translanguaging as Methodology to Study Language Cafés: Implications for Managing Multilingual Data." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2197882

Reilly, C., T. Costley, H. Gibson, N. Kula, M. M. Bagwasi, D. Dikosha, P. Mmolao, et al. 2023. "Emerging Principles for Researching Multilingually in Linguistic Ethnography: Reflections from Botswana, Tanzania, the UK and Zambia." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2194864.

Rolland, L. 2023. "'I'm Sure at Some Point We'll be Switching': Planning and Enacting an Interview Language Policy with Multilingual Participants." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2199000.

Rolland, L., J.-M. Dewaele, and B. Costa. 2020. “Planning and Conducting Ethical Interviews: Power, Language and Emotions.” In *Routledge Handbook of Research in Applied Linguistics*, edited by J. McKinley and K. Rose, 279–289. Abingdon: Routledge.

Schembri, N., and A. Jahić Jašić. 2022. “Ethical Issues in Multilingual Research Situations: A Focus on Interview-Based Research.” *Research Ethics* 18 (3): 210–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161221085857

Schrauf, R. W. 2000. “Bilingual Autobiographical Memory: Experimental Studies and Clinical Cases.” *Culture and Psychology* 6 (4): 387–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X0064001

Selleck, C. 2017. “Ethnographic Chats: A ‘Best of Both’ Method for Ethnography.” *Sky Journal of Linguistics* 30:151–162. http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2017/SKYJol30_selleck.pdf.

Selleck, C., and E. Barakos. 2023. “A Reflexive Approach to Researching Bilingualism in Wales: Language, Legitimacy and Positionality.” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2195382

Stelma, J., R. Fay, and X. Zhou. 2013. “Developing Intentionality and Researching Multilingually: An Ecological and Methodological Perspective.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23 (3): 300–315. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12040

Sugiharto, S. 2015. “The Multilingual Turn in Applied Linguistics? A Perspective from the Periphery.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 25 (3): 414–421. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12111

Taylor, T. J. 2000. “Language Constructing Language: The Implications of Reflexivity for Linguistic Theory.” *Language Sciences* 22 (4): 483–499. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(00)00016-4

Thoma, D., P. Lorette, and A. E. Krautz. 2022. “Bidirectional Language Effects: Evidence on the Emotionality of Bilinguals’ Autobiographical Memories from Pupillometry, eye-Movements and Self-Reports.” In *Recent Advances in Second Language Emotion Research*, edited by I. Mavou, M. Pérez Serrano, and J.-M. Dewaele, 67–94. Cizur Menor: Civitas Aranzadi Thomson Reuters.

Wei, Li, and O. García. 2022. “Not a First Language but One Repertoire: Translanguaging as a Decolonizing Project.” *RELC Journal* 53 (2): 313–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221092841

Wei, Li, and Zhu Hua. 2013. “Translanguaging Identities and Ideologies: Creating Transnational Space Through Flexible Multilingual Practices Amongst Chinese University Students in the UK.” *Applied Linguistics* 34 (5): 516–535. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt022