
Part II: **Methodological approaches:**
Translanguaging and participatory
ethnography

János Imre Heltai, Eszter Tarsoly, Zita Tündik, Erika Kerekes-Lévai,
Blanka Lóthi

5 Data collection: Linguistic ethnographic research and participatory approaches

The beginnings of the project presented in this volume date back to 2016. Over the years, the range of participants has changed considerably, but one trend has remained constant. The project, which began as multi-sited linguistic ethnographic research (cf. Marcus 1995), has gradually developed a participatory nature, which was at least in part due to our adoption of a translanguaging approach. This is not necessarily a straight development from A to B, but evolves in parallel with certain conditions and complementary processes. Linguistic ethnography investigates how local circumstances and individuals' experience are manifest in abstract structures of communication (Rampton, Maybin, and Roberts 2015: 16–17), and approaches these phenomena in their complexity. It endeavours to grasp the multiplicity of reality by recognising characteristic features of localities and of speakers and their ideologies. Commitment to, and responsibility towards, the “researched” subjects has a strong tradition since Labov's theorem of the observer's paradox. We understand participatory research as a further step towards the “other person”, inasmuch as it softens the hierarchical distinction between the researchers and the researched, by positioning all participants as parts of the same reality. The researchers no longer “investigate” the world of the researched; instead, they work together in their shared world and on the same questions. In this sense, participatory approaches go beyond participant observation: they are based on collaboration, involving all participants in research activities and in a shared commitment to a cause (Rappaport 2008). In participatory approaches, the researchers' role is conceived not as dissecting the “outside” world into analytical categories and explaining it; researchers, too, form a dimension of local reality, albeit a more remote one. This approach also questions traditional value appropriations to categories such as “vulnerable” local communities and “expertised” researchers. By operating through the joint involvement of both parties, participatory research renders the notion of vulnerable communities relative (cf. Marino and Faas 2020).

Participatory approaches have increasingly gained ground in ethnography, cultural anthropology and economics since the turn of the millennium (Reason 1998; Lamphere 2004; Balakrishnan and Claiborne 2017; Duke 2020), and they have two important characteristics. First, they assume mixed methods of data collection and interpretation, without limiting the epistemological possibilities to traditional academic methodologies, and treating local knowledge and knowledge

practices as equally valid forms of knowledge construction (Lykes and Hershberg 2007; Schubotz 2019). Second, the participatory approaches themselves can be very diverse. There is no agreement on their criteria, but issues of initiative, theme, interests and goals are of great importance (cf. Lajos 2017). In an idealistic participatory research, participants initiate and define through collaboration the themes and the goals of the research, which serves the interests of all parties involved.

For academic actors, research is a necessity, and their proactive role is evident. It is a far more complex question whether and to what extent a civil initiative considers the possibilities of research. This is one of the most serious dilemmas in the implementation of participatory research: how is it possible to ensure that the initiative does not come from the academic side, but that academic (research) activities play an important role in the process. In this respect, participatory research approaches are not always readily separable from action research (Whyte, Greenwood and Lazes 1991; Greenwood and Levin 2007), in which socio-political objectives and even political activities are more clearly pronounced (regarding Roma-related issues in Hungary see for example Málovics, Méreiné Berki, and Mihály 2021).

One way of resolving the above dilemma is to broaden our notion of research methods and epistemologies, to include, alongside methodologies and outputs validated in the academic world, other, “non-academic” activities and outcomes as equally valid approaches and outcomes of research. For example, our project included activities such as theatre and filmmaking, as well as collaborative writing and translation involving local participants (cf. Chapters 9.4 and 13.2.2), which were all an outcome of our interest in representing local translingual ways of speaking in as many environments as possible (e.g. on stage, book pages, and films available online). None of these are classic research activities or outputs but they were important parts of the research project as they supported the linguistic ethnographic and translanguaging pedagogical activities in- and outside of the school. Another way to resolve the above dilemma is to make various compromises concerning the four criteria of participatory research (initiative, theme, interests, goals). We have opted for the latter in the case of this book, which is a classic academic volume both in its structure and most of its writing style, but the academic genre-specific requirements have been reshaped as a result of our participatory approach to writing, which occurred in a collaborative way, involving all parties concerned, such as teachers, teacher trainees, and community members.

5.1 Participatory characteristics of the activities in Tiszavasvári

Our project, as a whole, was initiated by academic participants. Later on, in different sub-projects, an increasingly wide range of participants became involved. Academic participants, students, and teacher trainees, local teachers, Roma learners, and, even later, Roma parents were mobilised for various project-related tasks. These actors were all involved in the tasks of data collection, data processing and data interpretation, and their activities became increasingly diversified. Of particular importance is in this regard the contribution of local Roma parents as in general the Roma's inclusion in research projects is limited. At the beginning of the project we have two workshops and discussion groups with Roma parents who were active and involved in school activities and in earlier projects. We introduced key concepts of translanguaging, drawing their attention to both the potential and the pitfalls of developing a translanguaging stance at school. During our ethnographic work too, we have discussions about such topics of an academic nature, which enabled the local Roma to understand better how to contribute to data collection; for instance, in an earlier filming project in 2019 (cf. chapter 13.2.2), the local youth put themselves in charge of filming and interviewing the adults. In a 2017 survey, which we conducted to evaluate how the monolingual Hungarian tests fall short in providing a realistic image of the bilingual Roma pupils' abilities, we also involved parents: they provided Romani-language texts for the translanguing test and they took part in conducting it in order to ensure that translanguing ways of speaking were adopted throughout. Finally, the parents took an active part in the interpretation and evaluation of translanguing education practices at the school: first, through numerous discussions in which they informed us of their childrens and their own feelings about the approach, including its potential shortcomings; second, in providing reflexive commentaries which were incorporated in this book.

The authors of this volume include academic staff, teachers from Tiszavasvári and Szímő (Zemné), university students and teacher trainees, and parents from Tiszavasvári. The contribution of each of these actors to the present volume is considered to be of equal value. Therefore, texts written by these participants are not presented in a box or frame but as part of the main text. This volume is, therefore, one of the important outcomes of our research, which is increasingly seen as participatory. In this chapter we describe the steps that led to its creation. Some sub-projects based on participatory approaches are described in detail in other parts of the volume and are cross-referenced here.

The project is based on pedagogical activities which were implemented gradually since 2016 in Tiszavasvári, and 2019 in Szímő (Zemné), but which were in part informed by pre-existing innovations in the schools. School managements and teachers experimented even prior to the project with pedagogical approaches which involve not only pupils but also their families in school activities. Teachers and schools aimed to establish and maintain a collaborative relationship with parents and other local Roma. The main focus of these, however, was identity building and to achieve better learning outcomes among the learners, and not translanguaging. Below, we describe some examples of the pedagogical approaches and programs, initiated by the school in Tiszavasvári prior to the translanguaging project.

In the Tiszavasvári School, Magiszter, the current management has been in place since 2009. It was around that time that the school started working on a complex life careers programme, which is still in operation, and which reaches beyond the immediate remit of the school. A kindergarten is included in the same complex institution alongside the primary school. This complex institutional framework is capable of providing support for those in need from birth until the very end of life. The nursery has a separate professional management, but the advantage of operating within the same institutional framework is that the school and the nursery can coordinate better their pedagogical goals and commitments. The school completed a plethora of consecutive projects funded from external sources. Each project provided a different framework to implement systemic improvements in the institution. As early as 2009, a programme was launched to target young people (aged 17 to 25) of a disadvantageous social background. This activity was successful in showing that the school is committed to formulating a programme which goes beyond its boundaries as an institution. The programme was intended for young adults who graduated from the primary school, many of whom dropped out from secondary school. This programme tried to reach in their local neighbourhood young people who were gifted in some way. The programmes (football, painting, parent clubs, camps) all helped young people on the margins of society to find a new purpose. They had somewhere to go and a community to belong to. Meanwhile, the programme's designers kept in touch with families and parents. For instance, they organised talent shows and competitions; on these occasions the organisers had a chance to get to know the families living in the area the school services. Later, in 2012, the organisers developed a multi-stage, gradual school starters' programme in order to support the transition from nursery to primary education, which was followed by the designing of a modular curriculum, enabling young people to spend their free time in the afternoon constructively. The school's team also developed leisure time programme plans; they organised family days and leisure activities (for further details, cf. also Kerekes-Lévai's comments in Heltai 2020: 131).

While our project built strongly on these achievements of the school in Tiszavasvári, there were similar programs in Szímő (Zemné) too, but the interconnectedness of such prior projects and our translanguaging project was less pronounced, given the shorter duration of our collaboration with that school. The school in Szímő (Zemné) adapted small group teaching as a working method which allows teachers to focus on differentiated skills development, adapting to learners' individual abilities, in the early years of primary school, and has completed a programme whose aim was to enhance teachers' sensitivity to the cultural specificities of Roma pupils. In Slovakia, only one year of pre-primary education is compulsory, but local children rarely participate even in this one year fully. When they start school, they have to learn not only Hungarian but also the official state language, Slovak. Moreover, they might face intolerance reinforced by negative stereotypes. The main reason for the educational failure of Roma children in Slovakia is the difference between traditional forms of community education practices among the Roma and the official education system, which makes school a place of fear and persecution in the Roma's imagination. School subjects and their specific discourses are unfamiliar to Roma children when they start going to school, although in their home environment they communicate without the slightest difficulty, in fact, they "never stop talking". To help mediate this difference, the school jumped on the opportunity to employ a teaching assistant, an adult member of the local community, who knows the community's language well. This had several advantages. The assistant helps with teacher-student and teacher-parent communication, which resulted in the better integration of the children and a smoother transition from kindergarten to school. These steps are vital to compensate for the lack of substantial pre-school education.

With a student research group, János Imre Heltai visited Tiszavasvári in 2016, for the first time. Tiszavasvári as a research site proved to be particularly well suited for testing translanguaging practices in education for two reasons: on the one hand the town has a large Hungarian-Romani bilingual population, and on the other, the headteacher of the school attended by most bilingual pupils was open to introducing translanguaging. In the months and years that followed, the research group had spent 115 days in the town by the time the Erasmus partnership began in November 2019. Krisztina Majzik-Lichtenberger and Eszter Tarsoly also joined the team prior to the beginning of the Erasmus activities. In this period, students and researchers carried out linguistic ethnographic fieldwork. They conducted interviews and non-guided conversations with more than 70 participants (teachers and parents) resulting in 24 hours of recorded discussions. They attended various activities and events such as church services, family and community gatherings, extra-curricular educational activities etc. They also observed over 90 taught classes in the school. The main language of interactions

was Hungarian, and non-bilingual participants developed increasing familiarity with the translingual ways of speaking of local bilinguals relying on local Romani. Developing this familiarity involved work similar to the position of the ethnographer as language learner discussed e.g. in (Roberts et al. 2001; Gobb, Tremlett, and Danero Iglesias 2020).

Based on the first findings related to the bilingual practices of local Roma (cf. Heltai 2020: 89–112, 2021), and in close collaboration with headteacher Erika Kerekes-Lévai, participants organised workshops (20 workshops by November 2019, over 20 hours of recorded material) with local teachers to discuss the research group's findings and to explore possibilities to introduce translanguaging as a pedagogical stance in the school. The joint work started with a situation analysis and an exchange of ideas in which various participant groups shared their experience. The participants produced and reviewed a “Translanguaging Catechism” (Heltai 2022). This document outlines some of the basic tenets of translanguaging as a pedagogical stance, addresses the monolingual ideologies prevalent in Hungary, and analyses the prestige relations of Hungarian and Romani, pointing out that these can be reshaped to the benefit of the latter through conscious teacher reflection. Simultaneously with this work, researchers, students, and teachers prepared jointly approximately 15 pilot lessons involving learners' local Romani practices, in order to gain experience for developing translanguaging practices in teaching.

The first outcomes of our exploratory work were discussed in meetings organised with the participation of local Roma parents to allow them to familiarise with the new concept and (as we hoped) to win their support. This was necessary because, due to ruling language ideologies, Romani was suppressed both in- and outside of the school and local Roma internalised ideologies related to monolingual Hungarian schooling. The experiments with translanguaging, while reflecting actual language practices in the Majoros neighbourhood, contradicted the school-based practices of the past decades. Thus, local speakers needed to be reassured that the development of Hungarian language competences remains an important goal and that translanguaging can contribute to a greater success in this, too. Students and researchers became part local everyday life in the school and beyond, as they appeared repeatedly at events organised by the school or by other local organisations. Participants, researchers, students, teachers and local Roma children and parents, carried out in summer breaks extra-curricular projects built around activities involving translanguaging. In 2018, a theatre play was staged based on a Roma tale and with a bilingual script written jointly by university students and the local children; it was performed twice to local audiences and once in the capital (cf. Chapter 13.2.2). In 2019, with the involvement of local adults and children, participants made short films presenting content relevant to local cultural practices and

with the intention that the films could be used in school-based learning and classes (cf. Chapter 13.2.2). In 2020, participants produced a storybook which can be used at home and at school, based on local Romani ways of speaking and writing (cf. Chapter 9.4). In 2021, participants organised a project week to work together with local adults on the present volume. The aim of these projects was threefold. We considered these activities important to ensure the success of the new translanguaging educational approach, and to make the new stance and school language policy known and accepted among local Roma. A further aim of these joint activities was to build the potential for participatory research. Finally, the projects were intended to underline that translanguaging was not offered in its weak or scaffolding version (García and Lin 2017: 20; García and Kleyn 2016: 21), whose aim is to facilitate the learning of Hungarian, but in a transformative version, which includes among its goals the reshuffling of the local prestige relations between languages and their speakers (cf. for example García et al 2021).

Alongside these activities, participating researchers and teachers launched the activities serving as the basis for the present volume, the Erasmus+ project entitled *Translanguaging for equal opportunities: Speaking Romani at school* (TRANSLANGEDUROM). Originally planned for 24 months, the project was extended to 30 months, due to the Covid pandemic. Participants undertook to produce two intellectual outputs: this volume and a video repository on which the volume is based. The latter consists of 35 video items, each approximately 5 to 10 minutes in length. The videos consist of three parts. There is a translanguaging classroom scene in focus, highlighting important moments of learning and teaching. Each translanguaging classroom moment is preceded by an introduction, typically by the teacher whose class is shown in the recording, and accompanied by reflections by teachers, researchers, and teacher trainees. The videos received English subtitles.

The school in Szímő (Zemné) joined the project in November 2019, at the beginning of the Erasmus-funded strategic collaboration. Activities (interviews, roundtables, workshops) similar to those in Tiszavasvári were planned in the first project period, in collaboration with local Roma and teachers from the school. However, Covid-19 restrictions thwarted our plans, prompting us to rethink the role of Szímő (Zemné) as a case study rather than a site for full-scale comparison.

In December 2019, teachers from Szímő (Zemné) visited the school in Tiszavasvári, but later joint activities were limited to online working. In monthly online workshops, 3 (of about 15) committed educators from the school learned about translanguaging, based on best-practice examples from Tiszavasvári. In September 2021, members of the research group spent a week in Szímő (Zemné) and carried out on-site activities. They reached out to local Roma families, talked to adults

from the community, and attended classes at school. In addition, a study session was organised for all teachers in the Szímő (Zemné) school, where researchers and students reported on the most important achievements in Magiszter. Furthermore, approximately twenty parents attended a workshop, discussing where and how local Romani is present in the village. During the same week, alongside the project-implementation activities described above, we made the recordings of translanguaging classroom moments in the school. 30 films in our repository are based on classroom scenes made in Tiszavasvári and 5 in Szímő (Zemné).

5.2 Ethical considerations

As explained in Chapter 4, both in Tiszavasvári and Szímő (Zemné) most Roma live on the margins of local societies and are vulnerable due to multiple social dependencies. Conducting linguistic ethnographic research among them and initiating translanguaging in schools attended by their children required project participants to consider the following ethical questions during the data collection processes: 1. How to avoid strengthening social dependencies and how not to reinforce segregation; 2. How to ensure that research activities become accepted by local Roma, in other words, how to establish a sensitive approach to providing them with information about project goals and how to involve them in research activities with participatory approaches; 3. Much of our work which was originally designed to take place face-to-face was transferred to an online communicative space because of the circumstances brought about by the pandemic. This raised methodological as well as ethical issues. Below we discuss how the ethical considerations listed under 1 and to 2 were addressed, and we elaborate on 3 in chapter 6.

As the project is based on classroom video recordings, we provide all personal rights defined in the GDPR Law of the European Union. Legal integrity was important in the making of the films and in the protection of the pupils and other community members filmed. All parents signed a consent form to allow the filming. The content of the consent form and data protection notice was verbally explained to parents and they were also given a copy of the information sheet on request. The pupils and parents in Tiszavasvári were familiar with and trusted the members of the research team due to previous activities, and they knew that their presence was related to Romani language practices. In order to protect local learners, project participants decided to include only those classroom moments in the video repository which portrayed them in a positive light, which showcase

their minor or major successes at school, and which do not open the door to racist or other stereotype-based attacks and degrading opinions.

During their joint activities, researchers, students and teachers sought to reduce the stigmatisation of Romani and argued that the parallel activation of Romani and Hungarian resources leads to stronger general language competences (García and Kleyn 2016: 24), thus reinforcing Hungarian language skills. Despite the support of the school's leadership not all teachers felt that they would benefit from participating in the project, which testifies to the difficulties of rewriting deep-rooted ideologies and stereotypes. Many teachers, confronted every single day with learners' Romani practices, refused to embrace, or even learn about, a translanguaging stance. Tendencies to resent the presence of Romani and the lack of appreciation for its speakers are even stronger outside school than in the school environment. As a result, local Roma might feel that they would become more vulnerable if translanguaging practices were established: the denial of Romani competencies has a long tradition in this hostile environment and is strong among Romani speakers, who have the habit of hiding their Romani competences. As part of our commitment to the ethical considerations mentioned under 1 and 2 above, our translanguaging project is committed to bringing about changes in this environment, where non-Roma often strive to distance themselves from Roma in every respect. Members of the non-Roma majority usually deny all responsibility for the social tensions present in the town. They are anxious to keep all their positions in a majoritised minority situation, where the number of the inhabitants considered to be Roma will be greater than that of non-Roma, which is, assuming a continuation of current trends, in the process of unfolding.

Under these circumstances, members of the project took special care to avoid engaging in open warfare on several fronts against social injustices which are undoubtedly present. Even in situations where the researchers' positions differ substantially from the dominant discourse context of local non-Roma society, we avoided labeling local attitudes and practices. Instead, we endeavoured to interpret the various stakeholders' stance from their own perspectives. Focusing on the overlaps rather than contributing to generating potential sources of conflict, we sought to achieve subtle and gradual changes in current social conditions based on professional activities (on ethnicity and race in sociological research cf. Tremlett and Harris 2016). Our way to address these injustices was to create translanguaging spaces (Li 2011) with the promise of transformative power, which "combines and generates new identities, values and practices" (cf. Li 2018: 23). Project team members organising these activities launched a new project in 2022 to reach out to an increasing number of people in the town, to invite them to think about these issues, and, depending on their openness to new ideas, to collaborate with them to improve conditions.

The reception of the movies was tested continuously throughout the project. Researchers showed some of the short films to university students in teacher training in Finland and Hungary and evaluated them together. In the UK, the first completed films were shown to university students specialising in Central European area studies, some of whom chose to write their term papers on the subject, reflecting on the transformative potential of translanguaging. In Hungary, there is a network of institutions called *Roma Szakkollégium* ‘Roma college (network)’, connecting Roma students in higher education with each other. This tertiary education network aims to support Roma students of deprived sociocultural background (Biczó 2021). In 2021, Heltai showed films to Roma students in higher education in one of the network’s institutions. Some of their feedback highlighted that the pupils shown in the films are extremely vulnerable. Many of the Roma higher education students remembered their childhood difficulties and humiliations while watching the films. This occasion was also an important reminder for project participants that viewers’ perspectives can differ significantly, and these differences need to be taken into account; thus, in our discussion of the films while in the making included a variety of possible vantage points from which they could be viewed. We find it imperative to point out that the films, while not shying away from showcasing the challenges, deliberately avoid focusing on the children’s potential difficulties and failures. Our intention is not to hide these but to bring into focus the learners’ sense of success, abilities, and potential.

5.3 Filming classroom scenes

The presence of a camera is unusual in classrooms both for the learners and the teacher. Even the youngest learners, who were in the third grade (aged 8 to 9) at the time of filming, took part in countless open days and peer-observed lessons since they started school, and were, thus, accustomed to having visitors in class. It was noticeable that there were pupils who enjoyed the additional attention and became more active in the presence of observers. There were, however, shier pupils who became more withdrawn when there were outsiders in class. Initially, the camera was one such outsider and had a similar impact on the learners. At the outset, it required special effort to balance the behaviour of the two types of learners: those who enjoyed performing for the camera had to be held back, and those who were intimidated by it had to be encouraged. Co-operative tasks and activities proved to be helpful in this: they allowed introvert learners to stay in the background as group work did not require them to be in the limelight, while extrovert learners could come to the fore and perform while solutions were

checked with the whole class. Thus, gradually, the camera became a familiar object, as if it were a piece of classroom furniture, for both pupils and teachers.

The mood seemed relaxed in the classroom moments which researchers saw. Even if at times there was tangible excitement on the part of the learners, which might have been, at least in part, due to the camera's presence, there is ample evidence to suggest that the recordings were not staged. On the recordings and on the films based on them there is a variation in the intensity of pupils' engagement depending on a number of factors, which include working in groups v. individual or frontal work; at times when they were encouraged, or decided by themselves, to speak as they do at home v. in Hungarian-only classroom moments; and on occasions when they were confident in their interactions as opposed to feeling challenged by trickier tasks. This variation was obvious to researchers who could view the classroom scenes only through the camera's lens due to Covid restrictions, and it testified to the authenticity and genuineness of the recordings.

5.4 Outlook: The reconciliatory potential of translanguaging beyond the school

As a result of our translanguaging and participatory research activities, several changes are visible at the school. Teachers unanimously report that pupils are increasingly speaking Romani not only during lessons but also in breaks and after-school activities. Teachers who are not active in the project are beginning to adapt to this situation. Parents' attitudes have also changed: after having experienced the inclusion of their home language practices in school, Hungarian monolingual approaches no longer have exclusivity in their ideas about what schooling should achieve with their children. There have been changes in the linguistic landscape of the school. It remains to be seen, however, to what extent and in which ways these achievements are sustainable in the long run. Without the direct incentive of contributing to partly externally initiated project activities and the motivating presence of those outsiders, such as teacher trainees and researchers, who were eager to make themselves part of the school's community, it might be challenging for local teachers, learners, and their parents to adhere to the good practices laid down during our joint work. In order for this to happen, the changes initiated at the school need to develop a broader appeal in local society, outside of the school's community and its immediate environment. As a translanguaging stance is particularly suited for implementation in educational environments, this was the right way to approach participatory project activities which focused on the children's and their teachers' language practices. However, all this

has little or no effect on the circumstances and attitudes concerning Romani in Tiszavasvári. Project participants disseminate the activities in the local and national press. We have a responsibility to see whether and how the processes we initiated in the school context and its immediate environment might have an impact on the conditions of social life outside school. Therefore, we constantly reflect upon our activities in this framework and broaden our methodological approach beyond the one adopted in the TRANSLANGEDUROM project. The project currently led by Heltai, starting in 2022, explores possibilities of navigating (in)securitised conditions (e.g. Rampton, Silva, and Charalambous 2022) in the town, by forging alliances with scientific tools between the Roma and non-Roma.

References

- Balakrishnan, Vishalache & Lise Claiborne. 2017. Participatory action research in culturally complex societies: Opportunities and challenges. *Educational Action Research* 25(2). 185–202.
- Biczó, Gábor. 2021. Roma colleges for advanced studies network in Hungary. *Különleges Bánásmód* 7 (1). 7–15
- Duke, Michael. 2020. *Community-based participatory research*. Oxford Research Encyclopedias, Anthropology.
- García, Ofelia & Angel Lin. 2017. Translanguaging and bilingual education. In Ofelia García, Angel Lin & Stephen May (eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, 117–130. Switzerland: Springer. Switzerland.
- García, Ofelia & Tatyana Kleyn. 2016. Translanguaging theory in education. In Ofelia García – Tatyana Kleyn (eds.), *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*, 9–33. New York: Routledge.
- García, Ofelia, Nelson Flores, Kate Seltzer, Li Wei, Ricardo Otheguy & Jonathan Rosa. 2021. *Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialised bilinguals: A manifesto*. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 18 (3). 203–228
- Gobb, Robert, Annabel Tremlett & Julien Danero Iglesias. 2020. *Learning and using languages in Ethnographic Research*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.
- Greenwood, Davydd. J. & Morten Levin. 2007. *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*. London: SAGE.
- Heltai, János Imre. 2020. *Transzlingválás. Elmélet és gyakorlat* [Translanguaging. Theory and practice]. Budapest: Gondolat.
- Heltai, János Imre. 2022. Transzlingváló kiskaté pedagógusoknak. [Translanguaging Chatechism for teachers] *Magyar Református Nevelés* 23(3) 46–54.
- Lajos, Veronika. 2017. Sokszínű részvétel: Új szereplők és új színterek a kortárs magyar romakutatásokban [Diversity of participation: New actors and new domains in contemporary Roma studies in Hungary]. In János Bali (ed.), *Cigány világok a Kárpát-medencében* [Gypsy worlds in the Carpathian Basin], 149–167. Budapest: Magyar Néprajzi Társaság/ELTE BTK/Néprajzi Intézet.

- Lamphere, Louise. 2004. The Convergence of applied, practicing, and public anthropology in the 21st Century. *Human Organization* 63(4). 431–443.
- Li, Wei. 2011. Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5). 1222–1235.
- Li, Wei. 2018. Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics* 39. 9–30.
- Lykes, M. Brinton & Rachel M. Hershberg. 2007. Participatory and action research and feminisms: Social inequalities and transformative praxis. In Sharlene N. Hesse-Biber (ed.), *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and practice*, 297–326. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Málóvics, György, Boglárka Méreiné Berki & Melinda Mihály. 2021. Policy reform instead of policy transformation? Experiences of participatory action research (PAR) on desegregation policy in Szeged, Hungary. *International Journal of Action Research* 1–2021. 81–101.
- Marcus, George E. 1995. Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24. 95–117.
- Marino, Elisabeth. K & A. J. Faas. 2020. Is vulnerability an outdated concept? After subjects and spaces. *Annals of Anthropological Practice* 44(1). 33–46.
- Rampton, Ben, Daniel N. Silva & Constadina Charalambous. 2022. Sociolinguistics and (in) securitisation as another mode of governance. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacy*. Paper 293. To appear in Carolyn McKinney, Pinky Makoe & Virginia Zavala (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism: 2nd Edition*.
- Rampton, Ben, Janet Maybin & Celia Roberts. 2015. Theory and method in linguistic ethnography. In Julia Snell, Sarah Shaw & Fiona Copland (eds.), *Linguistic Ethnography: Interdisciplinary Explorations*, 14–50. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rappaport, Joanne. 2008. Beyond participant observation. Collaborative ethnography as theoretical Innovation. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 1(1). 1–31.
- Reason, Peter. 1998. Political, epistemological, ecological and spiritual dimensions of participation. *Studies in Cultures. Organizations and Societies* 4(2). 147–167.
- Roberts, Celia, Michael Byram, Ana Barro, Shirley Jordan & Bryan V. Street. 2001. *Language Learners as Ethnographers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Schubotz, Dirk. 2019. Participatory action research. In Sara Delamont, Alexandru Cernat, Joseph W. Sakshaug & Richard A. Williams (eds.), *Sage Research Methods Foundations*. London: Sage.
- Tremlett, Annabel and Roxy Harris. 2016. Beyond the interview: ethnicity/‘race’ in sociological research. In Linda McKie & Louise Ryan (eds.), *An End to the Crisis of Empirical Sociology? Trends and Challenges in Social Research*, 136–151. London: Routledge.
- Whyte, William F., Davydd J. Greenwood & Peter Lazes. 1991. Participatory action research: Through practice to science in social research. In Whyte F. William (ed.), *Participatory Action Research*, 20–56. London: Sage.

