

Eszter Tarsoly, Petra Réka Boros, Krisztina Czumpft,
Bernadett Jani-Demetriou, Gergely Olexa

6 Data processing: Retaining multiple perspectives and voices through abduction, in analysis, and translation

This chapter elucidates the principles of data processing with regards to three aspects of our work in the TRANSLANGEDUROM project. The first (6.1) focuses on the compilation of the video repository, which consists of 35 short films, and discusses the thematisation and classification of translanguaging lesson plans which served as a starting point for the videos. The second area of data processing discussed below (6.2) concerns online working. As a result of the Covid 19 pandemic, several project components had to be either abandoned or considerably modified to accommodate the methods and possibilities available in the online communicative space. Having to work for over half of the project's duration online meant that classroom observations, workshops, filming, and the processing of raw material filmed in classes needed to be re-thought. Turning this challenge to advantage, we acknowledged early on that while some aspects of the project will necessarily be carried out with a reduced scope compared to what was originally planned (most particularly the level of involvement of the newly recruited school in Szímő (Zemné), Slovakia, had to be compromised) some aspects of our work benefited from online working. While the online communicative space reduced to some degree the complex immersive experience that all ethnographic work involves, it prompted participants to place greater emphasis on phenomena observed on camera-recorded scenes and on their interpretation from multiple perspectives.

The third question of data processing concerns the role of translation in the representation of our data (6.3). In the first instance, this concerned subtitles to the films, and in the second phase of the project, the translation of passages written by non-English-speaking project participants (contributors from the local community in Tiszavasvári, local teachers in Tiszavasvári and Szímő (Zemné), and some university students and teacher trainees). Translators unavoidably face the task of giving voice to those whose texts are originally formulated in a language other than the language of publication. The conscious choice between one named language or the other (García et al. 2021: 216) is nowhere as obvious as in translation. This is a particular challenge for representation in three specific areas. The first one of these is the representation of translational data through translation in situations where the language resources involved in translanguaging (in our case mostly Hungarian and Romani) have no overlaps with the language in which the data is represented

(English). The second challenge concerns ideologically and (language-)politically mediated attitudes towards specific elements of language. This includes the treatment of “key words” for which even assumed “equivalents” are lacking because of cultural, social, and political mismatches between the language of the source and the target text. The third challenge concerns the problems of translation which have been actively contested in the context of post-colonialism (Gal 2015: 234; cf. also Clifford 1997, 2013; García 2020). All translation involves interpretation (e.g. Moll 2017) in which the translator brings to bear her experience with linguistic and cultural forms of expression and her social responsibilities on the choices she makes. Translating texts produced by people who are often denied the chance, because of social prejudice and hostilities, to speak for themselves even in their own language(s) involves particular responsibilities (Bosseau 2021; Deane-Cox 2013; Glowacka 2012). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language (Li 2018) has among its goals the potential of bringing such vulnerable voices to the fore, and this has implications and dilemmas for the representation through translation of translingual data.

6.1 Compilation of the video repository

This section focuses on the methods applied in the completion of the 35 short films showcasing and reflecting on translanguaging classroom moments. These are classroom scenes of varying length, stretching from only just a few moments to several minutes, in which translingual practices can be clearly evidenced in the classroom. The many contributors involved directly or indirectly with this process included pupils, parents, teachers, researchers, and university students. These participants came from different social and professional backgrounds and brought to bear on the selection and analysis of classroom moments their different ways of seeing and knowing. Our work was guided by a cooperative spirit, rooted in reciprocity and mutual dependence on each-other’s expertise, which meant that the roles of the different participants were equally important.

The compilation of the video repository started in the 2019–2020 academic year. Researchers and student researchers created a rubric which teachers used to document and systematise their experience of translanguaging classroom moments as and when they occur in class. The rubric was based on a number of observation criteria concerning learning organisation and activity type (e.g. whether the classroom in question is teacher-led or student-initiated, whether translanguaging is planned or spontaneous, whether it occurs in writing or speaking, etc.). The ninety classroom moments which teachers collected in this way served as starting points for the thematisation of the films of the video repository to be made.

During the review of the 90 classroom moments, the observational and classificatory criteria used in the rubric was found to be only partially relevant to their systematisation. Instead of insisting on the binary organisation of criteria, project participants decided that it was more helpful to focus on the effects of translanguaging in particular classroom moments, such as enhancing the comprehension of tasks or the material taught, bringing learners' existing competences to the fore, shaping student-teacher relationships, displaying identity processes or expressions of belonging, etc. This meant that the outlines of classroom moments were grouped by features of translanguaging and not exclusively by pedagogical criteria as originally planned. The resulting typology indicated the types of classroom moments participants wished to record for the films; of the 90 outlines, 30 translanguaging classroom moments were established in Tiszavasvári. Another 5 films were made in Szímő (Zemné).

As a next step, teachers in the Magiszter school recorded some of their lessons, trying to achieve situations similar to the 30 selected moments. Teachers made reasonable adjustments to the plans depending on the school years, groups of learners, and stages of the curriculum which they taught at the time of the recording. In order to preserve the educators' integrity and the intimacy of the classroom, teachers and researchers agreed that the raw recordings would be reviewed only by the project manager and one other researcher, not the entire team. The project manager and his immediate collaborator selected and cut from the raw recording the parts of the classes which were most relevant for the production of the short films. These 10 to 15-minute clips were then presented to all participants as raw materials to be further shortened and interpreted for the films.

Compiling a video repository of translanguaging classroom moments was part of our original project design; so was the analysis of camera-recorded data. What we could not have planned at the outset is that a partly new, online working group will be formed around these activities. In 2019 the (face-to-face) opening meeting of our project took place almost at the same time as the virus that causes Covid 19 was born. In March 2020, a week before the restrictions were brought into effect, we held another training event on-site in Nitra, Slovakia. In the face of the pandemic, the entire project had to be rethought: research seminars and training events to discuss and edit the classroom moments had to be held online. We were unable to visit the schools where our classroom data was recorded for approximately a year.

The project design in the new situation was as follows. As long as primary schools could remain open and operate (but not to be visited by outsiders such as researchers and university students), teachers regularly sent video recordings of entire lessons to the project leader. After the initial screening of these recordings, classroom activities of varying length were shown to the entire team on two, weekly online research seminars, which took place approximately for a year from

November 2020. Each seminar focused on one or two recordings, deciding which parts to include in a final excerpt. The short recordings were reviewed again by the entire team. During the review stage, members discussed the central idea which unfolded from the abridged recording, possible interpretations of it, and each and every reflective comment to be recorded by individual team members. The purpose of these detailed discussions was to leave room for individual interpretations while arranging them around a central theme that emerged from each recorded and edited class excerpt.

The recording of classroom moments in Szímő (Zemné) required a somewhat different approach because project-implementation work was partially interrupted by the circumstances related to the Covid 19 pandemic. While online knowledge-sharing events continued with the participation of the teachers, it was impossible to start recording classroom scenes without the ethnographic ground work in the community. The easing of restrictions in September 2021 temporarily allowed a number of researchers and university students to spend a week on site, and, in addition to the linguistic ethnographic activities mentioned in Chapter 5, they filmed classes during the last two days of their visit. The criteria for the selection of classroom moments were agreed before the visit, based on discussions on the ongoing online seminars.

The completed short films consist of three main parts: first, teachers contextualise the the translanguaging moment which features in the video, providing the details necessary to understand the scenes. This is followed by the recorded classroom scene or scenes. Finally, commentaries provided by teacher trainees, researchers, parents or the teachers themselves complete the film. All commentaries introduce a different analytical insight concerning the classroom scene, and the creators encourage viewers to elaborate on these or add their own analytical angles while discussing the films on seminars in teacher training or on translanguaging.

6.2 Methodological implications of working online

While both virtual ethnography and online class observations are well-established research practices (e.g. Hine 2000), their applicability to our project was limited. The follow-up work of filming was originally designed to take place face-to-face, building on a tradition of translanguaging and linguistic ethnography research seminars going back six years. Thus, members of the project team, particularly those who had limited prior exposure to the field sites, found themselves in a

transformed communicative space (Nguyen et al. 2020), whose main features can be summarised as follows.

- (1) Instead of observation undertaken in classrooms, our experience of translanguaging teaching and learning practices originated from video recordings, and was, thus, mediated by the camera.
- (2) Instead of training events with teachers, teacher trainees, and researchers, we shared experience on online training events.
- (3) Instead of face-to-face weekly seminar sessions, designated for the analysis of the materials recorded in classrooms and for the recording of commentaries, online research seminars were held twice a week, and commentaries were either recorded individually or on the online seminars.

The above alterations raised several questions concerning the possibilities of data collection and observation. It was uncertain whether the altered methods of data collection, observation, and filming were suitable as a way of ethnographic working. Our main question was whether they allowed us to make an immersed attempt to understand the teachers' and learners' experience in the same way as face-to-face immersion would (Hammersley 2018). We shall now review the three points of alteration outlined above in light of the answers we gained to these questions.

The most important dilemma arising from our online working was whether the classroom images viewed through the camera's lens would amount to the kind of immersive experience that is part of any ethnographic work. What was at stake here was our ability to engage with, and especially unpack, the layers of meaning associated with teachers' and learners' interactions, motivations, and attitudes in the translanguaging educational space they established. To this ethnographic challenge layers of uncertainty were added because not only the observers' gaze was guided, and in some respect perhaps limited, by the camera, but also the pupils' behaviour.

Insights gained from the teachers' reflections on the classroom moments were of utmost importance in helping us contextualise the excerpts we were seeing, thus broadening the perspectives that were narrowed by the camera's lens. Teachers' reflections influenced the theoretical framing of classroom moments, underpinning researchers' interpretations. Another source of practical insights was the teacher trainees' initial comments on the unabridged, 10 to 20-minute classroom moments we watched. Most teacher trainees had extensive experience working with the pupils in Magiszter over several years of fieldwork (cf. Chapter 5, Chapter 9.4, and Chapter 13.2.2). As to the pupils' behaviour, which could have been substantially altered by the camera's presence, after the first few recordings we watched we were reassured: thanks to careful planning of lessons and the trusting relationship between the learners and the teachers, the camera seemed to have little impact on classroom interactions.

After having developed confidence in our online working methods, we found that there were two important advantages to observing the classes through the camera's lens. First, the scenes recorded by the camera allowed the observers to have a narrower, therefore more specific focus: all observers had precisely the same visual vantage point in the moment of viewing the recordings. The sameness of this perspective, however, was underpinned by a diversity of our experience in the field site and of our analytical approach, with some observers having a stronger theoretical background and others more practised in applied research. The second advantage was precisely the multiplicity of perspectives which came in handy when we felt we lacked the multifaceted immersive experience which real-time-and-space observation would have allowed.

Working out what behaviours might mean is the stuff of ethnographic data collection and interpretation. The video-recorded and online nature of our field site provided fewer opportunities for both the serendipity of ethnographic encounters and checking our interpretations with teachers and pupils shortly after the event. However, the multiplicity of possible interpretations, which were repeatedly tested against each other as recorded scenes were viewed and reviewed several times, resulted in explanations of various degrees of specificity of each classroom moment. This approach to analysis enabled us to develop a working method based on abductive reasoning in our commentaries on the classroom moments.

Abductive reasoning is a logic of enquiry which has gained increasing recognition in the social sciences (e.g. Blaikie 2019) and applied linguistics (e.g. McKinley 2019, 2020; Rose, McKinley, and Briggs 2020) in recent years. Abduction in the original, Peircean sense is a type of hypothetical reasoning, which, similar to induction, uses the observation of data as a starting point and comes to conclusions which are always tentative, with the intention that they can be tested (Blaikie 2019: 2). The "tentative conclusions" are inferences to the best explanation, which are grounded in an idea, or *force marjeure*, and a method of testing its consequences (Gabbay and Woods 2005: 81). Our testing ground was the teachers' descriptive account of the classroom scenes, to which we shall return below. The definition of abduction in applied linguistics (Rose and McKinley 2017; Rose, McKinley, and Briggs 2020: 258) is also applicable to the way we worked. We established hypothetical premises and interpretations (e.g. in video 2 [*Teachers' questions in transformation*], a pupil appears in the role of interpreter or language assistant to the teacher thanks to his use of Romani in class), which were based on observations of recorded events in the classroom (the pupil mentioned above translates into Romani on his own initiative what the teacher said). We then pursued various theories (most prominently translanguaging theory) to explain our interpretations (e.g. the scene witnessed above was interpreted, in line with Li 2018, as an occasion when translanguaging brings fluid practices to the

fore, *transcending* reified language boundaries and *transforming* traditional roles and hierarchies in the classroom).

Abduction in social scientific enquiry is used to construct theory grounded in social actors' actions, language, and interpretations (Blaikie 2019: 3). Social actors' own accounts of their everyday practices, including the symbolic meanings, motives, ideologies, and rules that underpin their actions, is "abducted": reformulated into social scientific accounts and typologies but with the research participants' consent and cooperation. Abduction is, thus, particularly well suited for the *deconstruction* of everyday knowledge (including typifications, stereotypes, and ideologies), and for their *reconstruction* into theoretical concepts, by generating the most likely understanding and explanation of observable phenomena. For this reason, abductive reasoning aligns well with participatory research approaches, too. Chapter 8 argues that reflection on one's own motivations, practices, and ideologies is an ideal starting point for educators' professional development, and the implementation of a translanguaging stance is both preceded by and results in a reflexivity of this kind. The teachers' commentaries in the films are important not only as the teachers' reflections on their own practices but also as a testing ground for the researchers' and teacher trainees' hypothetical explanations of the "surprising phenomena", in Peirce's words (1934: 90), which was observable on the video recordings.

This takes us back to the second alteration of our planned methods, which meant that interactions between teachers and researchers took place in a "transformed communicative space" either in the form of online consultations (project meetings) or by researchers being sent video recordings of the teachers' detailed reflections. These reflections were discussed and edited in a way similar to our processing of the recorded classroom moments. The unavoidable slowness of processing allowed teachers and researchers more room for reflection. First, the time-lapse made it possible for teachers to develop a better understanding of the researchers' perspective: before preparing their commentaries, teachers were shown the short, 5-minute classroom excerpts selected on the online research seminars. On one of our online consultations a teacher mentioned that she was initially surprised by the researchers' choice of the particular classroom scenes, as she did not believe that they were remarkable in terms of learning organisation in any way. Such exchanges of views provided real learning points for participatory approaches in our ethnographic work insofar as such exchanges juxtapose the teachers' and researchers' different focus. For the former, the main observational criterium is how well information is conveyed and how much knowledge is transmitted, whereas for the latter the question is in which moments learners feel liberated and relaxed. After seeing the scene that was selected and hearing researchers' and teacher trainees' commentaries, however, she understood the rationale behind the selection, and this understanding informed her own reflections on her work (Zita Tündik, personal communication, May 2021).

Second, the teachers' commentaries functioned for the researchers as points of compass to orientate themselves in the recorded classroom scenes. (N.B. Researchers and teacher trainees initially interpreted the classroom scenes without having received the teachers' reflections; these were sent only once the 3-5-minute classroom scenes were shared with the teachers.)

6.3 Subtitling the movies, translating texts for the book

The last phase of the work with the short films in our video repository was subtitling them in English. This was followed by translating Hungarian contributions to the book into English. Below, we briefly describe the three most sensitive issues with regards to translation, and list some examples to illustrate how we addressed them.

The first translation challenge is the representation of translingual data in translation. Translation and translanguaging are often juxtaposed as terms and activities with different histories and epistemologies (García 2020: 85). It was suggested that in certain situations of conflict, and in contexts where speakers' everydays are fraught with tension, such as in our fieldsite, translanguaging is a better suited metaphor than translation to describe and influence the perception of difference (Brink-Danan 2015: 189). Translation moves along a spatio-temporal axis from *there-to-here* and *then-to-now* as it shuttles across different systems of semiosis, language, and cognition (Baynham and Lee 2019: 35). Translanguaging, in contrast, is imagined spatio-temporally as a vibrant assemblage (Pennycook 2018: 46, cited in Baynham and Lee 2019: 36), in the *here and now*, of language resources which were previously kept apart by the separation of social spaces and practices associated with them. Translation steers towards an end product, or *terminus*, which is referenced with the name of the same word as the process itself (as in *a translation*), while translanguaging has no aspirations to produce an outcome. Although one can speak of the effects and outcomes of translanguaging, these originate from the practice itself and lack embodiment in the form of an end-product. Both translation and translanguaging operate in the borderlands, or "hybrid sites of meaning" (Bhabha 1994: 234), but there is an important difference in speakers' consciousness of the borders when engaging in one or the other. Baynham and Lee juxtaposed translation and translanguaging precisely with regards to their relationship to borders, arguing that translanguaging destabilises language borders, turning them into sites of creative and critical potentialities, while translation "regards language borders with absolute seriousness, as the entire business of translating hinges on their resolution" (2019: 41). As a result, both the

written representation of translilingual data and the translation of that representation involves, schematically, the superimposition of fixed borders on something that is in flux, inasmuch as it sets up divisions within, and thereby objectifies, transitional, in-the-moment phenomena (cf. Baynham and Lee 2019: 38–44).

The theoretical tensions between translation and translanguaging had to be resolved in practice in the subtitles for the short films and in translating written representations of translanguaging discourse both in texts produced by local contributors and in texts presented as data in the book. In order to do so, a hearer-centred perspective of translanguaging (Makalela 2019: 237) was applied because this accommodates the social construction of named languages in the way they are conceived from the hearer's (or reader's) perspective, as opposed to the assemblage of communicative resources which disrupt these constructed boundaries in individual speakers' practices (cf. a speaker-centred approach). When presenting translilingual data, utterances perceived from a monolingual Hungarian perspective as Romani are indicated in capital letters in order to contrast them with what would be perceived as Hungarian utterances. When utterances are perceived differently by monolingual Hungarian hearers and Romani speakers, we adopted the latter's perspective (e.g. lexemes of local Romani, which are interpreted as Romani by bilingual speakers and as Hungarian by monolingual Hungarian speakers). For example in the sentence *O pasztori opre találtingya po ikri* 'the shepherd found the twins' (cf. Chapter 7) the word stems *pásztor* 'shepherd', *talál* 'find', and *iker* 'twin' are, from the perspective of a Hungarian speaker, transparent loans from Hungarian, but the utterance as a whole is perceived by speakers of local Romani as Romani. So, when providing the English translation of this sentence, we used all capital letters to indicate that the utterance as a whole is seen by local Roma as Romani.

Limitations of space were less strict in translilingual data cited in the book. A systematic and comprehensive discussion of the various ways in which translilingual data was represented in writing and in translation is impracticable here because of limitations of space. It is important to underline, however, that whenever boundaries had to be established to make decisions about translation or graphic options possible, we adopted the hearer's perspective from the point of view of the speaker who produced the utterance and not merely the perspective of the "white listening subject" (Flores and Rosa 2015; García et al. 2021) – monolingual Hungarian majority speakers. In future work, parallel texts may be a helpful technical tool in representing both what multilingual speaking subjects (in our case, Roma children and their parents) *say*, using their entire repertoire, and what Hungarian-monolingual listeners, such as the teachers, *hear*, when they make sense of those utterances. The monolingual hearer's perspective is different from that of multilingual hearers with regards to socially constructed language boundaries.

The second and third ethical issue with regards to translation has to do with the problem of equivalence in terms of both lexico-semantic and social-ideological representations across different semiotic systems (including socially constructed named languages). Gal (2015: 233) describes the problem of equivalence as the expectation, ingrained in Euro-American ideologies of communication, of maximal correspondence between word-labels across languages and what is “assumed to be a separately available real world”. Gal compares the workings of these ideologies to baptismal moments between terms from two named languages or semiotic systems. According to the ideologies Gal mentions, one-to-one correspondence is assumed in translation between elements of two (or more) naming traditions. Language experts and traditions of official translation strive to create such standardised equivalents and for the authority to legitimise them. The processual dynamic of translation, however, is very much unlike the supposed systematic correspondence between assumed, and potentially standardised, equivalents. It is, instead, a series of tentative approximations achieved through “the accruement of a series of intercultural moments in time” (Baynham and Lee 2019: 40), which create a translanguaging space within each moment of the process of translation. The series of transcultural and translingual events which dwell in the process of translation are organised by meaning making based on indexicality. “One starts by identifying a system of indexical signaling in one lingua-culture and then finds a way of ‘doing’ a signaling of roughly the same sort in another lingua-culture” (Silverstein 2003: 89–90; cited also in Gal 2015: 235).

Instead of ascribing to trends which seek to standardise practices in translation (“regimes of equivalence”), we preferred variation which captures subtle differences in style, register, and voice, expressed in lexical choices, characterising the original text. Our decisions concerning the translation of two of the key words of this book, Hu. *cigány* v. *roma* illustrate this. Both terms have established “equivalents” in English: ‘Gypsy’ and ‘Roma’, respectively. In most European languages, historically rooted prejudices led to the development of a derogatory, pejorative meaning for the former; hence, political correctness usually licenses only the latter. In Hungarian monolingual contexts, however, although the derogatory connotations and the subsequent proscription of *cigány* in discourses of political correctness exist, they are less pronounced than in some other languages. But, importantly for the present discussion, *cigány* is also the more intimate of the two terms, given that *roma* is associated with formal, official discourses, precisely because of its positive markedness for political correctness. In the Magiszter School and other social settings which Roma and non-Roma co-habit both teachers and learners use *cigány* to refer to both the ethnicity and the language. Researchers and teacher trainees, although they are members of the extended community organised around the school, usually refer to the members of the Majoros settlement as *roma*, although even in their practices there are discrepancies regarding the name of the language; participants often

warned themselves and each other to refer to the language as *romani* and in adverbial form as *romaniul* instead of *cigány* and *cigányul*. Teachers and learners in the classroom use, practically without exception, *cigányul*. The negative markedness of *cigány* for political correctness is irrelevant in contexts of intimacy. Sherwood provides a detailed review of the grammatical features of the derivability of ethnonyms, which supports our observation that historic or areal and cultural intimacy between Hungarian speakers and another named ethnic group plays a part in the way ethnonyms operate in the nominal derivation system of Hungarian (Sherwood 2002). The English noun *Gypsy* may have positive value attributions, too, which increasingly typify contemporary discourses, but these do not reflect an intimate v. formal opposition. The following OED (s.v. “Gypsy”) definition shows the simultaneous negative v. positive value attributions in English: “a person who possesses qualities or characteristics supposed to be typical of Gypsies; (a) a person who acts in a disreputable, unscrupulous, or deceptive manner (*obsolete*); (b) (in later use) a person who is free-spirited and carefree, or who travels to many places”. According to (b), the English noun *Gypsy* can be used even with reference to potentially wealthy and eccentric globe trotters. Neither the obsolescence of the pejorative use nor the specific features of the positive associations are the same in Hungarian for *cigány*.

The above analysis reveals what Clifford (2013: 48) explained as follows: “[t]ranslation is not transmission. Something is brought across, but in altered forms, with local differences. There is always a loss or misunderstanding along the way. And something is gained, mixed into the message”. Our decision was to use *Gypsy* in English when translating writings or utterances by members of the Tiszavasvári Roma community and they used the Hungarian term *cigány* with reference to themselves; we mostly used the same strategy when translating text by local teachers (i.e. contexts when *cigány* is positively marked for intimacy). When *roma* was used in the Hungarian by any of our contributors, this was rendered as *Roma* in English without exception. We followed the same procedure with regards to the name of the language: *cigányul* (*cigány-ul*: *cigány* ‘Gypsy’ suffixed with the adverbial *-ul*), when used by speakers of local Romani in their Hungarian speech or writing, was rendered as ‘in Gypsy’ because this reflects their practice better than ‘in Romani’. The latter was used when *romaniul* occurs in the Hungarian text (mostly in texts by researchers).

Translators’ ethical responsibilities are multiplied in situations of conflict, where being misunderstood is likely to be of profound concern for research participants and other parties who produce the texts to be translated (cf. Deane-Cox 2013: 312). Our videos contain classroom scenes involving children from a precarious community and their teachers; thus, careful attention to detail in representing them in the subtitles was imperative. Teachers’ work and ways of speaking must be understood in the context of local circumstances. The learners in the recordings display their linguistic and school-related cultural practices freely, even

though these practices are often stigmatised. It is impossible to convey such broad social-contextual information in the subtitles, but playing into the stereotypes must also be avoided.

In subtitling a certain degree of reductionism is unavoidable. Learners often exchange glances with one another or the teacher, they grin, smile, turn back to look at one of their peers, etc. These reactions are often subtle but, if the processing of verbal language is based on auditory input, it is possible for the viewer to process visual information alongside it. When relying on subtitles, it is more difficult, and often impossible, to detect in a busy and animated classroom scene precisely to which passage of the text the learners reacted, while the viewer has to read the subtitles, too. Importantly to our study, the time it takes to process visual input of two kinds (subtitle and classroom events) might also make it more difficult to detect when the learners, and not the teacher, initiate a particular classroom activity. Similarly, the role of pauses in speech, phatic language, suprasegmental elements, and the expression of emotions is difficult to convey in subtitles. The representation of these, however, has an impact on how certain reactions are interpreted by the viewer. For instance, in video 13 (video 13: 1.10) the teacher uses *hűha*, a phatic expression without clear propositional meaning, which can be translated as ‘whoa, wow, uh oh, all right! careful! woops!’ depending on the context. The teacher’s intonation makes it entirely clear to Hungarian-speaking viewers that her intention is to gently warn the pupils that something is not quite right in their answer, which is best conveyed by ‘careful!’ or ‘woops!’. Opting for one or the other solution contributes to the representation of the teacher’s entire personality and attitudes towards learners.

The translator’s responsibility towards the speaker or writer is twofold. First, their aim is to find the best close approximation in the text resulting from translation of the message in the original. Their secondary aim is, however, to avoid fictionalising a writer’s or speaker’s voice in the process of complex cultural recontextualisation, which would mean stripping the original off its identity and authenticity in order to accommodate the listeners’ and readers’ linguistic and cultural expectations in the translated text (cf. the adaptation of texts to the “white listening subject’s” expectations in colonial contexts; García et al. 2021; García, Aponte, and Le 2020). In order to satisfy both kinds of responsibility which seemingly grind against each other, three domains need to be navigated simultaneously: the cognitive domain of concepts, the linguistic and cultural domains of expression, and the social domain of liabilities and responsibilities, alongside the attempted alignment of value-attributions across ideologies, moral systems and socio-political structures in two separate systems (named languages) (cf. Pöchhacker 2008: 14–16).

We look at two last examples to illustrate the above dilemmas. The design of the central national curriculum in Hungary organises subject knowledge and subject-specific communication around the teaching and learning of key words (cf. Chapter 9). As a result, elicitation of such terms is a core part of teaching, as is learners' correct use and understanding of them. This is a domain which teachers and teacher trainees have limited scope to navigate, but its benefits for knowledge development can be harnessed through dialogic teaching, which leads learners in a questions-and-answers format towards the "correct answer" (ie. the key words taught). In teachers' and teacher trainees' accounts of a successful translanguaging teaching event, we decided to reformulate the Hungarian for, e.g., "teachers help learners arrive at the *correct answer* (Hu. *helyes válasz*)" as "teachers help learners to formulate more clearly what they wanted to say" or similar. Given the limitations of space in our writing to expand on such reformulations whenever they happen, we compromised through such adaptations of the original in order to avoid conveying the impression that the teacher supports the senseless and unexplained regurgitations of the lexical material taught.

The last example is taken from text produced by one of our local contributors in Tiszavasvári. Describing one of her own teachers, she says, in Hungarian, *nagyon rendes tanár volt* 'he was very caring' lit. 'he was a very nice/supportive/good teacher'. The lexical choices listed in the second translation attempt, labelled as *lit.* for *literal*, show that the Hungarian adjective *rendes* (approximately: 'orderly', adjective derived with the suffix *-es* from the noun *rend* 'order') is difficult to convey with either of the possible "equivalents" listed above. The contributor's intended meaning has to do not with the primary meaning related to orderliness but with kindness, an accommodating, supportive, caring attitude. In English, the adjective *supportive* would have been available, and, out of the specific context of our contributor's writing this would have been a commendable option. We opted for *caring* for two reasons. On the one hand, *supportive* would have suggested that the speaker admits her vulnerability and subordination by saying that the teacher provided the support she needed (this is, in fact, what happened; cf. Chapter 13.1). Our contributor's positioning of herself, however, was the opposite. While speaking with gratitude about the teacher's work, she assumed a morally strong position, which gave her the ground to evaluate the teacher's behaviour in general, instead of being merely a passive recipient of his benevolent actions. On the other hand, this story is told in the context of our discussion of caring and transcaring (Noddings 1986; García et al. 2012) in the Magiszter School. The concept of care was also applied in indigenous research writing (Gutterm et al. 2021: 118), in which it specifically foregrounds the encounters between indigenous and local societies and academia. Our own disciplinary context and its discourses underpinned our choice of translating *rendes* as 'caring'. In addition to our *care* given to specific

lexical choices, when translating local community members' and teachers' contributions we worked with a "thick translation" approach in mind (cf. Appiah 2000; cited also in Bachmann-Medic 2016: 179), preserving as much of the original writers' voice as an accessible rendering in English allowed.

6.4 Conclusion: Rethinking academic texts and knowledge production

The above discussion surveys our methodological considerations and findings with regards to three core-components of our data processing: the compilation of the video repository, the consequences of working online in a pandemic, and the ethical and practical considerations influencing translators' choice in the subtitles and in the volume. The discussion in this chapter serves not only to highlight the consequences of online working on our methods of collecting and interpreting data but also as a guide for those practitioners and researchers who will use the video repository alongside the book in the future. These users will likely approach the materials without having had field experience in our field site, thus, they will also gain exposure to it solely through the videos. The abductive methods of enquiry and stages of reflection, which resulted, at least in part, from the lack of opportunity to do off-line fieldwork or to hold face-to-face project meetings, are imprinted on the short films in our repository.

The reflexive stages of the overall process yielded important insights especially in the following areas. Working in a pandemic required to adjust our methodological approach to both making and processing the video recordings of classroom scenes: collaborating teachers were entirely in charge of this process without immediate feedback from researchers, and the interpretation of video recordings involved extended periods of reflections. As a result, teacher and teacher trainee contributors were empowered as they were in charge of making decisions regarding filming, camera positions, and interpreting what we see in the recording. The reflexive cycles during the processing of the recordings, in turn, contributed to reshuffling the power relations between other participant groups, due to researchers' increased reliance on learners' and teachers' multiperspective interpretations.

The reflexivity characterising our online working was extended to off-line workshops organised with the purpose of involving local parents as co-authors in the volume. This is an experimental feature of this volume and contributes to empowering local voices inasmuch as it highlights their distinctiveness in the process of interpretation. Interpretation is, thus, no longer an exclusive project of the researchers based in academic centres: reflections from all participants are an important feature

of every empirical chapter. The multiplicity of voices invites us to rethink what an “academic” text is and how the socially constructed boundaries of the genre can be broadened, or dismantled, in order to accommodate writing by those who so far have been the “researched” subjects, indigenous, migrant, and various other local populations.

References

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2000. Thick Translation. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *Translation Studies Reader*, 417–429. London/New York: Routledge.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2016. *Cultural Turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Baynham, Mike & Tong-King Lee. 2019. Translation and Translanguaging. Tensions and synergies. In Mike Baynham & Tong-King Lee (eds.), *Translation and translanguaging*. London: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. The Location of Culture. London: Routledge.

Blaikie, Norman. 2019. Abduction. In Sara Delamont, Alexandru Cernat, A. Joseph W. Sakshaug & Richard A. Williams (eds.), *Sage Research Methods Foundations*. London: Sage.

Bosseau, Charlotte. 2021. Translating Gender-Based Violence Documentaries: Listening Ethically to the Voices of Survivors. In Meng Ji & Sara Laviosa (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Translation and Social Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brink-Danan, Marcy. 2015. Faith in conversation: Translation, translanguaging, and the British God Debate. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 25(2). 173–194.

Clifford, James. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, James. 2013. *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Deane-Cox, Sharon. 2013. The translator as secondary witness: Mediating memory in Antelme's L'espèce humaine. *Translation Studies* 6(2). 309–323.

Flores, Nelson & Jonathan Rosa. 2015. Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Education Review* 85(2). 149–171.

Gabbay, Dov, M. and Woods, John. 2005. *The Reach of Abduction: Insight and Trial*. Amsterdam: Elsevier

Gal, Susan. 2015. Politics of translation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 44. 225–240

García, Ofelia, Gladys Y. Aponte & Khanh Le. 2020. Primary bilingual classrooms. *Translations and Translanguaging*. In Sara Laviosa & María González-Davies (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*, 81–94. London: Routledge.

García, Ofelia, Heather Homonoff Woodley, Nelson Flores & Haiwen Chu. 2012. Latino emergent bilingual youth in high schools: Transcaring strategies for academic success. *Urban Education* 48(6). 798–827.

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.

Glowacka, Dorota. 2012. The trace of the untranslatable: Emmanuel Levinas and the ethics of translation. *PhaenEx* 7(1). 1–29.

Gutterm, Hanna, Lea Kantonen, Britt Kramvig & Aili Pyhälä. 2012. Decolonized research-storying: Bringing indigenous ontologies and care into the practices of research writing. In Pirjo Kristiina Virtanen, Pigga Keskitalo & Torjer Olsen (eds.), *Indigenous Research Methodologies in Sámi and Global Contexts*, 113–143. Leiden: Brill.

Hammersley, Martyn. 2018. What is ethnography? Can it survive? Should it? *Ethnography and Education* 13(1). 1–17.

Hine, Christine. 2000. *Virtual Ethnography*. London: SAGE.

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

Makalela, Leketi. 2019. Uncovering the universals of *ubuntu* translanguaging in classroom discourses. *Classroom Discourse* 10(3–4). 237–251.

McKinley, Jim. 2019. Evolving the TESOL teaching-research nexus. *TESOL Quarterly* 53(3). 875–884.

McKinley, Jim. 2020. Introduction. Theorising research methods in the ‘golden age’ of applied linguistics research. In Jim McKinley & Heath Rose (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Moll, Yasmin. 2017. Subtitling Islam: Translation, Mediation, Critique. *Public Culture* 29(2). 333–361.

Nguyen, Minh Hao, Jonathan Gruber, Jaelle Fuchs, Will Marler, Amanda Hunsaker & Eszter Hargittai. 2020. Changes in digital communication during the COVID-19 global pandemic: Implications for digital inequality and future research. *Social media + society* 6(3).

Noddings, Nel. 1986 [1984]. *Caring, a Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1934. *Collected Papers* V. (Charles Hartshorne & Paul Weiss eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2018. *Posthumanist Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2008. Interpreting as mediation. In Carmen Valero-Garcés & Anne Martin (eds.), *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas*, 9–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rose, Heath & Jim McKinley. 2017. The prevalence of pedagogy-related research in applied linguistics: Extending the debate. *Applied Linguistics* 38. 599–604.

Rose, Heath, Jim McKinley & Jessica Briggs Baffoe-Djan. 2020. *Data Collection Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London: Bloomsbury.

Sherwood, Peter. 2002. Derivability from ethnonyms: Notes on the Hungarian derivational suffix =SÁG/=SÉG. In Eugen Helimski & Anna Widmer (eds.), *Wüša wüša – sei gegrüßt! Beiträge zur Finnougristik zu Ehren von Gert Sauer dargebracht zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag*. 315–322. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Silverstein, Michael 2003. Translation, transduction, transformation. In Paula Rubel & Abraham Rosman (eds.), *Translating cultures: Perspectives on translation and anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.