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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to investigate potential pedagogies for extending Multilingual Higher Degree Researchers’ (MHDRs) capabilities for theorising by having them use their full linguistic repertoire. This longitudinal study (2008-2016) in post-monolingual intercultural education has engaged 79 MHDRs, who in addition to speaking English also spoke Chinese, Hindi, Tamil or Vietnamese. A sample of 12 participants volunteered to engage projects informed by pedagogies of intellectual equality. The most significant findings reported in this paper are that MHDRs who have the will can develop their capabilities for theorising by (a) exploring conceptual divergences within/between languages; (b) using metaphors from multiple languages, and (c) using images that give expression to their intercultural intellect.
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Introduction
Local/global restructuring of knowledge production over the course of the past century, gives warrant to reconsidering the inclusion/exclusion of the theorising possible through multiple languages. Despite the internationalisation of research education, where any consideration is given to developing researchers’ capabilities for theorising the focus remains steadfastly wedded to those theories in English, produced and disseminated by Anglophone universities (Swedberg 2016). This has troubled scholars for a long time (Hoffman 1997). However, theorising about this interconnected, multipolar world warrants academic inquiries into ways of developing Multilingual Higher Degree Researchers (MHDRs) capabilities for theorising. This paper reports on a longitudinal project that is exploring how and why MHDRs might develop the capabilities for theorising through using their complete linguistic repertoire.
Objective

This paper reports results relating to the objective of investigating the prospects for extending the pedagogies likely to improve MHDRs’ theorising capabilities by having them use their wide-ranging linguistic repertoire.

Research question

The research question addressed here is what pedagogies might be useful for extending MHDRs capabilities for making an original contribution through using their linguistic repertoire for the production of theoretical tools? Answering this question required a review of research reporting multilingual researchers’ theorising.

Multilingual Researchers Theorising

To develop their capabilities for making original contributions to theorising education, multilingual researchers are using concepts from their various languages in English. In doing so they are challenging the privileging of English-only expressions of Euro-American theory. For instance, it is recognised that the capabilities South Pacific researchers have for theorising are not being developed when Western technorational and Christian religious knowledge are privileged in the analysis of South Pacific education (Tuinamuana 2007). Let us briefly consider three illustrations from South Pacific multilingual researchers.

The Tongan concept of kakala (garland of fragrant flowers) is used by Thaman (2009) with teacher education students to define research. The process comprises toli (materials selection), tui (making of a kakala) and luva (presentation of a kakala as a sign of respect and love). Thaman’s (2009) intellectual struggle is directed against the unequal the division of intellectual labour that positions between Euro-American scholars as theorists and South Pacific multilingual researchers as data generators.

Using the concept of tālanga, Vaka’uta (2009) explores an alter-native way of reading from the perspective of a tu’a (commoner). As a way of reading, tālanga is defined as a way of being and speaking. Tālanga provides an analytical lens for Vaka’uta’s (2009) to theorise or otherwise give new meanings to human welfare, socio-political affairs and people’s relations with natural rhythms of the earth’s climate.

‘Buggery’ and ‘bricklaying’ have been framed as Parisian conceptual tools without question by monolingual English-speakers. This being the case, Refiti (2013: 30) reasons that similar theoretical work can be generated from Samoan concepts. Refiti (2013) uses Samoan concepts to analyse the intellectual struggle between efforts to extend the space of academic freedom (manu), and efforts to capture and control such possibilities (tapu). Here theorising entails (a) activating Samoan
concepts on the proviso that they are creative rather than merely descriptive; (b) stitching these concepts together with those from other languages, and (c) knowing full well that the edges have not been trimmed and the seams remain exposed.

Against this is the monolingual claim which argues for the strict separation of languages for academic purposes (Enama, 2015). For instance, the use of L1 with the L2 is opposed. Total engagement with and exposure to L2 is expected and insisted upon. Language compartmentalisation means that L1/L2 are kept separate as distinct cognitive systems. Any difficulties with using L2 are attributed to interference from L1. Many methods for effecting subtractive monolingualism are underwritten by English-only movements or mandates. However, the evidence suggests little difference in academic outcomes, and that using of L1 aids work in L2. The following section outlines a framework for post-monolingual intercultural education that warrants multilingual knowledge production AND engagement with English-only monolingualism.

**Post-Monolingual Intercultural Education**

Post-monolingual intercultural education is the concept I use to refer to MHDRs:

1. demonstration and justification of the scholarly significance of using their full linguistic repertoire for developing their capabilities for theorising and generating original contributions to knowledge,

   **AND**

2. also addressing (English-only) monolingual theory, pedagogies and policies, including its power and privilege (Singh 2013).

On the one hand, there are good reasons for MHDRs learning and using English in their research. Concerns arise when English is the only language in which MHDRs present evidence they actually collected in another language or undertake theorising using only conceptual tools produced in English. This privileging of ‘English for academic purposes’ reduces MHDRs’ other languages to ‘home languages’. This raises concerns about the marginalisation, if not suppression of other languages. In some instances, English-only monolingualism imposes constraints on MHDRs’ efforts to make original contributions to knowledge, and thus limiting their academic freedom. On the other hand, even though MHDRs seemingly have nothing that counts as theory in their linguistic repertoire other than theories given in English, post-monolingual intercultural education gives them grounds for verifying the presupposition that their linguistic repertoire does provide resources are potentially equally valuable for theorising as to those in English.
Postmonolingual capabilities for theorising

The aim of post-monolingual intercultural education is to verify the presupposition that MHDRs can develop their theorising capabilities through using their full linguistic repertoire (Singh & Cui 2012). Those who have the will work to:

1. generate analytical concepts to make meaning of data; to categorise evidence using typologies; to use images to elaborate nuanced propositions, to question existing ways of labelling knowledge claims, and to demystify theorising;
2. interrogate the conditions under which these concepts, metaphors, images and modes of critical thinking might be useful and relevant to sociolinguistic contexts beyond those where they were produced;
3. investigate the significance of multilingualism in making original contributions to theorising by exploring how the theoretical resources they produce might gain a reasonably wide degree of authority or legitimacy.
4. explore the conceptual divergences that arise from related ideas within/between languages to produce theoretical tools in the act of self-reflexively exploring their own capabilities for theorising.
5. identify the sense and sensibilities associated with English-only monolingual theory, pedagogies and policies, including any tensions these create by way of academic dependency and sites for making strategic changes in their field of inquiry.

Are there reasonable grounds for investigating post-monolingual intercultural education? There are at least three research programs that can give warrant for further this study, namely research into the deliberative translanguaging practices; histories of inter-language knowledge exchange and pedagogies intellectual equality. However, it should be noted, rather ironically, that these research programs tend to advance their theorising within an English-only monolingual framework. Thus, in departing from this agenda, these ideas are used in this study to reflect and give expression to post-monolingual intercultural education.

Deliberative translanguaging practices

Translanguaging calls forth MHDRs’ intellectual performance through working across their languages. Translanguaging goes beyond the binary logic of treating languages as completely separate, autonomous entities, resisting the asymmetrical power of monolingualism (Li & Zhu 2013). Here translanguaging refers MHDRs’ flexible use of their entire linguistic repertoire, all their potential theoretical resources from their different languages, in order to generate theoretical tools with which to make sense of the evidence they generate through their investigations. Of course,
through such translanguaging practices the meanings of ideas are reinvented as they move through time from place to place rather than simply being transferred or translated. As a deliberative practice of meaning-making, translanguaging can be used by MHDRs in-between conventional theorising practices and disciplines in English. They can use deliberative translanguaging practices across the spectrum of disciplines from Mathematics and Engineering, through Technology and the Arts to Languages and Sciences (METALS). Through such practices, MHDRs develop their capabilities for selecting and combining meaning-making concepts, metaphors, images and modes of critiques from their complete linguistic repertoire to make original contributions to knowledge. In effect, deliberative translanguaging practices provide MHDRs’ with new ways of saying and doing theory as well as being theorists.

**History of inter-language knowledge exchange**

The history of inter-language exchange of scientific knowledge provides further warrant for investigating the possibilities of post-monolingual intercultural education. Modern theory travels almost exclusively (but not quite) from Europe and North American across the world (Akena 2012). However, history documents the diverse array of knowledge from Asia, Africa, the Middle Easterners, and other places which fed into modern Euro-American knowledge production (Montgomery 2000). This knowledge enabled and drove Western European colonial, economic and technological ventures throughout the world. However, as Belting’s (2011) study demonstrates, the mobility of theoretical ideas across time and space saw them transformed by this movement, as well as them in turn transforming the context into which they moved. A challenge for interested MHDRs today is contribute to similar movements of knowledge through intellectual cultures by engaging in theorising using their linguistic repertoire.

**Pedagogies of intellectual equality**

The idea of equality of intelligence (Rancière 1991) adds to the warrant to answering questions about post-monolingual intercultural education. A conventional orientation to education foregrounds inequality, making equality a goal that is deferred into the distant future, reinforcing the expectation that it cannot be achieved. In contrast, pedagogies of intellectual equality (Singh 2011) take equality as “a point of departure, a supposition to maintain in every circumstance … not an end to attain” Rancière (1991: 138). Specifically, pedagogies of intellectual equality entail working with interested MHDRs to verify the presupposition that, intellectually they are equally capable of theorising using the full linguistic repertoire as are monolingual HDRs who only use English. Here there is a need for caution. Verifying the
presupposition of the equality of intelligence is most definitely not about proving that MHDRs have equal intelligence as judged by one test or another. The point is that MHDRs who have the will to do so, take the chance to see what they can do, say and be by with the working presuppositions (a) that they speak multiple languages (and do not just emit noise) and (b) that by using their linguistic repertoire they can demonstrate (to themselves in the first instance) that they are intelligent, reasoning and reasonable beings capable of theorising.

In sum, there is evidence, arguments and concepts in the literature that give warrant to investigating post-monolingual intercultural education. On the one hand, the literature informing post-monolingual intercultural education recognises that MHDRs have access to a wide-ranging linguistic repertoire for producing innovative theoretical resources. This research suggests that they can shuttle across their full linguistic repertoire to extend their capabilities for theorising by drawing concepts, metaphors, images and modes of critical thinking in their various languages. On the other hand, the concept of post-monolingual intercultural education explicitly acknowledges MHDRs’ investment in English, as well as licensing the questioning of the values of English-only monolingualism and the investments Anglophone universities have in its practices. Adopting this two-sided orientation, post-monolingual intercultural education presents for Anglophone universities opportunities for developing teaching/learning activities whereby MHDRs make scholarly use of their complete linguistic repertoire. However, there is still “a long way to go in developing teaching strategies out of these broadly conceived models” (Canagarajah 2011: 401). The next section explains the longitudinal multi-cohort study used to generate evidence to investigate possibilities for using post-monolingual intercultural education with MHDRs.

A longitudinal multi-cohort study

A longitudinal, multi-cohort study was designed to generate evidence which could test the support or otherwise for the post-monolingual intercultural education of MHDRs. This research design was used to identify (a) the potential of post-monolingual intercultural education across this time with changing cohorts of MHDRs; (b) the changes that the post-monolingual pedagogies produced in the MHDRs’ capabilities and willingness to use their complete linguistic to theorise, and (c) the changes warranted in these pedagogies themselves. Not surprisingly, this has proven to be a complex project. In terms of scope it has involved repeated interventions with different MHDRs to develop the theorising capabilities. For the purposes of this study they were categorised as MHDRs, and not labelled ‘non-English speaking background students’ as it fails to explicitly acknowledge their
linguistic repertoire.

In terms of population, over the past 12 years this longitudinal multi-cohort study has worked with 79 MHDRs who in addition to speaking English, also spoke Chinese, Hindi, Tamil or Vietnamese. They were all presented with a common experience, namely insights into post-monolingual intercultural education. In accordance with ethical requirements governing voluntary participation in this research project, a self-selected sample of 12 MHDRs willing engaged in the next phase of this project. The defining characteristics that these 12 volunteers shared included being *multilingual higher degree researchers*; a common educational experience, and engaging in a research-and-publication project to develop their theorising capabilities using their full linguistic repertoire.

In terms of duration, this study has been conducted over a long time, with the initial multi-cohort study beginning in 2008. Fortunately, this study design makes it possible to distinguish short from long-term pedagogical possibilities through comparing the research of the self-selected sample with those who only participated in the common experience focusing on post-monolingual intercultural education. The existing data that has been produced through this longitudinal study is now being subjected to retrospective analysis, and used prospectively to inform future pedagogical interventions and data collection. None of this is possible using one-off studies.

The next section presents evidence from only one MHDR, who speaks both English and Vietnamese. However, this evidence is part of a systematic, longitudinal research project that has sought to produce trustworthy and credible knowledge about the complexities of languages in research in Anglophone universities (e.g. Singh & Chen 2012; Singh & Huang 2013). Managers, academics and HDRs in these universities bring multiple meanings and dispositions for relating to multilingualism and English-only monolingualism.

**Most significant findings**

This section reports findings on the following pedagogies which have been investigated and found useful for extending MHDRs’ capabilities for theorising:

1. exploring *conceptual divergences within/between languages*
2. accounting for the value of using *metaphors* from multiple languages
3. demonstrating the uses of *images* in meaning-making.

**Exploring Conceptual Divergences Within/Between Languages for Theorising**

The expected, ordinary translation of học tập phục vụ cộng đồng is Service Learning. This term is used at universities in Vietnam including for instance at Ho Chi
Minh City University of Science, Ho Chi Minh City University of Social Sciences and Humanities and Hoa Sen University. Given that there are six words in the Vietnamese concept and only two in English, this open up possibilities for moving beyond the predictable, uniform interpretation of these terms as equivalent. This divergence opens up possibilities for exploring what else this concept might have to offer in making meaning of service learning.

Table 2 indicates that the potential for learning (học) though serving (phục vụ) is variable and complicated. Learning and serving can be linked by more than one channel, depending on whether it is driven by curriculum requirements or social responsibilities to the local community or to the nation. Further, the translation of phục vụ (serve) can speak to a philosophy of serving, albeit according to different societal interpretations or expectations. For some serving may a part of students’ work whereas for others there may be a hierarchical divide between working and serving, learning and earning. Thus, working (làm việc) may be seen as making a societal contribution, while serving (phục vụ, hầu hạ) is held in lower status and undeserving of honour. From one perspective, phục vụ (serve) means to do someone else’s work, while cộng đồng means of all groups work together as a community. However, from another perspective, phục vụ means to do work that benefits others, although cộng đồng may mean adding to what is held in common.

Table 1. Analysis of divergence in học tập phục vụ cộng đồng (Service Learning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word-by-word</th>
<th>English/Vietnamese meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>học</strong></td>
<td>1. imitate (bắt chước), follow a good example (theo gương), learn and enquire (Học hỏi), study,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. research (nghiên cứu),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. receive teaching/education (thọ giáo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tập</strong></td>
<td>practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>phục vụ</strong></td>
<td>1. do someone’s own work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. do work that benefits society or others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. serve someone in a service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. serve someone who has more authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cộng đồng</strong></td>
<td>of all groups, adding the common things, together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MHDRs confront the challenge of finding ways to make an original contribution to knowledge. They may do this by making the ordinary unfamiliar; and the predictable strange. To do so, MHDRs can explore the conceptual divergences within/between languages by probing the taken-for-granted, singular understanding of
concepts. This opens up new possibilities for making meaning of key concepts. Through exploring conceptual divergences within/between languages it is possible to engage in intercultural educational dialogues that shift the focus to questions to theorising rather than translation.

**Theorising Through Using Metaphors from Multiple Languages**

Extending MHDRs’ capabilities for theorising may entail them making an original contribution to knowledge through using metaphors from their multiple languages. Table 1 illustrates how “service” and “learning” are encoded in Vietnamese metaphors. By providing summary observations these metaphors provide a reasonable and persuasive means for making arresting arguments that make meaning of ‘service’ and ‘learning’. Together these metaphors may be used to scaffold the re-theorisation of received notions of service learning. In other words, these metaphors provide a means for making sense of “service” and “learning”, scaffolding the chance to theorise “service learning” differently. The selection of metaphors presented in Table 2 open up the intellectual horizon for theorising the relationship among (a) women; (b) the services they are required to provide in the workplace, the home and for the family and (c) the learning required to develop their talents and capabilities.

**Table 2. Vietnamese metaphors about service and learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vietnamese metaphors</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cờ nộp cờ té</td>
<td>There must be boys and girls in giving birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dông con là nhà có phúc</td>
<td>Lucky families have lots of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cây được không trái, gái được không con</td>
<td>A woman who cannot give a birth to children is like a poisonous plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phụ nữ học làm gì cho làm</td>
<td>It is no good for women to get a higher degree in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Đàn bà đại không qua ngôn có</td>
<td>Women cannot do anything outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khôn ngoan cũng thế đàn bà, đầu rộng vừng đại cũng là đàn ông/</td>
<td>Women can never be better and more thoughtful than men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Đàn ông nông cần giữ kín, đàn bà sâu sắc như con đường trái</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metaphors are used extensively in making meaning, reasoning and understanding. Such theorising involves using metaphors to ground evidence in an intellectual culture. In other words, metaphors are part of the conceptual system that informs how researchers think, speak and act. Following Lakoff and Johnson (2006), researchers’ conceptual system can be understood as being largely metaphorical, that is to say the way researchers think entails using metaphors. They contend metaphors, although having limitations, have more value as conceptual tools than as decorative literary devices. Thus, metaphors are not just frozen idioms or tired clichés employed as rhetorical devices or status markers. Metaphors provide a vehicle for imagining, reasoning and theorising about all kinds of research ideas: from selfish genes to the string symphony that is the cosmos. Based on the systematic analysis of a large array of metaphors it would be possible to categorise them and identify those that can be used productively as theoretical resources. The focus would then turn to explaining the metaphor schemata in terms of their particular contextual usage and specific themes. The analysis of evidence would give explicit illustration of the value added through using the metaphor schemata to structure the analytical discussion in which they are employed.

**Demonstrating the Uses of Images in Meaning-Making**

Here consideration turns the question of how and why visual images might be used as tools for theorising that is to convey and expand meaning-making. Figure 1 shows a well-known Đông Hồ woodcut painting. Focus on this painting for a few minutes. Insert yourself somewhere inside it. Think about its important features and proceed analytically to identify the logic at work in the relationships between the varying parts/parties. The performance of the norms and rituals of marriage are grounded in the sensibilities the villagers feel for each other. The customs that emerge to support this event extend beyond the villagers’ immediate community of affections. The villagers have the sense to reach out to others whose good favours must be secured.

In terms of sensibilities and sense, this image represents an artist’s efforts to make meaning of differential power relations. Specifically, it depicts how those who exercise one form of power work to soothe the dangers posed by another form of power in order to carry on the intergenerational reproduction of their lives. This painting expresses the critical thinking of an artist regarding the social, political, and cultural influences of macro-level societal forces on individuals at the micro-level. Moreover, this image depicts how individuals influence macro-level societal forces. The image points to the problems with assuming either the causal uniformity or the fragmentary specificity of human events. Instead, this image can be read as showing
an uneven patchwork of temporal and spatial registers which nevertheless evince meaningful patterns across the contingencies of human activities. As a vehicle for summarizing a scholarly argument, this image provides a useful way of triggering researchers’ visual-theoretical imagination.

Figure 1: Đám cưới chuột (Rat’s wedding),
Tranh khắc gỗ dân gian Đồng Hồ (Đông Hồ folk woodcut painting)

In the sciences dealing with nature it is common to use forms of visual representations to work out and present analyses. This includes using images to visually theorise gender in science itself (Shteir & Lightman 2006). Images such as charts, diagrams, calendars, networks and photographs provide vehicles that are acts of scientific interpretation. Common, mundane everyday images provide resources for interpretive analysis, while they can also offer a visual theory that delivers more than what is represented in the written text. The visualization of such theorising is on the agenda of MHDRs operating at the interface of knowledge exchange between intellectual cultures. It is possible to give visual form to theory and concepts associated with the operations of systemic social conventions; structural relations of power; language, theory and knowledge; and, change and containment mechanisms.

Images provide social commentaries that represent instances of, and inspire theorising. They draw on, and engage human capabilities to understand, to reason, to theorise in a multimodal ways - using words, numbers and visual representations. It is useful to struggle with the question of how such images might be used in theorising service learning. Images such as this might be used to create a livelier, provocative, and deliberately different if not unorthodox analysis of service learning. This intellectually energising visual representation provides MHDRs with puzzles from which to work out, and rework the visual sense and sensibilities that allow interpretations of service learning beyond conventional views. Importantly, images are open to being remade to create new meanings. There are possibilities for MHDRs to create different versions of this image by recasting the social relations, actions and
forms through which evidence of service learning is variously depicted by different stakeholders. For instance, an intellectual challenge for MHDRs could be to rework this image to generate a visual-theoretical representation of the relations governing power, language/knowledge and gender relations in service learning.

**Discussion**

Through this longitudinal multi-cohort study it has been possible to generate evidence of pedagogies which support the claim for using post-monolingual intercultural education with MHDRs. This research project sought to redistribute the relationship between HDRs’ multilingual capabilities and English-only monolingual pedagogies. Pedagogies for post-monolingual intercultural education focus on the relationship among MHDRs as knowers; them using their full linguistics repertoire; the forms of theoretic-linguistic tools they can generate, and how these intersect with Anglophone university fixations on the commodification of English and marketing of theoretical knowledge in English.

MHDRs studying at Anglophone universities are supposed to know the places where their linguistic repertoire can and cannot be deployed. For instance, they are told that languages othered by the English-only pedagogies of Anglophone universities are their ‘home languages’. Despite this, in the shadows of these universities English coexists with other languages. This longitudinal research project has sought to re-theorise their coexistence through novel pedagogical interventions. This has entailed rendering MHDRs full linguistic repertoire visible, making it part of the intellectual spaces and media for the development of their theorising capabilities and their production original contributions to knowledge. This has meant the redistribution of what makes sense with respect to the theorising MHDRs are capable of, and re-partitioning the sensibilities governing the educational uses of their diverse linguistic capabilities. The result has been the designation of a new form of MHDR pedagogies framed in terms of post-monolingual intercultural education.

**Limitations**

Several caveats are worth noting here. The aim of the project reported upon here is to see what happens as a consequence of efforts to verify the presupposition that all human languages are equally capable of being used for theorising - posing questions, creating analytical tools, and generating propositions (see Dixon 2016). However, this does not mean the negation or denial of theories or theorising in English. Rather it allows MHDRs to treat such knowledge as one intellectual resource to be developed and tested along with many others. In other words, this is not a matter of Anglophone education “reducing the claims of its own values or by moderating its commitment to
these, or even by ‘relativising’ its positions” (Jullien 2014: 140).

As part of learning to theorise across languages, this project accepts that MHDRs have to understand that research is a multidimensional struggle. In this instance, this includes the intellectual struggle to understand and work against relativism and nativism. Ethnocentrism is not countenanced as an answer to challenges presented by English-only monolingualism. Likewise, it is misguided to assume that all efforts at theorising through exploring divergences within/between languages will necessarily or invariably generate theoretic-linguistic tools that are as helpful as existing theories.

The project reported upon in this paper embraces intellectual innovations made possible by divergences in the expression of concepts, metaphors and images within/between languages and across intellectual cultures. However, it is not the ‘origin’ of these ideas in one or other intellectual culture that is at issue here. Nor is the focus on why knowledge developed in one culture is not elaborated therein, but advanced by another. This research project focuses on extending the capabilities MHDRs have for theorising as a way of making original contribution to knowledge. Its focus is on them developing theorising through scholarly arguments and is not concerned with capturing their ‘voice’.

This research project explores possibility for MHDRs from any country working their particular linguistic repertoire to produce original contributions to theoretical knowledge in the humanities and the social sciences. As such, this approach does not focus turning existing theoretical knowledge in those languages into modern theoretical resources. For instance, it is not concerned with using classical terms from Confucianism as theoretical tools. Moreover, acknowledging the multilingual capabilities of HDRs requires implementing educational measures that enable them to achieve high levels of academic proficiency in all their languages: for instance, English and Vietnamese; Chinese and English; Turkish and English; English and Hebrew.

**Recommendations**

Post-monolingual intercultural education provides a basis for investigating the questions of who is and who is not capable of theorising using their linguistic repertoire, and how might the invention of monolingualism (Gramling 2016) - in many languages (not just English) be confronted? Further research is needed to explore the question of whether MHDRs can develop their capabilities for theorising using so-called “local knowledge” for larger purposes. In other words, can MHDRs develop concepts, metaphors and images from languages other than English into theoretical tools that have less parochial and broad scholarly value? Further research is needed to investigate how theoretical resources produced through, for and within
particular language communities might be inscribed with more general scholarly significance. Thus, problems for future research include questions about who might produce theory and in what languages; where might MHDRs find resources for theorising, and how might they make defensible claims about the value and originality of their contributions to theorising.

Of equal importance, is the contributions made by English-speaking, monolingual research collaborators. More needs to be known about their work with MHDRs who elect to explore their linguistic repertoire, and their role in confronting the complex, tense entanglements with research management invested English-only monolingual theory, pedagogies and policies. Thus, there is a need to find ways post-monolingual intercultural education can offer English-speaking monolingual HDRs meaningful and compelling interpretations of their current condition and, provide attractive and inspiring possibilities for their scholarly future.

Conclusion

This paper indicates that post-monolingual intercultural education offers a framework for extending the scope of pedagogies by directly engaging the linguistic diversity made possible by the increasing presence of MHDRs in universities throughout Anglophone universities. Three pedagogies in particular might be useful for extending MHDRs capabilities for making an original contribution to the production, application and circulation of theoretical knowledge. MHDRs can develop their capabilities for theorising by using their complete theoretic-linguistic repertoire.

This research has particular significance for MHDRs. Importantly MHDRs can know their own capabilities for theorising using alter-native conceptual reference points while contributing to a common intellectual project for analysing and debating education. Some MHDRs may come to see themselves as being creators of new theoretic-linguistic knowledge that serve interests of beyond monolingual English researchers. Others may see ongoing efforts by MHDRs to deepen their capabilities for theorising using their full linguistic repertoire as part of the international intellectual struggle to extend the spaces of academic freedom. For others it might provide a counter weight to efforts directed at capturing and controlling such possibilities through English-only medium instruction.
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