

Multilingual Researchers Engaging in Educational Theorizing

M. Singh

School of Education, Western Sydney University,
Kingswood Campus, Penrith, Australia
m.j.singh@westernsydney.edu.au

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate potential pedagogies for extending and deepening *Multilingual Higher Degree Researchers'* (MHDRs) capabilities for theorising by having them use their full *linguistic repertoire*, and understand the reasons for doing so. This longitudinal study, which was initiated in 2003, has engaged a population of 79 MHDRs, who in addition to speaking English, also spoke Chinese, Hindi, Tamil and Vietnamese, in *post-monolingual intercultural education*. 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 make an original contribution to the production, application and circulation of theoretical knowledge by (a) exploring *conceptual divergences within/between languages* for theorising; (b) accounting for the value of *theorising through using metaphors* from multiple languages, and (c) demonstrating and developing *multilingual capabilities for theorising* using images. This paper, and the research project of which it is a part, indicates that MHDRs can develop their capabilities for theorising by using their full linguistic repertoire. Future research in Anglophone universities can further investigate ways to institutionalise this as a means for MHDRs to make original contributions to knowledge.

Keywords: conceptual divergences within/between languages, linguistic repertoire, multilingual capabilities for theorising, multilingual higher degree researchers, pedagogies of intellectual equality, post-monolingual intercultural education, theorising through metaphors

Introduction

Despite the internationalisation of research education, where any consideration is given to developing multilingual higher degree researchers' capabilities for theorising the focus remains steadfastly wedded to those theories in English produced and disseminated by Anglophone universities. However, local/global restructuring of knowledge production over the course of the past century, gives warrant to reconsidering inclusion/exclusion of the theorising possible through multiple languages. In particular, the absence of non-Western theories and theorising in efforts to internationalise research education has troubled scholars for a long time (Hoffman, 1997). In an era of international education, theorising about this interconnected, multipolar world warrants academic inquiries into the legitimate place of the full linguistic repertoire of multilingual researchers. This paper reports on a longitudinal project that is exploring how, why and under what conditions, including *Multilingual Higher Degree Researchers* (MHDRs) might develop the capabilities for theorising through using their complete linguistic repertoire.

Objective

A key objective of this project was to improve the trajectories by which MHDRs could develop their theorising capabilities so as to make original contributions to knowledge as an outcome using their wide-ranging linguistic repertoire (Singh, Manathunga, Bunda & Qi, 2016). This paper specifically focuses on reporting results relating to the objective of investigating the prospects for extending the scope of doctoral pedagogies by directly engaging the linguistic diversity made possible by the increasing presence of MHDRs in universities throughout the Anglosphere.

Research Question

The key research question addressed here is what pedagogies might be useful for extending and deepening MHDRs capabilities for making an original contribution through using their linguistic repertoire for the production of theoretical tools? Answering this question required the development of an appropriate theoretical framework concerning post-monolingual intercultural education.

Post-monolingual intercultural education

Efforts are being made to have universities which enrol multilingual students, as do many in the Anglosphere, contribute to research, education and scholarly debates about enriching their personal multilingual capabilities and advancing local/global multilingualism (Preece, 2011). Post-monolingual intercultural education is the term used here to refer to HDRs (a) demonstration and justification of the significance of their multilingual intellectual repertoire, and (b) addressing the intersecting power and privilege of English-only monolingualism theory, pedagogies and policies. Thus, post-monolingual intercultural education is a vehicle whereby MHDRs who seemingly have nothing that counts as theory in their languages other than English, to claim intellectual equality by verifying that their linguistic repertoire does provide resources equal to those who only have English for theorising. The term “post-monolingual condition” is used by Yildiz (2011: 4) to “identify a field of tension in which the monolingual paradigm continues to assert itself while multilingual practices persist or re-emerge”. Given these tensions, this means researching and representing the use of multiple languages for complementary modes of theorising in what are now mistakenly said to be English-speaking monolingual universities.

Postmonolingual Capabilities

Post-monolingual intercultural education enables MHDRs - and their monolingual research collaborators - to structure access to, and to affect the mobility of theoretic-linguistic resources and modes of critique across epistemic communities, albeit in tension with monolingual forces (and the larger anti-multicultural, and racist policies) (Singh, 2001; 2009). In doing so, MHDRs have the potential to develop their capabilities for:

1. theorising through categorising evidence using typologies; engaging analytical
2. concepts to make meaning of data; using images to elaborate nuanced propositions, questioning existing ways of labelling knowledge claims, and demystifying ‘theory’ itself;
3. using the concepts, metaphors and images available in their full linguistic repertoire to extend and deepen their theorising capabilities, including exploring the conditions under which these might be applied to sociolinguistic contexts beyond those where they were produced.
4. demonstrating 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.
5. using 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.
6. identifying the tensions and problems of academic dependency created by the privileging of English-only monolingual theory, pedagogies and policies that might provide sites for making strategic changes in their field of inquiry. This entails interrogating rather than taking for granted the conditions under which post-monolingual theorising is seen as useful and relevant.

Combined with everyday encounters with MHDRs, the intellectual resources that have made post-monolingual intercultural education thinkable, sayable and doable include postcolonial critical thinking, pedagogies intellectual equality, histories of intercultural knowledge exchange, and practices of translanguaging. However, these research programs which question Anglo-centrism tend to frame their critiques in terms of Anglo-European theories. This reflects and gives expression to tensions created by the English-only monolingualism, ironically asserting itself in theoretical practices that license post-monolingual intercultural education (Preece, 2011).

Postcolonial Critical Thinking

Postcolonial critical thinking has influenced the theorising that informs post-monolingual intercultural education. Postcolonial critical thinking focuses on concerns about the geopolitics of theoretic-linguistic knowledge and issues of local/global knowledge production, circulation and consumption (Manathunga, 2010; 2014). An inventory of what post-monolingual intercultural education owes scholars in the field of postcolonial critical thinking indicates their work has informed several strata of theorising in this emerging field. This includes informing the multilingual researchers' capabilities for analysing, interpreting and theorising concerns about academic dependency (Beigel, 2011; In, 2006). Further, postcolonial critical thinking has contributed tactics to the local/global dynamics of decolonizing theorising through the post-monolingual production of theoretical knowledge.

Pedagogies of Intellectual Equality

Another impetus for developing post-monolingual intercultural education has been provided by "pedagogies of intellectual equality" (Singh, 2011) which offer the potential for generating theoretical tools beyond English. A conventional orientation to education foregrounds inequality, making equality a goal that is deferred into the distant future on the expectation that it cannot be achieved. In contrast, pedagogies of intellectual equality take equality as "a point of departure, a supposition to maintain in every circumstance ... not an end to attain" Rancière (1991: 138). Pedagogies of intellectual equality entail working with MHDRs to see what they can achieved through working with them to verify the presupposition that intellectually they are equally capable of theorising using the full linguistic repertoire as monolingual HDRs (Singh, 2012). Thus, interested MHDRs have the chance to see what they can do, say and be by with the working presupposition that they speak multiple language (and do not just emit noise) and they through these languages they can demonstrates that they themselves are intelligent, reasoning and reasonable beings (Singh & Chen, 2011). However, 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.

History of Intercultural Knowledge Exchange

An additional stimulus for the development of post-monolingual intercultural education has come through insights into the history of intercultural knowledge exchange (Beckwith, 2012). Modern theory travels almost exclusively (but not quite) from Europe and North America across the world (Akena, 2012). However, history documents the diverse array of knowledge from Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and other places which fed into modern Euro-American knowledge production (Freely, 2011). This theoretical knowledge enabled European colonial, economic and technological work throughout the world. 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. The challenge for today's MHDRs is enable the movement of theorising from around the world toward Euro-American regions of theorising (Singh, 2013).

Deliberative Translanguaging Practices

Translanguaging calls forth MHDRs' intellectual performance through working across their languages. Thus, 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 theorise or otherwise make sense of the evidence they generate through their investigations (Singh & Cui, 2011). As a meaning-making activity translanguaging can be used by MHDRs in-between conventional theorising practices and disciplines in English. They can work across the spectrum of disciplines from Mathematics and Engineering, through Technology and the Arts to Languages and Sciences (METALS). Through translanguaging 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, translanguaging practices provide multilingual HDRs' with new ways of speaking and acting, knowing and of doing. Of course, through such translanguaging practices the meanings of ideas are reinvented as they move from place to place rather than simply being transferred.

In sum, the concept of post-monolingual intercultural education raises questions about the values of the English-only monolingualism and the investments Anglophone universities have in its practices. The marginalisation, if not suppression of other languages sees this monolingual orientation to MHDRs' education imposing constraints on their efforts to make original contributions to knowledge, and thus limiting their academic freedom. Not surprisingly, innovations in post-monolingual intercultural education are haunted by the press for monolingualism. However, post-monolingual intercultural education recognises that MHDRs have access to a wide-ranging linguistic repertoire for producing innovative theoretical resources that extend across and merge two or more languages (Singh, 2017a; 2017b). MHDRs shuttle across their full linguistic repertoire as they extend their capabilities for theorising by drawing concepts, metaphors and images in their various languages. Thus, post-monolingual intercultural education presents for Anglophone universities opportunities for developing teaching/learning activities and forms of reward for MHDRs' scholarly uses 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). Through a longitudinal multi-cohort study it has been possible to conduct research into pedagogies which make a small but nonetheless significant contribution to addressing this research problem.

A Longitudinal Multi-Cohort Study

The method employed to address the objective of this project and its research question has been a longitudinal, multi-cohort study. This research design was used to identify (a) the changes that the post-monolingual pedagogies produced in the MHDRs' capabilities and willingness to theorize, and (b) the changes warranted in these pedagogies themselves. However, templates for reporting research cannot capture the complexities of this project. For instance, the larger context for this research is that certain political/managerial elites do not care about, and do not necessarily want to know the 'facts' that research offers; instead they insist on whatever they believe. Nevertheless, in terms of scope it has involved repeated interventions to develop the theorizing capabilities of different individuals (Swedberg, 2016), in this instance all of whom were MHDRs. Here it must be noted, that in accordance with the theory investigated in this study they were not labeled 'non-English speaking background students' as is commonly the case. This longitudinal study investigated the potential of post-monolingual intercultural education across this time and across changing cohorts through studying pedagogies for developing MHDRs' capabilities for theorizing and willingness to use their complete linguistic repertoire in doing so.

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 educational 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 participants willing engaged with *pedagogies of intellectual equality* to develop their theorising capabilities using their full linguistic repertoire. Thus, these 12 volunteers shared being *multilingual higher degree researchers* as a defining characteristic and shared a common educational experience through developing knowledge of *post-monolingual intercultural education* and *pedagogies of intellectual equality*.

The duration of this study is such that it has been conducted over a long period of time, with the initial multi-cohort study beginning in 2008. Thus, this longitudinal multi-cohort study makes it possible to distinguish short from long-term pedagogical possibilities through comparing the theses of the self-selected sample and those who only participated in the initial educational program in *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, a person 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, contexts where managers, academics and HDRs bring multiple meanings and ways of relating to multilingual situations (for reports of related findings see for example Singh & Chen, 2012; Singh & Cui, 2011; Singh & Huang, 2013; Singh & Meng, 2011).

Most Significant Findings

This section reports findings on the following pedagogies which have been investigated and found useful for extending and deepening MHDRs capabilities for theorising, specifically for theorising Service Learning:

1. exploring *conceptual divergences within/between languages* for theorising
2. accounting for the value of theorising through using *metaphors* from multiple

- languages
3. demonstrating and developing multilingual capabilities for theorising using *images*.

Exploring Conceptual Divergences Within/Between Languages for Theorising

The expected, ordinary, predictable 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 this Vietnamese concept and only two in English, this opens up possibilities for moving beyond the uniform interpretation of the terms as equivalent. This divergence opens up possibilities for exploring this concept in depth.

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 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 an ideology of serving, albeit according to different societal interpretations. For some serving may be a part of people's work whereas for others there may be a hierarchical divide between working and serving. Working (làm việc) is seen as making a societal contribution, but serving (phục vụ, hầu hạ) is held in lower status and undeserving of honour.

Table 1

Analysis of Divergence in Học Tập Phục Vụ Cộng Đồng (Service Learning)

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

MHDRs confront the challenge of finding ways to make an original contribution to knowledge. They may do this by making the ordinary, the expected and the predictable unfamiliar or 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 by shifting the focus to questions of theorising rather than translation. From one perspective, phục vụ (serve) means to do someone else's work, while cộng đồng means of all groups 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.

Theorising Through Using Metaphors from Multiple Languages

Post-monolingual intercultural education is oriented to extending MHDRs' capabilities for theorising. In this instance, this entails 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 theorise '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 of making sense of "service" and "learning", scaffolding the chance to theorise "service learning" differently.

Table 2

Vietnamese Metaphors about Service and Learning

Vietnamese metaphors	English translation
	Service
<i>Có nếp có tẻ</i>	There must be boys and girls in giving birth
<i>Đông con là nhà có phúc</i>	Lucky families have lots of children
<i>Cây độc không trái, gái độc không con</i>	A woman who cannot give a birth to children is like a poisonous plant
	Learning
<i>Phụ nữ học làm gì cho lắm</i>	It is no good for women to get a higher degree in education
<i>Đàn bà đại không qua ngọn cỏ</i>	Women cannot do anything outstanding
<i>Khôn ngoan cũng thể đàn bà, dẫu rằng vụng dại cũng là đàn ông/</i>	Women can never be better and more thoughtful than men
<i>Đàn ông nông cạn giếng khơi, đàn bà sâu sắc như coi đưng trâu</i>	

Metaphors are used extensively in making meaning, reasoning and understanding. Such theorising involves using metaphors to ground evidence in the intellectual culture. In other words, metaphors are part of people's conceptual system that informs how we think, speak and act. For Lakoff and Johnson (2006) people's conceptual system is largely metaphorical, that is to say the way we think is a matter of metaphors. They contend metaphors have more value as conceptual tools than as decorative literary devices. Thus, metaphors are not just matters of rhetoric let alone frozen idioms or tired clichés. Metaphors provide a vehicle for imagining, reasoning and theorising about all kinds of issues.

In this instance, the metaphors 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) educating their talents and capabilities. This entails systematically analysing large array of metaphors, a selection of which is represented in Table 2 to identify those that can be used productively as theoretical resources. The focus is then on explaining the metaphors in terms of their particular contextual usage and specific themes; giving explicit illustrations of the value added through using metaphor schemata in analysing evidence, and using metaphors to structure the analytical discussion in which they are employed.

Developing Multilingual Capabilities for Theorising Using Images

Here consideration turns the question of how and why visual images might be used as tools for theorising, that is to convey and contain or expand meaning-making. Figure 1 shows how a Đông Hồ woodcut painting. As a vehicle for summarizing a scholarly argument, this image provides a useful as a way of triggering researchers' visual-theoretical imagination. Focus on this painting for a few minutes; insert yourself somewhere inside it; think about its important features and precede analytically the logic at work in the relationships between the varying parts. The performance of the norms and rituals of marriage are grounded in the affections the villagers feel for each other. The customs that emerge to support this event extend beyond the villagers' immediate community of affections, outward to others whose good favours must be secured. In effect, this image represents an artist's efforts to make meaning of differential power relations, specifically how those with limited power work to soothe the dangers posed by the powerful in order to carry on their lives. This painting expresses the social, political, and cultural critical thinking of an artist regarding the influence of macro-level societal forces on individuals at the micro-level, and 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, it can be read as showing an uneven patchwork of temporal and spatial registers which nevertheless evince meaningful patterns across contingent human activities.



Figure 1: Đám cưới chuột (Rat's wedding), Tranh khắc gỗ dân gian Đông 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 visually theorising gender in science itself through the uses of images (Shteir & Lightman, 2006). Images such as charts, diagrams, calendars, networks and photographs provide vehicles for acts of scientific interpretation. Common, mundane everyday images provide resources for interpretive analysis, offering more than what is represented in the written text. The visualization of such theorising is on the agenda of multilingual researchers 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.

Paintings that provide social commentaries 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 paintings 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 readers with puzzles from which to work out, and rework visually the sense and sensibility that might allow different interpretations of service learning to conventional views. Because of its openness to making 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. For instance, an intellectual challenge for MHDRs could be to work on this image to explore its visual-theoretical potential for representing the relations governing power, language/knowledge and gender relations in service learning.

Discussion

This research project sought to redistribute the relationship between HDRs' multilingual capabilities and English-only monolingual pedagogies. MHDRs in 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 HDR pedagogies framed in terms of post-monolingual intercultural education.

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. However, English-speaking, monolingual research collaborators can be important. They can work with MHDRs electing to explore their linguistic repertoire as they confront complex, tense entanglements with research management invested English-only monolingual theory, pedagogies and policies.

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 Euro-American education "reducing the claims of its own values or by moderating its commitment to the, 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, including in this instance an intellectual struggle to understand and work against relativism and nativism. Thus for instance, ethnocentrism is not countenanced as an answer to challenges presented by English-only monolingualism (Singh, 2015b). 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 (Belting, 2011). This research project focuses on extending and deepening 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’ (Young, 2009).

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

Recommendations

The basis for the research reported here is the question of whether MHDRs can develop their capabilities for theorising using so-called “local knowledge.” In other words, can they develop concepts, metaphors and images from languages other than English into theoretical tools that have less parochial and much broader scholarly value. Pedagogically, post-monolingual intercultural education reformulates the questions of who is capable and who is not capable of theorising using their linguistic repertoire, and how to confront the intervention of monolingualism - in many languages (not just English) (Gramling, 2016). 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. 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. Of equal importance, 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

Multilingual higher degree researchers can develop their capabilities for theorising by using their complete theoretic-linguistic repertoire. 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 and deepening MHDRs capabilities for making an original contribution to the production, application and circulation of theoretical knowledge.

References

- Akena, F. 2012. Critical analysis of the production of Western knowledge and its implications for Indigenous knowledge and decolonization, *Journal of Black Studies*, 43 (6), 599-619.

- Beckwith, C. 2012. *Warriors of the Cloisters*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Beigel, F. 2011. Academic dependency, *Global Dialogue*, 2 (2), 19-20.
- Belting, H. 2011. *Florence and Baghdad*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press.
- Canagarajah, S. 2011. Codemeshing in academic writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, (95), 40-417.
- Dixon, R. 2016 *Are Some Languages Better than Others?* Oxford: OUP.
- Freely, J. 2011. *Light from the East*, London: I.B. Tauris.
- Gramling, D. 2016. *The Invention of Monolingualism*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Hoffman, S. 1997. An American social science, *Daedalus*, 106 (3), 41-60.
- In, K. 2006. Academic dependency, *Korean Journal*, 46 (4), 115-35.
- Jullien, F. 2014. *On the Universal*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. 2008. *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Li, W., and Zhu, H. 2013. Translanguaging identities and ideologies. *Applied Linguistics*, 34 (5), 516-535.
- Manathunga, C. 2014. *Intercultural Postgraduate Supervision*, London: Routledge.
- Manathunga, C. 2010. Intercultural postgraduate supervision, *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, (20), 5-23.
- Preece, S. 2011. Universities in the Anglophone centre, *Applied Linguistics Review*, (2), 121-145.
- Rancière, J. 1991. *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Shteir, A. & Lightman, B. 2006. *Figuring It Out*. Hanover: UPNE.
- Singh, M. 2001. Advocating the sustainability of linguistic diversity, in J. Lo Bianco (ed.), *Policy Activism in Australian Language Policy* (pp. 123-149). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Singh, M. 2009. Using Chinese knowledge in internationalising research education, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7 (2), 185-201.
- Singh, M. 2011. Learning from China to internationalise Australian research education, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48(4), 355-365.
- Singh, M. 2012. Pedagogies of intellectual equality for connecting with non-Western theories, in H. Wright, M. Singh, and R. Race, (eds.), *Precarious International Multicultural Education* (pp. 237-258). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Singh, M. 2013. Worldly critical theorizing in Euro-American centred teacher education? In X. Zhu and K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Global Teacher Education* (pp. 141-169). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Singh, M. 2016. 'Other thoughts' to guide research educators, candidates and managers. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 48 (5), 535-539.
- Singh, M. (2015b). Against Asia-centric methods. In H. Zhang, P. Chan and J. Kenway (eds.), *Asia as Method in Education Studies* (pp. 144-162). New York: Routledge.
- Singh, M. (in press/2017a). Emergent post-monolingual research methodology, in R. Erwee & P. Danaher (eds.) *Handbook on Developing and Administering a University*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Singh, M. (in press/2017b). Urban education across the post-colonial, post-cold war South Pacific, in G. Noblitt and W. Pink (eds.) *International Handbook of Urban Education* (2nd edition), Dordrecht: Springer.
- Singh, M., and Chen, X. (2012). Ignorance and pedagogies of intellectual equality. In A. Lee and S. Danby (eds.), *Reshaping Doctoral Education* (pp. 187-203). London: Routledge

- Singh, M., and Cui, G. 2012a. Epistemic justice and the communication of non-Western theoretical tools. In A. Yeung, C. Lee & E. Brown, (eds.), *Communication and Language* (pp. 303-324). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Singh, M., and Huang, X. 2013. Bourdieu's lessons for internationalising Anglophone education. *Compare*, 43 (2), 203-223.
- Singh, M., Manathunga, C., Bunda, T. and Qi, J. 2016. Mobilising Indigenous and non-Western theoretic-linguistic knowledge in doctoral education. *Knowledge Cultures*. 4(1) 54–68.
- Singh, M., and Meng, H. 2013. Democratising western research using non-western theories, *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(6), 907-920.
- Swedberg, R. 2016. Can you visualize theory? *Sociological Theory*, 34 (3), 250-275.
- Yildiz, Y. 2011. *Beyond the Mother Tongue*, New York: Fordham University Press.
- Young, M. 2009. Education, globalisation and the 'voice of knowledge', *Journal of Education and Work*, 22 (3), 193-204.