

Singh, M. (2019). Learning to theorise from Bourdieu: Using Zhōngwén (中文) in English for research publication purposes. In G. Mu, K. Dooley & A. Luke (Eds.). *Bourdieu and Chinese Education: Inequality, Competition, and Change* (pp. 214-238). London: Routledge.

## **Learning to Theorise From Bourdieu: Using Zhōngwén (中文) in English for Research Publication Purposes**

Michael Singh  
*Western Sydney University, Australia*

### **Abstract**

There is pressure on researchers in Zhōngguó (中国 China) to disseminate their research in international refereed journals published in English. Training programs in *English for research publication purposes* (ERPP) address the challenges of researchers and *higher degree researchers* (HDRs) who want to, or feel pressed by governments and universities into, publishing their research in English-medium publications. Operating within a monolingual English-only framework, ERPP programs do not address the uses of researchers' translanguaging capabilities for theorising or the intercultural self-confidence required for such knowledge production. This chapter addresses the grounds for programs in ERPP operationalising a post-English-only approach to extending researchers' capabilities for theorising using analytical tools from Zhōngwén (中文 Chinese language) and English. The argument advanced here is informed by an investigation into a long-term ERPP intervention, which began in 2006. Extending the theorising capabilities of HDRs from Zhōngguó, this intervention addressed the challenges of using aphorisms in Zhōngwén as analytical tools when writing research for dissemination in English. Evidence from their publications is situated in reference to accounts of Bourdieu's (1977, 1991, 1993, 1999, 2004) efforts, and that of his translators, to disseminate concepts he developed in French among monolingual English-speaking researchers.

**Keywords:** academic English; disruptive; dissemination; domination; English for research publication purposes; English-medium universities; higher degree researchers; intercultural self-confidence; knowledge production; linguistic repertoire; monolingual mindset; multilingual; post-English-only; theorising; translanguaging

**Author note:** Michael Singh (Western Sydney University, Australia) undertakes teaching and research relating to localising Chinese language education through educating teachers via service-learning; pedagogies for internationalising research education that explore theoretic-linguistic divergences; disruptive innovations in English medium instruction, research and management, and the impact of the new spirits of capitalism on the learning and earning of young adults.

### **Introduction**

Across every discipline in many countries where researchers' first language is not English, there is a press for them to disseminate their research through publications in academic English (López-Navarro, Moreno, Quintanilla, & Rey-Rocha, 2015; Rezaeian, 2015). As Bourdieu and Passeron (1994/1965, p. 8) reminded us, "academic English" is no one's "mother tongue." Fifty years later, this is a significant point given that postcolonial migrants, post-Cold War refugees, and international students have increased the number of students capable of translanguaging practices in English-medium universities. Now, education is about the tensions between imposing provincial English-only habits onto these students, and translanguaging practices that offer the potential for enhancements in research and knowledge production (Verran, 2001).

However, English-medium universities have not moved in the direction of post-English-only approaches that add value to students' translanguaging practices. Disseminating research through English-medium publications has become a marker of researchers' academic performance and worth to the neglect of their translanguaging practices. *Higher degree researchers* (HDRs) are encouraged to do likewise as part of their candidature. The pressure from the state and universities for English-medium publications now surpasses researchers' professional desire to disseminate their research to global scholarly communities (Ge, 2015). Comparative ratings of nation states' knowledge-producing capacity sustain innovations which put English first, as do international rankings of universities and the international marketing of English-medium education.

Methods of research writing are difficult even for researchers working in their first language. For researchers in Zhōngguó (中国 China), their efforts to publish in English can be perplexing. Even rewriting research already published in Zhōngwén (中文 Chinese language) for publication in international English-medium journals can be a struggle (Cargill, O'Connor, & Li, 2012). Researchers who use Zhōngwén in their everyday academic work can find the challenges to meet the academic English requirements of journal editors, reviewers, and readers disconcerting. These challenges include the added intellectual demands of translating concepts from Zhōngwén and writing research in academic English, with its peculiar register and genres, thus demanding a large investment of time (e.g., Bai, Millwater, & Hudson, 2012; Kim & Lim, 2013; Yang, 2013).

Not surprisingly, the press for researchers in Zhōngguó to contribute to global knowledge production by writing for English-medium research journals has created an opportunity for monolingual English-medium universities to market a new field of knowledge. In Australia, the long-term disinvestment in funding the university education of the public by a serial coalition of Labor–Liberal governments drives this commodification of English. The problems many researchers from Zhōngguó face in producing papers acceptable for publication in such journals, and the pressure on them to comply with their university's publication performance requirements, have led to the creation of *English for research publication purposes* (ERPP). The government of Zhōngguó invests public taxes in funding ERPP training programs for its researchers. The focus of ERPP training is on putting into practice the principles for writing research in academic English (Corcoran & Englander, 2016).

ERPP training sees researchers learning strategies to make papers readable in academic English through creating coherent and cohesive structures. They learn to demonstrate their original contributions knowledge by indicating how findings differ from those currently available in English-language literature (Wallwork, 2011). Likewise, they make improvements in their English-medium research papers by actively reading publications in English in their own disciplines. Active reading entails underlining archetypal phrases that express various formulaic language functions, noting the structuring of research papers, and using segments of published papers as templates.

Research into ERPP training programs reports increases in researchers' competence in writing in academic English (Geiger & Straesser, 2015). However, a major concern is evident in the case made for ERPP. Corcoran and Englander (2016) explained that the rationale for ERPP is "the increasing demands on many [post-English-only] scholars outside the centre(s) of scientific knowledge production to publish their research in international [English-medium] scholarly journals" (p. 1). In other words, ERPP imposes English as the dominant language for disseminating the world's research and uses its dominance in global knowledge production to reinforce that dominance. In Bourdieu's (1999) terms, ERPP entails "the imposition of the dominant principle of domination" (p. 227). Publishing research in English is largely (but not exclusively) for monolingual English-speaking editors, reviewers, and readers, situated in reference to research already published in English. That English now commands the attention of governments, universities, and researchers throughout the world, the problem is that as "an 'authorized language,' invested with the authority of [largely monolingual English-speaking researchers], the things it designates are not simply expressed but also authorized and legitimated" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 170).

Three characteristics of monolingual English-speaking researchers are relevant to this study. First, they work with research published in English, the language of knowledge production. Second, some have a "monolingual mindset" (Creagh, 2017; Ndhlovu, 2015), seeing research through what they insist are the norms of academic English, or holding this to be the only language in which worthwhile research is produced and disseminated, or opposing the use of any other language for research. Third, some monolingual English-speaking researchers contest monolingual English-only instruction, research, and management. This move entails working to add value to knowledge production through inviting HDRs to employ knowledge from their languages to create meaning and explore what such "translanguaging practices" (García & Wei, 2014) mean for learning transformation. Together, these ideas inform a proposal for what a post-English-only approach to ERPP could look like for researchers from Zhōngguó. Likewise, for monolingual English-speaking researchers, translating their research into other languages makes possible its dissemination to a diversity of scholars (Hoffecker & Abbey, 2017).

Emerging trends in global knowledge production contradict the imposition of English as the dominant principle for research dissemination, and thus the dominant vehicle for generating advances in knowledge (Hollingsworth, Müller, & Hollingsworth, 2008). Zhōngguó, for instance, is now a knowledge-producing superpower, making advances in science and technology (Gupta, 2016). Researchers in Australian universities conduct world leading projects with researchers from Zhōngguó in artificial intelligence, supercomputing, driverless cars, and military technology (Iggulden, 2017). That researchers from Australia and Zhōngguó report on their research in English-medium journals ignores the asymmetry in global knowledge production, especially that being generated in Zhōngwén. In part, the rationale for teaching students throughout the world how to learn Zhōngwén is to engage with Zhōngguó as a knowledge-producing superpower (Wang, 2013).

Some researchers working in fields related to ERPP have raised concerns about the imposition of English-medium research publications as the dominant principle for dominating global knowledge production (Alatas, 2006; Chen, 2010; García & Wei, 2014; Ranciére, 2015). This research provides resources to guide disruptive innovations in using ERPP. This chapter addresses possibilities for post-English-only approaches to ERPP. Here, "post-English-only" refers to researchers extending their capabilities for theorising by using their full linguistic repertoire when publishing research in English. Such approaches make a theoretical advantage of researchers' translanguaging capabilities while accommodating the norms governing research writing in English given the tensions posed by the asymmetrical press for global

production and dissemination of knowledge in English. With an estimated 6,000 languages throughout the world, most countries have multilingual populations. Like Australia, Zhōngguó is a multilingual country (Liang, 2014). Many researchers in Zhōngguó speak Zhōngwén, English, and other minority or international languages. A minority of the world's researchers practice English-only monolingualism.

This chapter arises from a longitudinal investigation into a post-English-only approach to ERPP (Singh, 2018). Securing legitimacy for theorising in Zhōngwén in English-medium universities requires positioning within scholarly tradition. This study is situated in reference to Bourdieu's (1977, 1993, 1999, 2004) efforts to share his French concepts with monolingual English-speaking academics, albeit with the aid of translators. Bourdieu (1991) understood languages to be sociolinguistic phenomena, which are differentially valorised, with educational proficiency in languages being defined by institutionalised mechanisms rooted in linguistic hierarchies that structure the production and communication of human knowledge. By considering the dissemination of Bourdieu's French concepts in English-medium publications, it is possible to discern lessons for using analytical tools in Zhōngwén through research publications in English to report something new or distinctive. Taking a theory-building perspective (Swedberg, 2017), this study was designed to extend the capabilities of HDRs for theorising by using aphorisms in Zhōngwén as analytical tools when writing research for publication in English. This study provides grounds for considering what such a post-English-only ERPP program could look like in the context of Zhōngguó being a global knowledge-producing superpower.

## **French Conceptual Tools in English for Research Publication Purposes**

For me, the importance of Bourdieu's research lies in how he engaged in theorising, more than his analytical concepts (Singh, 2010; Singh & Han, 2010). However, this research was undertaken when my knowledge was slight; with the extension of my studies, this chapter brings forward and reworks these ideas from that research (Singh & Huang, 2013). The significance of Bourdieu's theorising resides in "the manner in which he produced, uses, and relates . . . concepts, substantive theories, methodological prescriptions, or empirical observations" (Wacquant, 1992, p. ix). Practically, theorising entails using metaphors as conceptual tools to generate propositions that provide insights into a given phenomenon (Swedberg, 2017). Rather than applying a predetermined theory, Bourdieu used metaphors as tools to analyse and enrich the meaning made of phenomenon he investigated. This section considers lessons from Bourdieu's efforts to have the conceptual tools he produced in French disseminated via English-medium research publications by HDRs uses aphorisms in Zhōngwén.

## **Collective Contributions to Theorising**

For Bourdieu (2004), theorising relies "on collective experience regulated by norms of communication and argumentation" (p. 72). Theorising benefits from the collective knowledge-producing capabilities of the world's post-English-only researchers regulated by norms of translanguaging practices for communicating and making scholarly arguments for the conceptual resources generated through their research. Thus, theorising involves a "reflexivity reflex" (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 89), whereby the meaning made of evidence and counterevidence serves to generate and test analytical tools. To mediate if not mitigate complacency, self-

indulgence, and narcissistic reflexivity, one's scholarly community, locally and internationally, subjects researchers' analytical concepts to critiques. As Bourdieu (2004) explained, theorising involves

collective process performed before an audience and subject to rules. . . . a peer group that is both very critical—the group for whom one writes, and the most daunting of audiences—and very reassuring—the group that underwrites and backs up (with references) and provides guarantees of the quality of the products. (p. 83)

Challenging Bourdieu's (2004) conceptual tools accords with his own scholarly ethos of mobilising collective critique to test and improve researchers' theorising. Not surprisingly, critiques have been advanced against Bourdieu's (1977) research (e.g., Goodman & Silverstein, 2009; Silverstein, 2004; Yacine, 2004). These critiques question the practice of collecting data in countries such as Zhōngguó and making exclusive use of theories disseminated in English (or those translated from French) for data analysis (Alatas, 2006; Chen, 2010).

Alternative approaches are possible. Scribner and Cole's (1981) study indicated that Vai literacy learners in Liberia have the capability for theorising, evident in tasks involving logic, reasoning, taxonomic categorisation, and metalinguistic reflection on knowledge about language. Rejecting any presumed divide between data collection and theory generation, post-English-only literacy education can extend these capabilities. Further, Street's (1984) study of Iranian villagers showed that literacy is a socially grounded practice, challenging mistaken assumptions that reduce literacy to mechanical or technical skills. Economic, political, and social factors adhere to literacy practices, which are affected by the mobilisation for changes in these domains. For English-medium universities enrolling ever more post-English-only HDRs, this research suggests that extending their capabilities for theorising is as important as learning mechanical techniques. Through translanguaging practice, they can use their linguistic repertoire to deepen their capabilities for theorising, capabilities needed for making original contributions to knowledge.

However, literature on ERPP says little about enabling flows of theoretical knowledge from the field of production in one language for dissemination in English-medium research publications (Corcoran & Englander, 2016; Wallwork, 2011). For Bourdieu (1999), the reason is that “competitors . . . often have a hidden interest in not understanding, or even in preventing understanding from taking place in others” (p. 221). It is not in the interest of ERPP programs to incorporate theoretical knowledge from other languages because of the competitive market advantage to be had in preventing understanding that theorising occurs in other languages. Intellectual competitors, Bourdieu (1999) contended, “constantly peddle prejudices, stereotypes, received ideas, and hastily simplistic representations which are fuelled by . . . misunderstandings, general incomprehension, and wounded pride” (p. 220). A focus on HDRs' technical research skills fuels incomprehension of theory and theorising (Swedberg, 2017) while reinforcing prejudices against theorising in other languages (Shusterman, 1999).

Bourdieu (1999) understood that the theoretical resources he generated in French are used in English in ways such that what they say does not matter, “so much as what they can be made to say” (p. 224). In the international competition for knowledge production and dissemination, ERPP comprises “the imposition of the dominant principle of domination” (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 227). For researchers in Zhōngguó, the dominant principle of domination is that English-medium journals are the vehicle for publishing their research, provided it references theories disseminated in English. Innovations that shore up the academic value of research published in English sustain the dominant principle of domination. Domination is effected through assigning status by ranking journals, identifying needs of researchers in

Zhōngguó for training in how to publish research in English-medium journals, promoting new commodities such as ERPP training, and struggling to protect the dominating position of English within the international education market. However, the commoditisation of Australian education due to the coalition of Labor–Liberal governments’ disinvestment in funding its universities undermines their capability to resist threats to their integrity by local and international corporate and political interests.

## Translating Conceptual Tools

Scholars confront challenges in translating Bourdieu’s concepts from French to English. Focusing on cross-sociolinguistic similarities and overlapping principles of theorising establishes plausible bridgeheads for translanguaging. The translation of French concepts into English alters their meaning as much as the socio-historical changes associated with the time delays taken for translations. These sociohistorical effects strain contextual differences in understanding Bourdieu’s concepts. This is evident in the 30-year delay between the 1965 publication in French of *Rapport Pédagogique et Communication* and its publication in English as *Academic Discourse: Linguistic Misunderstanding and Professional Power* (Bourdieu, Passeron, & Martin, 1994/1965). The evident changes in the titles suggest that conceptual divergences are more important than any literal or direct translation.

Likewise, Bourdieu’s use of the French word *méconnaissance* challenged the translator, given that “misrecognition” does not capture its rich meaning. To express this term as an analytical concept in English, the translator gave it a “specific scientific sense” (Nice, 1977b, p. xxvi) by making recurrent use of *méconnaissance* throughout *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990).

Bourdieu’s (1999) theories written in academic French contributed to, and bore the marks of France’s intellectual traditions, scholarly arguments, and public policy debates. Specially, the field of production for Bourdieu’s early French conceptual tools was imperial France and its colony, Algeria. Scholarly and public debates in France saturated the Bourdieu’s field of knowledge production, some of which Bourdieu, his translators and readers overlooked or took for granted. The lack of details about the context of theory production can pose challenges. Consider, for example, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, a product of Bourdieu’s (1977) early empirical studies:

Fieldwork in Kabylia which provided the ethnographic basis for this text and the starting-point for its reflections was carried out amid the tragic circumstances of the Algerian war [which] brought to a head the contradictions inherent in the ethnologist’s position. (Nice, 1977a, p. vii)

Although the theorising in *Outline* was a product of Bourdieu’s position in France’s war against Algeria’s national liberation, this is not necessarily evident in the book itself. Bourdieu (1977) undertook his research in the Algerian resettlement camps to which the French military moved the Kabyles. However, *Outline* does not refer to Bourdieu being part of the 400,000-strong French military involved in the Algerian War of Independence that ended its 130 years of colonial rule. Bourdieu produced his theorising about the Kabyles’ experiences in the context of the many anticolonial wars fought by imperial France (Goodman & Silverstein, 2009; Silverstein, 2004). However, *Outline* did not engage the Kabyles’ theorising about imperialism, colonialism, militarism, nationalism, liberation, or independence (Lane, 2000; Yacine, 2004).

*Outline* is “open to misreading” (Nice, 1977a, p. viii) for various reasons, in part because details of the context of production are not included in the translated text. Originally published in French in 1970, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), wrote *against* the structural Marxism advanced by Althusser (1969). Bourdieu’s innovative efforts to transcend or otherwise break out of Althusserian theorising appear contradictory and eclectic (Nice 1977a, p. viii). While intending to combat the structuralist perspective, it ensnared Bourdieu’s theorising, especially with their international circulation in English. His theorising amounted to no more than the claim that institutions of the state, schools and universities function to reproduce the viability of capitalism.

## **Monolingual English-Speaking Scholars’ Reception of French Analytical Concepts**

Integral to the publication of analytical concepts in French or Zhōngwén in English-medium research journals is their reception and engagement by monolingual English-speaking editors, reviewers, and researchers. For example, monolingual English-speaking researchers questioned Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of habitus by drawing attention to the problematic relationship between concepts generated in another language and their dissemination in English-medium research publications. For Lane (2000), the Bourdieuan concept of “habitus” means that the Kabyles had a disposition to position themselves as tradition bound, and this habitus structured their sense of “what can or cannot be achieved based on intuitions gained through past collective experience” (p. 25). Likewise, Fowler (1997) understood habitus as meaning that the Kabyles “choose actively what they are objectively constrained to do. Thus, they make a virtue out of necessity” (p. 18). In effect, Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of habitus positions the Kabyles as relying on their past collective experiences to sustain innovations in their traditions because French colonialism made it necessary for them to do so.

Bourdieu (1977) used the concept of habitus to explain that the Kabyles needed to satisfy their immediate material demands for subsistence. Their habitus was characterised by “temporal immediacy,” constraining them to focus on their daily needs (Lane, 2000). Hence, the Kabyles had no time for theorising their conditions of existence under French colonialism. They had no time to theorise what they had come to know of imperial France over the past century or more, or to theorise innovations that might disrupt French colonialism. The “temporal immediacy” of the Kabyles’ habitus meant they were bereft of time for “constructing a rational political project for the future” (Lane, 2000, p. 163).

Further, the habitus of the Kabyles made the “cultural reproduction of domination inevitable” (Bohman, 1999, p. 141), irrespective of whether that domination be French or Arab. Moreover, the Kabyles’ habitus meant they were unaware of how they themselves reproduced French colonial domination. This lack of awareness meant that they were unable to theorise how to “transform their social world through willed praxis” (Lane, 2000, p. 96). The habitus of the Kabyles constrained them to reproducing their subjugation, such that any self-generated “innovation and transformation [was] improbable and dependent on external social conditions” (Bohman, 1999, p. 141). They had to rely on Bourdieu’s (1977) theory to understand the limitations of their habitus and transformative possibilities. However, there are problems in taking habitus to mean that the Kabyles do “not have the capacity for rational calculation which would enable [them] to become a revolutionary force” (Robbins, 1991, p. 26).

The problem here is that forgoing interpretations of Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of habitus make it difficult to “account for the emergence of an indigenous liberation movement which [proved] powerful enough to provoke the downfall of a French Republic” (Lane, 2000,

p. 16). Moreover, the rise of the anticolonial liberation movements against France in Algeria (and in Cameroon, Madagascar, Vietnam, and Western Sahara) indicate that some colonised people made the time to theorise imperialism and liberation even while addressing their immediate needs. Their theorising informed the planning and enactment of their preferred futures outside the French empire. In other words, Algerian anticolonialists suspended their “investment in the immediate self-evidence of everyday life in order to make a rational calculation of possible future gains” (Lane, 2000, p. 21).

A danger in Bourdieu’s (1977) *Outline* is reading it as granting colonial researchers’ capabilities for theorising, while denying colonised peoples the intellectual agency they have for theorising (Bohman, 1999; Fowler, 1997). For example, Bourdieu did not give the Kabyles’ aphorisms any “specific scientific sense” (Nice, 1977, p. xxvi), using them instead as data to advance his own theorising (Yacine, 2004). Importantly, Bourdieu did not have an “ethnocentric belief in a congenital difference between the primitive and the modern mentalities” (Lane, 2000, p. 32). He also attributed the same lack of capability for theorising to the French working class. In contrast, Goodman and Silverstein (2009) and Margolis (1999) contended that theorising is a capability of all peoples. Bourdieu’s concept of habitus cannot fully explain the Kabyles’ theorising, which produced the innovations, which disrupted French colonialism and contributed to changes in their conditions of life, problematic though these remain (Roberts, 1982).

Bourdieu (1991, 1999, 2004) along with his translators invested considerable effort to have conceptual tools he generated in French disseminated via English-medium research publications. His efforts to do so provide useful insights for HDRs from Zhōngguó interested in developing their intercultural self-confidence through introducing analytical concepts in Zhōngwén into English-medium research publications. To meet the scholarly sensibilities of monolingual English-speaking academics, post-English-only researchers in Zhōngguó might consider how they can give metaphors in Zhōngwén the sense of being analytical concepts in English-medium journals. To aid the dissemination of concepts produced at a given time and place in Zhōngwén via English-medium publications, readers benefit from knowing the relevance of the sociohistorical field of conceptual production and understanding how the translation has been produced to accommodate a different time, place, and language.

Here it is important to avoid the genetic fallacy of assuming that the sociohistorical context of production decisively determines the meaning and uses of concepts. Specifically, it is a mistake to read Bourdieu’s theorising as absolutely determined by French imperialism, colonialism, militarism, and structuralism. This fallacy ignores the challenges of theorising the complexities of a given situation faced by all researchers, given that “there is no position from which to do an objective, detached study of one’s own sense of reality” (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1999, pp. 92–93). Neither past collective experiences of HDRs from Zhōngguó nor the objective constraints of today’s English-medium research publications deny them using aphorisms in Zhōngwén to develop intercultural self-confidence for theorising in Zhōngwén, a position from which they can pursue disruptive innovations in ERPP.

The investment made here in debating Bourdieu’s (1977) framing of the Kabyles’ habitus has been necessary for drawing lessons that might inform HDRs from Zhōngguó about developing their intercultural self-confidence through using analytical tools from Zhōngwén in ERPP. Bourdieu conducted his research in collaboration with formidable Kabyles intellectuals. His co-researchers and authors included Abdelmalek Sayad, Mouloud Feraoun, and Mouloud Mammeri who were variously a sociologist; teachers, poets and novelists. Designated as informants, they were dependant on the patronage of Bourdieu; their relationship with him bore the scholarly non-reciprocity inherent in French colonialism.

There are, however, two important lessons to be drawn from accounts of these Kabyles

intellectuals (Silverstein & Goodman, 2009). First, HDRs from Zhōngguó should question Bourdieu's concepts and theorising wherever warranted. These Kabyles intellectuals criticised Bourdieu's ethnographies for lacking attention to the specificities of the Kabyles' uses of their oral traditions and history in responding to their socio-political concerns. Likewise, their rich, textured accounts of the specificities of the Kabyles' life stood in marked contrast to Bourdieu's, even though his own theorising was derivative of scholarly conversations with them. Second, HDRs from Zhōngguó should extend their own proclivities for theorising in Zhōngwén and English. These Kabyles intellectuals' anti-colonialist theorising about the Kabyles' intellectual culture and modes of critique was informed by the classics produced by Ancient Mediterraneans from Greece. Through researching protests and strikes they theorised about the French colonial occupation as a socio-cultural rupture, recognising that post-colonial liberation would not create a tabula rasa free of the double yoke of patriarchy and religious authority. A challenge for HDRs from Zhōngguó is to mobilise forms of theorising through which they recognise themselves, promote their intellectual flourishing and build their intercultural self-confidence. The next section briefly considers methods for investigating a pedagogical intervention through which they could learn to invest their research with the added value that comes with theorising.

## Notes on Research Methods

This chapter arises from a longitudinal pedagogical study which, beginning in 2006, entailed working with HDRs from Zhōngguó to deepen their capabilities for theorising by using their full linguistic repertoire for research publications produced in English (e.g., Gao, 2012; Huang, 2011; Lu, 2017; Meng, 2012; Qi, 2013; Shen, 2017). The co-existence of hundreds of languages in English-medium universities produced through migration and internationalisation presents opportunities for translanguaging knowledge-producing practices. To do so, it was necessary to explore with these HDRs expected uses of their languages in producing and disseminating knowledge via English-medium publications to an international readership. To engage with the normative constraints that categorise languages as bounded vehicles for knowledge production and dissemination, this educational intervention began by inviting the HDRs' consideration of possibilities for supplementing their labelling as being of "non-English-speaking backgrounds" or as speaking "home" or "community" languages. Labels are sociolinguistic practices used to intervene in and to give effect to the constitution and shape research.

In response to the force of these insubstantial and elusive labels, they considered what "post-English-only HDRs" might mean for their production of analytical concepts from their full linguistic repertoire to make meaning of the evidence they were analysing. This multiplication of the labels available for these HDRs brought their translanguaging capabilities up against the university's dominant principle of domination expressed through English-medium instruction, research, and management. Strategies used in this educational intervention invited these post-English-only HDRs to extend their creative capabilities for writing research publications that used largely English along with Zhōngwén. Moving recursively, they accounted for the productive value of interrelationship among languages, identified the presence of loanwords in English and Zhōngwén, and explored divergences in concepts across these languages.

The HDRs who volunteered to participate in this study engaged in an ERPP training program, which was based on four presuppositions (Singh, 2010, 2011). First, the intellectual culture of Zhōngguó provides a portfolio of resources—aphorisms, metaphors, and images—

which can be given the sense of analytical concepts. Second, HDRs from Zhōngguó can extend their capabilities for theorising through using these resources in Zhōngwén to analyse the evidence they generate through research conducted largely in English. Third, they can use Zhōngwén in research reported in English-medium publications in ways that appeal to the sensibilities of editors, reviewers, and readers. Fourth, for intellectual freedom to have meaning in Australian universities, HDRs who elect to use translanguaging practices to extend scholarly debates should not be restricted, punished, or ostracised. These HDRs explored ways of verifying these presuppositions by drawing insights from Bourdieu's (1977, 1999, 2004) uses of French concepts in English-medium publications. The goals addressed here concerned the place of theorising within the international research community, especially the distribution of the capabilities for theorising within that community, and the relationship between making an original contribution to theorising and publishing in English-medium research journals.

The rationale for researching this educational intervention in ERPP draws on two interrelated fields of research. First, scholars who focus on interrupting academic dependency on theories produced or disseminated in English informed this method (Alatas, 2006; Chen, 2010). The problem of academic dependency, which is driven by English-medium instruction, research, and management, is that it mistakenly assumes the "world as a whole has one permanent centre from which culture changing ideas tend to originate" (Battiste, 2008, p. 184). In other words, the dominant principle of domination produces academic dependency on theories disseminated in English among post-English-only researchers. For HDRs from Zhōngguó to think critically about their academic dependency, they can learn from Bourdieu's use of French concepts in English-medium publications to extend their uses of concepts from their complete linguistic repertoire.

Second, historical evidence of the circulation of Asian and African theoretical ideas throughout Europe informed this research. The intellectual connections throughout Zhōngguó, Arabia, and Europe span the centuries (Hobson, 2004). Historical studies indicate that the uneven knowledge flows throughout Eurasia have produced far-reaching heterogeneity in the intellectual assets used for theorising (Goody, 2010). The historical record provides warrant for rejecting claims that Europe or Zhōngguó have totally separate homogeneous categories of knowledge (Clarke, 1997). As in the past, Zhōngguó has connections to global knowledge-producing networks. As a knowledge-producing superpower, Zhōngguó is the focus of intellectual and linguistic desires from beyond its borders. An appreciation of the history of alternations in global flows of knowledge production, dissemination, and appropriation (Goody, 2010; Gordin, 2015; Hobson, 2004) gives warrant to innovations in ERPP that effect translanguage knowledge flows. These disruptions include deepening post-English-only HDRs' capabilities for theorising using their full linguistic repertoire and mobilising the multiplicity of theoretical resources available across humanity's intellectual cultures and languages.

Bourdieu (1977) used over ninety Kabyles' aphorisms as data, analysing them to sustain arguments using his French concepts. Rather than reproducing this approach, this study focused on giving aphorisms in Zhōngwén a specific scientific sense as conceptual tools. The aims were to demystify theory and theorising for these HDRs from Zhōngguó and to build their intercultural confidence for contributing to international scholarly debates through generation theoretical tools in Zhōngwén. A key question for the HDRs who volunteered to participate in this study was what theoretical sense could aphorisms in Zhōngwén be given for research publications reported in English. To deal with this quandary, they began by using chéngyǔ (成语) or idioms (Mah, 2002) as conceptual tools to analyse evidence generated through their own research. The excerpts presented below indicate their uses of translanguaging practices (García

& Wei, 2014) to extend their theorising capabilities. Through translanguaging practices, the post-English-only HDRs made use of their full linguistic repertoire, explicitly integrating Zhōngwén and English into their research studies, bringing their translanguaging capabilities and the knowledge it provides them access to out of the shadows. The importance of these excerpts is that they contribute to evidence of post-English-only HDRs' intellectual enrichment through engaging the dominant principle of domination in ERPP.

## Using Zhōngwén Concepts in English-Medium Research Publications

For the HDRs in this project, producing theoretical tools from aphorisms available in Zhōngwén and using them in research publications produced in English were intellectual challenges. The following excerpt provides insights into reasons for this, including the misrepresentation of the intellectual culture of Zhōngguó and prejudice against creating analytical concepts from resources available in Zhōngwén:

I had various concerns about the value of conceptual knowledge from Zhōngguó for my research produced in English. These concerns emerged from my knowledge about the importance to me and Zhōngguó of undertaking education abroad and doing so in English. . . . By analysing these concerns I extended my disposition towards using conceptual tools from Zhōngguó in my research which was undertaken abroad and largely reported in English.

I acquired knowledge from abroad when I started to learn English; I was six years old then. This English language learning was extended during my studies at a British university in Zhōngguó where I was immersed in theoretical knowledge from abroad. When writing essays as a student at that university I was not encouraged to use theoretical sources from Zhōngguó. Too many citations to Zhōngguó references led to a minus mark. All students were discouraged from using Hànzì (汉字 written script) and concepts in Zhōngwén (Mù Tián, 目田).

This excerpt suggests that as a field of knowledge production, Zhōngguó produces no analytical concepts that are worthy of scholarly essays, let alone be published in English-medium research journals. Positioning Zhōngguó as a data-mining site makes English the vehicle for sourcing theories for its analysis. Often HDRs from Zhōngguó accept this positioning; the expectation is that they do so. In those universities in Zhōngguó where education is conducted within an English-only monolingual mindset, students' intercultural confidence in using Zhōngwén as a language for theorising is undermined. English-medium instruction fails to extend their capabilities for using conceptual assets in Zhōngwén as analytical tools.

However, through study abroad, some HDRs from Zhōngguó learn they can make an advantage of their translanguaging capabilities in what are ostensibly English-medium universities. They find that translanguaging practices enable them to work with concepts they know in Zhōngwén and then make strategic use of them in research produced largely in English. The following two excerpts theorise how this English-only monolingual mindset imposes constraints on education conducted in Zhōngguó and abroad, undermining the intellectual freedom required for using Zhōngwén analytical tools:

我用了“traditional”来形容中国的教学法，用“new”来形容 CLT。这个用词也暗示了 我对中国的教学法“没有信心”，因为 traditional 有点贬义在里面，而 new 又有一点宣扬褒义的成分。在 [British university in China], Chinese knowledge 是不受到推崇的。所以在一个西方国家做学术也好，教书也好，我都是很谨慎的运用中国的知识。中国的知识也经常被打上 traditional 的标签，而西方兴起的教学法常常是“new”。这可能也是 globalisation 给我们灌输的意识。所以，我现在本身就是一个矛盾体。

When HDRs developed their ideas in Zhōngwén, they included these in their research publications along with their elaboration of these ideas in English. Instead of making a direct or literal translation of the above, this HDR used the forgoing ideas as a stimulus to make meaning of the educational dilemma she had come to recognise. She brought these ideas together to extend her entry-level capabilities for theorising:

Rather than look for research reporting innovative teaching in Zhōngguó I used the terms “traditional” to conceptualise the methods for teaching in Zhōngguó, and “new” for imported ideas about communicative language teaching. On reflection, this hierarchy suggests my *misrecognition* (Bourdieu, 1977) of theorising in Zhōngwén about language teaching as “inferior” to the language education theory produced and disseminated in English. When I was studying at a British university in Zhōngguó, knowledge in Zhōngwén was refused re-cognition. Zhōngwén and the conceptual tools it provided access to, were rendered unrecognisable, being denied any place in our assignments. Therefore, thinking of knowledge in Zhōngwén as inferior became deeply rooted in my mind, my *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1977). When studying abroad, I was conservatively cautious when it came to producing conceptual tools in Zhōngwén for my research. It went without saying that writing and theorising in English was “natural.” Knowledge from Zhōngguó is always labelled, pejoratively as “traditional” while knowledge in English is often labelled, approvingly as “new.” This idea is informed by the globalisation of knowledge in English. Paradoxically, my research embodied these contradictory elements.

Here, a challenge for HDRs in this study was to verify the presupposition that Zhōngwén provides concepts for incorporation into English to make meaning of the evidence they had collected. They had to critically reflect on their knowledge of aphorisms in Zhōngwén, their appropriateness in speaking to the scientific sensibilities of monolingual English-speaking editors, reviewers, and researcher, and the conditions that might make it possible for them to be expressed as analytical tools in research published in English. Understanding that neither English nor French are the world’s only sources of analytical concepts tools (Gordin, 2015) built their intercultural confidence in using Zhōngwén as analytical concepts and extended their sense of intellectual freedom.

To avoid obscuring the specific scientific sense of an ordinary French word for monolingual English-speaking researchers, Nice’s (1977b) strategy was to use Bourdieu’s concept of *méconnaissance* without translation. When extracting concepts from their field of production in Zhōngwén to give the sense of being analytical tools in English, the HDRs provided additional details as a necessary part of their elaborated translations. The following excerpt illustrates the moves required to use Zhōngwén conceptual tools in a largely English-medium research report:

Philosophical concepts in Zhōngwén provided important analytical tools for making sense of evidence about the Australian school culture in which I worked as a volunteer teacher–researcher. To make sense of this situation I used the concept, *yīn dì zhì yí* 因地制宜. Here 因 (*yīn*) means “according to,” 地 (*dì*) means “location, places or earth.” 制 (*zhì*) means “making” and 宜 (*yí*) means “appropriate plans or measures.”

Historically, this concept, *yīn dì zhì yí* 因地制宜, once referred to an agricultural strategy (*dì* means earth). In twenty-first century Zhōngguó this concept has been given a specific urban sense, with *dì* now understood as the natural, socio-cultural and economic environments. Thus, the concept *yīn dì zhì yí* now means that an appropriate plan always has to take local conditions into consideration.

In terms of education in Zhōngwén there is a similar concept, *yīn cái shī jiào* 因材施教 which encapsulates the importance of learners. 因 (*yīn*) means “based on, according to.” 材 (*cái*) literally means “the wood which is used as material for building” but is a metaphor for “students.” 施 (*shī*) is a verb, means “conducting” and 教 (*jiào*) means “education” or “teaching.” Thus, students need to be educated to make a contribution to their country—and now the world—just as wood needs to be shaped for building a house. As a whole the concept *yīn cái shī jiào* means, teachers should conduct their teaching in accordance with student’s characteristics and capabilities so they can contribute to their country (e.g. Australia, Àodàliyà, 澳大利亚) and the world in which Zhōngguó is a knowledge producing superpower. *Yīn dì zhì yí, yīn cái shī jiào* 因地制宜, 因材施教 can be used to make sense of possibilities for localising the contents, teaching/learning methods and modes of assessment in teaching Australian school students how to learn Zhōngwén (Mi Tu, 米兔).

To accommodate the distance the aphorism had to travel across languages and intellectual cultures, a little of the field where it was produced was provided as part of the process of elaborating its specific scientific sense. The practice of theorising involves explaining a particular aphorism in Zhōngwén in a way that develops its sense as an analytical tool. The sensibilities governing monolingual English-speaking researchers who regard themselves as authorities on what constitutes theorising in English, despite well-established debates, provide the point of reference for these moves (Choi, 2010; Guo & Beckett, 2007). By using such aphorisms as analytical concepts, the HDRs extended their intercultural confidence and capabilities for theorising in Zhōngwén and English. They furthered their understanding of the structures, including those governing intellectual freedom, which enabled their production of theoretical tools in Zhōngwén for use in English-medium research publications.

The work of educating HDRs from Zhōngguó in universities, which privilege English-medium instruction, research, and management, provides evidence and a starting point for thinking critically about the contradictions inherent in this position. There are HDRs from Zhōngguó who can theorise about their positioning within the international education market and the positions available to them through the historically informed international education policy of Zhōngguó:

The Government's education policy in Australia claims to realise the importance of its students knowing key regional Asian neighbours. One reason for this is that Zhōngguó is Australia's largest trading partner. However, it remains to be seen just how essential monolingual English-speaking researchers in Australia see the need to better understand the theoretical assets of Zhōngguó.

The concept *zhī jǐ zhī bǐ, bǎi zhàn bù dài* “知己知彼，百战不殆” is especially relevant here. 知 *zhī* means “to know, understand or meet.” 己 *jǐ* means “myself” and 彼 *bǐ* means “other people, a partner or opponent.” Thus, the first part of this concept means: know the characteristics of one's self as well as those of one's partners or opponents. 百 *bǎi* means “hundred,” 战 *zhàn* means “war or fighting in a war,” 不 *bù* means “no or none,” and 殆 *dài* means “risks.” Thus, this part of the *chéngyǔ* 成语 means: “You could fight a hundred times with no failure.” However, you should not become involved in fighting a hundred wars. Having its origins in military theory produced in Zhōngguó, this aphorism proposes that if people want to win, they must know themselves as well as their opponents. That Zhōngguó and Australia are trading partners gives import to this proposition.

Zhōngguó invests heavily in Australian export commodities such as agriculture, education, energy, technology and tourism. In this context, the aphorism, *zhī jǐ zhī bǐ, bǎi zhàn bù dài* “知己知彼，百战不殆” means that Australia should know that its key international partner, Zhōngguó, has theoretical tools for explaining global patterns in language-and-knowledge production and dissemination. It should avoid the misrecognition of these. For Australian universities knowing Zhōngwén so as to engage in Australia/Zhōngguó theorising is likely to increase mutual understanding (Wéi Guān, 围观).

This excerpt indicates that HDRs from Zhōngguó are capable of theorising the illusions specific to English-medium universities, which make international education a commodity that works for economic-specific interests. The marketing of monolingual English-medium commodities such as ERPP is but one instance of this agenda. The economic importance of Australian universities being successful in their market engagement via education with Zhōngguó is undeniable. International education is a billion dollar industry, being a mainstay of Australia's economy and a vital part of the Government's economic plans (Australian Government, 2015).

Bourdieu (1993) misrecognised the Kabyles' theorising about France's imperial, colonial, and military power in Algeria and so did not engage with it. Likewise, the Australian Government misrecognises the warrant for intellectual engagement with Zhōngguó, which asserts its own agency through international education to become a knowledge-producing superpower. The Australian Government's (2015) international education policy is a mechanism for compensating for its disinvestment in the education of its public. HDRs from Zhōngguó apprehend the misrecognition evident in this Australian Government policy. Some theorise about its limitations and contradictions. Of course, Australian researchers are under no illusions about the specific motivations of Australia's government and the manifold shortcomings of its international education policy (Deloitte Access Economics, 2016; McCrohon & Nyland, 2018). Importantly, HDRs from Zhōngguó can multiply the positions available for an interested study of internationalising education through ERPP, inserting post-English-only knowledge production into this agenda.

In sum, HDRs from Zhōngguó can engage in theorising using conceptual tools they can access in Zhōngwén for dissemination in English-medium research publications. Through drawing on their full linguistic repertoire for ERPP, post-English-only researchers can be “reflexive in ways that are crucial for their ability to become aware of and change the conditions under which they act and speak” (Bohman, 1999, p. 140). Through their awareness of the theoretical resources available in Zhōngwén, the tensions posed by English-medium instruction, and their capabilities for giving a specific theoretical sense to aphorisms in Zhōngwén, they contribute to changing the conditions for publishing research produced in English.

## Heterodoxy and Orthodoxy

Here, Bourdieu’s (1977) concepts of heterodoxy and orthodoxy are helpful to making sense of ERPP as a field that brings together research education, languages, and theorising through research dissemination. The forgoing account suggests that HDRs from Zhōngguó can provide leadership for engendering post-English-only approaches to building intercultural self-confidence in theorising in English and Zhōngwén. Doing so entails two interrelated moves. First, the heterodox possibilities of researchers using their full linguistic repertoire to make original contributions to knowledge have to be explored. Second, the tensions posed by the orthodoxy of English-only research education and publication have to be investigated in reference to English being both necessary and insufficient for global knowledge production.

Opening up the portability of theoretical assets in Zhōngwén entails making it possible for them to move across intellectual cultures, languages, and education institutions. Specifying the analytical sense of aphorisms in Zhōngwén for English-medium research publications involves a heterodox string of innovations that disrupt any monolingual mindset. The selection of aphorisms in Zhōngwén takes into consideration the explanation required for journals produced for largely monolingual English-speaking researchers. Giving aphorisms in Zhōngwén the sense of being analytical tools is integral to appealing to reviewers’ sensibilities.

Monolingual English-speaking research educators in English-medium universities can sponsor post-English-only theorising in English-medium research publications. However, this stance means not joining the relatively homogeneous group of agents who control and sustain the power of orthodox English-only monolingualism and who oppose learning transformations that might disrupt the “dominant principle of domination” (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 227). For example, Corcoran and Englander (2016) recommended innovations in ERPP that sustain this orthodoxy, whereby “journal editorial committees . . . embrace diverse and divergent forms of English-language research papers” (p. 5). Inserted into the orthodoxy of English-only monolingualism, ERPP is a field occupied by agents who hold positions of power that take writing and theorising in English as the only acceptable ways of contributing to global knowledge production. The professional authority of heterodox agents of post-English-only approaches is stripped from away by orthodox elites who impose limits on the languages used for theorising and critical thinking.

However, while orthodox English-only monolingualism is dominant, it does not exist in a state of innocence, but rather it exists only in relation to humanity’s linguistic heterodoxy. In many places throughout the world, this orthodoxy has not managed to secure itself as natural or normal, as being above, and beyond question, except without violence. Migrant and international education provokes contact with the languages of diverse intellectual cultures that question ERPP. Such contact invites a suspension of innovations to sustain monolingual

English-only modes of knowledge production and dissemination. Critiques of English as the dominant principle of theoretical domination echo critiques of English-only hegemony (Alatas, 2006; Chen, 2010). The conventions governing monolingual English-medium instruction, research, and management are questioned (Macedo, Dendrinos, & Gounari, 2015). The globalisation of Zhōngguó provides a necessary condition for questioning the ERPP orthodoxy. However, in itself this is not sufficient for producing post-English-only theorising and research publications. Beyond questioning the orthodoxy of ERPP, there remains the work of publishing much more post-English-only research in English-medium journals for acceptance of this new academic convention.

In Bourdieu's (1977) terms, the state of heterodoxy at play in a world of English language imperialism (Choi, 2010; Guo & Beckett, 2007) and its associated theoretical colonisation (Alatas, 2006; Chen, 2010; Singh, 2015) signifies the presence of already existing choices. Given dissatisfaction with English-only monolingualism, the existing heterodoxy of humanity's languages sees some post-English-only researchers using their intellectual agency to conduct research which prioritises disruptive innovations necessary for changing the prevailing orthodoxy. The concept of *zhī jǐ zhī bǐ, bǎi zhàn bù dài* (知己知彼, 百战不殆) makes explicit an understanding in Zhōngguó about the hundreds of possibilities for competition in the world's established educational order. The following propositions might usefully inform moves to do so, as they point to the disruptive rather than reproductive uses of the Kabyles' knowledge for theorising.

For the Tamazight-speaking Kabyles, the following axiom expresses intellectual equality, "The [person] who has no enemies is a donkey" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 11). Thus, challenging post-English-only researchers to extend their capabilities for theorising by using their full linguistic repertoire "is to credit [them] with the dignity of [scholars] of honour, since the challenge, as such, requires a riposte and therefore is addressed to [researchers] deemed capable of playing the game of honour, and of playing it well" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 11). Languages make theorising possible. Highly specific versions of languages give form to theories. Theorising can be usefully analysed and better understood in relation to the languages in which researchers produce and receive such knowledge. From Bourdieu's work, researchers from Zhōngguó learnt that theorising entails transforming ordinary words into academic language through specifying their definition, context, and use. Forming and informing researchers capable of making positive uses of their full linguistic repertoire contributes to the struggles over languages in English-medium universities, which sanction negative processes for distancing themselves from Zhōngwén.

The Kabyles dismiss as dishonourable a challenge to anyone who is incapable of engaging with it: "Better that he should strip himself . . . than that I should unclthe him" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 11). Thus, monolingual English-speaking researchers dishonour themselves when challenging post-English-only researchers to engage in theorising, but deny them the use of their translanguaging practices. The international languages market incorporates inequalities, sanctions, and censorship which define what languages can and cannot be used for knowledge production and reception. To argue for disruption to the professional learning of monolingual English-speaking research educators and then to challenge a researcher for using pseudonyms in Zhōngwén to anonymise the names of Australian schools where she conducted her doctoral studies is an act of bad faith. There is more to the bad faith inherent in this challenge; naming Zhōngwén in relation to an imagined monolingual English-only Australian valorises an unnamed linguistic hierarchy. Such bad faith contains Australia's linguistic diversity so as not to disrupt or undermine the domination of English-only monolingualism. The expectation was for the researcher to adjust her intellectual ambition to realise her goal of theorising in Zhōngwén and English by wanting what the field

of English-only research publication offers her. Through peer review classifications governing linguistic hierarchies are “translated” into seemingly disinterested academic judgements of merit while reinforcing as unquestionable the legitimacy and maintenance of English-only academic research, processes, and products. However, making apparent the linguistic diversity of Australia’s schools through using Zhōngwén pseudonyms makes monolingual English-only prohibitions appear less axiomatic or natural. The monolingual mindset is delegitimised. The arbitrariness of seeing English-only research publications as the way of doing research and the way researchers ought to do it is recognised.

For the Kabyles, “the prudent, circumspect [person] does not get involved with [a senseless challenge]” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 12). Only critical analyses “coming from an equal in honour deserves to be taken up . . . for there to be a challenge, the [researcher] who receives it must consider the [researchers] who makes it worthy of making it” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 12). Making orthodox English-only monolingualism the “dominant principle of domination” (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 227) evident in ERPP opens its hierarchical order of languages for theorising to challenge. Post-English-only researchers’ capabilities for using their full linguistic repertoire to theorise gains legitimacy through them making their experiences of theorising in Zhōngwén evident in English-medium journals. Theories are both intellectual currency and educational commodities in the international academic marketplace where English currently holds a legitimate place in the world’s linguistic hierarchy. The manipulation of researchers’ linguistic resources contributes to the current domination of English in theorising and research publication. Rather than being unwitting partners, among the dominated are those willing to learn from those who currently dominate global knowledge production in order to compete for this distinction. The educational marketing and consumption of ERPP makes theorising an intrinsically sociolinguistic practice. Questions about the uses of languages in knowledge production and exchange always bring into play multidirectional relations of power and authority, governing the price for making such profitable contributions. Tamazight and Zhōngwén are among the world’s unequally positioned languages, constituted through competitive struggles over the production, dissemination, and uses of knowledge and the processing of theorising.

“Post-English-only” research, theorising, and publication names practices of translanguaging which exist namelessly in the shadows of English-medium universities. Post-monolingual ERPP explicitly addresses the need for post-English-only researchers to use conceptual resources from their various languages in English to extend original knowledge production, to deepen their theorising capabilities in those languages, and to publish in sophisticated academic genres in languages othered by English. Centres of global knowledge production exist beyond those in the world’s dominant language. Post-English-only researchers can use translanguaging practices to publish their research in international English-medium scholarly journals. Instances of post-English-only theorising which can command attention through publication are invested with the authority of their scholarly community—editors, reviewers, journals, readers, and those who cite the works. The *British Journal of Sociology of Education* and *Compare* are among those English-medium research publications in which theorising in Zhōngwén has been expressed (Singh & Han, 2010; Singh & Huang, 2013).

Post-English-only research publications gain legitimacy from the scholarly communities which authorise their dissemination. These innovations in ERPP also engender scholarly communities through the disruption of orthodox English-only monolingual knowledge production and dissemination. Post-English-only researchers verify their claims on intellectual equality from their capability to formulate instances of post-English-only theorising. In offering a means for expressing what is usually repressed, the mobilisation of their translanguaging capabilities announces what they can do, say, and be. Doing, saying, and

being a post-English-only researcher rests on a dialectical relationship between those with the power to make English the authoring language for research publications and groups which supplement this position by authorising post-English-only research, theorising, and publication.

## Conclusion

Unequal language/theory power relations are evident in the disjunction between humanity's linguistically divergent knowledge production and its asymmetrical dissemination via the use of ERPP. Academic English is not the first or preferred language of the majority of the world's researchers. Post-English-only researchers have a long-term interest in challenging the dominance of English-only instruction, research, and management in universities. To bring their HDRs' translanguaging practices out of the intellectual shadows, monolingual English-speaking academics encourage post-English-only education, despite university management turning against them.

This chapter has guided readers through an inherently complex argument via recursive moves using Bourdieu (1977) to encourage both critical thinking about Bourdieu's work and research informed by the spirit of Bourdieuan theorising. The argument is that translanguaging practices make a post-English-only approach to ERPP an educational possibility in English-medium universities. This is especially so where this approach is used as a vehicle for extending HDRs' theorising capabilities. Australia's English-medium universities have yet to confront willingly their failings in this regard.

Existing approaches to ERPP operate within an English-only monolingual mindset. Even so, such approaches warrant supplementation with more fulsome consideration of the possibilities post-English-only approaches offer researchers tasked with the challenge of publishing their research in English. There is need for further research by post-English-only researchers and their monolingual English-speaking colleagues into using the press for ERPP as a vehicle for extending their capabilities for theorising using their full linguistic repertoire.

Inequities in original knowledge production are growing due to increasing English-language hegemony and homogeneity in using theories produced in English. It is important to understand the changing approaches of those responsible for driving and enacting policy and pedagogy in Zhōngguó and abroad. There is a need for studies of the disruptions by post-English-only researchers to the inherently unequal relations of power within global research-driven knowledge production. Future theorising is likely to benefit from extending the collective knowledge-producing capabilities of post-English-only HDRs regulated by norms of translanguaging practices for communicating scholarly argumentation. Using concepts in Zhōngwén in English-medium research publications can contribute to the intercultural self-confidence necessary to counter the standardisation and homogenisation of the world's intellectual culture that is being aided by ERPP.

## References

- Alatas, S. (2006). *Alternative discourses in Asian social science*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Althusser, L. (1969). *For Marx*. London: Verso.
- Australian Government (2015). *Draft national strategy for international education* (For consultation). <https://internationaleducation.gov.au/International->

network/Australia/InternationalStrategy/Documents/Draft%20National%20Strategy%20for%20International%20Education.pdf

- Bai, L., Millwater, J., & Hudson, P. (2012). Chinese teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) academics' perceptions about research in a transitional culture. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(1), 91–102.
- Battiste, M. (2008). The decolonization of Aboriginal education. In P. Dasen & A. Akkari (Eds.), *Educational theories and practices from the majority world* (pp. 168–195). New Delhi: Sage.
- Bohman, J. (1999). Practical reason and cultural constraint. In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu* (pp. 129–152). Malden: Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). The social conditions of the international circulation of ideas. In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu* (pp. 220–228). Malden: Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu P., & Passeron, J. (1994/1965). Language and relationship to language in the teaching situation. In P. Bourdieu, J. Passeron, & M. Martin, *Academic discourse*, (pp. 1–34). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J., & Martin, M. (1994/1965). *Academic discourse*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cargill, M., O'Connor, P., & Li, Y. (2012). Educating Chinese scientists to write for international journals. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31(1), 60–69.
- Chen, K. (2010). *Asia as method*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Choi, P. (2010). Weep for Chinese university. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(2), 233–252.
- Clarke, J. (1997). *Oriental enlightenment*. London: Routledge.
- Corcoran, J., & Englander, K. (2016). A proposal for critical-pragmatic pedagogical approaches to English for research publication purposes. *Publications*, 4, 6. doi:10.3390/publications4010006
- Creagh, S. (2017). Multiple ways of speaking back to the monolingual mindset. *Discourse*, 38(1), 146–156.
- Deloitte Access Economics (2016). *The value of international education to Australia*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government.
- Dreyfus, H., & Rabinow, P. (1999). Can there be a science of existential structure and social meaning? In R. Shusterman (Ed.). *Bourdieu*, (pp. 84–93). Malden: Blackwell.
- Fowler, B. (1997). *Pierre Bourdieu and cultural theory*. London: Sage.
- Gao, T. (2012). *Shake your amazing body*. (Master's thesis). Penrith: Western Sydney University.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ge, M. (2015). English writing for international publication in the age of globalization. *Publications*, 3(2), 43–64.
- Geiger, V., & Straesser, R. (2015). The challenge of publication for English non-dominant-language authors in mathematics education. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 35(3), 35–41.
- Goodman, J., & Silverstein, P. (2009). *Bourdieu in Algeria*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Goody, J. (2010). *The Eurasian miracle*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Gordin, M. (2015). *Scientific babel*. London: Profile Books.
- Guo, Y., & Beckett, G. (2007). The hegemony of English as a global language. *Convergence*, 40(1/2), 117.
- Gupta, S. (2016). Science superpowers find common ground. *Nature*, 539(7629), S6–S9.
- Hobson, J. (2004). *The Eastern origins of Western civilisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffecker, L., & Abbey, D. (2017). From English to Chinese, Japanese, and Russian. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 105(1), 49–54.
- Hollingsworth, J., Müller, K., & Hollingsworth, E. (2008). China. *Nature*, 454(7203), 412–413.
- Huang, X. (2011). *A self-study of a Chinese teacher–researcher's practice of transnational knowledge exchange*. (Master's thesis). Sydney: University of Western Sydney.
- Iggulden, T. (2017, December 15). Australian universities accused of sharing military technology with China. *CNN News*. <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2017-12-15/universities-sharing-military-technology-with-china/9260496>
- Kim, L., & Lim, J. (2013). Metadiscourse in English and Chinese research article introductions. *Discourse Studies*, 15(2), 129–146.
- Lane, J. (2000). *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Pluto Press.
- Liang, S. (2014). *Language attitudes and identities in multilingual China*. Cham: Springer.
- López-Navarro, I., Moreno, A. I., Quintanilla, M. Á., & Rey-Rocha, J. (2015). Why do I publish research articles in English instead of my own language? *Scientometrics*, 103(3), 939–976.
- Lu, S. (2017). *Chinese modes of critical thinking*. (Doctoral thesis). Sydney: University of Western Sydney.
- McCrohon, M., & Nyland, B. (2018, January 12). The perceptions of commoditisation and internationalisation of higher education in Australia. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 1–10. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12564-018-9515-z>
- Macedo, D., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2015). *Hegemony of English*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Mah, A. (2002). *A thousand pieces of gold*. London, England: Harper.
- Margolis, J. (1999). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu* (pp. 64–83). Malden: Blackwell.
- Meng, H. (2012). *Democratising Australian, Anglophone research education in the face of Eurocentric knowledge transfer*. (Doctoral thesis). Sydney: University of Western Sydney.
- Nice, R. (1977a). Translator's foreword. In P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nice, R. (1977b). Translator's note. In P. Bourdieu & J. Passeron (1990), *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Ndhlovu, F. (2015). Ignored lingualism. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 35(4), 398–414.
- Qi, J. (2013). *Critique-based multilingual knowledge co-construction*. (Doctoral thesis). Sydney: University of Western Sydney.
- Rancière, J. (2015). *The method of equality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rezaeian, M. (2015). How to write and publish a scientific manuscript in English. *Journal of Human Health*, 1(3), 61.
- Robbins, D. (1991). *The work of Pierre Bourdieu*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Roberts, H. (1982). The unforeseen development of the Kabyle question in contemporary Algeria. *Government and Opposition*, 17(3), 312–334.

- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Shen, H. (2017). *Translanguaging for bilingual educational theorising in higher degree researcher education*. (Doctoral thesis). Sydney: University of Western Sydney.
- Shusterman, R. (1999). Introduction. In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu* (pp. 1–13). Malden: Blackwell.
- Singh, M. (2010). Connecting intellectual projects in China and Australia. *Australian Journal of Education*, 54(1), 31–45.
- Singh, M. (2011). Learning from China to internationalise Australian research education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48(4), 355–365.
- Singh, M. (2015). Against Asia-centric methods. In H. Zhang, P. Chan, & J. Kenway (Eds.), *Asia as method in education studies*, (pp. 144–162). New York: Routledge.
- Singh, M. (2018). Post-monolingual research methodology. In R. Erwee, M. Harnes, & P. Danaher (Eds.), *Postgraduate education in higher education, university development and administration* (pp. 1–28). Singapore: Springer.
- Singh, M., & Han, J. (2010). Peer review, Bourdieu and honour. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(2), 185–198.
- Singh, M., & Huang, X. (2013). Bourdieu's lessons for internationalising Anglophone education. *Compare*, 43(2), 203–223.
- Silverstein, P. (2004). Of rooting and uprooting. *Ethnography*, 5(4), 553–578.
- Silverstein, P. & Goodman, J. (2009). Introduction. In J. Goodman & P. Silverman (Eds.), *Bourdieu in Algeria*, (pp. 1–62). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Swedberg, R. (2017). Theorizing in sociological research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 43, 189–206.
- Verran, H. (2001). *Science and an African logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wacquant, L. (1992). Preface. In P. Bourdieu & L. Wacquant (Eds.), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (pp. ix–xiv). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wallwork, A. (2011). *English for writing research papers*. New York: Springer.
- Yacine, T. (2004). Pierre Bourdieu in Algeria at war. *Ethnography*, 5(4), 487–509.
- Yang, Y. (2013). Exploring linguistic and cultural variations in the use of hedges in English and Chinese scientific discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 50(1), 23–36.