Valuing a translingual mindset in researcher education in Anglophone higher education: supervision perspectives

(Jane Andrews[1] and Richard Fay)

Abstract

This article explores some implications of plurilingualism and translingual practice for teaching and learning in higher education. Research in this area tends to focus on the undergraduate experience whereas our focus is on doctoral supervision, a less-discussed but rich site for studying plurilingual and translingual practice. We consider linguistic aspects of research supervision interactions and linguistic practices in research sites in real world contexts. Revisiting a data set of written, self-reported, researcher profiles, the article explores how doctoral researchers and supervisors explain, and reflect on, their linguistic practices in supervision interactions and associated research practices. The data set is analysed by means of a thematic analysis informed by our reading of applied linguistics research into plurilingualism and translingual practice. The analysis highlights a wide range of linguistic practices and conceptualisations of languages in research, including, on the one hand, a separation of languages, and, on the other, a fluidity in how researchers use their diverse linguistic resources for different purposes in their research practice. The article concludes with the recommendation that researcher education should foreground language more than is currently evident in some Anglophone higher education contexts, and that this can be framed in terms of plurilingualism and translingual practice.

Keywords:

plurilingualism; researcher education; translingual practice; translingual researcher mindset

[1] Corresponding author: jane.andrewsEDU@uwe.ac.uk

1.   Introduction

In this article, we explore a set of publicly-facing, written, researcher reflections generated as part of a research network[2] which sought to foreground the possibilities for, and complexities of, using multiple languages in research practice. The network was set up because we had to come to realise that such possibilities and complexities were under-discussed outside language-focused disciplines. Further, in our UK higher education contexts, institutional policy and researcher education vis-à-vis language considerations were similarly minimal. The network, therefore, sought to shine a spotlight on researchers' thinking about ways in which they used language(s) in their research. It was not framed by a particular conceptualisation of language and languages – rather, it simply used 'multilingual' as a familiar term for the researchers with whom were we engaging. The discussion in the article is organised as follows: we first introduce the background to the research network project; then, with reference to the literature on *plurilingualism*, *translanguaging*, and *translingual practice*, we outline the conceptual position regarding language and languages which has guided our thinking about researcher education in Anglophone higher education in the UK. Next, we set out our research methodology for the study reported here, before presenting a thematic analysis of supervisor and doctoral researcher profiles. We then discuss the implications of the themes seen in the data for linguistic practices within doctoral supervision and as extending to the research studies being supervised. We conclude with guiding principles, informed by our data analysis, intended to support the doctoral researchers' and supervisors' development of a *translingual researcher mindset* especially, but not exclusively, in researcher education provision in Anglophone higher education settings like ours.

2.   The research network project

The research network brought together researchers from different disciplines in order to share and explore the linguistic practices in their research including: consulting literatures in different languages; language choices when negotiating access to research participants; working with data gathered in one language and reported in another; and interactions in supervision teams where a range of linguistic resources are available. The project website was designed to publicise and report on the specific events of the network but, additionally, it provided a space for public-facing, written profiles from any interested researchers in which they could share their reflections on their own understandings and practices of using more than language in the research process. It is these profiles which are the focus of the analysis and discussion in this article and they have already

---

informed earlier work (see Holmes et al. 2013, 2016). The more focused analysis presented here, building on the foundation of that earlier work, explores researchers' practice(s) vis-à-vis language in doctoral supervision and related research. The objective was to draw out some implications for researcher education especially in Anglophone higher education contexts. The researcher profiles were self-authored by researchers in response to this invitation posted on the website and forwarded to participants of the network events:

> Researchers are invited to reflect on their experiences of researching multilingually (including supervision of e.g. doctoral students working multilingually) and also on their developing awareness of the complexities and possibilities of this multilingual dimension to research practice.

The invitation generated thirty-four profiles of which six came from the research network team themselves and the remaining twenty-eight were either from network event participants or respondents directly to the website invitation. The home disciplines of profile writers included ones with a foregrounded linguistic specialism (e.g. applied linguistics, intercultural communication, linguistics, and modern languages) and others where this was less the case (e.g. counselling and couselling psychology, education, Jewish studies, philosophy, and social anthropology). Their profiles ranged in length from 147 to 831 lines and were, in the majority of cases produced in English, although Arabic, Danish, and Spanish were also represented. They contained reflections on a variety of aspects of research practice, including previous or current experiences within doctoral research, drawing upon different language repertoires in research and any challenges associated with this. The researchers were self-selecting – i.e. they chose to submit their profiles – and, perhaps unsurprisingly, the profiles do not contain the negativity – i.e. language as 'problem' rather than 'resource' (cf. Preece & Marshall, this Issue, Preece, 2019) - that we heard about elsewhere in the project.

Although our analysis was driven by a concern for Anglophone higher education, and by our UK university contexts in particular, it is important to remember that researchers involved are complex individuals. Thus, while a supervisor might have been UK-based at the time of the profile writing, they may have taught and worked in non-Anglophone universities in other countries previously, and whilst the dominant language in their ongoing supervision might be English, they may have experience of supervising using other languages. Similarly, doctoral researchers may be reflecting on recent or more distant experience which took place in the UK or in another Anglophone setting, and the languages they use in their research might have very different parts to play in their academic and wider lives. But, taken together, this set of self-selected researchers provide us with a

rich source of insights into the language aspects of the co-constructed supervision space within researcher education.

3.   Conceptualisations of languages in research

For Canagarajah (2013, p. 9), the "umbrella term" *translingual practice* captures the "common assumptions" shared by terms including *plurilingualism* (Corcoran et al., 2018; Coste et al., 2009; Kubota, 2014; Marshall, 2009; Marshall & Moore, 2013; Preece, 2019) and *translanguaging* (e.g. García & Kleyn, 2016; García & Li Wei, 2014; Li Wei, 2018; Otheguy et al., 2015). Such assumptions include: the need to problematize the understanding of languages as separate, bounded, labelled entities; the recognition of the ideological nature of labelling; the fluidity with which users make use of all the available linguistic codes in their repertoire; and the integrated competence with which users make use of their linguistic repertoire in contrast to the idea of competence as language-specific. These assumptions are ones we also shared in our analysis of the researcher profile data. Although this was originally generated as stimulated by a 'multilingual' reference point, the analysis reported below was based on the fluidity and dynamic nature of an individual's repertoire and the ways in which the multilingual resources within this repertoire "overlap and intersect, and develop in different ways with respect to languages, dialects, and registers" (Choi et al., 2018, p. 1).

We have found Canagarajah's umbrella term *translingual practice* (Andrews & Fay, 2018a, 2018b) helpful when engaging with the differing terms articulating these common assumptions. In our earlier writing about linguistic preparation for research, we argued for the development of a translingual researcher mindset (Andrews & Fay, 2018a, pp. 230-232). We noted that, although "more thinking and planning relating to languages in research will always be invaluable", the particularities of each context of research make it impossible to prescribe a curriculum for linguistic preparation for research. Instead, a key objective of researcher education vis-à-vis language(s) in research might be support for researchers (in our case, both supervisors and their students) in developing "a translingual mindset". We argued that such a mindset is built on linguistic preparation. Thus, researchers can usefully find out about three language-related issues, namely: the linguistic features of the context of the research (i.e. focusing on the way that language in that context has been shaped by historical, political and geographical considerations); the language preferences and habits of the participants in that research; and the way in the linguistic is understood in disciplinary research tradition in which the research has been designed.

We also argued that such a mindset might be encouraged by researchers from one disciplinary background engaging with the practices of other research traditions. Overall, we proposed that, "for researchers preparing to work with people and ideas in linguistically diverse contexts, … raising awareness of, and developing skills in, a 'translingual mindset' will be valuable" (Andrews & Fay

2018a, p232). These proposals were our initial steps towards a more systematic approach to researcher education regarding language and research. We now want to extend this thinking more explicitly to researcher education (including both doctoral researcher development and supervisor awareness training), and do so focusing on researcher education in Anglophone university settings.

Such settings demonstrate considerable variation around the globe, and, for the purposes of this article, we acknowledge that our thinking is driven largely by our immediate experience of researcher education in our UK university contexts. Notwithstanding the linguistic diversity evident within and around our institutions, nor their (aspirationally) internationalised character, the institutional and pedagogical practices of our institutions - with the exception, to some extent, of language-focused departments - are ostensibly monolingual. Thus, the day-to-day business of university governance and management is undertaken in and through English, and the pedagogic and epistemological consequences of English-based teaching, learning, research, and knowledge-work are rarely discussed. Further, the linguistic repertoires of staff and students tend to be similarly devalued, being narrowed, for example, to concerns about English competence, particularly whether the level of English is seen as adequate from international and other staff and students for whom English is not a first language.

Thus, our institutions operate essentially monolingually despite the linguistic diversity within and around them. Teaching and learning (including researcher education) takes place very largely in and through English with little or no value attached to the diversity within the linguistic repertoires and practices of staff and students. This monolingual-English orientation is also evident, as elaborated upon in the work of Lillis (2010), in the dominance of English in global academic publishing. A good case could be made for embracing the *plurilingual turn* or vision (Coste et al., 2009; Piccardo, 2018) in order to challenge these institutional practices and the Anglocentric, monolingual myth (Edwards, 2004) on which they seem to be built. Such an embrace, although it has traditionally been located in the school sector rather than higher education, can be seen in the inclusion and delineation of plurilingual competence in the Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR, 2018). Distinctive attention is given in the framework guidance to the skill of mediation in supporting communication between individuals who cannot communicate directly with each other. The possible affordances of mediation and plurilingual competence in the context of researcher education will be explored later in this article.

In keeping with the essentially monolingual Anglophone institutional practices of teaching and learning, with the exception of some language-oriented studies, doctoral supervision and examination is also undertaken in and through English. In our UK-based experience, doctoral provision pays little attention to the wider linguistic diversity in the immediate context, or in the

researched contexts; nor is attention given to the linguistic richness of many of the researchers' repertoires or those of their participants and supervisors; nor is it accorded to the literatures in other languages which could inform the researched topics and phenomena. With these considerations in mind, we now explain our methodology and methods of working with researcher profiles to explore reports of, and reflections on, linguistic practices in the sites of doctoral supervision and research practice.

4.   Methodology

The profiles identified for this article formed about half of the total set of profiles. We explored the content of the profiles through an interpretivist lens (Silverman, 2014), making use of a process of thematic analysis (Braun & Clark, 2006) with codes being generated in an inductive way (Thomas, 2006). This enabled us to notice reported reflections and experiences of importance to the profile writers. We undertook a close reading of the content of the profiles to explore the experiences of doctoral supervision as reported by the profile writers. We focused on their conceptualisations of language in research in terms of the languages used in supervision interactions and language issues planned for and/or encountered in the research itself. Our presentation and discussion of the data are guided by the themes that emerged. These were informed by the literature on plurilingualism, translanguaging, and translingual practices in education.

We explored 14 data extracts from six supervisors and seven research students from our data set of self-authored researcher profiles. It is important to note that the six supervisors were not working with the seven research students and, further, they were not necessarily in the same institutions as each other. Hence, issues raised by a supervisor or student were not in response to what another respondent had raised. However, we can observe that as the data set developed on the project website and it was publicly available, it is possible that profile writers were influenced in what they shared by other profile writers' reflections and experiences.

The extracts focused upon below have been selected due to their capacity to offer the richest opportunities for us to analyse conceptualisations of language as reported in research supervision interactions and the research itself. The extracts from supervisor profiles are presented and discussed then the same process is used for the research student profiles. Both data sets are explored through the themes that emerged from the thematic analysis, namely: separating languages; valuing and foregrounding languages; moving beyond language; and fluid linguistic practices.

5.   Findings and discussion

5.1   Supervisor data

The findings and discussion in this section are based around seven data extracts from five academics who undertook doctoral supervision as part of their academic work in different UK universities. The data extracts are presented together below and a discussion follows.

> Extract 1:
>
> *"Looking back, I appear to have been undeterred by the fact that I had no knowledge of Russian. Oddly enough, I don't recall ever having considered that this might be problematical. As it turned out, it wasn't, because the supervision team included an expert Russian linguist. It also helped that the researcher who wrote the thesis was supremely competent."*
> *Supervisor 1*

> Extract 2:
>
> *"At present I supervise a range of PhD students who are working multilingually and who have all increased my awareness of ethical, creative and sensuous dimensions to multilingual research, as well as to the limits to the concept of multilingualism and whatever we may define as the limits of 'the multilingual field."*
> *Supervisor 2*

> Extract 3:
>
> *"The stimulus for my interest in 'researching multilingually' has been a constant concern in the back of my mind as I have supervised doctoral students from numerous countries. They were obliged to write in a foreign language, English, even though they collected and analysed data in another language, usually their first or dominant language. The translation of their data had to be treated as unproblematic if they were not to get lost in writing their thesis by going down pathways of reflection on the nature of translation or, when reflecting on their own thought processes, the relationship of language and thought."*
> *Supervisor 3*

> Extract 4
>
> *"To me, their [doctoral students'] research is always 'multilingual' because of the number of different discourses which need to be untangled and negotiated. I think these discourses can be thought of as small languages, and can have just as much complexity in their differences as large language – especially as these differences may not always be immediately apparent."*
> *Supervisor 4*

> Extract 5
>
> *"Much of my recent career has involved supervising doctoral research students from a range of linguistic backgrounds. They have all carried out critical qualitative studies, mostly of aspects of professional life in English language education. They have taken on some very tricky areas, such as the cultural politics of native-speakerism, and the identities of students which go against common cultural stereotypes. In almost all cases we have worked together to find ways to uncover hidden and unexpected meanings which go against established discourses. "*
> *Supervisor 4*

> Extract 6
>
> *"… the way in which the researchers themselves need to acquire different (small) languages – of being a researcher and of being a professional at least, which take from different parts of one's identity. Mastering and working with these different (small) languages of course require building*

on experience from life; and living and working with more than one (big) language will certainly add to one's repertoire of such experience."

Supervisor 4

Extract 7

"I began to realise that writing in English was not just a 'language issue', but involved questions and dilemmas about identity and cultural values. For instance, several Saudi students said that they found it 'Western' and 'self-centred' to write in the first person and to put themselves at the centre of the thesis (as required by their supervisors) and that they felt disempowered, not being able to create the multi-layered text (drawing on metaphors) which they could compose in Arabic."

Supervisor 5

It is notable that in this small set of supervisor reflections there does not appear to be a consensus on what is needed for supervisors and research students to make effective use of their own and each others' linguistic repertoires for doctoral supervision. Instead, a spectrum of conceptualisations of language emerges in the reflections. This spectrum moves from a position of expectation that linguistic competence is essential (Extract 1) if a study involves data and/or participants using a language other than English, to an expansive attitude which encourages a supervisor to reflect that all doctoral students are involved in engaging with multilingualism (Extract 4) due to the need to negotiate and use different discourses in doctoral studies.

The positioning of students within the supervisors' profiles also varies. In Extract 1, Supervisor 1 values the linguistic expertise of the doctoral researcher (who is "supremely competent") and signals that this contributes to successful supervision relationships. The possibility of supervisors learning from doctoral researchers is also noted by Supervisor 2 in Extract 2. Supervisor 2 refers to doctoral researchers "who have all increased my awareness of ethical, creative and sensuous dimension to multilingual research", which attributes innovative thinking and the pushing of boundaries to doctoral researchers. Supervisor 4 in Extract 6 positions the doctoral researcher as a collaborator in the supervision dialogue in which joint meaning making is taking place. The supervisor explains "we have worked together to find ways to uncover hidden and unexpected meanings" which shows that they do not see themselves as the more knowledgeable team member but as a fellow researcher who is ready to share ideas as an equal.

These examples of doctoral researchers as empowered and empowering members of supervision teams contrast with Extract 3 in which the supervisor expressed their concern for students working across different languages in their studies. Supervisor 3 notes in Extract 3 that in order for such studies to be achieved successfully, the doctoral researcher may need to treat translation issues as "unproblematic if they were not to get lost in writing their thesis". The implication of this comment is that the supervisor is needed as a guide so as to avoid the doctoral researcher losing their way or giving too much attention to questions of language in research, such

as translation. The language issues raised by the research are presented as problems due to their having the potential to distract the doctoral researcher and delay their completion of the study. Interestingly, Supervisor 3 also reveals a concern that perhaps such issues have not been given the attention they merit when saying they have "a constant concern in the back of my mind as I have supervised doctoral students from numerous countries".

Two supervisors explore the impact of issues operating in connection with, but beyond language, which they consider to have an influence on supervision interactions. Supervisor 4 in Extract 5 refers to the need for doctoral researchers undertaking "critical qualitative studies, mostly of aspects of professional life in English language education" to interrogate discourses inherent in data and literature relating to the study. The implication here is that paying attention to language in research practice involves more than just considering translation or interpretation. For Supervisor 4, researching in a critical paradigm will lead doctoral researchers and supervisors into analysis of discourses regardless of whether the research can be seen as multilingual or not.

Supervisor 5 in Extract 7 reframes the issue raised in the research profile prompt when observing that "writing in English" is less of a concern than the "questions and dilemmas" which arise when a doctoral student encounters different cultural practices and expressions of identity within the UK doctoral format. This supervisor provides the example of students from Saudi Arabia who had found writing in the first person an unfamiliar and unwanted style for them. The expectation of the written style for a doctorate produced in the UK meant that these students "felt disempowered" and could not write in their chosen style using features which they would use when writing in Arabic. Supervisor 6 refers to these dilemmas as relating to "identity and cultural values" as seen to arise when students from one linguistic and cultural background are studying and being examined in a different linguistic and cultural context, in this case, Anglophone higher education in the UK.

The supervisor data explored above illustrates a spectrum of ideas and concerns about how to advise doctoral students who are drawing on plurilingual resources for their research work. Across this spectrum, the four themes mentioned above can be considered. To recap, these are: separating languages; valuing and foregrounding languages; moving beyond language; and fluid linguistic practices. Supervisors 1 and 3 reveal an orientation towards languages as separate entities. Managing these separate entities within the research study is a task to be shared by doctoral researchers and supervisors. Supervisor 1 considers this process to be effective when the linguistic competence of the whole team is assured. Supervisor 3, however, considers this to be a challenging task in which the supervisor needs to guide the doctoral researcher to support them and avoid them "getting lost".

Supervisors 2 and 4 demonstrate a welcoming and expansive orientation towards languages in research, pointing to the theme of languages being valued and foregrounded. Both supervisors share that working with different languages with doctoral students is both commonplace and also a source of learning and collaboration for them as supervisors. The theme of moving beyond language emerges from Supervisors 5 and 6, who note that when considering languages in research there is an inevitability that this will lead on to connected questions of identity and culture. For Doctoral Researcher 5 there is similarly an inevitability that questions in the areas of language, discourse, culture and identity will arise when a research study is shaped within a critical paradigm.

In contrast to the theme of 'separating languages' already explored and evident in the supervisor data, the idea of languages as being resources which can be used in a fluid manner is also present. Supervisor 4 notes that doctoral researchers may be involved in using or acquiring what are referred to here as "small languages". These small languages are exemplified in extract as being those associated with different contexts such as professional life or the academic research field.

As already noted, the supervisors do not share the same conceptualisations of language in research and also they challenge and question the prompt they were asked to respond to in this reflection exercise. Supervisors 2 and 5 bring in concepts such as ethics, creativity, sensuousness, identity and values in relation to languages in research. These concepts are in tune with the arguments proposed in Canagarajah's (2013) work on translingual practice where in-the-moment choices of linguistic resource are seen as purposeful expressions of identity. Supervisor 4 challenges the notion that we can understand the researcher's task being at the level of a bounded language, rather it is, in their view, at a discourse level where the work of critique and discussion needs to take place. Supervisors 1 and 3 could be seen to be the nearest to positioning themselves in a plurilingual space of the kind conveyed in works referenced earlier (see CEFR, 2018; Choi et al., 2018; Coste et al., 2009) with their awareness of research students' and supervisors' needs for competence and expertise in spoken and written forms of language.

5.2   Doctoral researchers' data

The written data extracts below come from doctoral students and were prompted in the same way as the supervisor data above and discussed and explored using the same themes.

> *Extract 8:*
>
> *"I also did my own research in more than one language during my diploma thesis. I interviewed doctors who came from the former Soviet Union to Germany and wanted to work as doctors again. I did the interviews in Russian, but wrote the paper in German. This meant that I had to translate some parts, which I found sometimes quite difficult. Besides I wasn't sure, if it was*

methodologically correct. Unfortunately I couldn't find any studies or information about the accurate procedure at that time."

Doctoral Researcher 1

Extract 9:

"My supervision team comprises of two academics, one French and one English, both equally fluent in both languages, making my research richer with their varied inputs and advice."

Doctoral Researcher 2

Extract 10:

"reading literature and communicating with respondents/participants bilingually sometimes became a complex issue; problematic negotiation of entry into local communities for investigation, choosing a working language raised a concern about practical complexities … students sometimes liked to challenge themselves to use English rather than Chinese"

Doctoral Researcher 3

Extract 11:

"I struggle with a huge amount of data – I did not press too hard to make them speak English – I wanted them to be comfortable in expressing their ideas"

Doctoral Researcher 4

Extract 12:

"My scholarly work has not only benefited from accessing bibliographical sources both in the original as well as in their translations, but also through my personal acquaintances with other scholars, which I made during my student years. One important challenge to such an enterprise were the barriers to creative thinking imposed by monolingual academic contexts both in Spanish and in English, where I often met a lack of understanding from the side of my supervisors who never quite appreciated a multilingual approach to my research projects."

Doctoral Researcher 5

Extract 13

"My doctoral research used the new research approach of Narrative Inquiry, Collective Biography, to apply to identity study, mainly individual identity with a hint of collective sense, examining the impacts of two aspects, culture and language. Although the main focus of my research was not purely on doing research multilingually, it formed a large part of my thesis."

Doctoral Researcher 6

Extract 14:

"I am fluent in English and French, besides my Greek mother tongue and I found that creativity has been the bridging element in channelling the flow of languages within, depending on context. For example, I found myself writing poetry in English as my second language when trying to overcome the 'writer's block' during the period of writing my thesis or when attempting to discover ways for personal expression and healing. I have also used poetry as a medium for depicting qualitative data in counselling research.

Doctoral researcher 7

As with the supervisor data, the engagement with our prompt produced a set of reflections covering a range of experiences which can be seen to be shaped by the studies being undertaken and the linguistic resources being used within the studies. A deeper exploration of the data below focuses, once again, on the ways in which languages are conceptualised in the research processes and supervision interactions as reported by these doctoral researchers.

The writers of Extracts 9 and 12 express positive reflections on multiple languages in their research because they added a richness and benefits. For Doctoral Researcher 2, this richness came from the two academics who are characterised by their linguistic resources ("one French and one English") on the supervisory team who provided "varied inputs and advice". For Doctoral Researcher 5, the situation was different, however. The benefits of accessing scholars and bibliographic sources in different languages in the research process were appreciated by the doctoral researcher but less so by the supervisory team. Extract 12 reports on barriers in what the writer characterises as "monolingual academic contexts" encountered as "a lack of understanding from the side of my supervisors who never quite appreciated a multilingual approach to my research projects". It is notable that the barriers here are defined in terms of people who, in the doctoral supervision process, serve as gatekeepers to the academy. Extract 12 also alludes to the constraint of context which is termed as monolingual and gives an insight into what influences doctoral research practices beyond individual action.

Three extracts (8, 10 and 11) outline a sense of struggle faced when working across different languages in research. The struggles relate to lack of guidance when translating data (Extract 8), negotiating access to communities for data collection and "choosing a working language" (Extract 10) and dealing with "a huge amount of data" (Extract 11). In each case here the doctoral researchers had linguistic competence in the languages of their participants but the many choices relating to how to work across these languages in the context of doctoral research presented challenges for them. In the cases of Doctoral Researchers 3 and 4 (Extracts 10 and 11) the struggle they experienced was an outcome of their showing respect for their participants who were responding using a language that was either unexpected or which generated extra work for the researcher. Extract 10 refers to participants who spoke in English rather than the expected Chinese "to challenge themselves" with the implication that an interaction in Chinese may have been anticipated to produce a more flowing text. Extract 11 on the other hand reports on the researcher allowing participants to speak in their chosen language (rather than English, the language in which the research would be reported) out of respect for them: "I wanted them to be comfortable in expressing their ideas".

Doctoral Researcher 6 explains their research study was framed as a narrative inquiry, and, although not having a main focus on researching multilingually, this attention to language "formed a large part of my thesis". This researcher, in Extract 13, ties in their focus on identity (individual and collective) and culture with language and as such they naturally needed to pay attention to language. This is in contrast with Doctoral Researcher 12 who made a conscious personal decision to work across different languages in their research, despite not being encouraged to do so by their

supervisors. This could be considered as an example of individual researcher agency in relation to research decision-making. Extract 14 illustrates a further example of a researcher using their agency in drawing on their linguistic repertoire in their research process. The example is distinctive and reflects a creative, rather than an instrumental, use of languages in research: "I found myself writing poetry in English as my second language when trying to overcome the 'writer's block' during the period of writing my thesis or when attempting to discover ways for personal expression and healing".

The themes already used to explore the supervisor data are brought in here to allow further consideration of the doctoral researcher data. The theme of separating languages can be identified as underpinning the reflections in Extracts 8 and 9. Doctoral Researcher 2 outlines how they engage with, and get different support from, supervisors from different language backgrounds and Doctoral Researcher 1 explains a process of working first in one language and then in a different language in their research process. Similarly, a separation of languages is conveyed in Extracts 10 and 11. However, because the participants' choice of language is unexpected there is perhaps an overlap with the theme of fluidity in that both doctoral researchers report responding to their participants' wishes even if it created complications for their research. The theme of fluidity is also displayed by Doctoral Researcher 7 in their use of poetry in English as a second language as a tool for overcoming writer's block and a means of communicating qualitative data.

Extract 13 shows the doctoral researcher allowing the choice of methodology and larger focus on identities and culture to direct their attention to language and dedicate a large part of the thesis to this topic. The theme of moving beyond language seems to apply here in that the researcher is, on the one hand, not starting out on their research as, for example, an applied linguist, but is nevertheless, remaining open to being guided to linguistic aspects of the research. This contrasts with Doctoral Researcher 5 who sees scholars and texts in different languages as a wider, beneficial set of resources which can be drawn upon to inform the study being crafted. Doctoral Researcher 5 displays the theme of 'valuing and foregrounding languages' even though, as noted earlier, this approach is not appreciated by the supervisors guiding the researcher and the study.

The doctoral researchers all reported on challenges they faced in working on their distinctive projects and engaging in working across languages. Despite their struggles, all the doctoral researchers reflected positively on the benefits of their work across languages. There could be seen to be a parallel with Preece's work (2019) in which she argues that undergraduate and master's students' linguistic resources are not recognised or valued in their universities. In our data set, Extract 12 provides the most extreme incidence of a supervisory team lacking appreciation of the researcher's practice of moving between languages. The benefit of using a flexible, plurilingual

approach in their research for distinctive purposes e.g. accessing sources and interacting with other scholars, is apparent to the researcher but not to the supervisors.

Our data set illustrates to us that researchers' linguistic resources allow them to engage in plurilingual practices in their research for a variety of purposes. While these practices are not guided by research textbooks for doctoral students, they allow doctoral researchers to be sensitive to their participants' linguistic preferences and to the context of the research.

6.   Discussion

The thematic analysis presented above provides a clear indication of the differing conceptualisations of languages in research amongst this set of doctoral supervisors and doctoral researchers. This group represented researchers at differing stages of the research process, in different disciplines, paradigms, and contexts. The diversity of positions on language, from fluid, creative uses of linguistic resources to more instrumental uses of bounded languages, suggests to us that the task of providing more substantial policy and practice guidelines regarding the possibilities for, and complexities of, using languages in research is not one that can achieved through prescription of a particular conceptualisation of language. Our thinking leads us to propose that researchers may benefit from being flexible and open to expected or unexpected uses of linguistic resources by themselves and by others, e.g. research participants. These could be for personal reasons such as a creative way to overcome a writer's block (Extract 14) or for language practice (Extract 10) amongst other reasons. We suggest that this openness and flexibility can be captured within the concept of a translingual mindset which signals openness for possibilities of different uses of linguistic resources but that these possibilities may not necessarily be acted on. In addition, our data provide us with an opportunity to reflect on how current work theorising plurilingualism, mediation and translingual practice might inform and guide practice. In this article, our focus is on research practice rather than language education per se but we extend our discussion here to include the education that informs research practice.

The network project prompted a rich set of researcher reflections focused on the use of languages in research. Whilst the contributors of these profiles were self-selecting, we have no reason to doubt that other researchers, if prompted appropriately, would be similarly productive. It seems that, while the substance of the reflections might vary considerably, the reflective move is one that has potential in researcher education. Such reflection was an integral part of our proposed translingual researcher mindset, which we hoped would encourage researchers to be reflexive about their linguistic practices and guide them in the research choices they make. The analysis presented here provides some possible lines for what might be included in such researcher education.

Researchers could be encouraged (through researcher education provision) to reflect where, on a spectrum from "separating languages" to using "fluid linguistic practices" they consider themselves to be most comfortably located as researchers, and where the practices to be used in their study and supervision process might be also placed.

Further, it seems (as Extract 12 above suggests) that an essentially monolingual context of doctoral research supervision can easily work against a purposeful embrace of the linguistic possibilities and complexities raised by a particular research project. But, when that monolingual context is Anglophone in character (as it is in our setting), then the hierarchical relationships between English (as a privileged and privileging language of international scholarship) and other languages may make the embrace of the wider linguistic possibilities and complexities harder. Evidence of this danger is not particularly present in our data-set. However, as researchers ourselves, and with our supervisory roles in mind, we want to propose that the foregrounding of the linguistic considerations through researcher education provision is important in Anglophone university settings given the problematic status of English as the main lingua franca of international scholarship and research. It also suggests to us that the researcher education provision needs to not only foreground linguistic considerations but also problematize them in relation to the role of English in international research activity. Such foregrounding and problematizing would be foundational in developing a translingual researcher mindset.

When we speak of researcher education for doctoral studies, formal research training classes and supervision are central. But we also note that the discussions in supervisions sessions both shape and are shaped by the wider aspects of the research as reflected in our data (e.g. fieldwork encounters, paradigmatic norms, identity issues in research writing). Whilst a plurilingual approach to researcher education might usefully seek to encourage the embrace of the richness of the linguistic repertoires of the supervisors and doctoral researchers involved, we prefer to use the translingual researcher mindset terminology to capture this desire for supervisors and doctoral researchers to develop an openness towards the linguistic possibilities and complexities of all aspects of their research activity. A translingual mindset would encourage researchers to consider linguistic possibilities within and beyond their own linguistic repertoires and in the planned and unplanned aspects of the research, throughout the research process.

In practical terms, the development of a translingual researcher mindset could be added to the researcher education curriculum of Anglophone university settings like ours. While the analysis of the researcher profiles in this article by itself does not provide a clear sense of how that development might be framed, as research practitioners, we wish to conclude by providing five principles which could guide this endeavour in Anglophone higher educational settings:

1) Language needs to be acknowledged as central to the research process and this reaches beyond questions of translation and interpretation.

2) Issues of researcher identity, positionality, and values need to be viewed as clustering together with linguistic considerations in research projects.

3) While acknowledging linguistic repertoires within research (those of researchers and research participants) may improve the transparency of the research process, they raise challenges to the researcher, e.g. increasing the amount of data to be worked with, that need acknowledgement.

4) Foregrounding language in research should involve mutual learning between doctoral researchers and supervisory teams as critical and challenging questions are addressed in the research.

5) When researchers foreground language in their research they are likely to need to challenge institutional norms and expectations as shaped by global practices, e.g. in publishing.

Acknowledgements

References

Andrews, J., Fay, R. and White, R. (2018a). From linguistic preparation to developing a translingual orientation – possible implications of plurilingualism for researcher education. In J. Choi and S. Ollerhead (Eds.), *Plurilingualism in learning and teaching: complexities across contexts* (pp.220-233). London: Routledge.

Andrews, J., Fay, R. and White, R. (2018a). What shapes everyday translanguaging? Insights from a global mental health project in northern Uganda. In G. Mazzaferro (Ed.), *Translanguaging as everyday practice* (pp.257-273). Cham., Switzerland: Springer.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, **3**(2): 77-101.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge.

Choi, J., Ollerhead, S. and French, M. (2018). Introduction. In J. Choi and S. Ollerhead (Eds.), *Plurilingualism in learning and teaching: complexities across contexts* (pp.1-17). London: Routledge.

Council of Europe (2018) *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment Companion volume with new descriptors* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Available from https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989 [Accessed 18 July 2019]

Corcoran, J., Gagné, A. and McIntosh, M. (2018). A conversation about 'editing' plurilingual scholars' thesis writing. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, **28**: 1-25.

Coste, D., Moore, D., and Zarate, G. (2009). *Plurilingual and pluricultural competence – Studies towards a Common European Framework of Reference for language learning and teaching* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Edwards, V. (2004). *Multilingualism in the English-speaking world*. Oxford: Blackwell.

García, O. and Kleyn, T. (Eds.) (2016). *Translanguaging and multilingual students – learning from classroom moments.* London: Routledge.

García, O. and Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging language, bilingualism, and education.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J. and Attia, M. (2013). Researching multilingually: new theoretical and methodological directions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, **23**(3): 285-299.

Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J. and Attia, M. (2016). How to research multilingually: possibilities and complexities. In Z. Hua (Ed.), *Research methods in intercultural communication* (pp.88-102). London: Wiley.

Kubota, R. (2014). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory and neoliberal multiculturalism: complicities and implications for Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, **37**(4): 474-494.

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

Lillis, T. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: the politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

Marshall, S. (2009) Re-becoming ESL: multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, **24**(1): 41-56.

Marshall, S. and Moore, D. (2013). 2B or not 2B plurilingual? Navigating languages, literacies, and plurilingual competence in postsecondary education in Canada. *TESOL Quarterly*, **47**(3): 472-499.

Otheguy, R., García, O. and Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: a perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, **6**(3): 281-307.

Piccardo E. (2018) Plurilingualism: Vision, Conceptualization, and Practices. In: Trifonas P., Aravossitas T. (eds) *Handbook of Research and Practice in Heritage Language Education*. Springer International Handbooks of Education. Springer, Cham

Preece, S. (2019). Elite bilingual identities in higher education in the Anglophone world: the stratification of linguistic diversity and reproduction of socio-economic inequalities in the multilingual student population. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1543692

Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting qualitative data: a guide to the principles of qualitative research* London: Sage.

Thomas, D. R. (2006) A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data in *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 27 No. 2, 237-246.