

---

# Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen

---

Herausgegeben von  
Lutz Küster, Birgit Schädlich, Karen Schramm  
und Britta Viebrock

Themenschwerpunkt:  
**Mehrsprachige Forschung –  
Mehrsprachigkeit in der Forschung**

koordiniert von Dagmar Abendroth-Timmer  
und Britta Viebrock

**FLuL**  
51. Jahrgang · 2

**SONDERDRUCK / OFFPRINT / TIRÉ À PART**

BRITTA VIEBROCK, GABRIELA MEIER, RANDA AISABAHI\*

## DISSECTing multilingual research in the field of language education: a framework for researcher development

**Abstract.** Our contribution presents the DISSECT framework we have developed in order to foster the reflexive education of plurilingual researchers regarding contexts, approaches and opportunities of multilingual research. The framework focusses on multilingual social contexts, within which research takes place, and on plurilingual researchers and their individual linguistic resources. We discuss the scope and dimensions of multilingual research approaches and systematise six language-related aspects of decision-making during the research process. We then consider the systemic perspective, extend our considerations to the international research community and discuss the opportunities and challenges of multilingual research approaches with regard to the hegemonic role of English in academic contexts. Our examples illustrate specific language-related choices in the research process and possible consequences. We discuss how plurilingual researchers can be encouraged to systematically reflect on language-related aspects of their research process as a way of not only supporting multilingual research approaches, but also social justice aspects that are related to this. While our considerations take the field of language education research as their starting point, the proposed framework is also applicable to other disciplines.

**Abstrakt.** Unser Beitrag stellt das von uns erarbeitete DISSECT-Modell vor, das zur reflexiven Bildung von plurilingualen Forschenden in Bezug auf Kontexte, Ansätze und Möglichkeiten mehrsprachiger Forschung dient. Mehrsprachigkeit beschreibt zum einen multilinguale gesellschaftliche Kontexte, innerhalb derer Forschung stattfindet, zum anderen plurilinguale Forscher:innen und ihre individuellen sprachlichen Ressourcen. Wir diskutieren Reichweite und Dimensionen mehrsprachiger Forschungsansätze und nehmen eine Systematisierung von sechs spezifischen sprachlichen Entscheidungsfeldern im Forschungsprozess vor. Im Anschluss berücksichtigen wir die systemische Perspektive, erweitern unsere Überlegungen auf die internationale Forschungsgemeinschaft und diskutieren die Chancen und Herausforderungen mehrsprachiger Forschungsansätze im Hinblick auf

---

\* **Contact addresses:** Prof. Dr. **Britta VIEBROCK**, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt/Main, Institut für England- und Amerikastudien, Norbert-Wollheim-Platz 1, 60323 FRANKFURT/M., Germany  
*E-mail:* viebrock@em.uni-frankfurt.de  
*Research areas:* Teaching English as a Foreign Language, research ethics, qualitative research methodology

Dr. **Gabriela MEIER**, University of Exeter, Graduate Schools of Education, School of Social Science and International Studies, St Lukes Campus, EXETER, EX1 2LU, UK  
*E-mail:* g.s.meier@exeter.ac.uk  
*Research areas:* Language teacher education, multilingual socialisation and social cohesion, mixed method research in multilingual educational environments.

Dr. **Randa AISABAHI**, Alyamamah University, INTERLINK Language Institutes, King Fahd Branch Road, ALQIRAWAN RIYADH, 13451, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia  
*E-mail:* rsibahi@interlink.edu  
*Research areas:* Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, pre-service and in-service teacher training, curriculum development and design in language teaching

die Hegemonie der englischen Sprache in akademischen Kontexten. Es folgen einige Beispiele zur Illustration konkreter sprachlicher Entscheidungen im Forschungsprozess und möglicher Konsequenzen. Die systematische Anleitung plurilingueller Forscher:innen zur Reflexion sprachbezogener Aspekte im Forschungsprozess diskutieren wir als Entwicklungsmöglichkeit zu einer umfassenden Förderung gesellschaftlich notwendiger mehrsprachiger Forschungsansätze. Während unsere Überlegungen ihren Ausgangspunkt in der fremdsprachendidaktischen Forschung haben, ist das vorgeschlagene Modell auch in anderen Disziplinen anwendbar.

**نُبذة مختصرة.** تعرض مساهمتنا النموذج "ديسكت" (DISSECT) الذي قمنا بتطويره من أجل إثراء مجال التعليم التأملي بالنسبة للباحثين متعددي اللغات وذلك بالتركيز على سياقات ومقاربات وفرص البحث المتعددة اللغات. فبينما يشير النموذج من ناحية إلى السياقات الاجتماعية المتعددة اللغات التي يتمركز البحث حولها، يشير من ناحية أخرى إلى الباحثين متعددي اللغات ومواردهم اللغوية الفردية. بعد مقدمة موجزة للموضوع وعرض للمشكلة، نقوم بمناقشة نطاق وأبعاد مناهج البحث متعدد اللغات وننظم ستة جوانب لغوية فيما يتعلق بصنع القرار للباحثين أثناء عملية البحث. ثم نأخذ بعين الاعتبار المنظور المنهجي، ونوسع اعتباراتنا لتشمل مجتمع البحث الدولي ونناقش فرص وتحديات مناهج البحث متعددة اللغات فيما يتعلق بهيمنة اللغة الإنجليزية في السياقات الأكاديمية. نوضح بعض الأمثلة لخيارات لغوية معينة في عملية البحث والنتائج المحتملة. كما نناقش كيف يمكن تشجيع الباحثين متعددي اللغات على التفكير بشكل منهجي في الجوانب المتعلقة باللغة في عملية البحث الخاصة بهم كطريقة ليس فقط لدعم مناهج البحث متعدد اللغات، ولكن أيضًا جوانب العدالة الاجتماعية المرتبطة بذلك. في حين تأخذ اعتباراتنا مجال أبحاث تعليم اللغة كنقطة انطلاق، فإن النموذج المقترح قابل للتطبيق أيضًا في تخصصات أخرى.

## 1. Introduction

“If we were only to work in English, we would misunderstand our world. Monolingualism keeps us parochial even if the language we speak has achieved global dominance.” (BUTLER 2020: n.p.)

BUTLER’s remark nicely illustrates what we wish to establish in this article: a position in favour of multilingual research practices within an international academic community that often takes an English-dominated language bias for granted. We take as a starting point the documented demand for alternative research practices implied in critical approaches (cf. AMANO et al. 2016; CURRY/LILLIS 2014) and steer away from more radical positions which tend to view English as an imperialist tool or as part of a linguisticide (cf. PHILLIPSON 1998; SKUTNABB-KANGAS 2015). We suggest a more reconciliatory position that recognises English as an important and relevant – but by far not the only – language of knowledge production and dissemination. Hence, we embrace the need for integrating the multilingual realities researchers navigate in their daily practice, by promoting and cherishing plurilingualism as a valuable resource. We use the terms multilingual(ism) to describe situations and practices and plurilingual(ism) to refer to personal resources.

Multilingual research practices position the plurilingual researcher in a mediating role between English-dominated academic conventions and contexts in which other languages are foregrounded. A plurilingual researcher is, therefore, capable of making audible and mediating the voices of population groups or individuals that would otherwise remain unheard in the wider academic world and/or public discourse. Through this, multilingual research contributes to a greater understanding of society’s

diversity, including linguistic diversity in global contexts. According to PENNYCOOK (2001: 101), voice is “the opening up of a space for the marginalized to speak, write or read [...] so that the voicing of their lives may transform both their lives and the social system that excludes them.” A plurilingual researcher who manages a multilingual research project can thus be understood as a catalyst figure for enabling solidarity and social justice by making voices and knowledge heard across linguistic boundaries that might otherwise remain silent or invisible.

Against this backdrop, we make visible and systematise six dimensions, in which juggling with more than one language may pose challenges or offer opportunities for plurilingual researchers. We are concerned with the question as to which linguistic options are available to researchers in the fields of multilingualism, language and education studies, when conducting their research projects and positioning themselves in their respective academic communities. We address this question and substantiate our position (a) by drawing on selected studies that are either concerned with the inclusion of various languages at different stages of the research process (cf. GANASSIN/HOLMES 2013; HOLMES et al. 2013, 2016; ANDREWS et al. 2018; KULL et al. 2019) or with options plurilingual researchers, like ourselves, have for disseminating their research results and thus make their voices heard in an English-dominated academic community (cf. GNUTZMANN 2008; CURRY/LILLIS 2014; AISABAH 2019), (b) by presenting ethnographic data (informal interviews, field notes, reflections, documents and workshop products) we collected in the ENROPE project during two intensive study weeks that aspired to provide high-quality networking and qualification structures for novice researchers in the field of multilingualism, language and education studies (cf. ENROPE 2020b) and (c) by sharing our own autoethnographic explorations as researchers in and of multilingual situations (cf. ELLIS et al. 2011).<sup>1</sup>

From our respective positions, we are aware that multilingualism is not systematically considered in the development of novice researchers. Drawing on our joint experiences, observations, as well as existing research, we have developed the DISSECT framework to support colleagues who wish to engage in reflective education for plurilingual researchers. We will start by defining the scope of multilingual research and its different dimensions (section 2) before looking at the opportunities and challenges of multilingual research within an English-dominated academic world both from a systemic as well as an individual researcher’s perspective (section 3). We will then move towards elaborating on concrete examples of language choice and their consequences (section 4). Based on our analysis, we will reflect upon future options for carrying out much-needed multilingual research (section 5) before we finally present the main tenets of the DISSECT framework and highlight our theoretical and

---

<sup>1</sup> All three authors of this paper are speakers of English as a second or further language and experts in the field of multilingualism, language and education studies with experience in European and Middle Eastern contexts. While not all of us master the following languages, between us we use variants of (in alphabetical order) Arabic, Dutch, English, French, German, Spanish to varied extents.

practical contributions to understanding and doing research in multilingual contexts (section 6).

## 2. Scope and dimensions of multilingual research practices

At the outset of our considerations is a contradictory development: On the one hand, the “multilingual turn” (CONTEH/MEIER 2014; MAY 2014) has been recognised in language and education studies. It highlights the role of multilingualism in globalised societies and proposes an alternative to long cherished monolingual speaker norms by valuing the language competences of plurilingual individuals as resources for learning and communication. It has led to a greater appreciation of languages that were formerly perceived as less prestigious, to a greater appreciation of different competence levels in several languages and of different competence levels in the various language skills. While the notion of a plurilingual individual who employs versatile language competences in various multilingual settings for learning and teaching has become studied more widely and is appreciated by the multilingual turn literature (cf. MEIER 2017), this does not necessarily transfer to knowledge produced and disseminated by research and academia as a whole. In these contexts, the hegemonic function of English is undeniable (cf. AMMON 2012; O’NEILL 2018). This hegemony also influences disciplines that attach great importance to multilingualism and plurilingual language competences and becomes particularly apparent in formal research communication (such as this article), where the use of English grants access to opportunities of publications or conference presentations, or in more informal international communication, where English is used as a “lingua academica” (FAN 2017; YANAPRASART/LÜDI 2018). Given the multilingual reality of today’s societies and research contexts, we find it somewhat surprising that reflections on the representation of multilingual research practices are not more prominent. From our own experiences and observations, we know that researchers who engage in multilingual research are faced with complex questions and difficult decisions. In this article, we aspire to unpack some of these questions by defining and theorising dimensions that are relevant to researching multilingually.

Research in multilingual contexts or across linguistic boundaries requires one or more languages and/or language varieties for different purposes and in different phases of the research process. It may be a common practice either out of necessity, i.e. because it takes place in a multilingual community with plurilingual research participants (cf. GANASSIN/HOLMES 2013; PHIPPS 2013; KULL et al. 2019), or out of academic interest, i.e. because plurilingualism or multilingualism are to be examined. It may also be a combination of both, for instance because a plurilingual researcher who is part of the researched community aspires to mediate the experiences of plurilingual individuals in multilingual environments (cf. MAEDER-QIAN 2018). Many of these practices are also concerned with social and ethical issues of providing underrepresented groups with a voice, for instance where local communities use a

language that is different from that used by the researcher (cf. LEE 2017). While the legitimacy of such multilingual research is not to be questioned, the opportunities and challenges that come with it for the individual researcher in an English-dominated academic world require careful reflections. By reflecting on our sets of data and experiences, we have identified five of the six DISSECT dimensions – practical, structural, ethical, identity-related as well as theoretical/methodological – that help structure the understanding that, we argue, might become necessary for the individual researcher to engage in multilingual research practices:

While the *doable/practical* (D) dimension focuses on practical or technical decisions concerning language choices made at different points in the research process, the *structural* or *systemic* (SS) dimension refers to the institutional context in which one's research takes place, the decision-making authorities and norms that influence language choice. The *ethical* (E) dimension foregrounds the relationship between the researcher, research participants and user groups and its maintenance through language choice, while the *identity-related* (I) dimension emphasises the researcher as a plurilingual individual making sense of the influences of their different languages on their personal and professional self. The *theoretical* (T) dimension sets apart extended methodological contemplations or theoretical and conceptual discussions that might become necessary on account of some of the previously mentioned questions.

A sixth dimension was derived from HOLMES et al. (2013: 93-94), who modelled four levels of analysis at which language decisions need to be made: the researcher, the researched phenomenon, group or person, the research context as well as the aspect of representation or dissemination. HOLMES et al.'s (2013) model thus strongly suggests a need to reflect on context, which we thus included as the sixth dimension. The *contextual* (C) dimension enables a reflection on situational requirements, expectations and traditions related to language choices in the local context. This requires a reflection on social norms, interactions and meaning-making that may differ from context to context.

Together the initial letters of the six dimensions spell DISSECT. We use this as a metaphor that represents our way of dissecting research processes into separate parts, which then allow us to examine their structure and respective relations. The DISSECT framework offers a guide for the individual researcher to reflect on their research projects and consider both individual and contextual language options as well as structural and systemic influences (see section 5). The next section shows the rationale of our considerations related to the interlinkages of practical and structural and systemic influences, through critically examining the international academic community in which such researchers operate.

### 3. Multilingual research within an English-dominated academia: systemic considerations

A consideration of the constraints and benefits of multilingual research is inextricably linked with the discussion of the controversial role of English as the dominant language in academia. Looking at the mere numbers, English certainly is “the undisputed lingua franca of scholarly exchange [...] the language of the most prestigious international conferences and journals” (BENNETT 2013: 169), which might render multilingual approaches a hidden practice that remains unreflected and does not become visible in the final outputs. This dominance of English has been associated with notions such as ‘cultural imperialism’ or even ‘epistemicide’, defined as the practice of appraising ideologies, knowledge, values or scientific approaches associated with an Anglo-American culture as superior to the extent that other knowledge systems are threatened with extinction (cf. GNUTZMANN 2008; BENNETT 2012). In a similar vein, fears have been expressed that the academic discourse may run the risk of being dominated by an ‘Anglo-American mindset’ (cf. the discussion in GNUTZMANN 2008: 78–81). Moreover, it has been argued that articles in languages other than English are often not on the radar of scientists with potentially serious consequences (cf. AMANO et al. 2016). Indeed, “a bias toward English-language science can result in preventable crises, duplicated efforts and lost knowledge” (PANKO 2017: 1). English dominance in academia is, therefore, not merely a practical issue, but importantly also points to the systemic dimension of language use as constrained in research practices that can limit progress.

In contrast, other scholars have rejected what some refer to as an ideological or cultural imperialist agenda underlying the use of English (e.g. PHILLIPSON 1998; SKUTNABB-KANGAS 2015), and stressed other aspects such as the practicality, international intelligibility and neutrality or impartiality of a shared language (cf. BRUTTGRIFFLER 2008). The latter particularly comes into play when English is no longer understood as a national language that privileges its speakers of English as a first language, but as an international lingua franca which is used between speakers of other languages for whom English is a medium to achieve communicative balance and reach out to wider audiences, thus offering opportunities. English arguably plays a crucial role in today’s global communication and knowledge production.

Taking a slightly different point of departure, namely the understanding of linguistic appropriation as an empowerment strategy, TURNER (2004) has argued in favour of the importance of proficiency in (written) English as an important component of ‘academic literacy’ that might open up (rather than constrain) spaces for researchers for the participation in or critique of academic practices. This is also expressed by participants of AISABAHI’s (2019) study, which deals with the question whether English medium publications are opening or closing doors to authors with non-English language backgrounds. Even those academics who displayed conflicting sentiments towards the prevalence of the English language admitted that publishing in English helps them establish their credibility and standing as international researchers, accept-

ing the English language as a “reality” or “tool” as illustrated by a Portuguese journal editor and reviewer: “It’s a fact [...] I think it’s positive that the information are [sic] circulating via an international lingua franca” (AISABAHI, 2019: 80).<sup>2</sup>

Such an acceptance of the English-dominance in academia does not necessarily discard the “sense of disempowerment by standardised procedures” (HOLMES et al. 2013: 287) that has reportedly been experienced by plurilingual researchers whose first language is not English or who do not work in an English-speaking environment within what plurilingual researchers perceive as a predominantly monolingual academic world. The remarks of a Serbian journal editor from AISABAHI’s (2019: 82) study may serve as a case in point: “I am not in favour of Englishisation in our academic world. [...] It still revolves around a very narrow circle of people. [...] It marginalizes a lot of non-native English speakers in terms of publishing, in terms of editing and in terms of writing”. Thus, language use and language choice in academia seem to be about the accepted hegemony of English and related to this the legitimisation and belonging to a professional community, as well as resistance to this, as addressed by the structural/systemic and identity dimension mentioned above.

Nevertheless, we believe that the sense of disempowerment described could be turned into a sense of empowerment when looking at the benefits of multilingual research practices which may not only be a reflection of the multilingual setup of contemporary society but could also be understood as a political act against any imperialist or epistemicidal tendencies, and by redefining one’s individual plurilingualism as an expression of BOURDIEU’s (2000 [1974]) ‘symbolic capital’, which describes the individual’s opportunities to gain and maintain social recognition and social prestige. Appreciation of one’s own language repertoire – including but not being limited to English – and related opportunities in the research context is expressed in the identity dimension. However, this appreciation of languages as a resource, also for research, has not readily translated into the recognition of academic literature in languages other than English, which indicates that the structural/systemic dimension of the English bias in research is rather persistent.

A more positive valuation of multi- and plurilingualism as expressed in the multilingual turn and contemporary moves towards valuing other languages, for example in multilingual journals or annotated bibliographies promoting publications in languages other than English (cf. ENROPE 2020a), which may offer alternatives to mainstream publishing in English (cf. also CURRY/LILLIS 2014). Despite the alleged imperative of the academic world to publish in English, plurilingual researchers do have a choice to use other languages. These alternatives may carry an element of subversiveness in an English-dominated environment and have yet to prove themselves as equally respected modes for academic exchange. That said, a questioning of estab-

---

<sup>2</sup> Interestingly, all 14 interviews in AISABAHI’s study were conducted in English. Even the one interviewee who shared Arabic as a first language with the researcher, chose to speak English. This insight may point to the identity dimension (4), in that academics between them might appropriate English to express belonging to the global research community.



lished practices, underlying power relations and the suggestion of reformatory interventions is a *sine qua non* from a critical perspective. CURRY and LILLIS (2014) draw on the notions of ‘strategies’ and ‘tactics’ to capture the individual’s choices to conform to existing rules and practices or to subvert them. From their point of view, strategies – in essence – denote the conformance to official policies, rules and expectations or established academic practices, while tactics denote the “contingent, subversive moves” (ibid.: 5) exercisable by an individual to undermine the official strategy or erode established practices, arguably related to our identity dimension. One such way of making language choices is expressed by a participant in AISABAHI’s study (2019: 90) who adopts a dual focus in order to address both local and international contexts: “half of my research is published in my L1 and I intend to keep it this way.” This choice is a calculated action with both strategic and tactical elements to find a balance between English requirements, plurilingual academic realities and the way researchers position themselves. Admittedly, a non-mainstream choice is more difficult to make for an early-career researcher, who seeks entry into the international academic community, than it is for a well-established one. Nonetheless, the mere opportunity of language choice should be understood as empowering, while being aware of its challenges, as multilingual research yields the opportunity to find and develop one’s voice in different languages. It depends on the specific systemic conditions whether or not this symbolic power will be redeemed.

What is more, while the international recognition of research is of indisputable importance, its impact is often even more significant at local level, which indicates that there are tensions between the structural and contextual dimensions. Local significance is particularly important in educational contexts as research results might be used to improve teaching approaches, for the purpose of material development or the design of teacher education programmes in relation to a specific curriculum and context. CURRY and LILLIS (2014: 3) have critically discussed how through the exclusive use of English in academic communication, knowledge may be ‘circulated away’ from the local communities where it was produced and might be used to improve local practices. This observation can also be interpreted as a prompt for reflecting on the purpose and audience of the dissemination of research results. Our observation data (see also section 5) suggest that early-career researchers explore the possibilities of an alternative understanding of impact when reflecting on the benefits of local publications (easy accessibility for local community, feedback into local practices, more direct impact) as opposed to English-medium international publications (international visibility, academic prestige). In a similar vein, participants in AISABAHI’s (2019: 90) study conceptualise publishing in their respective first language as an ethical obligation to promote academic discussion in local contexts as felt by the Portuguese journal editor and reviewer: “Writing in your own mother tongue [...] trying to promote your own field in your own country and also internationally if you can.” To give another example, MEIER (2010) summarised publications written in German about bilingual programmes in Germany in English, thus making visible epistemic knowledge to the international research community, which had hitherto largely been ignored in the Eng-

lish-speaking discourse. In response to MEIER's article, a researcher working in the field of bilingual education in Australia expressed her shock that she had until then ignored those programmes, even though she was able to read German. Such mediation between academic language communities points to an empowerment of multilingual researchers, as described by TURNER (2004). At the same time, the observations indicate a close inter-dependence between practical, ethical, identity and contextual dimensions, and how together they may perpetuate or transform practice at system and theoretical/methodological level.

#### 4. Examples of language choices in multilingual research projects

Our fundamental appreciation of the necessity and benefits of multilingual research should not obscure its challenges. Indeed, reading, writing or communicating across languages within a research team or with participants who do not share a mutual language can be very strenuous and time-consuming. Moreover, it might impact the outcome of a research project. KULL et al. (2019) for example report on the methodological and practical challenges in a binational (Switzerland, China), trilingual research project resulting from the different languages and educational cultures involved. The linguistic complexities included interviewing in different languages (including regional vernaculars), partly with the help of interpreters, and the transcription of data into the different languages and coding across languages. In a similar fashion, MEIER (2012) conducted a study in an English-French bilingual school in London that required a range of linguistic decisions. Offering participants a choice of French and English, the two school languages and languages the researcher could use, interviews and other data were collected in both languages. However, other languages were not considered as means of data collection. This means some participants could speak their first language and others used their 2nd or 3rd language in the interviews. The themes that resulted from coding the transcripts were based on the English and French quotes. Such methodological considerations query whether the findings might have been different had all participants been able to use their first or strongest language, as cultural biases or perceived expectations inherent in the two school languages may have influenced what they said.

In MEIER's (2012) study, data in the original language was coded and analysed. In some cases, however, data is translated before analysis. KULL et al.'s study (2019: paragraph 4) is an example of how interpretation and translation might influence the representation of research participants' voices. KULL et al. observed that the translated interviews were less comprehensive and less detailed than the interviews carried out in the first language and questioned whether the use of a foreign language for interviewing or the help of an interpreter were responsible for this. TAROZZI (2013) argues that translation and mediation for research purposes inevitably involves bias and may potentially distort participants' views. But he also stresses how it can be a helpful tool or analytic resource in social research: Assuming that any data translation is based on

careful and differentiated linguistic and cultural negotiations, additional challenges might stem from the calibration of codes across languages or the use of codes identified in one language to sets of data or texts that are only available in another. The necessity to mediate codes and data between languages might also contribute to a greater accuracy. Therefore, translation touches on practical, ethical and methodological dimensions, as language decisions in these areas can potentially influence findings.

Ethical and systemic dimensions become particularly apparent in the dissemination process of MEIER's study (2012): For various reasons, she published a formal article on her study in French. She first wrote the article in English, her strongest academic language. This was then translated with the help of the French Embassy in London, resulting in two versions of the same text. While one might think that this will help disseminate the findings in two language communities, only one could officially be submitted to an academic journal. Of course, she informally shared both versions with the participating groups, but the English version is not findable through conventional academic directories. In addition, the French-language publication has not been recognised or quoted widely in the international academic sphere. This example illustrates and confirms that language choices researchers make can mean a choice between serving the community and furthering their own academic career, while the system perpetuates this dilemma by allowing only one language version to be formally published.

How a plurilingual researcher's identity may be influenced by such rigorous structures of academic publishing and the dominance of English is illustrated by further examples from AISABAHI (2019). She shows how the researchers' local contexts and their linguistic resources diverge from mainstream academic publishing in English and result in feelings of insecurity, uneasiness, low self-esteem and fears of rejection, affecting their identity. Experience of this type of scholarly exclusion may be attributed to insufficient language competences or the rejection of what are perceived as non-mainstream ways of thinking or expressing arguments. In addition, international novice researchers, whose L1 is not English, may choose to do their dissertations in an Anglo-American setting and experience a troublesome socialisation process into academia, where their alternative ways of thinking or approaches to academic writing are not rewarded or supported (cf. TURNER 2004). The way this attribution may influence the voice and the identity of plurilingual researchers is shown in the comment by a Romanian scholar in AISABAHI's study (2019: 97):

When you are writing, you're projecting your own identity or your own voice in whatever it is the message that you want to put forth, right? I think that it is something that has to do with academia [...] with the objectivity ideal [...] so in order to fit in the model that the academia proposes, you have to sacrifice your own voice, and you have to sacrifice your own identity.

The notion of "sacrifice" (or "loss" in another participant's comment) experienced by plurilingual researchers in international academic publishing on account of their perceived language boundaries is yet another example of the identity dimension. Such

findings may support HOLMES et al.'s (2013) idea of disempowered rather than empowered international researchers.

## 5. Ways forward: reflective researcher education with the DISSECT framework

So far, we have shown that language choices may not only be influenced by individual language competences, but also by structural or systemic prerequisites, which may not be easily overcome by an individual researcher. In this section, we draw on our experience of working with and as post-graduate researchers. Through examples from the ENROPE (2020b) project we indicate the power of reflective researcher education, and the role our six-dimension framework may play in this.

We believe it is the responsibility of established researchers to challenge, creatively re-negotiate and expand established language practices in academia. Not only do they have the institutional grounding to do so, they also serve as role models and are influential in the education and mentoring of the next generation of researchers and can thus sway possible professional trajectories. Through their gatekeeping function they can perpetuate established procedures including English-dominated practices. Alternatively, they can encourage exploratory reflection by opening spaces to carefully dissect multilingual research practices and consider the complex linguistic opportunities and challenges, plurilingual researcher identities and any potential political and ethical implications of this. In the process, novice researchers may discover their voice and reflect on their experiences (cf. also HOLMES et al. 2016) and develop their own identity stances. Critical researcher socialisation of this kind may also include reflections on whether the choice of language is a deliberate conformance, subversion or unconscious subjugation to existing practices and strategies.

Our experiences of two intensive study weeks with early career researchers (see ENROPE 2020b) suggest that the hegemony of English as a default position in academic contexts exists even when plurilingualism and education is the topic of scrutiny. However, we have also observed that in response to specific prompts and invitations for reflection greater complexity and critical understandings surface: When encouraged to map which languages the study week participants used in their daily academic work and for what purposes (ENROPE 2021: 36f.) it became clear that they engaged in versatile multilingual practices and had encountered some of the questions and choices we have discussed above. When encouraged to reflect on their personal identities as plurilingual speakers and the multiple languages they have at their disposal for different (also non-academic) purposes, a greater sense of recognition became visible in the participants' expressions that had not been there before. This sense of recognition led to the inclusion of several different languages (not only English) in subsequent presentations at the venue, which did carry a sense of subversion in view of existing practices (cf. ENROPE 2021a). Our observations and experiences also highlight the influential position of established researchers to raise awareness of

multilingual practices in academia as they, by way of habitual practices, conform to existing language choices or, by way of deliberate reflective interventions, make visible alternatives that challenge and expand on those.

Moreover, our observations illustrate that reflective researcher education lends itself to an extended awareness-raising opportunity, focusing on questions of how to be(come) a researcher, establish international contacts, get access to and position oneself in the academic community. While initially novice researchers start their projects with learning the tools of the trade, i.e. methods of data collection, instruments for analysis, academic writing skills in the target language etc., it is often only after they have been specifically prompted that they gain a more systemic understanding of research institutions and the structure of academia, including the language factor in this. Such prompts are also helpful for questioning the systemic and political implications of language choices, underlying power relations, strategic and tactical options within the academic system (cf. CURRY/LILLIS 2014) or working on their voice as a political instrument. This can also be seen in the reflection of one ENROPE study-week participant on the context of an earlier workplace where the use of English served neutrality purposes and reconciled the divergent language uses of conflicting ethnic groups. Thus, the use of English can be an acceptable compromise, or preference, in contexts where other language choices may be contested. This example illustrates how language choice – both monolingual or multilingual – is context-sensitive and inevitably a political choice.

Our call for a reflection of multi- and plurilingualism in research, as well as reflective researcher education in this field is in line with ANDREWS et al. (2018) and HOLMES et al. (2016). For the purpose of explicit and systematic reflection, we propose the DISSECT framework (see table 1) as a necessary routine in researcher education in multilingual contexts. The framework offers dimensions for awareness raising, decision-making and action for both established researchers in their roles as researchers, researcher educators and change agents as well as novice researchers, who wish to understand the research processes and respective options to exercise plurilingual agency (cf. ENROPE 2021).

	Dimension	Focus on	How do I as a researcher...
<b>D</b>	Doability	practical or technical decisions concerning language choice	... collect and analyse data in practical ways in one or more languages?
<b>I</b>	Identity	the researcher as a plurilingual individual making sense of the influences of their different languages on their personal and professional self	... understand, construe or position myself in my local academic context as well as in an English-dominated academic world?
<b>S</b> <b>S</b>	Structure System	academic structures and linguistic expectations	... situate my work within formal language regulations, relevant institutional requirements and personal assumptions?
<b>E</b>	Ethics	the relationship between the researcher, research participants and user groups and role of language choice in this	... use one or more languages to enhance or hinder trust and/or bias between me as a researcher and the participants and user groups?
<b>C</b>	Context	situational requirements, expectations, norms and traditions related to language choices	... understand and relate to the linguistic context in which participants are situated and in which findings are produced?
<b>T</b>	Theory	theoretical and conceptual discussions that might privilege knowledge produced in English over that produced in other languages	... construct theoretical understanding that guides my work; is this based on publications that stem from English and/or more diverse language traditions?

**Tab. 1:** DISSECT framework of dimensions for reflection in plurilingual research

## 6. Conclusion

Drawing on literature that either criticises, or accepts, the hegemony of English in the field of academia, we discussed opportunities, constraints and risks that such monolingual academic practices afford for individuals and societies and illustrated these with examples. We placed the development of plurilingual researchers at the centre of this article, as they can function as catalyst figures and mediate between language communities, thus empowering voices of those who may otherwise not be heard and enabling knowledge to be shared across and within language boundaries. Being able to provide access to those voices is linked to developing our own voices and understanding our power as researchers. As illustrated in this article however, novice – and more established – researchers may not be aware of their potential as linguistic catalysts and may therefore continue to perpetuate an English bias in academia, and “mis-

understand the world” as BUTLER (2020) suggests. Thus, we understand this article as a response to the call for an explicit reflection of multi- and plurilingualism in research, as well as a more systematic researcher education related to this (in line with ANDREWS et al. 2018; HOLMES et al. 2016).

In order to enable explicit reflection in a systematic way, we produced a six-dimension framework – DISSECT – that can be used in researcher education to stimulate reflection on language practices in academia, and how researchers can position themselves in – and in the long term influence – this. To develop this framework, we drew on relevant literature, our own research, educational projects and observations in our roles as novice and experienced researchers, researcher educators and supervisors working in diverse research settings in Europe and in the Middle East. The main contribution of this articles is twofold, as it has theoretical and practical implications.

Theoretically, our article incorporates and expands on existing understandings, above all HOLMES et al. (2013), and theorises the English hegemony in academia, as well as plurilingual practices that exist, in the new six-dimension DISSECT framework. We theorise, discuss and illustrate each of the six dimensions (Doability, Identity, Structure/System, Ethics, Context and Theory), and show the intertwined and complex linguistic dilemmas that researchers might encounter in relation to these. The DISSECT framework is designed to stimulate reflection on the way language choices can influence theory and knowledge generation, and how they can perpetuate and transform power structures and systems.

In practical terms, our six-dimension DISSECT framework can be used as a prompt in researcher education, potentially together with this article. As shown through the ENROPE intensive study weeks, offering spaces for reflection and discussions to evaluate language practices in a systematic way are a precondition to raise awareness and open up new identity possibilities and practices as researchers.

Through our six-dimension framework, we invite researchers – potentially of all disciplines – to reflect on the way languages are used in the different practices and processes, and what relationships of power are established in situations where research is negotiated between different groups (author-reader, researcher-research participants, student researcher-supervisor, author-reviewer, colleagues in research teams, colleagues in conferences).

Assuming multilingual research is a common and even desirable practice, whose importance is likely to increase even further, we hope that by theorising opportunities and challenges of researching plurilingually and by providing a concrete tool for researcher educators, we help pave the way for a future generation of linguistically aware researchers who are able to engage in linguistically sensitive and conscious practices of knowledge production and dissemination, rather than take the status quo for granted.

**Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to Goethe University, the University of Exeter, The ENROPE Group and critical friends who enabled, inspired and guided our work.

## References

- AISABAH, Randa (2019): *English Medium Publications: Opening or Closing Doors to Authors with Non-English Language Backgrounds?* University of Exeter, PhD thesis.
- AMANO, Tatsuya / GONZÁLEZ-VARO, Juan P. / SUTHERLAND William J. (2016): “Languages are still major barrier to global science”. In: *PLoS Biology* 14.12, e2000933.
- AMMON, Ulrich (2012): “Linguistic inequality and its effects on participation in scientific discourse and on global knowledge accumulation – With a closer look at the problems of the second-rank language communities”. In: *Applied Linguistics Review* 3.2, 333–355.
- ANDREWS, Jane / FAY, Richard / WHITE, Ross (2018): “From linguistic preparation to developing a translingual mindset – possible implications of plurilingualism for researcher education”. In: CHOI, Julie / OLLERHEAD, Sue (eds.): *Plurilingualism in Teaching and Learning*. London: Routledge, 220–233.
- BENNETT, Karen (2012): “Epistemicide in modern academia: The political and cultural consequences of English as lingua franca”. In: *The Translator* 13.2, 151–169.
- BENNETT, Karen (2013): “English as the Lingua Franca in academia: Combating epistemicide through translator training”. In: *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 7.2, 169–173.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre (2000 [1974]): *Zur Soziologie der symbolischen Formen*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- BRUTT-GRIFFLER, Janina (2008): “Intellectual culture and cultural imperialism: implications of the growing dominance of English in academia”. In: GNUTZMANN, Claus (ed.): *English in Academia: Catalyst or Barrier?* Tübingen: Narr, 59–72.
- BUTLER, Judith (2020): “The promise of multilingualism”. [https://update.lib.berkeley.edu/2020/04/27/the-promise-of-multilingualism-by-judith-butler/?fbclid=IwAR30lg6yoIcSVw\\_ui8i6ptdZJD9sXg401dZiki-sTUj0sfeRJz\\_QEapjCzE](https://update.lib.berkeley.edu/2020/04/27/the-promise-of-multilingualism-by-judith-butler/?fbclid=IwAR30lg6yoIcSVw_ui8i6ptdZJD9sXg401dZiki-sTUj0sfeRJz_QEapjCzE) (23.03.2022).
- CONTEH, Jean / MEIER, Gabriela (eds.) (2014): *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- CURRY, Mary Jane / LILLIS, Theresa M. (2014): “Strategies and tactics in academic language production by multilingual scholars”. In: *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 22.32, 1–24.
- ELLIS, Carolyn / ADAMS, Tony E. / BOCHNER, Arthur P. (2011): “Autoethnography: an overview” [40 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 12.1, Art. 10, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101108> (23.03.2022).
- ENROPE (2020a): *Annotated Bibliography*. <https://enrope.eu/annotated-bibliography> (23.03.2022).
- ENROPE (2020b): *European Network for Junior Researchers in the Field of Plurilingualism and Education*. <https://enrope.eu> (23.03.2022).
- ENROPE (2021): *European Network for Junior Researchers in the Field of Plurilingualism and Education: Qualification Handbook*. <https://enrope.eu/handbook> (23.03.2022).
- FAN, Lingjuan (2017): “English as lingua academica: The case of the Chinese Translation Fund for the Humanities and Social Sciences”. In: *The Translator* 23.4, 428–440 [DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2017.1385944].
- GANASSIN, Sara / HOLMES, Prue (2013): “Multilingual research practices in community research: The case of migrant/refugee women in North East England”. In: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23.3, 342–356.
- GNUTZMANN, Claus (2008): “Fighting or fostering the dominance of English in academic communication?” In: GNUTZMANN, Claus (ed.): *English in Academia: Catalyst or Barrier?* Tübingen: Narr, 73–91.
- HOLMES, Prue / FAY, Richard / ANDREWS, Jane / ATTIA, Mariam (2013): “Researching multilingually: New theoretical and methodological directions”. In: *International Journal of Applied*



*Linguistics* 23.3, 285–99.

- HOLMES, Prue / FAY, Richard / ANDREWS, Jane / ATTIA, Mariam (2016): “How to research multilingually: Possibilities and complexities”. In: ZHU, Hua (ed.): *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication: A Practical Guide*. New York: Wiley Blackwell, 88–102.
- KULL, Annatina / PETERSEN, Suse / CAMP, Marc-Antoine (2019): “Sprachlich-kulturelle Herausforderungen bei der qualitativen Inhaltsanalyse musikbiografischer Interviews mit chinesischen und schweizerischen Musikstudierenden [21 paragraphs]”. In: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 20.3, Art. 24.  
<https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/3373/4465> (23.03.2022).
- LEE, Sherrie (2017): “The bilingual researcher’s dilemmas: Reflective approaches to translation issues”. In: *Waikato Journal of Education* 22.2, 53–62.
- MAEDER-QIAN, Jingyue (2018): “Intercultural experiences and cultural identity reconstruction of multilingual Chinese international students in Germany”. In: *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39.7, 576–589.
- MAY, Stephen (ed.) (2014): *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*. London: Routledge.
- MEIER, Gabriela (2010): “Two-way immersion programmes in Germany: Bridging the linguistic gap”. In: *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 4, 419–437.
- MEIER, Gabriela (2012): “Enseignement bilingue et l’amélioration de performances scolaires: les conclusions de l’expérience Wix Primary School / École de Wix a Londres” (traduit par Laurent Battut). In: *Synergies Europe* 7, 53–75.
- MEIER, Gabriela (2017): “The multilingual turn as a critical movement in education: assumptions, challenges and a need for reflection”. In: *Applied Linguistics Review* 8.1, 131–161.
- O’NEILL, David (2018): “English as the lingua franca of international publishing”. In: *World Englishes* 37.2, 146–165.
- PANKO, Ben (2017): “English is the language of science. That isn’t always a good thing”. In: *Smithsonian Magazine online*, 2 January. <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/english-language-science-can-cause-problems-180961623/> (23.03.2022).
- PENNYCOOK, Alastair (2001): *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- PHILLIPSON, Robert (1998): “Globalizing English: are linguistic human rights an alternative to linguistic imperialism?” In: *Language Sciences* 20.1, 101–112.
- PHIPPS, Alison (2013): “Linguistic incompetence: Giving an account of researching multilingually”. In: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23.3, 329–341.
- SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (2015): “Linguicism”. In: CHAPPELLE, C. (ed.): *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Wiley, 1–6.
- TAROZZI, Massimiliano (2013): “Translating and doing Grounded Theory Methodology. Intercultural mediation as an analytic resource [47 paragraphs]”. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 14.2, Art. 6.  
<http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs130263> (23.03.2022).
- TURNER, Joan (2004): “Academic literacy in post-colonial times: hegemonic norms and transcultural possibilities”. In: PHIPPS, Alison / GUILHERME, Manuela (eds.): *Critical Pedagogy: Political Approaches to Language and Intercultural Communication*. Clevedon etc.: Multilingual Matters, 22–32.
- YANAPRASART, Patchareerat / LÜDI, Georges (2018): “Diversity and multilingual challenges in academic settings”. In: *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 21.7, 825–840.