INTERNATIONAL AND DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

English-Medium Instruction and the Internationalization of Universities

Edited by
Hugo Bowles · Amanda C. Murphy

palgrave
macmillan

International and Development Education

Series Editors
W. James Jacob
Collaborative Brain Trust
American Fork, UT, USA

Deane E. Neubauer
East-West Center
Asia Pacific Higher Education Research
Honolulu, HI, USA

The International and Development Education Series focuses on the complementary areas of comparative, international, and development education. Books emphasize a number of topics ranging from key higher education issues, trends, and reforms to examinations of national education systems, social theories, and development education initiatives. Local, national, regional, and global volumes (single authored and edited collections) constitute the breadth of the series and offer potential contributors a great deal of latitude based on interests and cutting-edge research. The series is supported by a strong network of international scholars and development professionals who serve on the International and Development Education Advisory Board and participate in the selection and review process for manuscript development.

SERIES EDITORS
W. James Jacob, Vice President of Innovation and International, Collaborative Brain Trust, and Fulbright Specialist, World Learning and U.S. Department of State.
Deane E. Neubauer, Professor Emeritus, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, and Adjunct Senior Fellow, East-West Center.

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD
Clementina Acedo, *Webster University, Switzerland*
Philip G. Altbach, *Boston University, USA*
N'Dri Thérèse Assié-Lumumba, *Cornell University, USA*
Dennis Banda, *University of Zambia*
Carlos E. Blanco, *Universidad Central de Venezuela*
Sheng Yao Cheng, *National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan*
Evelyn Coxon, *University of Auckland, New Zealand*
Edith Gnanadass, *University of Memphis, USA*
Wendy Griswold, *University of Memphis, USA*
Ruth Hayhoe, *University of Toronto, Canada*
Yuto Kitamura, *University of Tokyo, Japan*
Jing Liu, *Tohoku University, Japan*
Wanhua Ma, *Peking University, China*
Ka Ho Mok, *Lingnan University, China*
Christine Musselin, *Sciences Po, France*
Yusuf K. Nsubuga, *Ministry of Education and Sports, Uganda*
Namgi Park, *Gwangju National University of Education, Republic of Korea*
Val D. Rust, *University of California, Los Angeles, USA*
Suparno, *State University of Malang, Indonesia*
Xi Wang, *University of Pittsburgh, USA*
John C. Weidman, *University of Pittsburgh, USA*
Weiyan Xiong, *Lingnan University, China*
Sung-Sang Yoo, *Seoul National University, Republic of Korea*
Husam Zaman, *UNESCO/Regional Center for Quality and Excellence in Education, Saudi Arabia*
Collaborative Brain Trust 45 W South Temple, #307, Salt Lake City, UT 84010, USA
Professional Development Program East-West Center1601 East-West Road, Honolulu, HI 96848, USA

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14849

Hugo Bowles • Amanda C. Murphy
Editors

English-Medium Instruction and the Internationalization of Universities

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Hugo Bowles
Department of Law
University of Foggia
Foggia, Italy

Amanda C. Murphy
Centre for Higher Education
Internationalisation
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
Milan, Italy

International and Development Education
ISBN 978-3-030-47859-9 ISBN 978-3-030-47860-5 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47860-5

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2020
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: MirageC

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Series Editors Introduction

We are pleased to introduce another volume in the Palgrave Macmillan International and Development Education book series. In conceptualizing this series we took into account the extraordinary increase in the scope and depth of research on education in a global and international context. The range of topics and issues being addressed by scholars worldwide is enormous and clearly reflects the growing expansion and quality of research being conducted on comparative, international, and development education (CIDE) topics. Our goal is to cast a wide net for the most innovative and novel manuscripts, both single-authored and edited volumes, without constraints as to the level of education, geographical region, or methodology (whether disciplinary or interdisciplinary). In the process, we have also developed two subseries as part of the main series: one is cosponsored by the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawai'i, drawing from their distinguished programmes, the Professional Development Program and the Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership (APHERP); and the other is a publication partnership with the Higher Education Special Interest Group of the Comparative and International Education Society that highlights trends and themes on international higher education.

The issues that will be highlighted in this series are those focused on capacity, access, and equity, three interrelated topics that are central to

educational transformation as it appears today around the world. There are many paradoxes and asymmetries surrounding these issues, which include problems of both excess capacity and deficits, wide access to facilities as well as severe restrictions, and all the complexities that are included in the equity debate. Closely related to this critical triumvirate is the overarching concern with quality assurance, accountability, and assessment. As educational systems have expanded, so have the needs and demands for quality assessment, with implications for accreditation and accountability. Intergroup relations, multiculturalism, gender, health, and technology issues comprise another cluster of opportunities and challenges facing most educational systems in differential ways when one looks at the disruptive changes that regularly occur in educational systems in an international context. Diversified notions of the structure of knowledge and curriculum development occupy another important niche in educational change at both the pre-tertiary and tertiary levels. Finally, how systems are managed and governed are key policy issues for educational policymakers worldwide. These and other key elements of the education and social change environment have guided this series and have been reflected in the books that have already appeared and those that will appear in the future. We welcome proposals on these and other topics from as wide a range of scholars and practitioners as possible. We believe that the world of educational change is dynamic, and our goal is to reflect the very best work being done in these and other areas. This volume meets the standards and goals of this series and we are proud to add it to our list of publications.

American Fork, UT, USA — W. James Jacob
Honolulu, HI, USA — Deane E. Neubauer

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Ikuya Aizawa is a researcher in the EMI Oxford research group at the University of Oxford. His EMI-related research focuses on Japan, and has most recently appeared in the journal *Higher Education, Studies in Higher Education*, and the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.

Hugo Bowles is Full Professor of English at the University of Foggia. His research covers many areas of applied linguistics and language education, particularly English for specific purposes (ESP), with an emphasis on legal and health communication, and English as a lingua franca (ELF). His research methods include genre, discourse and narrative analysis. His publications include *Conversation Analysis and LSP* (2007) and *International Perspectives on English as a lingua franca* (2015, Palgrave). His book *Storytelling and Drama* (2010) won the 2012 Prize for Linguistics by the European Society for the Study of English (ESSE).

Francesca Costa is Associate Professor of English Language and Linguistics at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Since 2001 she has been involved in teaching and research at all levels of education on content and language integrated learning (CLIL), integrating content and language in higher education (ICLHE) and English-medium instruction (EMI) contexts with reference to input, output, the acquisition of lexis,

focus on form, code-switching, teachers' identity and defamiliarization. She has published several articles on these subjects and presented her work at both national and international conferences.

René Gabriëls is a lecturer at Maastricht University (The Netherlands). His main fields of research are in social philosophy, sociolinguistics, philosophy of language and sociology of stratification. His research focuses on democracy, inequality, human rights, linguistic justice, poverty and the relation between semantics and pragmatics. He has written books about intellectuals, racism and local democracy and articles on the abovementioned topics. He is doing research on English-medium instruction (EMI) at universities and food banks in the Netherlands.

Diandian Guo was born and raised in China, and came to Europe for her Euroculture Master's degree. She has lived in France and the Netherlands, and graduated from the University of Groningen in 2016. After graduation, she has been involved in activities to increase the inclusion of international citizens of Groningen, both inside and outside of the university. In 2019, she worked as project assistant for the International Classroom project at UG.

Kevin Haines has worked in international higher education programmes in the Netherlands since 1992 and has worked for the International Classroom Project at University of Groningen since 2013. He specializes in guiding university lecturers and students in international classrooms and English-medium instruction (EMI). He is coauthor of the IntlUni Principles (www.intluni.eu) and was academic coordinator of the EQUiiP project (www.equiip.eu) between 2016 and 2019.

Jagdish Kaur is a senior lecturer at the Department of English Language, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya in Malaysia. She conducts research on English as a lingua franca, intercultural pragmatics and English-medium instruction. She has published her work in journals such as *World Englishes, Journal of Pragmatics, Intercultural Pragmatics* and *Text&Talk*.

Monique Kroese works as a senior trainer of professional and intercultural skills at the Faculty of Economics & Business (FEB) of the University of Groningen. Working with both lecturers and students, she manages a number of projects aimed at making the faculty a more inclusive environment. She has worked with teams and individuals in businesses to enhance their effectiveness.

Karen M. Lauridsen is an associate professor (emerita) and educational developer at Aarhus University (Denmark), specializing in international programmes and English-medium instruction. She was the coordinator of *IntlUni—The Challenges of the Multilingual and Multicultural Learning Space* (2012–2015), and a partner in the *EQUiiP* Project—*Educational Quality at Universities for Inclusive International Programmes* (2016–2019). Most recently, she has also worked with evidencing the value (impact) of professional development activities. KML is a frequent speaker at higher education conferences on the internationalization of higher education, English-medium instruction and the creation of an internationalized learning experience for all students.

Cristina Mariotti is Associate Professor of English in the Faculty of Political Science at Università di Pavia, Italy. She has done research on the cognitive processes involved in the content-based learning of English and incidental language acquisition in CLIL. Her interests also include interaction strategies in second language acquisition, English-medium instruction in academic settings and the use of subtitled audiovisual materials in language learning. She has published on these topics, taken part in EU-funded projects and presented her work at both national and international conferences.

Jim McKinley is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics and TESOL at UCL Institute of Education, University of London. His research explores implications of globalization for second language writing, English language education and teaching in higher education. Some of his recent work can be found in *Higher Education*, *Studies in Higher Education*, and *Teaching in Higher Education*, and he is an editor and author of several recent books on research methods in applied linguistics. He is co-Editor-in-Chief of the journal *System*.

Misganaw Solomon Mengistu is Vice President for Research and International Relations and a lecturer at St. Mary's University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. His fields of studies are in educational research and evaluation, teaching English as a foreign language and English language and literature. He has published articles on higher education in Ethiopia and is involved in research on the challenges of internationalization in EMI tertiary education.

Amanda C. Murphy is Professor of English Language at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan and Brescia, Italy. She is also Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the same institution. Most of her publications lie within the paradigm of corpus linguistics applied to contrastive linguistic themes, specialized text types and language learning. Her publications on themes linked to internationalization revolve around EMI, language, identity and culture. Through an MBA in Social Entrepreneurship delivered by Università Cattolica in several African countries, she is interested in collaborative trans-national education between Italy and the African continent.

Jennifer Valcke is an educational developer for the Unit for Medical Education (UME) at Karolinska Institutet in Stockholm, Sweden. Her role includes teaching, training and advising on issues related to intercultural education and content and language integrated learning (CLIL) and ensuring quality in English-medium instruction (EMI). She provides support for educational leaders to implement KI's internationalization strategy. Her research focuses on developing criteria for quality teaching and learning at university in English across disciplines. Other areas of research focus on the pronunciation of English as a lingua franca, teacher perceptions in the international classroom and the professional development of teachers.

Ying Wang is Lecturer of Applied Linguistics in Modern Languages and Linguistics at the University of Southampton. Her research interests include English as a lingua franca, English education, English-medium instruction, and language ideologies, with the focus on China and Chinese speakers of English. She has published and presented interna-

tionally in the said research areas. She has a monograph entitled *Language ideologies in the Chinese context: Orientations Towards English as a lingua franca* to be published by Mouton De Gruyter in June 2020.

Robert Wilkinson (Maastricht University, Netherlands) is retired but continues to conduct research on English-medium instruction (EMI) and multilingualism. He worked at the Language Centre at Maastricht University, and previously in Scotland, Czechoslovakia and France. He has run training courses and consultancies in EMI and Languages for Specific Purposes in many countries. He is Chair of the ICLHE Association.

Christopher Worthman is Professor of Secondary English in the Department of Teacher Education at DePaul University in Chicago. His research focuses on literacy development in in- and out-of-school settings and the role of literacy in identity formation and social transformation. He has written about critical literacy practices in adult education and community-based programmes, in-school writing development and magical realism as a way of re-presenting traumatic experiences. He is also the co-creator and current facilitator of Language and Literacy Practices Across the Academy, an international programme to prepare university instructors to teach in English and internationalize their curriculum.

Acronyms

BM	Bahasa Melayu—Malay language
BON	Beter Onderwijs Nederlands (Better Education Netherlands)
CAE	Certificate of Advanced English
CEF/CEFR	Common European Framework (of Reference) B1/B2/C1/C2 levels of language competence
CFU	Credito Formativo Universitario—Unit of University Education Credit (Italy)
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
CMI	Chinese-medium instruction
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CPE	Certificate of Proficiency in English
CUMEX	Consortium of Mexican Universities
EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
EAIE	European Association of International Education
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
ELF	English as a lingua franca
EMI	English-medium instruction
ETP	English-taught programmes
FAQ	Frequently Asked Question
FCE	First Certificate of English
FEB	Faculty of Economics and Business (University of Groningen)
HE	Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution

IAU	International Association of Universities
iBT	internet based test (of English)
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
IHE	Internationalization of Higher Education
IHES	Internationalization of Higher Education for Society
IPHEM	Internationalization Policy in Higher Education in Malaysia
JASSO	Japan Student Services Organization
KNAW	Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences
L1	First (mother tongue) Language
LLH	Language Learning History
LLPA	Language and Literacy Practices across the Academy (DePaul University)
LPI	Language and Pedagogy Institute, DePaul University
MEB(HE)	Malaysia Education Blueprint (Higher Education)
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOHE	Ministry of Higher Education (Malaysia)
MOSHE	Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Ethiopia)
MUN	Model United Nations
NES	Native English speaker
NNES	Non-native English speaker
NVAO	Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organization
PBL	Problem-based learning
PPT	Microsoft PowerPoint (slides)
SA	Study Association (University of Groningen)
TGUP	Top Global University Programme (Japan)
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
UG	University of Groningen
UM	Maastricht University
WHW	Higher Education and Scientific Research Act (Netherlands)

List of Figures

List of Tables

1

EMI and the Internationalization of Universities: An Overview

Hugo Bowles and Amanda C. Murphy

This introductory chapter[1] describes the state of the art in the area of internationalization of higher education (IHE) and English-medium instruction (EMI) by setting out the key concepts, research methods and areas of controversy to be addressed in the various chapters of the volume. The first section of the chapter looks broadly at internationalization as a field, outlining the areas of study, and the findings of large-scale surveys as well as identifying the most popular areas of research. The

[1] Both authors are responsible for the overall design and argument of the chapter, the introduction and the conclusions. Section 1.1 was written by Amanda Murphy and 1.2 by Hugo Bowles.

H. Bowles
Department of Law, University of Foggia, Foggia, Italy
e-mail: hugo.bowles@unifg.it

A. C. Murphy (✉)
Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy
e-mail: amanda.murphy@unicatt.it

© The Author(s) 2020
H. Bowles, A. C. Murphy (eds.), *English-Medium Instruction and the Internationalization of Universities*, International and Development Education,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47860-5_1

second thematic section looks at how internationalization intersects with English-medium instruction, paying particular attention to language policy, the role of English as a lingua franca (ELF), and the teaching and learning of disciplinary content. The section concludes with some recommendations for research and teaching in EMI.

Overall, we argue that the spread of EMI has outpaced research and that if the unfettered political-economic drive towards internationalization is to be successful and fair, researchers need to question whether its English language policies actually help the process of internationalization by producing sustainable economic and social development. Secondly, there needs to be a less ideological and more evidence-based research focus on the teaching and learning processes of EMI. Thirdly, English as a lingua franca is by now a given for international education, while other languages and cultures are undervalued in the concept of internationalized HE. We hold that explicit recognition of local languages and cultures at policy level, engagement with them in the curriculum and the classroom, and the involvement of academics in this process, would be an effective counterweight to the threat to cultural identity posed by internationalization exclusively through English.

1.1 Internationalization of Higher Education

Internationalization concerns all the dimensions of higher education, from its ideal, social and economic purposes, its management and policies, to the everyday tasks and functions of lecturers and students in the classroom. Research into the concept and process is carried out on both large and small scales and in quantitative or qualitative fashion. There are many mismatches between policy and practice in the field: while stakeholders maintain that the aim of internationalization is to prepare students for a globalized world and to improve the quality of education, large-scale research surveys find that priority activities are considered to be the recruitment of international students and the creation of opportunities for mobility (see also Aizawa and McKinley, Chap. 2; Kaur, Chap. 6); these activities point to the importance of procuring income rather than, for example, installing quality assurance mechanisms to ensure quality education. Other examples of disconnect emerge in this

volume from research into discourse in the media about internationalization through English-taught programmes and the experience of students involved at grassroots level (see Wang, Chap. 5; Gabriëls and Wilkinson, Chap. 3). An emerging trend in internationalization research is the increasing importance given both to internationalization of the curriculum (Sanderson 2011; Clifford, V. et al. 2013; Leask 2015) and to pedagogical matters in general, both in terms of teacher training (see Worthman, Chap. 7) and from the point of view of students' learning experiences (see Costa and Mariotti, Chap. 10), also outside the formal curriculum (see Haines, Kroese and Guo, Chap. 8).

1.1.1 Internationalization and Englishization

As Hilary Kahn recently put it, "the term internationalization… [is] not consistently conceptualized or practised, even though different individuals might assume they are using these terms in the same way as others" (2019: 7). In her view, research on internationalization is not always "embraced by academia as genuine scholarship". The term was used in politics in the nineteenth century before it began to be used in connection with higher education. In the Oxford English Dictionary, it is first attested in 1860 with reference to the "legal internationalization" of the Scottish crown with France, and in 1875 with reference to facilitating a scheme of "internationalization" of the Suez Canal; the OED defines the word simply as "an action or process of making something international in character, composition or scope". In higher education, it is a buzzword that has gained currency since the 1980s and now represents one of the strategic goals of universities around the world, promoted particularly by university leadership or specially dedicated administrative units, and less obviously perhaps, by academics.

Two well-known definitions of internationalization applied to higher education can be usefully cited: the first explains it as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions (primarily teaching/learning, research, service) or delivery of higher education" (Knight 2004). This definition purports to be politically neutral and focuses on the objectives and functions of education. An update on this definition, coined by the team responsible for

the Report on Internationalization of Higher Education, requested by the European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education, introduces the idea of *intentionality* into the process, and specifies two goals. The 2015 definition reads:

> the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society. (De Wit et al. 2015)

De Wit et al.'s definition makes three additions to the original—that internationalization is intentional, dedicated to educational improvement and affects society in a meaningful way. It is perhaps in terms of these last two aspects—improvement and social outcome—that recent developments in EMI have called university internationalization into question. Does EMI improve internationalization in such a way that its social consequences are really the ones that were intended?

While the origins and Renaissance developments of scholarly and educational enterprises may have been international—see for example the historical studies of De Ridder-Symoens (1992) and Pedersen (2000)—it is sometimes forgotten that universities of more recent foundation, from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, had more national orientations (De Wit 2011: 6). The twenty-first century will face similar choices between, on the one hand, the need to educate graduates with an international worldview, preparing them for interconnected societies and systems with fluid borders, and, on the other, the need to take national cultural priorities into account.

One such source of tension that EMI has brought to the fore is the effect of global English on the status of national languages (see Gabriëls and Wilkinson, Chap. 3) and a more general process of Englishization, understood as the increasing presence, importance and status of English at all levels in the educational domain (Lanvers and Hultgren 2018: 1). EMI is also one of the conduits for the commodification of higher education, leading to unequal access (e.g. in China, see Wang, Chap. 5) and an acritical attitude to the quality of the educational experience.

1.1.2 Areas of Research and Publication in IHE

As a research area, the internationalization of higher education crosses all social and disciplinary boundaries. Research by practitioners and academics covers sub-areas as diverse as university management, strategy and leadership, international relations for the development of partnerships between institutions, mobility (both real and virtual) of students and staff for study or societal projects, measurements of impact, individual and group research collaborations, and pedagogy in terms of contents and classroom practice (Heneghan and Hrisotov 2020: 36). The variety of possible methodologies is reflected in the current volume, which includes quantitative research based on questionnaires (see Gabriëls and Wilkinson, Chap. 3 and Costa and Mariotti, Chap. 10), official documents (see Murphy and Solomon, Chap. 4), content analysis of online question and answer forums and newspaper reports (see Wang, Chap. 5), and qualitative research conducted through focus groups and semi-structured interviews (see Kaur, Chap. 6 and Lauridsen, Chap. 9). Most of the authors in the volume adopt a mixed-methods approach.

Since no single model of internationalization fits all contexts and institutions (Hudzik 2014), there is a plethora of case studies in the field, but large-scale quantitative surveys have also been carried out, particularly by international organizations that promote and sustain internationalization in HE, such as the European Association of International Education (EAIE) and the International Association of Universities (IAU). Through online questionnaires, they assess internationalization at international, national and institutional level, bringing trends in policies or currents of practices to light among the various stakeholders. Given the global reach of internationalization and its global aims, these surveys are important sources of information.

Two examples of these surveys are the EAIE Barometer (Sandström and Hudson 2018) and the IAU Global Survey (Marinoni 2019), whose findings will be summarized in turn. The EAIE barometer, polling mostly HE leaders and administrative staff, is a wide-ranging survey across forty-five countries within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). It investigates goals, strategies, priorities, risks and challenges, and the

impact of EU and national policies. The most popular goals are to prepare students for a globalized world, enhance their employability and improve the quality of their education. A minority of institutions place financial benefits among their main goals, which contrasts with the fact that recruitment of international students, along with creating mobility opportunities, is a priority activity for more than half the institutions. Despite the professed interest in quality education, quality assurance mechanisms do not score high among priorities. Other less popular internationalization activities come under internationalization at home by changing the curriculum or the campus. Low priority is attached to transnational education and engagement with the local community and society. A new research strand called internationalization of Higher Education for society (IHES) is an attempt to redirect energy in a different direction (see Brandenburg et al. 2020).

The IAU survey reports on answers from 907 HEIs in 126 countries. In nearly all the institutions polled, internationalization is now part of mission/strategic plans, is driven by institutional leadership and the international office, and is funded from the institutional budget. While the most expected benefit is to enhance international cooperation and capacity building, and improve the quality of teaching and learning, risks to society are seen to be the commodification and commercialization of education programmes and brain drain. Obstacles to internationalization are considered to be the lack of financial resources, administrative hurdles and the lack of knowledge of foreign languages.

On a global scale, a gap has emerged between the values attached to internationalization, which are mostly academic enhancement and institutional autonomy, and the activities carried out, which are student mobility, strategic partnerships and international research collaboration. Importance is also attributed to internationalization of the curriculum in most regions, interpreted either as creating activities where students' international perspectives can be developed, or as professional development opportunities for staff.

Research articles on internationalization have burgeoned in the last twenty years. A search of Elsevier's Scopus database using the keywords "internationalization" and "higher education" produces 1858 articles since 2000. A search for the most frequent lexical three- or four-word phrases in the abstracts of these articles using the AntConc software

(Anthony 2019) produced a top six of "English-medium instruction", "internationalization of the curriculum", "teaching and learning", "higher education systems", "higher education policy" and "international student mobility". The most popular research methodologies were "case study" and "semi-structured" interviews. These findings are a good indicator of current areas of interest and of research methodologies.

As regards publications, the *Global Perspectives on Higher Education* series published by Sense/Brill has forty-five titles to date, while the younger Routledge series entitled *Internationalization in Higher Education* has published fifteen books so far. In the Sense/Brill series there is a focus on the quality of high-ranking universities, investigations into internationalization in particular countries or geographical areas, models and identity in specific types of universities (of Catholic orientation, for women only, or family-run), and campuses abroad. In the Routledge series, the monographs cluster into areas such as the theory and strategy of HEI, particular pedagogical themes, and aspects of study abroad and mobility, often with an intercultural perspective.

Overall, the aims, functions and stakeholders in higher education suggest that it is a process that is mostly implemented top-down by institutional leadership. The EAIE barometer and the IAU global survey, which document how internationalization has moved from being an add-on activity in universities to being included in their strategic plans, show a certain amount of disconnect between the declared aims of internationalization (preparing students for the global workplace, improved quality of education) and the activities that are generally considered important, such as student mobility. In these global surveys, the internationalization of research does not feature as a high priority. Analysis of the Scopus database shows increasing importance being attributed to issues around the classroom: teaching through English, teaching and learning, and internationalization of the curriculum.

1.2 English-Medium Instruction

In the IAU survey described above, one cited obstacle to internationalization is the lack of knowledge of foreign languages. Prior to the whole internationalization movement, which, at least in Europe, was given

considerable momentum by the Bologna Process, practising foreign languages and interacting with foreign cultures was one of the main reasons why students began attending courses at universities abroad. With the advent of the Erasmus mobility scheme, which allowed huge numbers of students and academic staff to move from one country to another, knowledge of a foreign language became less important. Courses started to be taught in English and students could acquire the social and professional advantages of study abroad without having to learn another language. So, although there has been an explosion in the number of English-taught courses across the world (Dearden 2015; Macaro et al. 2018), increased mobility has not led to greater or more varied language learning.

There are a few counter-examples of internationalization where other languages thrive: one of Romania's top universities, Babeș-Bolyai University (BBU) in Cluj, officially maintains Hungarian, German and Romanian as languages of instruction, representing the different ethnic groups in Transylvania (Szabo et al. 2020), while the University of the Basque Country is a well-documented example of a trilingual university (Lasagabaster 2015). However, the language of instruction is almost universally English, and EMI has now become the elephant in the internationalization room, requiring urgent attention from researchers and policymakers.

1.2.1 EMI: Culture, Teaching and Language Policy

The exponential growth of English-taught programmes is well documented: figures from the EAIE-Study Portals publication of 2017, based on 1617 HE institutions in the EHEA that offer at least one English-taught degree programme, report that there are 68,000 English-taught Bachelor's degrees in Europe, and 54,000 Master's programmes. Clearly, teaching through English is a successful means of attracting international students and internationalizing at home, but it is problematic from several points of view; firstly, in terms of the quality of education, which is claimed to be one of the drivers of internationalization, and secondly, in terms of the marginalization of other languages and cultures. Quality of education is clearly linked to, but not limited to, English language

proficiency: three of the chapters in this book (Chap. 2 Aizawa and Kinley—Japan; Chap. 6 Kaur—Malaysia; and Chap. 5 Wang—China) report on worries signalled by students (in the case of China) and academic staff (in Malaysia) about the poor quality of communication and interaction in the classroom, and limited learning efficiency. Language competence is also a matter of concern in Ethiopia, as reported in official documents (Murphy and Solomon, Chap. 4).

Besides language proficiency, the training and mindset of lecturers teaching through English is an important but neglected topic. Two chapters in this volume directly address the question of professional development for lecturers. Worthman (Chap. 7) illustrates a successful training programme for teachers from Mexico which shifts emphasis in the teachers' minds and practice away from language onto the curriculum, while Lauridsen (Chap. 9) reports on strengthening the nexus between policy and academic practice for creating an international learning opportunity for students in the classroom, which, she argues, "does not happen by osmosis".

The lack of a multicultural perspective within internationalization is lamented particularly by researchers in China, Japan and South Korea (Piller and Cho 2013; Le Phan 2013; Williams 2015; Tsuneyoshi 2018; Aizawa and McKinsley Chap. 2, this volume). The threat English poses to national cultural identity and other languages is increasingly witnessed in the media, for example in Italy (Pulcini and Campagna 2015) and the Netherlands (Edwards 2016). In this volume, the complexity of the Dutch situation is illustrated by drawing at least partially on the student perspective: at Maastricht University, Gabriëls and Wilkinson (Chap. 3) report a preference for a form of multilingualism, rather than monolingualism, as do Costa and Mariotti (Chap. 10) in the Italian classroom. Interestingly, this contrasts in part with the view from international students in Groningen (see Haines, Kroese and Guo, Chap. 8), who declare that the adoption of ELF (as opposed to Dutch) in student associations outside the classroom helps the process of inclusion of international students; while expressing a certain openness to learning Dutch to connect with the outside community, English helps them integrate into the learning community within the university.

In the era of burgeoning EMI and tension around national and cultural identity, language policies at national and institutional level are becoming a crucial issue. According to Spolsky (2004), there are three components in the language policy of a speech community: language planning and management, language practices (e.g. interaction between minority languages and a lingua franca), and beliefs about language and language use. While this categorization is only specifically adopted by Wang (Chap. 5), all three components emerge in a thread running through many of the chapters, pointing to a recurring and problematic gap between policies and actual practice, as well as a general lack of clarity within existing policies.

The most heated debate about language planning and management is currently taking place in the Netherlands: Gabriëls and Wilkinson (Chap. 3) report on the discussions surrounding a law passed in 2019 called 'Language and accessibility', provoked by discussion at national level regarding the defence of the Dutch language in higher education. The consequences of a lack of policy, or having only a partial policy, can also be problematic, as shown in the case of Malaysia (Kaur, Chap. 6).

Lack of clarity about what an existing policy actually entails is also a hindrance to effectiveness. Aizawa and McKinley (Chap. 2) point out that higher education reforms in Japan, such as the Top Global University Project that is intended to enhance the competitiveness of Japanese universities, state that courses are taught "in a foreign language" but do not explicitly say whether that language is English (although it inevitably is). Other areas of implicitness include the level of proficiency required to take or teach EMI courses, a notably unregulated issue worldwide. In China there is a similar level of implicitness: courses may be taught in English and the universities that do so receive financial help, indicating government support. From the analysis of the questions and answers on an online forum, Wang (Chap. 5) deduces a significant amount of concern among students about the level of proficiency required to attend EMI courses profitably. What seems obvious is that implicit, rather than clear, policies are another threat to quality.

Recognition, or the lack of it, given to minority languages is also an important feature of language policy, as argued by May (2014). This is particularly clear in Ethiopia (Murphy and Solomon, Chap. 4), where communication outside the HE classroom or between students inside the

classroom takes place in local languages, while instruction is delivered in English. At primary school, other languages are beginning to be given due recognition. In the interest of quality education, it may be necessary to extend this multilingual curriculum to secondary school and even higher education, given the inadequate performance on English tests at a national level.

Highly relevant to this policy thread, though not featured in this volume, is the role of political economy in relation to language policy. A recent collection by Ricento (2015a) has challenged the widespread assumption that EMI automatically reaps material or social benefits for individual and societies. Romaine (2015), for example, argues persuasively that "pursuing English in the name of development without careful planning will continue to reinforce inequalities rather than foster national unity or increase economic competitiveness" (p. 254). ELT has not been shown to be cost-effective in developing countries (Coleman 2011: 15) and early exposure to English-medium instruction in low-income countries can even be detrimental to academic achievement and attainment of literacy (Romaine 2015). For Grin (2015), linguistic diversity is more advantageous to individuals and economies than the "banalization" (p. 129) of English through EMI and there are strong economic arguments that it is multilingualism rather than English proficiency that correlates with increased trade (Melitz 2008; Arcand and Grin 2013). According to Ricento (2015b) "the overall consensus is that money and human resources would be better spent in developing literacy and academic skills through local or national languages" (p. 290). If this is the consensus applying to schools in underdeveloped post-colonial countries, then it raises the question of whether EMI courses are also being 'dumbed down' at tertiary level (see Sect. 1.2.2) and, if so, of how it limits the development of literacy among university students.

1.2.2 EMI and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

This section addresses the current state of play in EMI from the perspective of internationalized English. Dafouz and Smit (2014) have argued that university education worldwide should not be defined by a narrow, monolingual view of English but needs to adopt a multidisciplinary