

Multilingual Education

Ben Fenton-Smith
Pamela Humphreys
Ian Walkinshaw *Editors*

English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific

From Policy to Pedagogy

 Springer

Multilingual Education

Volume 21

Series editors

Andy Kirkpatrick

Department of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences, Griffith University,
Brisbane, Australia

Bob Adamson

Chair Professor of Curriculum Reform,

Department of International Education & Lifelong Learning,

The Education University of Hong Kong, Tai Po, Hong Kong SAR

Editorial Board

Jan Blommaert, University of Tilburg, The Netherlands

Kingsley Bolton, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Feng Anwei, The University of Nottingham, Ningbo, China

Ofelia Garcia, The Graduate Centre, City University of New York, USA

Saran Kaur Gill, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Mingyue (Michelle) Gu, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin NT,
Hong Kong SAR

Gu Yueguo, The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

Hartmut Haberland, Roskilde University, Denmark

David C.S. Li, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom,
Hong Kong SAR

Li Wei, Birkbeck College, University of London, UK

Low Ee-Ling, National Institute of Education, Singapore

Tony Liddicoat, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

Ricardo Nolasco, University of the Philippines at Diliman, Manila,
The Philippines

Merrill Swain, Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, University of Toronto,
Canada

Virginia Yip Choy Yin, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, NT,
Hong Kong SAR

The book series Multilingual Education publishes top quality monographs and edited volumes containing empirical research on multilingual language acquisition, language contact and the respective roles of languages in contexts where the languages are not cognate and where the scripts are often different, in order to be able to better understand the processes and issues involved and to inform governments and language policy makers. The volumes in this series are aimed primarily at researchers in education, especially multilingual education and other related fields, and those who are involved in the education of (language) teachers. Others who will be interested include key stakeholders and policy makers in the field of language policy and education. The editors welcome proposals and ideas for books that fit the series. For more information on how you can submit a proposal, please contact the publishing editor, Jolanda Voogd. E-mail: jolanda.voogd@springer.com

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/8836>

Ben Fenton-Smith · Pamela Humphreys
Ian Walkinshaw
Editors

English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific

From Policy to Pedagogy

 Springer

Editors

Ben Fenton-Smith
School of Humanities, Languages
and Social Science
Griffith University
Brisbane, QLD
Australia

Ian Walkinshaw
School of Humanities, Languages
and Social Science
Griffith University
Brisbane, QLD
Australia

Pamela Humphreys
Griffith English Language Institute
Griffith University
Brisbane, QLD
Australia

ISSN 2213-3208

Multilingual Education

ISBN 978-3-319-51974-6

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-51976-0

ISSN 2213-3216 (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-319-51976-0 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016963668

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved 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, express 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.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature

The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

EMI Issues and Challenges in Asia-Pacific Higher Education: An Introduction	1
Ian Walkinshaw, Ben Fenton-Smith and Pamela Humphreys	
Part I	
The Languages of Higher Education in East and Southeast Asia: Will EMI Lead to Englishisation?	21
Andy Kirkpatrick	
EMI Programs in a Vietnamese University: Language, Pedagogy and Policy Issues	37
Huong Thu Nguyen, Ian Walkinshaw and Hiep Hoa Pham	
English Medium Instruction in Korean Higher Education: Challenges and Future Directions	53
Eun Gyong Kim	
English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Pakistan: Policies, Perceptions, Problems, and Possibilities	71
Ahmar Mahboob	
EMI in Anglophone Nations: Contradiction in Terms or Cause for Consideration?	93
Pamela Humphreys	
The Significance of EMI for the Learning of EIL in Higher Education: Four Cases from Japan	115
Nobuyuki Hino	
English as a Medium of Instruction in Singapore Higher Education	133
Kingsley Bolton and Werner Botha	

Language Policy and Transnational Education (TNE)	
Institutions: What Role for What English?	153
Stuart Perrin	
A Case Study of Assessment in English Medium Instruction	
in Cambodia	173
Stephen H. Moore	
Part II	
Professional Development for EMI: Exploring	
Taiwanese Lecturers’ Needs	195
Ben Fenton-Smith, Christopher Stillwell and Roger Dupuy	
“Being a Professor and Doing EMI Properly Isn’t Easy”.	
An Identity-Theoretic Investigation of Content Teachers’	
Attitudes Towards EMI at a University in Hong Kong	219
John Trent	
English as a Medium of Instruction in Indonesian	
Higher Education: A Study of Lecturers’ Perceptions	241
Anita Dewi	
Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the Teaching	
of and Through English: Rethinking Linguistic Boundaries	
in an Australian University	259
Kathleen Heugh, Xuan Li and Ying Song	
English Medium Education in a University	
in Brunei Darussalam: Code-Switching and Intelligibility	281
Athirah Ishamina and David Deterding	
Unwritten Rules: Code Choice in Task-Based Learner Discourse	
in an EMI Context in Japan	299
Paul J. Moore	

Contributors

Kingsley Bolton School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Werner Botha School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

David Deterding Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei

Anita Dewi Caulfield Library, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Roger Dupuy Division of Continuing Education, University of California, Irvine, USA

Ben Fenton-Smith School of Humanities, Languages and Social Science, Griffith University, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

Kathleen Heugh School of Communication, International Studies and Languages, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Nobuyuki Hino Graduate School of Language and Culture, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

Pamela Humphreys Griffith English Language Institute, Griffith University, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

Athirah Ishamina Language Centre, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei

Eun Gyong Kim School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), Daejeon, South Korea

Andy Kirkpatrick Department of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

Xuan Li School of Communication, International Studies and Languages, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Ahmar Mahboob Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Paul J. Moore School of Languages and Cultures, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

Stephen H. Moore Department of Linguistics, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Huong Thu Nguyen Faculty of English for Specific Purposes, Foreign Trade University, Hanoi, Vietnam

Stuart Perrin The Language Centre, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Jiangsu Province, People's Republic of China

Hiep Hoa Pham English Department, Hue University of Foreign Languages, Hue, Vietnam

Ying Song Adelaide Institute of Business and Technology, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Christopher Stillwell School of Education, University of California, Irvine, USA

John Trent Department of English Language Education, Hong Kong Institute of Education, Tai Po, Hong Kong

Ian Walkinshaw School of Humanities, Languages and Social Science, Griffith University, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

EMI Issues and Challenges in Asia-Pacific Higher Education: An Introduction

Ian Walkinshaw, Ben Fenton-Smith and Pamela Humphreys

Abstract This chapter makes the case for a research focus on English medium instruction (EMI) in Asia-Pacific higher education. Three key reasons are provided: (i) the rise in the geopolitical status of English as a lingua franca; (ii) the expansion of higher education in the region; and (iii) the boom in large-scale internationalisation education policies by Asia-Pacific governments. In this context, the very meaning of ‘EMI’ is problematized, with the binary ‘it is or it isn’t’ distinction eschewed in favour of more nuanced, situated conceptualisations, and extending to EMI in Anglophone contexts. The paper then outlines some of the key challenges relating to EMI at the governmental, institutional and classroom levels, as well as considering issues of language assessment and content outcomes. Finally, an overview of work by key researchers on EMI in Asia-Pacific is provided, focussing on: (i) EMI policies and practices in various Asia-Pacific polities; (ii) issues affecting EMI instructors; and (iii) multiple language use among learners in EMI contexts.

Keywords Asia-Pacific · Content-based language teaching (CBLT) · Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) · English as a *lingua franca* (ELF) · English medium instruction (EMI) · Higher education

I. Walkinshaw (✉) · B. Fenton-Smith
School of Humanities, Languages and Social Science,
Griffith University, Brisbane, QLD, Australia
e-mail: i.walkinshaw@griffith.edu.au

B. Fenton-Smith
e-mail: b.fenton-smith@griffith.edu.au

P. Humphreys
Griffith English Language Institute, Griffith University,
Brisbane, QLD, Australia
e-mail: p.humphreys@griffith.edu.au

1 Introduction

At the last count, there were almost 8000 courses being taught in English at universities in non-Anglophone countries around the world (Mitchell 2016). Arguably, the global spread of English had previously been felt more at the elementary or secondary levels of education in countries where English was not the dominant local language. Moreover, the primary focus of English language education was language acquisition for communicative purposes. But the last two decades have seen huge changes. Now, English as a ‘medium’ of instruction (EMI) (as opposed to English as an ‘object’ of instruction) is becoming a ‘new normal’, and a key site for this change is higher education, nowhere more so than in the Asia-Pacific.

The purpose of this book is essentially fourfold: (i) to consider the social, historical, political, economic and ideological drivers of EMI’s rapid growth in higher education in Asia-Pacific higher education; (ii) to critically review the extent and nature of current practice in a variety of national and cultural contexts; (iii) to evaluate achievements and impacts; and (iv) to speculate on future developments in EMI policy and pedagogy. This volume is among the first to critically examine the emerging global phenomenon of English as a medium of instruction, and the first title to exclusively explore Asia-Pacific university contexts.

2 EMI and Higher Education in Asia-Pacific

Asia Pacific is ripe for a discourse on EMI in higher education for several reasons. The first is the role of English within the geopolitical make-up of the region, where it has become almost by default the sole contact language for trade, commerce, diplomacy, and scholarship (Kirkpatrick 2010). Its position is cemented by its status in regional economic and trade agreements: for example, English is the *de facto lingua franca* of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN),¹ an organisation aimed at economic and social growth and regional stability. Recent moves to establish an ASEAN Economic Community with a single market and production base (Guerrero 2010), and potentially an ASEAN common currency, underscore the need for cooperation and unified decision-making—all of which takes place in English as a *lingua franca*. Regional economic growth has been further stimulated by the 1989 establishment of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and the post-2000 entry of Cambodia, China, Laos, Taiwan and Vietnam into the World Trade Organisation (WTO) (other Asia Pacific nations became members in 1995). These factors have created an explosion of demand throughout the region to raise the English language competence of the present and

¹The ASEAN member-states are Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. An expanded body, ASEAN+3, incorporates China, Japan and South Korea.

future workforce (Kirkpatrick and Sussex 2012). It is little wonder that tertiary institutions are eager to increase the range of courses and programs offered through EMI.

The second reason is the growth of the higher education sector in the Asia-Pacific. At the launch of the 2015 OECD *Education at a Glance Report*, the organisation's Director for Education and Skills noted that it is in Asia that "you can see the hunger for learning" (Pie News 2015). This hunger is evident in the data: outward bound students from Asia continue to represent over half of the world's mobile international students, and they dominate by a large margin (IEAA 2015). It is also evident in the growth of domestic (home) enrolments in Asian universities, which has seen "an explosive growth over the last few decades from 20 million students in 1980 to 84 million in 2011" (Chien and Chapman 2014, p. 21). For example, in Thailand and Malaysia, postgraduate enrolments have increased by 300% and 400% respectively over the last decade (Chien and Chapman 2014). A senior policy advisor for the European Commission summed up the state of play during an opening address to a high profile education conference in 2013, arguing that Europe could not afford to rest on its laurels, and citing China and India (as well as Latin America) as countries which were developing high-quality education offerings (Rigg 2013). Universities in Asia are no longer only leading the way as the *source* countries of outward bound students but have also begun to actively promote themselves as higher education *destination* markets. In China, for example, the international higher education sector has grown by 13% each year since 2003, from just under 78,000 enrolments up to a total of 380,000 by 2014, and it has set the ambitious goal of being the largest provider of education to outwardly mobile Asian students with 500,000 enrolments in schools, colleges and universities by 2020 (IEAA 2015). From 2016, foreign students studying at Beijing's universities enjoy new work rights (Xinying 2016), making it an attractive destination. Elsewhere in Asia, there are similar trends: Malaysia's international student enrolments increased by more than 25% between 2010 and 2015. In Japan, international student enrolments passed 180,000 in 2014, and both South Korea and Singapore attract students in their tens of thousands. Interestingly, this growth is not being driven by students from traditional source countries such as China but by other Asian countries such as Indonesia, Pakistan and Thailand, and many Asian countries are setting ambitious targets for future growth. Malaysia and South Korea have aims for 200,000 international students each by 2020 and 2023 respectively, for example (IEAA 2015). The increase in higher education enrolments from domestic students along with the desire to attract international students has resulted in a more globalised student body in universities in the Asia-Pacific region and, in turn, an increase in the need for EMI provision.

A third reason stems from the policy actions of governments in the Asia-Pacific in relation to internationalisation. EMI has become a centrepiece of macro-level language policy and planning over the past quarter century, both regionally (i.e.

policies formed Asia-wide) and nationally (i.e. policies formulated by ministries of education). In 2008, ASEAN set a plan to achieve greater regional harmonisation involving 6500 higher education institutions and 12 million post-secondary students (Dang 2015), while the 2012 APEC summit resolved to improve academic staff and student mobility, akin to the EU's Bologna process. Such high-level policy initiatives consolidate the push to EMI (Kirkpatrick 2014). Nationally, many policies are breathtakingly broad in their intended scope and impact, as illustrated by the three following snapshots of language policy and planning reforms underway in the Asia-Pacific higher education sector:

- *Indonesia*: The Minister for Higher Education recently announced the implementation of a bilingual curriculum (Bahasa Indonesian/English) in universities nationwide in 2016 (Dewi this volume). The policy is intended to “encourage English fluency among all students and teaching staff”, with the expectation that they will “communicate in English and all academic references would use English terms” (The Jakarta Post 2015).
- *China*: the Ministry of Education requires 5–10% of its undergraduate specialisation courses be taught in English or another foreign language and counts the number of EMI courses offered as a criterion of official evaluations of local universities (Lei and Hu 2014). Future grand plans include the development of Zhejiang University (Times Higher Education 2013), scheduled for completion in 2016, where the on-campus working language will be English. Another development is the establishment of Western university campuses which operate in English, such as Nottingham University's Ningbo campus (Perrin this volume; Pessoa et al. 2014).
- *Japan*: The Japanese government has made available ¥7.7 billion (US\$77 million) to 10 “top” universities to elevate them to the top tier of world rankings, and to 20 “global” universities to stimulate internationalization. The Education Ministry stipulates that a common condition for both funding streams is that they increase both the “ratio of foreign faculty and students” and the number of “lectures in English” (MEXT 2014). It is also envisioned that all domestic university students' entry-level English proficiency will be boosted by learning English exclusively through English in their senior high school years, a pedagogical strategy that was implemented nationwide in 2013 (Hashimoto 2013).

It is clear from the studies in this volume and elsewhere that implementing these visions at the meso (institutional) and micro (program/course/individual) levels has often been experimental. Whether this is by necessity or poor management is a common theme in debates about EMI. Indeed, Kirkpatrick (2014) comments that while most Asian universities have accepted that they need to provide EMI courses if they want to raise their international profile, few have developed the language policies that need to go hand in hand with such a decision. EMI is clearly not just a linguistic change but has been described as a geopolitical, economic and ideological phenomenon that is impacting university eco-systems more broadly (Madhavan Brochier 2016).

3 What Does ‘EMI’ Mean?

At this juncture, it is worth taking a step back to consider what is meant by the term “English Medium Instruction”. Experts have suggested that EMI is still ill-defined and not fully agreed upon (Airey 2016). Indeed, Ernesto Macaro, Director of EMI Oxford’s Centre for Research and Development on EMI, went as far as to say that “we do not yet know what EMI is” (Rigg 2013) and that its meaning is still evolving (British Council 2013). Knagg noted the “monolithic fallacy” related to EMI, i.e. the assumption that there is only one type, when in fact EMI practices are heavily context-dependent (British Council 2013), a view borne out by the diversity of EMI contexts and perspectives in the present volume. Madhavan Brochier (2016) defines EMI as “teaching subjects using the English language without explicit language learning aims and usually in a country where English is not spoken by a majority of the people”, but accepts that even this is open to dispute (and indeed two chapters in this book (Heugh, Li and Song; Humphreys) posit forms of meaningful EMI in Anglophone countries). EMI therefore appears to have reached its Rumsfeldian moment, where although much is known, commentary on the “known unknowns” is equally prevalent.

Clearly, a current conundrum is the proliferation of closely related terms that have clouded the nexus between discipline-specific learning and academic language. As Madhavan Brochier recently put it, echoing the work of Ernesto Macaro (British Council 2013) while drawing on her own practical wisdom born of “hundreds of hours” observing EMI classrooms in France:

English Medium Instruction is not the same as Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL); it’s not a substitute for English for Academic Purposes (EAP); and it’s not a refashioning of English for Specific Purposes (ESP). [...] It is something that stands on its own.

The key point of distinction, she argues, between EMI and the others is that

EMI has no exclusively stated language-learning aims. [...] I’ve never seen anyone go into an EMI course thinking: “Great, I’ll work on my students’ English as well”. In fact, what I see is quite the opposite. [...] If that happens, it’s a happy by-product.

The word “by-product” is apt since it is evocative of experimentation, a recurring theme in EMI’s nascent literature (this book included). There is almost a characterisation of EMI as the maverick younger sibling of CLIL/CBLT/EAP/ESP²—making it up as she goes along, resistant to doing things systematically, but somehow getting all the attention in recent times. Taguchi (2014), interestingly, uses the same word, describing EMI as “a tool for academic study...a by-product of the process of gaining content knowledge in academic subjects” (p. 89) and therefore without explicit language outcomes.

²CBLT = Content-based Language Teaching; EAP = English for Academic Purposes; ESP = English for Specific Purposes.

Another way to grapple with the difference between EMI, CLIL and EAP/ESP is via Airey's (2016) conceptualisation of a language/content continuum. In his model, EAP courses are positioned as focusing exclusively on language outcomes whereas CLIL is concerned with both content *and* language goals. EMI is further along the continuum and is said to focus only on learning related to content. It is common to hear calls for "more EAP" in institutional contexts where the implementation of EMI is perceived to require support—a model that links EAP and EMI but keeps them discrete. This can be a marriage of convenience for language specialists on the one hand and discipline specialists on the other, who may find close collaboration too challenging but be happy for each camp to pursue their goals within the same institution. It is also a likely reason that CLIL, which idealises the synthesis of both approaches, has not gained significant traction in higher education globally (although it has at the primary/secondary levels)—it would require university academics to give equal weight to content and language in their teaching, a revolutionary change in most contexts. It is also noteworthy that CLIL is the only acronym of the three without an "E" in it. This is because it is concerned with the way(s) language is used within a discipline (e.g. to formulate arguments or frame concepts), and is therefore as much about the L1 as the L2. EAP and EMI are both concerned specifically with English: EAP with how English operates in academic domains; EMI with the transmission of academic knowledge through English.

The meaning of the "E" in "EMI" (the notion of *which* or *whose* English is being referred to) is indeed a point of controversy and one that is raised by several contributors to this volume (e.g. Kirkpatrick and Mahboob). The "E" may, for example, denote an American, British or other "native speaker" norm, or English as an International language (EIL), or English as a *lingua franca* (ELF). Currently, there is no single model that can be used as a global standard (Pennycook 2012) and generally what is meant by "English" in the implementation of EMI policies is not articulated. It is not clear, for example, whether countries adopting EMI as the *lingua academica* of higher education should be aiming to emulate a specified native speaker variety or whether a standard local variety might (or should) be accepted. Kirkpatrick (2014) and many others (e.g. Jenkins 2013; Taguchi 2014) have also raised the issue of ownership in such contexts where English is not the L1 of most of the stakeholders, along with the possible negative impact on local languages when English is used in their stead.

Finally, we argue that, in many contexts, programs cannot and should not be defined using the binary distinction of "EMI" or "not EMI", or what Knagg (British Council 2013) refers to as "the on-off fallacy". Rather, EMI is a more nuanced concept operating on continua of usage at varying levels including institutional, course and classroom. For example, depending on the context, English might be used outside of the classroom for on- or off-campus interactions as well as inside the classroom. At classroom level, the extent of use might vary from English being simply the language of the textbook (Lei and Hu 2014), or the medium of delivery, or the language of assessed activities, or the language of classroom activities or the language of all classroom interactions. English might also be used along with other

languages, allowing for code-switching and translanguaging, as chapters in this volume describe. While the extent of English use may not always be explicitly stated, it is possible for language policies to articulate this, such as the distinction made at the Hong Kong Institute of Education between Medium of Instruction (MOI) and Classroom Language (CL) (Kirkpatrick this volume).

In summary, the meaning of “EMI” is a long way from being settled. On the contrary, it is a contested term and far from value-neutral.

4 Challenges for EMI

We preface our discussion of the issues in EMI with the view that its implementation has largely been promulgated with good intentions. The aim of macro-level stakeholders to increase the quality of educational offerings and to develop English language proficiency, potentially leading to a well-qualified, internationally-minded, bi- or multilingual workforce, is laudable. Nevertheless, in many cases, macro- and meso-level stakeholders seem to have adopted EMI policies uncritically, attracted by the opportunity for marketing, internationalisation and/or financial benefit (Dearden 2014). Scholars (e.g. Hamid et al. 2013; Nguyen et al. this volume; Kirkpatrick this volume; Wilkinson 2013) argue that these presumed advantages are sometimes prioritised ahead of educational benefits such as gaining academic knowledge. Gibbs (2010, cited in Jenkins 2013) characterises the situation as “a collusion of mediocrity based on immediacy, hedonism and financial return” (p. 251).

More research is needed into the motives underlying the implementation of EMI, best practice for delivery, and the implications for teaching, learning and teacher professional development (Dearden 2014). In many cases a policy-level short-sightedness exists regarding the myriad “difficulties and challenges” (Hamid et al. 2013, p. 11) inherent in implementing such a policy at the institutional and classroom levels. What is not generally considered at macro-level is that teaching content in EMI requires not just expertise in discipline content and the ability to effectively communicate knowledge to learners, but also what Wilkinson (2013) terms “language competence”, i.e. the capacity to effectively teach discipline content through the medium of English. In many contexts, there is a shortage of teachers possessing sufficient language competence (Dearden 2014; Hamid et al. 2013; Vu and Burns 2014). Added to this is a lack of clear guidelines for faculty on how to deliver education through the medium of English (Dearden 2014). Staff may also be compelled to operate with limited training, resources (e.g. assessment, learning materials, coursebooks) (Dearden 2014; Hamid et al. 2013; Vu and Burns 2014) or funding, and without the illuminating benefit of research findings (Dearden 2014).

There may also be unrealistic expectations of student outcomes: research indicates that the input from content teaching does not necessarily equate to language proficiency development (Hamid et al. 2013; Wilkinson 2013). And if learners do not have sufficient academic language capability, then their content learning may suffer as well—what (Hamid et al. 2013) call a double loss rather than the hoped-for

double gain (see also Shohamy 2013)—impacting on their performance at university and their career options on exit.

Finally, there is the question of whether and how language outcomes should be measured in EMI contexts. This includes the issue of whether standards of English should be set for entry and/or exit in EMI contexts (as argued by Nguyen et al. in this volume), and, if so, how language outcomes might be measured or evaluated (Lei and Hu 2014; Pan 2009). It has also been suggested that a threshold of language is required for lecturers to participate effectively in EMI (Klaassen and De Graaff 2001), raising the allied issue of whether teaching staff too should be required to have a minimum level of English to deliver EMI, and, if so, how that might be ascertained.

5 Previous Research

While research into EMI is growing, only a small number of studies focus solely on tertiary education in Asia-Pacific. It was in Europe that the EMI phenomenon gained its initial momentum, in the wake of the Bologna Declaration of 1999 that created a European Higher Education Area, and the first major reports on EMI therefore tended to focus on the that context. Two key examples are Wächter and Maiworm's (2008, 2014) oft-cited and continually updated documentation of the growth of English taught programs across the continent, and Coleman's 2006 state-of-the-art report on EMI in European higher education, which was one of the first to clearly delineate the multiple drivers and impacts of EMI on this part of the world. In this section, we briefly outline some of the key recent studies, with a view to their applicability to Asia-Pacific, and foreground areas where the current book may extend or complement existing findings and initiate further enquiry. Our overview is not intended to be exhaustive, since the chapters in the collection offer detailed literature reviews of their own.

The collection most akin to the current volume is Hamid et al.'s (2014) *Language planning for medium of instruction in Asia*, which explores the policy and practice of medium of instruction (MoI) in various Asian education contexts.³ Applying a language policy and planning perspective, Hamid et al. (2014) offer insight into the contexts, processes, goals and outcomes of MoI policies across the region, with a particular focus on micro-level stakeholders including teachers, students and parents. Hamid et al.'s comprehensive overview of the policy and practice of MoI in Asia is followed by studies of numerous polities in Asia Pacific: Bangladesh (Hamid, Jahan and Islam), Hong Kong (Poon), India (Bhattacharya), Indonesia (Zacharias), Japan (Hashimoto), Malaysia (Ali), the Maldives (Mohamed), Nepal (Phyak), Vietnam (Dang, Nguyen and Le) and Timor-Leste (Taylor-Leech). These studies are

³The papers from this volume are also available in the February 2013 special edition of *Current Issues in Language Planning*.

copiously referenced throughout the current volume. A point of difference is that Hamid et al. are concerned with MoI generally rather than EMI specifically (though many of the chapters do examine English-medium educational contexts), and their focus is confined to non-Anglophone contexts. The majority of chapters explore primary- and secondary-level contexts rather than higher education and therefore provide a complementary contribution to the current work.

Similar in focus and scope to the current volume is Kirkpatrick and Sussex's 2012 collection, *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education*. The book outlines the characteristics of English as an Asian language and the range of roles which English plays across Asia, encompassing Malaysia, Indonesia, China, Japan, Sri Lanka and others. While the first section of the collection is dedicated to issues of language education policy, the chapters in the other three sections also address non-pedagogical aspects of language use: ELF, the language-culture interface, and the interactional norms of English users in Asia. Like the Hamid et al. work, it is largely confined to primary and secondary contexts rather than tertiary education, thereby complementing this volume.

A book which charts similar territory comes from Doiz et al. (2013). Their edited collection *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* explores the pedagogical and methodological challenges of EMI implementation at universities in a variety of social, political and linguistic contexts. Their focus is largely Europe, with forays into the US, Israel, Hong Kong and South Africa. Another work dealing with a similar theme is Jenkins' (2013) *English as a lingua franca in the international university*. Jenkins examines the functions and status of ELF in global higher education. She problematizes the prevailing ideology of 'appropriate' English language usage (invariably a standard/native variety) to which university management and academics hold and which informs policy and practice at most Anglophone and non-Anglophone institutions. The work explores English language policies and practices at international universities.

Haberland et al.'s (2013) collection *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* explores the interplay between English and other languages in a range of bilingual and multilingual educational contexts. The chapters tease out some of the factors characterising successful bilingual and multilingual learners. Although the subject matter overlaps to some extent with the current book, Haberland et al.'s focus is on bi- and multilingualism rather than EMI, and is also largely concerned with Europe, though educational contexts in China and Japan are also described.

Finally, we make mention of a special journal issue on the topic of EMI published by the *International Review of Applied Linguistics* in 2014. It presents a series of case studies in order to critically examine the role of EMI in terms of the challenges and opportunities for developing English skills for the global society. Its focus is not specifically on Asia Pacific, but several studies do investigate that area: Lei and Hu examine the effectiveness of EMI in raising Chinese undergraduate students' English language competence; Taguchi investigates the process of pragmatic socialisation in EMI courses in Japan; and Mahboob demonstrates how genre-based approaches may be applied to online language and literacy teaching to

support the needs of English as an additional language (EAL) students at EMI institutions in Hong Kong.

6 Aims and Scope of the Book

This collection is deliberately broad in scope, intending to address a range of EMI issues for a variety of stakeholders including: government or institutional policy-makers; educators or researchers in international education; practitioners or specialists in CLIL, content-based language teaching (CBLT) or EAP; and academics and researchers in teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) or ELF.

The book explores a variety of polities in the Asia-Pacific region, which is defined for our purposes as the countries of East and Southeast Asia, South Asia and Oceania. Represented in this collection are Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan and Vietnam. In our view, any discussion of EMI in Asia-Pacific needs to encompass both Anglophone and non-Anglophone contexts. EMI is a feature of most if not all Australian tertiary institutions, for example, since almost all learning activities are conducted solely in English. And because around one fifth of the Australian higher education sector's overall cohort are fee-paying international students (OECD 2015), there is a large population who use English as an academic *lingua franca* (Björkman 2013; Jenkins 2013) to communicate with each other and with domestic (home) Australian students.

Beyond this introductory chapter, the volume offers a collection of fifteen further chapters divided into two broad sections: Part 1 provides nine chapters focusing on EMI policies and practices in various contexts in Asia-Pacific (Nguyen, Walkinshaw and Pham; Kim; Mahboob; Humphreys; Hino; Bolton and Botha; Perrin; S. Moore) while the six chapters in Part 2 continue to provide overviews of the respective country profiled, while also shifting the emphasis to the classroom and the 'lived experience' of key internal stakeholders, i.e. instructors (Fenton-Smith, Stillwell and Dupuy; Trent; Dewi) and students (Heugh, Li and Song; Ishamina and Deterding; P. Moore).

6.1 Part 1

Kirkpatrick opens the discussion by noting the exponential increase in EMI offerings in the region. He describes recent developments in contexts including Malaysia, with its aim to be a regional education hub, and Myanmar as a counter-example. Kirkpatrick argues that EMI policy implementation is occurring without adequate planning or preparation for teachers and students (a theme we

revisit in Part 2). A crucial insight in this chapter is that successful internationalisation is not the same as Englishisation (i.e. propagating an English-speaking world view). He therefore urges policy makers at national and institutional levels to ensure that language policies are coherent and systematic, involve all stakeholders in their development, and consider the bi/multilingual needs of such contexts.

Many of the issues raised by Kirkpatrick are recast by Nguyen, Walkinshaw and Pham within the context of Vietnam (“[EMI Programs in a Vietnamese University: Language, Pedagogy and Policy Issues](#)”). This chapter is highly representative of the current state of EMI in the region because it neatly captures the pressures exerted on the ‘micro’ by the ‘macro’ in policy and implementation. Vietnam now has an overarching governmental vision (the National Foreign Language 2020 project), but its trickle down to actual institutions has given rise to a variety of local challenges. This chapter profiles one long-standing public university in which the move to EMI has been encumbered by low English language entry standards, the lecturers’ lack of expertise in English language instruction, and the expedient importation of unsuitable learning materials from overseas. However Nguyen et al. outline a range of feasible and practical strategies that could enhance the experience of EMI for all concerned in Vietnamese higher education, all of which are applicable elsewhere.

The situation in Korea, as elucidated by Kim in her chapter, “[English Medium Instruction in Korean Higher Education: Challenges and Future Directions](#)”, has similarities with Vietnam, and the author is well placed to provide insight: Dr Kim is Associate Professor and Director of the EFL Program in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at KAIST (Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology), an institution that leads Korea not only in engineering but also in the scale of EMI reform. It controversially converted to full EMI-mode in 2006, mandating that all courses be taught in English, a point of significant national attention as outlined in this chapter. Korea is a very significant site of EMI research because so many institutions like KAIST have attempted major EMI innovation, to the extent, for example, that 30% of university classes in Seoul had switched to EMI by 2011. Kim’s comprehensive overview of this context is an absorbing report on the background, developments, motivations and washback (good and bad) from this national education movement.

In the next chapter our attention shifts to a very different cultural context: Pakistan. Ahmar Mahboob’s chapter, “[English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Pakistan: Policies, Perceptions, Problems, and Possibilities](#)”, makes the case that unlike many other countries, where EMI has only recently been cultivated to internationalise the higher education system and/or globalize the student body, Pakistan entrenched English long ago as the MOI for university education, and the choice was more political than commercial. He argues that post-independence Pakistan favoured English as a tertiary MOI despite a surfeit of indigenous languages to choose from because of its status as the mode of communication for national governance, and because the promotion of any one local language would risk the alienation of other linguistic communities, possibly threatening national unity. Ironically, however, English continues to disadvantage

those students who enter higher education from regions and backgrounds in which English is not the MOI at primary or secondary level. Mahboob entertains, but rejects, the adoption of ‘Pakistani English’ to resolve this problem, instead suggesting that a genre-based EMI pedagogy is a possible way forward.

As if to illustrate the point made earlier by Rigg (2013), Knagg (British Council 2013) and others that EMI is continually evolving and undergoing redefinition across different national contexts, we next turn to a study of EMI in an Anglophone nation, Australia. In her chapter, “[EMI in Anglophone Nations: Contradiction in Terms or Cause for Consideration?](#)”, Humphreys revisits the very meaning of “EMI”, questioning whether the concept can only be applied in non-Anglophone contexts. Her view is that it should not, primarily because Anglophone nations (e.g. Australia) have ramped up their international student intakes to such an extent that many credit-bearing courses comprise significant (even majority) numbers of students for whom English is an additional language. Given this fact, one may ask whether three or more years spent in an English medium degree program in an Anglophone country actually improves ELP, both objectively (as indicated by empirical evidence) and impressionistically (as indicated by employers’ perceptions). Humphreys’ findings on these measures are sobering for Anglophone higher education, and run counter to the accepted wisdom that academic English is best acquired via study in countries where English is the L1.

In his chapter, “[The Significance of EMI for the Learning of EIL in Higher Education: Four Cases from Japan](#)”, Hino explores the role of EMI for learning EIL in Japanese higher education. He outlines the current state of EMI in Japanese universities against the backdrop of government initiatives such as the Global 30 Project and the Super Global Universities Project, which aim to boost the profile of Japan’s top institutions by (among other things) increasing the number of programs and courses taught through EMI. His focus then shifts to several localised case-studies which highlight the variable shape of EMI in Japan’s tertiary classrooms: overseas students in Japan on an exchange program taught through EMI; a course comprising equal numbers of Japanese and overseas students learning and communicating through EMI; a class of Japanese students taught by an English-speaking instructor; and a course where all participants are Japanese but English is the sole medium of instruction. Hino draws on these data to champion a *lingua franca* model for learning/using English, rather than a ‘native speaker’ model. He also argues that interactive skills in EIL are developable in any authentic educational milieu, regardless of linguistic diversity.

The next chapter, “[English as a Medium of Instruction in Singapore Higher Education](#)”, shifts the focus to a historical and contemporary overview of the state of EMI in Singapore, whose higher education institutions have long conducted learning through EMI. Bolton and Botha first trace the steps in Singapore’s history which led to the use of English as an educational medium post-independence, foregrounding the role played by the colonial language policies of earlier times. They then turn to the contemporary context, describing the current state of EMI in Singaporean universities and polytechnics (with an illustrative focus on one national institution) and exploring the political and economic underpinnings of

current language policy in Singapore higher education. What stands out is the pragmatic foresight of Singapore's government in the post-independence years: the language which they mandated as the medium of instruction in HE has since become the primary means of communicating with Singapore's many regional and international trading partners.

The following chapter, “[Language Policy and Transnational Education \(TNE\) Institutions: What Role for What English?](#)”, is important because it brings together two booming strands in international education: EMI and transnational education. Until now, such discussions have been largely missing in the EMI literature. TNE is defined as education “in which the learners are located in a country different from the one where the awarding institution is based” (UNESCO/Council of Europe 2000). Perrin overviews the challenges faced by institutions delivering EMI in a TNE environment, including the need to create and adopt a workable language policy. The chapter therefore documents one of the first institutional language policies to be created and implemented at a university in mainland China. The institutional research undertaken prior to implementing the policy involved over 700 stakeholder participants via surveys and interviews, from which a framework for the ensuing policy was developed around six key themes: the language of (i) learning and teaching, (ii) assessment, (iii) research, (iv) recruitment, (v) administration, and (vi) social/daily life. Findings emphasized the need to consider the variety of English used, whilst recognizing the importance and status of the host country's first language.

The final chapter in Part 1 draws on Stephen Moore's experience of tertiary education in Cambodia, where he established a Bachelor of Education program in teaching English as a foreign language at a major Cambodian university. His focus in “[A Case Study of Assessment in English Medium Instruction in Cambodia](#)” is assessment practices in EMI, an under-researched area. This case study is situated in the institution where Moore was previously employed; he details the assessment practices utilised in several English-medium programs and highlights the pedagogical challenges of implementing them, including issues of teacher agency, learner engagement, assessment for learning and quality control, among others. In doing so, he foregrounds concerns which are part and parcel of establishing and delivering an English-language educational program in a developing country.

6.2 Part 2

The following three chapters discuss EMI in tertiary education from the point of view of instructors, the front-line stakeholders who must enact any EMI policy decision. Relatively limited attention has been given to their experiences and attitudes in the literature to date. Fenton-Smith, Stillwell and Dupuy's study of this topic in their chapter, “[Professional Development for EMI: Exploring Taiwanese Lecturers' Needs](#)”, uniquely spans two contexts of praxis: Taiwan, where the EMI institution is located, and the USA, where the overseas professional development

opportunity to enhance their EMI teaching skills was to be delivered. It examines the preparatory work undertaken to ascertain the pre-program attitudes of participants on EMI as policy (both institutional and national) and practice. From this critical starting point, Fenton-Smith et al. offer insight into the likely necessary elements for an effective PD program for such a cohort. The chapter also raises a key question that those delivering PD to instructors may need to grapple with: How to strike a balance in the delivery of such programs between realistic and the idealistic desired outcomes, and the need to deal with any conflicting perceptions. This chapter conveys a refreshingly positive attitude from the instructor stakeholder perspective, while cautioning that rigorous and principled instructor support will increasingly be required as EMI provision grows.

The next chapter, “[Being a Professor and Doing EMI Properly isn’t Easy: An Identity-Theoretic Investigation of Content Teachers’ Attitudes Towards EMI at a University in Hong Kong](#)”, continues the focus on the views of university teaching staff, this time in the Hong Kong higher education context. Proposing a framework to understand teacher identity, Trent reveals the dominant discourses that constrained and enabled the academic staff in his study to negotiate multiple identities, including ‘academic economist’, ‘researcher’, and ‘teacher’. The qualitative data describe the challenges that Economics and Finance academics experienced in constructing their preferred identities in an EMI environment and how they negotiated such challenges via ‘the discourse of rationality’ and the ‘discourse of possibility’. Trent considers implications for policymakers wishing to afford greater agency to academic staff in the identity construction, critical to both their capacity and willingness to implement EMI policies.

The third chapter to analyse EMI through the prism of those who deliver it is Dewi’s study of Indonesia (“[English as a Medium of Instruction in Indonesian Higher Education: A Study of Lecturers’ Perceptions](#)”), situated in a country that recently announced a large-scale ambition to shift to EMI across its higher education sector, as mentioned earlier. The intriguing thesis at the heart of this paper is that of “positive imperialism”—the idea that English can be readily recognised by local actors (e.g. university lecturers) as imposed by outside powers (“the West”), but agentively coopted by those actors and turned to their own advantage. This notion is explored through data gained via a questionnaire and interviews with thirty-six Indonesian EMI academics, and the results indicate that English is viewed by them as a tool for (among other things) international advancement, positive identity formation, and curriculum improvement.

The final three chapters in this volume are devoted to the theme of multiple language use in EMI classrooms. This topic is the site of a shift in thinking vis-à-vis learning and using English as an additional language: while a traditional EFL paradigm would view code-switching and mixing as interference errors from the L1, they may be recast in an EMI paradigm as bilingual resources to be exploited in the classroom. In that vein, Heugh, Li and Song (“[Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the Teaching of and Through English: Rethinking Linguistic Boundaries in an Australian University](#)”) explore the role that code-switching and translanguaging play in teaching content through English in Australian tertiary

contexts. (Similar to Humphreys' chapter, Heugh et al. interrogate an Anglophone rather than non-Anglophone EMI environment.) They outline a systematic pedagogical shift at their institution from a conventional EAL approach toward a multilingual one which supports translanguaging in the teaching of content through EMI to students from a range of linguistic backgrounds. Their study, which examines the writing proficiency of Chinese-speaking international students studying in Australia, emphasizes the correlation between students' written proficiency in Chinese and that in English, as well as identifying a relationship between their metalinguistic expertise in translation and proficiency in their home language. These findings promote a shift from a monolingual objective in teaching (both of and through) English to a multilingual objective.

Ishamina and Deterding's contribution to the volume ("[English Medium Education in a University in Brunei Darussalam: Code-Switching and Intelligibility](#)") continues the theme of students using multiple languages in an EMI tertiary context by considering the use of code-switching among university undergraduates in Brunei. The primary research in this chapter investigates incidences of misunderstandings arising from the use of Malay that occurred when Bruneian students were talking in English to non-Bruneians in informal settings. The study found that most instances of code-switching did not lead to serious breakdowns in communication. The authors conclude that code-switching does not interfere with the successful implementation of EMI at tertiary level in the Bruneian context, and (in contrast to some chapters in the volume) note that the use of English is unlikely to undermine the dominant use of the local language, Malay, in tertiary education or Bruneian society more generally.

Paul Moore extends the multilingual theme along similar lines in his chapter, "[Unwritten Rules: Code Choice in Task-Based Learner Discourse in an EMI Context in Japan](#)", though his context is formal and task-focused rather than informal. His study probes code-choice among Japanese university students during classroom oral presentation tasks. Like Hino's chapter, Moore's study is anchored in the context of Japan's Global Universities Project and similar initiatives aimed in part at boosting students' English proficiency and propagating EMI in Japanese HE. Such initiatives tend to emphasize second language use, disparagingly casting first language use as 'interference' or 'negative transfer' (Barnard and McLellan 2013). The value of Moore's study therefore is its examination of L1 use through a benefit rather than a deficit prism: he provides insight into how and why Japanese learners of English draw on their first language as a resource for constructing their additional language in a classroom milieu.

7 Concluding Remarks

As we will see, the chapters in this volume (like much other literature on EMI) acknowledge that the adoption of EMI is not value neutral and can have unintended consequences. The authors cite desired positive impacts such as the stimulation of

internationalization, an improved institutional profile, bi/multilingualism, educational benefits, increased mobility for graduates and university staff, and financial return. Yet there is also undeniable evidence that EMI's impact can be negative for both teachers and students—what might be termed ‘the gap in the EMI promise’—and for the status of local languages as modes of communication in academic contexts. It is too simplistic to say that EMI in higher education is a good or bad thing—those judgements rightly belong to local actors in the first instance, and this volume delivers no definitive ‘party line’ one way or the other. What we do know is that EMI is a phenomenon that necessarily occurs in situ in response to particular pedagogical, political, economic and social forces. On a practical level at least, it is the manner in which EMI is implemented, and the policy communications and processes underlying that implementation, which determine the success or otherwise of the eventual outcome (conceding, however, that ‘success’ is an ideologically loaded term). Hence, the *raison d’être* of this book is to describe the range of ways EMI has been interpreted and implemented by polities throughout Asia Pacific, foregrounding the issues and challenges that have emerged, and providing EMI stakeholders at all levels with a critical overview of current thinking, scholarship and practice.

References

- Airey, J. (2016). CLIL and EAP (Content and Language Integrated Learning and English for Academic Purposes). In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 71–83). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Barnard, R., & McLellan, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an academic lingua franca: An investigation of form and communicative effectiveness*. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- British Council. (2013.) *British Council regional policy dialogue 2: The role of English in higher education: Issues, policy and practice*. https://www.britishcouncil.org.br/sites/default/files/regionalpolicydialogue_emi.pdf. Accessed October 27, 2015.
- Chien, C.-L., & Chapman, D. (2014). Graduate education in Malaysia and Thailand. *International Higher Education*, 76, 20–22.
- Coleman, J. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39(1), 1–14. doi:10.1017/S026144480600320X.
- Dang, Q. A. (2015). The Bologna process goes East? From ‘third countries’ to prioritizing inter-regional cooperation between the ASEAN and EU. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European higher education area: Between critical reflections and future policies* (pp. 763–783). Cham: Springer.
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction – a growing global phenomenon: Phase 1. Interim Report April 2014*. British Council. www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe. Accessed March 25, 2016.
- Dewi, A. (2017). English as a medium of instruction in Indonesian higher education: A study of lecturers’ perceptions. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J.-M. (Eds.). (2013). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Guerrero, R. B. (2010). *Regional integration: the ASEAN vision in 2020*. IFC Bulletin, 32. <http://www.bis.org/ifc/publ/ifcb32c.pdf>. Accessed July 11, 2015.
- Haberland, H., Lønsmann, D., & Preisler, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education (Vol. 5)*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf, R. B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 1–15. doi:10.1080/14664208.2013.792130
- Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf, R. B. (2014). *Language planning for medium of instruction in Asia*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Hashimoto, K. (2013). ‘English-only’, but not a medium-of-instruction policy: The Japanese way of internationalising education for both domestic and overseas students. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 16–33.
- IEAA. (2015). *The increasing pull of China*. <http://www.ieaa.org.au/blog/the-increasing-pull-of-china#>. Accessed February 14, 2016.
- International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. (2014). *Special issue: English-medium education in the global society*, 52(2).
- Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a Lingua Franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model (Vol. 1)*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in East and Southeast Asian universities. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies of languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 15–30). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2017). The languages of higher education in East and Southeast Asia: Will EMI lead to Englishisation? In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Sussex, R. (2012). *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Klaassen, R., & De Graaff, E. (2001). Facing innovation: Preparing lecturers for English-medium instruction in a non-native context. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(3), 281–289. doi:10.1080/03043790110054409.
- Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2014). Is English-medium instruction effective in improving Chinese undergraduate students’ English competence? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 99–126. doi:10.1515/iral-2014-0005.
- Madhavan Brochier, D. (2016, May 14). *Ten truths (and a lie) about EMI*. IATEFL webinar.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2014). *Press release: Selection for the FY 2014 Top Global University Project*. http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/26/09/_icsFiles/afidfile/2014/10/07/1352218_02.pdf. Accessed February 3, 2016.
- Mitchell, N. (2016). *Universities around the world offer tuition in English*. www.bbc.co.uk. Accessed July 25, 2016.
- Nguyen, H. T., Walkinshaw, I., & Pham, H. H. (2017). EMI programs in a Vietnamese university: Language, pedagogy and policy issues. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- OECD. (2015). *Education at a glance 2015: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/eag-2015-en. Accessed August 15, 2016.
- Pan, Y.-C. (2009). Test impact: English certification exit requirements in Taiwan. *TEFLIN Journal*, 20(2), 119–139.

- Pennycook, A. (2012). Lingua francas as language ideologies. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Perrin, S. (2017). Language policy and TNEs: What role for what English? In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in higher education in Asia Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pessoa, S., Miller, R., & Kaufer, D. (2014). Students' challenges and development in the transition to academic writing at an English-medium university in Qatar. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 127–156.
- Pie News. (2015). *OECD: Half of world's mobile students from Asia in 2013*. <http://thepienews.com/news/oecd-half-of-worlds-mobile-students-from-asia-in-2013/>. Accessed September 11, 2016.
- Rigg, P. (2013). English as the lingua franca of higher education? <http://www.universityworldnews.com>. Accessed February 28, 2016.
- Shohamy, E. (2013). A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J.-M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 196–212). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Taguchi, N. (2014). English-medium education in the global society. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 89–98.
- The Jakarta Post. (2015). Bilingual curriculum to be compulsory in universities starting from 2016. *The Jakarta Post*. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2015/11/30/bilingual-curriculum-be-compulsory-universities-starting-2016.html>. Accessed February 22, 2016.
- Times Higher Education. (2013). *China on the fast track*. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk>. Accessed March 12, 2016.
- UNESCO/Council of Europe. (2000). *Code of good practice in the provision of transnational education*. Romania: Bucharest.
- Vu, N. T., & Burns, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction: Challenges for Vietnamese tertiary lecturers. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(3), 1–31.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The picture in 2007*. Lemmens: ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Bonn.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-taught programs in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. Lemmens: ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Bonn.
- Wilkinson, R. (2013). English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 3–24). Canada: Multilingual Matters.
- Xinying, Z. (2016, January 13). *Beijing opens paths for international students*. English.gov.cn. <http://english.gov.cn>. Accessed September 6, 2016.

Part I

The Languages of Higher Education in East and Southeast Asia: Will EMI Lead to Englishisation?

Andy Kirkpatrick

Abstract There has been a striking increase in the number of universities in the Asian Pacific region that are moving to offer courses and programmes through English as a medium of instruction. In this chapter I shall first review this increase by describing in some detail recent developments in the use of EMI in higher education in Malaysia and Myanmar. I shall then provide a brief summary of developments in EMI in selected other countries of the region. I shall critically discuss the motivations for this move to the adoption of EMI and argue that, in most cases, the move to implement EMI has been undertaken without adequate planning and without adequate preparation for teachers and students. I shall then consider the possible implications of this move to EMI for staff and students and for languages other than English. I shall conclude by proposing that universities need to embrace an inclusive language education policy in adopting EMI courses. I shall argue that EMI policy cannot be successfully adopted by considering EMI in isolation from other languages and without appropriate and adequate planning and preparation. In so doing, I raise some issues of concern with the notion of the definition of the 'English' in EMI and in 'English only' policies. Universities who have adopted EMI policies and programmes need to (i) take into account the use of English as a lingua franca and (ii) to ensure that the policies clearly identify and encourage bi/multilingualism in the university.

Keywords English medium instruction (EMI) • Medium of instruction (MOI) • Englishisation • Multilingualism • Higher education • English as a lingua franca

A. Kirkpatrick (✉)
Department of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences,
Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
e-mail: a.kirkpatrick@griffith.edu.au

1 Introduction

The increase in the number of English medium of instruction (EMI) courses and programmes offered across Europe (Maiworm and Wachter 2002; Wachter and Maiworm 2008) is being replicated, although not yet to the same extent, across higher education institutions (HEI) across East and Southeast Asia. The main motivation for the increase in EMI courses in European HEIs was stimulated by the Bologna Declaration of 1999 through which a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) was established. The main aim of this was to encourage universities across Europe to ensure that their degree structures converged so that student and staff mobility across the universities could be guaranteed. The success of this ‘convergence’ can be seen in the numbers of students who have undertaken at least part of their degrees in universities other than the ones in which they were initially enrolled. For example, under the Erasmus scheme some 3 million students have taken advantage of cross-border education. Staff mobility is also common, with 300,000 staff teaching in different universities (Lek 2014).

The major factor which has allowed this extent of staff and student mobility has been the increase in the provision of EMI courses. English has become the academic lingua franca of these programmes leading one scholar to note that ‘it seems inevitable that English, in some form, will definitely become the language of education’ (Coleman 2006, p. 11). Phillipson agrees saying that ‘What emerges unambiguously is that in the Bologna Process, internationalisation means English-medium higher education’ (2009, p. 37).

While it has been noted that the countries of Northern Europe and Scandinavia have been the main drivers of the move to EMI and that this has influenced Nordic scientific terminology (Hultgren 2015), this is not to say that similar developments are not being seen in the countries of southern Europe (Doiz et al. 2013). In a recent international conference in Spain, Jorge Sainz, the general director for university policy in the Spanish Ministry of Education was quoted as saying ‘...we are working to internationalize our universities. We are trying to promote the courses we offer in English and ensure the quality of both materials and language taught’ (Rigg 2013, n.p.).

Phillipson has serious concerns about this move to EMI. He warns that the move to EMI will result in adopting English ways of thinking. ‘How can one go along with the use of English without exposing oneself to the risk of being anglicized in one’s mental structures, without being brainwashed by the linguistic routines?’ (2006, p. 68–69). This prospect has also been noted by scholars in Australia: ‘Internationalization has become little more than an entrenchment of the English language as an instrument of power and of an English speaking world view as the only legitimate perspective through which the world can be viewed and interpreted’ (Trevaskes et al. 2003, p. 5). In short, does internationalization lead to Englishisation? (Kirkpatrick 2011).

In this chapter, I shall first review the spread of EMI courses and programmes in HEIs in East and Southeast Asia and then consider the implications of this spread