

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

for the questions raised above. Two recent developments which are encouraging a Bologna-like move to ensure degree programmes converge will be noted here. The first is that the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) group of countries agreed at its 2012 summit to seek ways in which to facilitate staff and student mobility across the universities of the region. The second is that the ASEAN Universities Network which comprises some 30 universities in the countries of ASEAN is also seeking to encourage staff and student mobility across the universities of the network.¹ There are many other motivations for developing EMI programmes including the desire for universities to rise in the global ranking scales and to earn student fees, and these will be discussed further below.

In the review of the increase of EMI programmes and courses in East and Southeast Asia, I shall start with a relatively in-depth review of developments in Malaysia, as this represents an interesting example of how an Asian nation is attempting to set itself up as an education hub, and the associated tension that arises between global and local imperatives, namely the ‘perceived need for English for international ambitions through the internationalization of higher education and the need to preserve the local language’ (Ali 2013, p. 75). I next review recent developments in EMI in Myanmar after providing a brief overview of the context. I have chosen to discuss Myanmar as it provides a counter-example to Malaysia. I shall then provide examples from a selection of other Asian settings before critically evaluating these developments. I shall conclude by offering some proposals which might ensure successful implementation of EMI programmes. These proposals will stress how essential it is to consider English in its multilingual contexts in these Asian HEIs. To paraphrase Ernesto Macaro, Director of EMI Oxford: Centre for Research and Development on EMI, we need to accept the inevitability of this increase in EMI programmes but to observe them with a critical eye and to try and exert a positive influence on the implementation of these programmes wherever possible (2015). The types of questions that need to be borne in mind when implementing EMI programmes include:

1. To what extent does a coherent national and/or institutional policy exist and, if so, how are staff and students informed of these policies and what role, if any, did they have in developing these policies?

¹The participating universities in the ASEAN Universities Network (AUN) are: Universiti Brunei Darussalam (Brunei Darussalam); Royal University of Phnom Penh, Royal University of Law and Economics (Cambodia); Institut Teknologi Bandung, Universitas Airlangga, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Universitas Indonesia (Indonesia); National University of Laos (Laos); Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Universiti Utara Malaysia, University of Malaya (Malaysia); Yangon Institute of Economics, University of Mandalay, University of Yangon (Myanmar); Ateneo de Manila University, De La Salle University, University of the Philippines (Philippines); National University of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore Management University (Singapore); Burapha University, Chiang Mai University, Chulalongkorn University, Mahidol University, Prince of Songkla University (Thailand); Can Tho University, Vietnam National University, Hanoi, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City (Vietnam).

2. Does the move to EMI affect students and staff for whom English is an additional language, and, if so, in what ways?
3. Do staff receive any training/professional development to prepare them for teaching their content subjects through English and, if so, what is the nature of this training?
4. What are the beliefs/feelings of staff and students to this increase in EMI and are these beliefs/feelings elicited and listened to?
5. How does the move to EMI affect the roles and value accorded to languages other than English as (a) languages of education and pedagogy and (b) as languages of scholarship and in what ways?
6. What 'English' is the 'E' in EMI taken to be? Is it held to be a native speaking variety of English or is the use of English as a lingua franca understood, accepted and/or encouraged?

2 EMI in Malaysia

In Malaysia (pop. 30 million), there is a great deal of linguistic diversity. The major groups include the Malays and indigenous population, known as *bumiputra* ('sons of the soil') who make up more than 60% of the population. 26% of the population are Malaysian Chinese and about 8% are of Indian ethnicity. English-medium education has had a long history, although since Malaysian independence from the late 1950s onwards, a primary focus of government language policy has been the promotion of the national language, Bahasa Malaysia, not least in education (Gill 2006). In 2002, the Malaysian government decided to re-introduce English as a medium of instruction for maths and science from the first year of primary school. This policy was, however, abandoned after a study showed that children, especially those from poorer backgrounds and from more remote rural areas, were not coping. There was also found to be an inadequate number of maths and science teachers who were able to teach these subjects through English (Gill 2012). This push to teach maths and science through English was linked to then Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir's desire to see Malaysia become an education hub and the announcement in 1991 of *Wawasan 2020* (i.e. Vision 2020). This spurred the establishment of EMI programmes in private universities and it was also the Prime Minister's wish to get EMI accepted as the medium of instruction for science, engineering and medical degrees in public universities. However, his plan was thwarted by Malay nationalists who insisted on retaining the national language, Bahasa Malaysia, as the MoI (Ali 2013). This led to problems as graduates from the public universities, who are in the main ethnically Malay, were graduating monolingual in Malay, while graduates from the EMI private universities, who are typically of Chinese and Indian ethnicity, graduated multilingual including high proficiency in English, making them far more employable than their monolingual Malay counterparts from the public universities. This is worth noting as the reasons

for introducing EMI are typically associated with goals of internationalization, but here we see a strong local motivation for EMI provision, local employability. As a result of this discrepancy between the linguistic value and, thus, employability of graduates from public and private universities, the Ministry of Higher Education ruled in 2005 that public universities must use EMI in the teaching of science and technology, starting with first year students in 2005/6.

There are now 20 major public universities in Malaysia and more than 100 private institutions, and a number of branches of overseas universities. There are also a number of local private universities including those established by public utility corporations such as the national telecommunications agency, the electricity board and Petronas, the national oil company (Gill and Kirkpatrick 2013).

Despite the initial opposition to the use of EMI in public universities, the promotion of *Wawasan 2020* and the Education Act of 1996 which allowed for the use of EMI in private universities, led Malaysia to become one of the earliest Asian countries to develop transnational private higher education opportunities for its citizens and to also develop the nation as a regional hub of education (Gill 2004, p. 140). Indeed Malaysia provided higher education opportunities in English as far back as the 1980s. This was when Malaysian educational entrepreneurs responded to a sudden local need for cheaper international degrees by developing a system whereby students did two years at a Malaysian private college and then through “credit transfer” could enter the third year of EMI universities in the Anglosphere (Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom, for example). Based on this model, they then went on to initiate “twinning programs” (“1 + 2” and “2 + 1”) with British and Australian universities in the late 1980s (Gill and Kirkpatrick 2013).

In a study which investigated how EMI policy was introduced and implemented at one public university in Malaysia, Ali (2013) looked at the issue at three levels, namely: the macro level (national policy); the meso level (university documents); and the micro level (actual stakeholders). She found that there was no explicit reference to EMI policy as such in any of the documents. For example, at the national level, the current National Higher Education Action Plan makes no explicit statement about MoI policy. The document does note that the use of English is to be encouraged, especially in science, mathematics and technical subjects and also urges universities to strengthen their students’ English proficiency to meet ‘the goals for a quality workforce needed by the country, and for the internationalization of the universities’ (Ali 2013, p. 81). At the meso-level, Ali examined university documents such as the Policies and Codes of Practice in Teaching and Learning for Diploma and Bachelor Programmes (PCPTL) in which there is a section entitled ‘The Policy on Language Instruction in Teaching and Learning’. The advice given here is ambiguous. The policy equivocally states that the official MoI of the university is Bahasa Malaysia. But it then goes on to say that ‘Languages of instruction, other than Bahasa Malaysia, can be used with permission of the respective faculty, but that in such cases students must be given the opportunity to be assessed in Bahasa Malaysia’. The policy also states that when there are international students in the classroom, EMI becomes the de facto policy. As Ali points

out, apart from the reference connected with international students, this document makes no explicit reference to EMI but, at the same time, legitimates its use. This has caused confusion at the micro-level as her interviews with staff indicate. One staff member reported that, as EMI was ‘natural’ in science and engineering, ‘we have to teach a lot of our subjects in English’ (2013, p. 84–85). Another said ‘The university is changing and therefore lack of policy becomes much more glaring... we now need a good [language] policy’ (2013, p. 87).

It is clear, therefore, that the university does not have a coherent language policy with regard to EMI. It is also clear that any policy that has been developed has been developed top-down without any consultation with staff or students. The result is great confusion among the stakeholders. As part of her conclusion, Ali quotes the recommendation made by the Language Planning scholar Dick Baldauf nearly 20 years ago. I repeat this quote here as it encapsulates all that is not currently being done, with the exception of a small handful of cases, in the implementation of EMI programmes across HEIs in East and Southeast Asia.

The advantage of university language, literacy and communication policy approach to tertiary literacy is that it can be more than the sum of its parts. It can stress language problems are not just issues for students, but for staff, and that there are not only problems to be solved, but cross-cultural understandings and information to be gained. Ultimately, HEIs will be most successful in dealing with language literacy and communication issues if these matters are defined and supported at the top (‘top-down’), provided for through expert assistance where necessary but contextualized across the HEI’s curriculum by individual university staff. That is, policy needs to be developed in consultation with and have the commitment of those working most closely with the students (‘Bottom-up’) (Baldauf 1997, p. 4).

Having briefly reviewed the situation in Malaysia, I now turn to Myanmar.

3 EMI in Myanmar

The current language policy in Myanmar is for EMI to be used in all HEIs and this therefore presents an extreme case of an EMI policy being enforced top-down without attention to the real situation on the ground. In terms of its history with English, Myanmar is unique among ASEAN nations. Even though it was formerly a British colony, its period of self-imposed isolation under the dictatorial rule of U Ne Win (1962–88) has meant that English has long since ceased to have any institutional role. The role of English in Myanmar is thus more akin to an EFL setting. In Kachruvian terms, it is an expanding circle country rather than a typical post-colonial outer circle country.

Myanmar is Mainland Southeast Asia’s largest country (Callahan 2003) and is an ethnically and linguistically diverse country, with a population of about 50 million. Accurate figures are hard to come by, but estimates of the number of languages spoken vary from 70 to more than 100 (Watkins 2007). The 1931 census identified 135 ethnic groups ‘in most cases identified by and with the language spoken by each group, although not always accurately’ (Sercombe and Tupas 2014,

p. 148). This categorisation of 135 ethnic groups was re-introduced by General Saw Maung at the time of the State Law and Order Council (SLORC) (Callahan 2003). It is generally agreed that there are 8 major ethnic groups: Bamar, Chin, Kachin, Kayah, Kayin, Mon, Rakkhine and Shan (Djite 2011). The three main language families represented are Tibeto-Burman, Tai-Kadai and Mon-Khmer. About 70% of the population are L1 speakers of Burmese. Mon has 8 million speakers and Shan has 6 million (Sercombe and Tupas 2014). Arakanese, Chin, Jingpho and Karen also have more than half a million speakers each (Callahan 2003). There are scripts for several of the indigenous languages including Mon, Shan, Karen, Kachin, Chin and Llahu (Djite 2011, p. 8; Hlaing 2007).

From independence in 1948, the language policy has promoted Burmese and the 1947 Constitution states that 'the official language of the Union shall be Burmese' (Djite 2011, p. 45). The use of English was permitted—and taught as a subject from Grade 6 and as a medium of instruction for Maths and Science in Grades 10 and 11, but there was no specific mention of indigenous languages (Sercombe and Tupas 2014). The 1974 Constitution reiterated the place of Burmese as the official language, and Article 152 reads: 'Every citizen shall have the right to education. Burmese is the common language. Languages of the other national races may also be taught' (Sercombe and Tupas 2014, p. 156). The 1974 Constitution therefore gave ethnic minorities the right to teach their own languages, but this was later removed and Burmese again became the sole language of education. In 1992, Burmese was again mandated as the language of instruction in schools at all levels (Djite 2011, p. 47). The 2008 Constitution proclaims that every citizen 'has the right to freely develop the literature, culture, customs and tradition they cherish', although Burmese remains the sole medium of instruction in schools, with the exception of the teaching of Maths and Science at Grades 10 and 11, where English is the MoI (Djite 2011, p. 49). English was also made the MoI for higher education (Djite 2011).

It was the failure of one of U Ne Win's daughters to be accepted into university in England because of her poor English that led to a re-think of the Burmese-only language policy and the revival of English. Despite the government's apparent wish to revive English, however, this has proved to be a difficult task for a number of reasons. First, at least one generation of Burmese has not studied English. Second, the 1988 coup saw the schools and universities closed for several months and the removal of all foreign teachers. Third, the period from 1988 under the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) (later renamed the State Peace and Development Council or SPDC) has also seen frequent disruptions to schools and universities, including their regular closure for significant periods of time. These disruptions have meant that education as a whole suffered under the SLORC regime. Fourth, many educated Burmese who speak English have left the country. There are thus very few qualified and proficient English teachers left in the country. Finally, resources and materials are poor. The role of English in Myanmar is thus restricted to the elite and to a small number of domains, mostly involving NGOs and aid programmes. The recent opening of Myanmar to foreign businesses has increased the need for English, and this need is also reflected internationally with Myanmar's recent more active involvement with ASEAN.

In Myanmar at present the focus is on the Myanmar language, the language of the majority, and English, which is currently introduced as a subject from Grade 1 and as the language of instruction for science and maths in Grades 10 and 11. The languages of Myanmar are not, generally speaking, taught systematically. As a native speaker of Mon, Yen Snaing reports that at school everything was done in the Myanmar language. He was only able to learn Mon secretly and unofficially in a local monastery, but he is not literate in Mon and feels orphaned from his mother tongue (Yen 2015). As indicated above, the MoI for all HEIs is English. This is unlikely to lead to Englishisation in Myanmar, however, for two major reasons: first there is a serious shortage of lecturers who are able to lecture in English; and second, very few of the students have adequate proficiency to be able to learn and study content subjects in English (see also Nguyen et al. this volume). As Drinan notes in her account of English language provision in Myanmar (2013, p. 8).

Using English as a Medium of Instruction (MoI): this is fundamentally not working for teaching Maths and Science as few teachers can use English, let alone, teach another subject in English. Students are not learning or understanding important concepts in Maths and Science. They merely remember the technical terms in English for the tests. Most teachers use a mix of Myanmar (for explanation) and English (for technical terms). However even if they were taught totally in Myanmar, students would still find understanding concepts difficult because of the teacher-centred methodology. If English is going to be used as a MoI, teachers need training and support in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL).

While Drinan is here talking about the school system, the situation is exacerbated at the tertiary level. Teaching remains teacher-centred and students ‘learn’ by rote without developing any understanding of what they are memorising.

Myanmar, given its unique historical links and severance with English, probably represents an extreme example of where EMI has been introduced without any consultation with stakeholders, without consideration of the English language proficiency of teachers or students and without acknowledgment that resources are scarce, if not non-existent. There is little danger of the internationalization of education, exemplified by the insistence of the use of EMI in all HEIs, leading to Englishisation in this context. While Myanmar may be an extreme case, comparable situations have been described elsewhere. For example, the authors of a recent review of medium of instruction policies across ten countries in Asia concluded that, ‘at the macro policy level, there seems to be a simplistic understanding of MOI as a cheap solution to complex language problems for achieving overly ambitious politico-economic goals and that this leads to less than ideal MOI implementation illustrated by teachers’ and students’ struggles as policy actors at the micro level’ (Hamid et al. 2013, p. 1).

4 EMI in Other Selected Settings in Asia

A number of chapters in this volume describe the situation in several Asian HEI settings including Indonesia, Taiwan, Korea and Brunei. Here I add a brief review of the situation in The Philippines, Japan, and China, including Hong Kong.

The Philippines has some 90 private universities listed on the relevant web page (eduphil.org, 2011). These are all EMI universities. Perhaps the most prestigious university in the Philippines is The University of the Philippines at Dilman, a state university. Some years ago, in an attempt to promote the national language, Filipino, as a language of education and research, the university experimented with offering courses through Filipino and encouraging staff to publish in Filipino. The unpopularity of the policy among both staff and students led the university to abandon the Filipino policy, however, and revert to English medium. As Martin (2014) points out, the dominant role of English in the leading universities of the country is deeply embedded in the educational system, and unlikely to change, despite the recent move to mother tongue-based multilingual education at the early primary school level (Kirkpatrick 2011). Nevertheless, although English is unchallenged as the formal language of instruction, Tupas (2007) points out that code-mixing and switching is a ubiquitous reality throughout the whole of Philippine higher education. In general terms, however, internationalisation has meant Englishisation and the corresponding removal of Filipino as a language of education and scholarship.

Japan is also embracing international education, although internationalisation in the Japanese context tends to mean that it wants the world to better understand what it means to be Japanese (Kirkpatrick 2014). The Japanese Government introduced the Global 30 Project, which was designed to attract international students to Japan to study in one of 30 universities. The website announces that ‘With the introduction of the “Global 30” Project, the best universities in Japan are now offering degree programs in English. The aim of the Global 30 project was to attract 300,000 international students; to date, however, results have been disappointing, with less than 22,000 international students enrolled in 2011. Indeed the low numbers of international students has led to the recent abandoning of the Global 30 Project, which also drew criticism as many of the EMI programmes were exclusively for international students and excluded local Japanese students. (McKinley 2015). The Global 30 Project has been replaced by the Super Global Universities Project under which 13 of Japan’s top universities have been given extra funding to help them compete internationally and a further 24 universities have been identified whose role is to show Japan in a more global light. In a study at one of the 13 ‘Super Global Universities’ McKinley (2015) looked at three EMI programmes, namely English Studies, Liberal Arts and Green Science. Funding for the Green Science major was extremely generous as the programme had 11 students with 8 full-time staff members, a model that can hardly be viable in the longer term. The Liberal Arts major was criticised by staff as being a second rate American programme instead of being Japan’s leading international programme. Judging by this example and the failure of the Global 30 Project, the future of these international EMI programmes in Japan looks bleak.

China’s University and College Admission Systems (CUCAS) lists EMI courses offered by Chinese universities (<http://www.cucas.edu.cn>) and it is clear that Chinese universities are increasing the number of EMI courses which they offer. As long ago as 2001, the then Premier Zhu Rongji, said that he hoped all classes (at his

alma mater, Tsinghua University's School of Economics and Management) would be taught in English, as China needed to be able to exchange ideas with the rest of the world (Gill 2004).

In addition to the several 'foreign' universities setting up in China, offering their programmes through English, of which Nottingham University in Ningbo is a good example, many local universities are seeking to grow their international student numbers by increasing their EMI programmes. While the most prestigious universities may have the staff—and be able to recruit international staff—to be able to deliver programmes through English, there remain concerns. For example, even at Beijing University,² while many are proud of the introduction of bilingual and EMI courses, some lament the reduction of Chinese-medium courses. One sociology professor felt that students do not have enough knowledge of the subject in Chinese and that teaching in English would only undermine their grasp of the subject (Hayhoe et al. 2011, p. 123).

The prestigious East China Normal University in Shanghai is also increasing its EMI programmes. The university's goal is to attract 5000 international students to live on campus and for 10% of courses to be 'taught bilingually' (Hayhoe et al. 2011, p. 204), although it is not clear what 'taught bilingually' means in practice. The longer term goal is to develop 100 courses taught in English.

In Hong Kong, the government's aim is for its citizens to be trilingual (in Cantonese, Putonghua and English) and biliterate (in Chinese and English). This laudable aim is undermined by the fact that six of the eight government-funded universities are English medium. This, naturally enough, has led parents to demand EMI in secondary schools and this has resulted in more content classes being taught in English classes in secondary schools and a corresponding decrease in the number of content classes being taught in Chinese. Hong Kong therefore exemplifies how a top-down macro-level policy promoting a trilingual and biliterate citizenry can be undermined by meso-level university language policies (Kirkpatrick 2014). This can also be seen, even at the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) which was founded in 1963 with the express purpose of providing Chinese medium education. However, the desire to rise in the university rankings led the university to internationalise and, to do this, introduce a wide range of EMI courses. This move was challenged by students on the grounds that it ran counter to the University's charter. The courts ruled in favour of the university arguing that a university had the right to choose its MoI (Li 2013).

Despite these moves to increase the number of EMI programmes it is offering, the CUHK has recently, however, established an initiative designed to promote the use of Chinese as a language of scholarship in an attempt to counter the hegemony of academic English (Li 2015). To date, 32 universities across China have signed up to this initiative in a sign that, at least in the case of Chinese, the local language is to be promoted as a language of scholarship and education (<http://std.stheadline.com/yesterday/edu/1119go04.html>). The only Hong Kong government-funded

²Also referred to as Peking University.

tertiary institution—the private universities are all EMI—which has developed a language policy that fits with the government aim of trilingualism and biliteracy is the Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIEd) (see also Kirkpatrick 2014). The way the policy distinguishes between the medium of instruction (MOI) and Classroom Language (CL) is worthy of note (Xu 2014, p. 218).

The MOI, to be adhered to strictly in all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, bears on the following: (a) the course outline, including synopsis, aims and objectives, main assigned readings, teaching and learning activities, and course intended learning outcomes; (b) formative assessment in writing, including major assignments and quizzes; and (c) summative assessment such as the final exam. Accordingly, all assessed activities of an EMI course should be in English, while those in a CMI course should be in Chinese.

‘Classroom language’ (CL) refers to the language of interaction between teacher and students and among students in the classroom (lectures, tutorials, labs and so on). While the CL of an EMI course is English by default, a CMI course may be conducted in Cantonese or Putonghua, subject to the teacher’s preference after considering all relevant factors, such as the students’ language backgrounds and abilities.

Subject to the moment-by-moment classroom learning and teaching needs, the teacher of a CMI or EMI course may find it necessary to switch to some other language(s). It should be noted that classroom code-switching, which is typically driven and justified by students’ enhanced learning outcomes, do not constitute a breach of the Institute’s new LLT policy.

There is not space here to discuss the policy in detail (but see Xu 2014), but the HKIEd’s new language policy is worthy of note for a number of reasons: first, uniquely among Hong Kong’s universities, it dovetails with the government’s overall language policy and promotes trilingualism. This serves to demonstrate just how essential it is that a national or regional language education policy is coherent across all levels of the education system. A language policy that ignores or has no legislation over just one part of the overall system is almost certain to fail. This is well exemplified by Hong Kong where the majority of universities are allowed to adopt EMI-only education. Second, it recognizes the multilingual make-up of staff and students and has tailored the language policy to try to meet their needs. In this, it allows code-mixing and sees peoples’ use of their available linguistic resources as natural (see also Gu 2013). Third, the policy also recognises the continual developmental nature of language proficiency and thus recognises the importance of continual language support. Finally, while stressing the importance of English, the policy also promotes both Cantonese and Putonghua and thus reflects a respect for Chinese as a language of education and scholarship.

To date in this chapter, I have discussed in some depth the situation with regard to EMI policy and provision in HEIs in Malaysia and Myanmar and given a brief sketch of the situation in the Philippines, Japan and China, including Hong Kong. As the study of the developments within a single university in Malaysia has shown (Ali 2013), the settings are characterised by diversity with different universities enacting different policies. However, it is possible to draw a conclusion, albeit a general and overall one, of what is happening by returning to consider the six questions raised earlier. In the concluding section of this chapter, I turn to these and provide tentative answers to the questions.

5 Discussion

1. To what extent does a coherent national and/or institutional policy exist and, if so, how are staff and students informed of these policies and what role, if any, did they have in developing these policies?

Very few countries reviewed in this chapter have developed coherent language education policies at the national level. Most appear simply to have decided that EMI is somehow a good thing which should be implemented as widely as possible, with no consideration for the situation on the ground with regards to key issues such as the relative language proficiency of staff and students, the availability of adequate and appropriate materials and the overall feasibility of the policies being implemented. Myanmar represents the most egregious case but, even in Malaysia, where English has played an institutional role for decades, the policies are unclear at best with no guidelines as to how they are to be implemented at the university level. In no instance, with the exception of the Hong Kong Institute of Education, have key stakeholders been consulted about these top-down policies.

2. Does the move to EMI affect students and staff for whom English is an additional language, and, if so, in what ways?

It is clear that, in many cases, staff and students simply do not have the necessary levels of proficiency in English to teach and learn content subjects in English. For example, the introduction of EMI across all higher education institutions in Myanmar is likely to lead to the continuation of rote learning and the implementation of a textual translation method as staff and students alike struggle to use English as a medium of instruction.

3. Do staff receive any training/professional development to prepare them for teaching their content subjects through English and, if so, what is the nature of this training?

No systematic training or development of staff in how to combine language and content appears to be being offered in any of the HEIs reviewed here. It should be noted, however, that other chapters in this volume report that stakeholders are more engaged in the implementation of EMI (see Fenton-Smith et al. this volume).

4. What are the beliefs/feelings of staff and students to this increase in EMI and are these beliefs/feelings elicited and listened to?

As far as can be determined, no systematic survey of staff and student feelings or attitudes to the increased use of EMI has been conducted at the university or national level. Stakeholders are presented with a 'policy' and expected to implement it with no training or preparation.

5. How does the move to EMI affect the roles and value accorded to languages other than English as (a) languages of education and pedagogy and (b) as languages of scholarship and in what ways?

The move to EMI has sidelined the use of local languages as languages of education. This is particularly evident in places such as Myanmar and the Philippines. But where the levels of staff and student proficiency in English are low—as is the case in Myanmar, for example—Englishisation is unlikely to take place. Rather, as noted by Drinan above, the EMI class actually becomes a textual translation class whereby staff translate the English textbooks into Burmese or where the students memorise by rote English expressions, without any real understanding of what they are memorising. Where levels of English proficiency are relatively high, however, as in the Philippines for example, there is little doubt that English has replaced Filipino as the major language of education and knowledge dissemination at the HEI level.

6. What ‘English’ is the ‘E’ in EMI taken to be? Is it held to be a native speaking variety of English or is the use of English as a lingua franca understood, accepted and/or encouraged?

There seems to be implicit acceptance that the ‘E’ in EMI is a native speaker standard. No policy, with the exception of the Hong Kong Institute of Education’s, makes any mention of the role of English as an academic lingua franca or demonstrates any understanding that all language learning is developmental and that students (and staff) will need continual support. And only the HKIEd policy recognises the multilingual nature of the universities in question and allows, indeed encourages, the use of the linguistic resources of both staff and students in teaching and learning. Generally speaking, however, it is assumed that the ‘E’ in EMI means a native speaker variety of English and that EMI policy is a monolingual policy through which only English will be used in teaching and learning. This is the case despite decades of research that testifies to the presence of code-mixing and the multilingual nature of teaching and learning in multilingual contexts (for a recent summary see Barnard and McLellan 2014).

6 Conclusion

In the opening section of the chapter I paraphrased Ernesto Macaro’s view that ‘we need to accept the inevitability of this increase in EMI programmes but to observe them with a critical eye and to try and exert a positive influence on the implementation of these programmes wherever possible’. It would seem that the implementation of EMI in many of the cases outlined above would suggest that much needs to be done if these EMI policies are to be implemented successfully. First and foremost, language education policies need to be developed at the national and institutional level. These policies need to be coherent and involve stakeholders in their development. They need to address several key issues, namely:

How can we be sure that the levels of English proficiency of both staff and students are adequate enough to be able to handle the learning and teaching of complex cognitive subjects through the medium of English?

How can we be sure that we have fully consulted key stakeholders in the development of any language education policies? How can we be sure that the policy is actually being successfully implemented?

How can we ensure that staff and students are able to use their linguistic resources in fulfilling teaching and learning tasks through the medium of English? In other words, what systematic use of languages other than English can be allowed/encouraged in order to help learning and teaching through English (Swain et al. 2011)?

How can we ensure that staff and students receive adequate and ongoing training and development both in English itself and, for staff, in the teaching of content subjects through English?

How can we ensure that local languages are not sidelined from education and, instead, are developed as languages of education and scholarship?

How is the 'E' in EMI to be defined and understood? Is it to be a native speaker variety of English or is the use of English as an academic lingua franca to be acknowledged and supported? It would seem essential that the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) is acknowledged and supported in all multilingual settings.

Unless and until Ministries of Education and universities develop language education policies which are framed by the consideration of these key issues, then it seems unlikely that the implementation of EMI can be successful. This very lack of success will mean that, in many cases, internationalisation will not lead to Englishisation, other than by default. Successful internationalisation will require the adoption of systematic and coherent EMI policies that recognise the multilingual nature of the respective settings by recognising the role of English as an academic lingua franca and by encouraging the use of local languages in teaching and learning and as languages of education and scholarship.

References

- Ali, N. L. (2013). A changing paradigm in language planning: English-medium instruction policy at the tertiary level in Malaysia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 73–92.
- Baldauf, R. B. (1997). Tertiary language, literacy and communication policies: needs and practices. In Z. Golebiowski (Ed.), *First national conference on tertiary literacy: Research and practice* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–19). Melbourne: Victoria University Press.
- Barnard, R., & McLellan, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Callahan, M. P. (2003). Language policy in modern Burma. In M. Brown & S. Ganguly (Eds.), *Fighting words. Language policy and ethnic relations in Asia* (pp. 143–175). Cambridge Mass: MIT Press.
- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39, 1–14.
- Djite, P. (2011). *Language difference: Language and development in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). Future challenges for English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 213–221). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Drinan, H. (2013). *ELC report*. Yangon: British Council.
- Fenton-Smith, B., Stillwell, C., & Dupuy, R. (2017). Professional development for EMI: Exploring Taiwanese lecturers' needs. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.), *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gill, S. K. (2004). Medium of instruction policy in higher education Malaysia: Nationalism versus internationalization. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium in instruction policies—Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 135–152). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gill, S. K. (2006). Change in language policy in Malaysia: The reality of implementation in public universities. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(1), 82–94.
- Gill, S. K. (2012). The complexities of re-reversal of language-in-education policy in Malaysia. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 45–62). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gill, S. K., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2013). English in Asian and European higher education. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Gu, M. (2013). Cultural identity in teaching across borders: Mainland Chinese pre-service teachers in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 33(4), 407–423.
- Hamid, O. M., 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.
- Hayhoe, R., Zha, Q., & Li, M. (2011). East China normal university: Education in the lead. In R. Hayhoe, J. Li, J. Lin & Q. Zha (Eds.), *Portraits of 21st century Chinese universities: In the move to mass higher education* (pp. 192–220). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer & Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Center, University of Hong Kong.
- Hlaing, K. Y. (2007). The politics of language policy in Myanmar: Imagining togetherness, practising difference. In H. G. Lee & L. Suryadinata (Eds.), *Language, nation and development in Southeast Asia* (pp. 150–180). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Hultgren, A. K. (2015). English as an international language of science and its effect on Nordic terminology: The view of scientists. In A. Linn, N. Berner & G. Ferguson, (Eds.), *Attitudes towards English in Europe. Language and Social Life* (Vol. 2, pp. 139–164). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as a medium of instruction in Asian education (from primary to tertiary): Implications for local languages and local scholarship'. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 99–119.
- 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.
- Lek, D. (2014). Cross border higher education in ASEAN: Structures, policies, development and integration. *ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership Working Paper Series*, 4, 1–26. Singapore: S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, NTU.
- Li, D. C. S. (2013). Linguistic hegemony or linguistic capital? In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 65–83). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Li, D. C. S. (2015, December). When world Englishes meet world Chinese. *Presentation at the International Conference on Corpus Linguistics and Technology Advancement*. December 16–18, Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Macaro, E. (2015, July). *Presentation at the EMI: Global views and countries in focus symposium*. July 4, Oxford.
- Maiworm, F., & Wachter, B. (2002). *English-language-taught degree programmes in European higher education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Martin, I. P. (2014). *Philippine English revisited*. *World Englishes*, 33(1), 50–59.

- McKinley, J. (2015, November). EMI in a Japanese Global 30 University. *Presentation at the language education and diversity conference*, November 23–26. Auckland.
- Phillipson, R. (2006). Figuring out the Englishisation of Europe. In C. Leung & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Reconfiguring Europe* (pp. 65–86). London: Equinox.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). English in higher education, panacea or pandemic? In P. Harder (Ed.), *English in Denmark: Language policy, internationalization and university teaching* (Vol. 9, pp. 2–57)., Angles of the English-speaking world Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press and the University of Copenhagen.
- Rigg, P. (2013). *English as the lingua Franca of Higher Education?* University World News. <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=201311211522458650>. Accessed December 13, 2015.
- Sercombe, P., & Tupas, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia (Palgrave Studies in Minority Languages and Communities)*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Swain, M., Kirkpatrick, A. & Cummins, J. (2011). *How to have a guilt-free life. Using Cantonese in the English classroom*. Hong Kong: Research Centre for Language Education and Acquisition in Multilingual Societies, Institute of Education.
- Trevaskes, S., Eisenclas, S., & Liddicoat, A. (Eds.). (2003). Language, culture and literacy in the internationalisation process of higher education. In *Australian perspectives on internationalising education* (pp. 1–12). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Tupas, T. R. F. (2007). Go back to class: The medium of instruction debate in the Philippines. In H.G. Lee & L. Suryadinata (Eds.), *Language, nation and development in Southeast Asia* (pp. 17–38). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Wachter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Watkins, J. (2007). Burma/Myanmar. In A. Simpson (Ed.), *Language and national identity in Asia* (pp. 263–287). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xu, Z. (2014). Functional English and Chinese as medium of instruction (MOI) in a multilingual educational context: A case study of two courses in a higher institution in Hong Kong. In K. Dunworth & G. Zhang (Eds.), *Critical perspectives in language education* (pp. 209–228). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Yen, S. (2015, February 6). Me and my language. *The Irrawaddy*, p. 34–37.

English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in
Asia-Pacific

From Policy to Pedagogy

Fenton-Smith, B.; Humphreys, P.; Walkinshaw, I. (Eds.)

2017, VIII, 320 p. 11 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-51974-6