

The language(s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism?

Andy Kirkpatrick

School of Languages and Linguistics, Griffith University, Australia

There has been a striking increase in the number of universities in the Asia-Pacific region that are moving to offer courses and programmes through English. In this article I shall consider the possible consequences of this increase in English as a medium of instruction (EMI) for staff and students for whom English is not a first language and for university language education policy. In so doing, I raise some issues of concern connected with the notion of the E in EMI and English-only policies. I shall argue that those universities which have adopted EMI programmes need to consider revising their policies to (i) take into account the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) and (ii) to encourage bi- and multilingualism within the university.

Keywords: English medium instruction; higher education; English as a lingua franca; multilingual language education; Asia-Pacific

Introduction

There has been a striking increase in the number of universities around the world that are moving to offer courses and programmes through English and several recent publications have documented and discussed this phenomenon (for example, Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2013; Wächter & Maiworm, 2008). The major move towards English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in Europe was motivated by the Bologna Process, the primary aim of which was to standardise university degrees across Europe so as to facilitate student and staff mobility and credit transfer. As the authors of the publications referenced above have noted, this move to standardise degrees and encourage mobility also led to a rapid increase in the number of EMI programmes. Using a single language allows much easier staff and student mobility. As English is the current international language, it has taken on the role of the language of instruction, the apparently tacit assumption being that it is the obvious choice. Phillipson has gone as far to suggest that, “in the Bologna process, internationalization means English-medium higher education” (2009, p. 37). This is perhaps an overstatement, as many European countries and systems remain committed to teaching in the national language and have developed policies to encourage the use of the national language alongside English (Haberland, Lönsmann, & Preisler, 2013). Nevertheless, there is no doubt that there has been a significant increase in the number of EMI programmes. This is also true throughout East and Southeast Asia, where many universities now offer EMI programmes, mainly, but certainly not exclusively, at postgraduate level (Kirkpatrick, 2014; Kirkpatrick & Gill, 2013). In this article I shall consider the possible implications of this increase in EMI and raise some issues of concern. I shall argue that those universities which have adopted EMI programmes need to revise their policies to (i)

take into account the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) and (ii) to encourage bi- and multilingualism.

EMI in Asian HE

Hong Kong presents an excellent example of the rise of English in higher education. Of the eight government-funded universities, six are English medium. Only the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) has a bilingual policy; and only the Institute of Education has a language policy which aims for functional trilingualism in Cantonese, English and Putonghua (Xu, forthcoming). The bilingual policy at the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) has, however, recently been threatened by the desire of a recent Vice-Chancellor to see CUHK rise in the international rankings tables. This desire is of course, perfectly understandable. But, as these rankings give great weight to internationalisation, this, in turn, creates pressure on universities to deliver courses through English in order to attract ‘international’ staff and students. The move to the use of EMI at CUHK occasioned a student-led legal challenge which argued that the increased use of EMI violated the university’s charter, namely that Chinese would be the primary medium of instruction. The university was founded in 1963 with the express aim of providing a Chinese medium tertiary education. At the time, Hong Kong University was the only university in Hong Kong and this offered English medium education. The account of the controversies surrounding the recent language education policy at CUHK story has been eloquently provided by Li (2013) and here I simply note that the legal challenge failed with the Supreme Court ruling that the university had the right to set its own medium of instruction policy. The international significance of Hong Kong’s only Chinese medium university moving to offer an increasing number of courses through English appears to have been overlooked. At the same time, the inherent benefit of offering a bilingual Chinese-English tertiary education also appears to have been ignored. Certainly, with the exception of the Institute of Education, which I discuss later, none of Hong Kong’s six EMI universities has considered adopting a bilingual Chinese-English policy, despite Chinese and English being the world’s two most important languages (as measured by the numbers of roles, domains and speakers). It seems that the universities, in their desperate desire to climb the rankings, are sacrificing Chinese on the altar of English, even though Chinese is such a vibrant and important language of communication and scholarship.

Similar trends, involving the promotion of English medium education in higher education at the expense of the national language, are observable throughout East and Southeast Asia. I have detailed these elsewhere (for example, Kirkpatrick, 2014) and here briefly note that there are different pathways and vehicles for the promotion of EMI in regional universities. First, universities from English-speaking countries have set up campuses in Asia. These promote themselves as providing an English medium education. A prime example is the campus at Ningbo, set up by England’s Nottingham University. The website boasts that “all degree programmes are taught in English to the same high standards at the University of Nottingham in the UK” (<http://www.nottingham.edu.cn/en/admissions/studywithus.aspx> accessed 18 December 2013). The 2014 International Student Prospectus, available at the same website, also stresses the use of English as the medium of instruction, “All our degree programmes are taught in English, and you will receive a British-style education. All coursework material is in English and all assignments and exams are submitted in English”. The questions I shall return to later are (i) what sort of English is referred to here and (ii)

why is English the only language allowed for instruction, course materials and assessments?

The second source of EMI programmes in higher education in the region is through partnerships which universities from English-speaking countries form with regional universities or 'providers'. Curtin University, which is based in Perth, Western Australia, provides an excellent example. It delivers a host of EMI courses throughout the region in collaboration with regional partners. It also operates a Curtin campus in Miri, Sarawak.

The third source of EMI programmes are regional universities themselves, and these constitute by far the greatest number. While many government and prestigious universities are following this trend, the demand for EMI programmes and degrees can be seen by the extraordinary rise of private universities, almost all of which pride themselves on and market themselves as being English medium.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that there is a huge demand for EMI courses and degrees and that this is reflected in the greatly increasing numbers of tertiary institutions throughout the region which now offer EMI programmes. This increase is partly explained by the universities desire to rise in the rankings. A further impetus for the adoption of EMI programmes is that, a Bologna-like agreement was reached to stimulate staff and student mobility across regional universities at the 2012 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit. Perhaps, however, the key motivation for many universities is financial: universities hope to be able to make money out of the fees that both local and international students will pay for the apparent privilege of having an EMI tertiary education.

I now turn to consider three interconnected issues that need to be considered in light of this increase in EMI education. In discussing these issues it is necessary at times to look beyond higher education both in the direction of primary and secondary education, and at broader socio-cultural contexts because they and higher education policies impact on each other. The first issue is that the adoption of EMI disadvantages many students and staff for whom English is not a first language. The second is that EMI policies usually exclude other languages. EMI actually means English-only. The third issue is that the English of EMI is almost always based on a native speaker model, and thus ignores the development of new varieties of English and the crucial role of English as a *lingua franca*.

EMI and disadvantage

The first concern centres on forcing students (and staff) to use a language which is not their first and in which they are unlikely to have as great a level of proficiency. This may seriously disadvantage students. Studies have long since shown that people learn best in their first language (for example, Benson, 2008). As Shohamy (2013) shows from a long term study of the performance in mathematics by Russian speaking migrants to Israel, it took these migrants 8 years "and in some cases far beyond" (p. 206) before they did as well in the exams and tests in Hebrew, the official medium of instruction, as they did in their first language, Russian. It is also worth noting that this was in spite of the fact that the sole medium of instruction was Hebrew, that is to say the migrants needed 8 years of Hebrew medium of instruction (MoI) before being able to operate in Hebrew as well as in Russian. These results support Cummins' study (1981) which showed that migrants to Canada needed at least 5-7 years instruction in the second language (English) before they acquired enough proficiency to be able to handle cognitively demanding concepts through that language.

That children learn best in their first language has been the basis of UNESCO language education policy since 1953. It has also been the bedrock of Hong Kong's language education policy, recently reiterated in the 2005 *Review of Medium of Instruction* (Education Commission, 2005) which stated that the Chinese medium of education policy should be upheld for Secondary 1 to Secondary 3, as the mother tongue is the most effective medium for all students. Support for mother-tongue teaching was again pronounced in the Hong Kong government's *Fine-Tuning the Medium of Instruction for Secondary Schools* (Education Bureau, 2009), although, as will be shown below, this document has had precisely the opposite effect.

Further support for the use of Chinese as the medium of instruction for Hong Kong has been provided by recent research findings. Ho and Man (2007) found that students performed better when assessed in Chinese than when assessed in English. Yip and Tsang's (2007) study showed that students in English medium programmes performed well in maths but experienced greater problems than their Chinese medium counterparts in science subjects. Ho and Man concluded that, "In high-language-loaded domains such as reading and science, students' performances are commonly underestimated when being assessed in English" (2007, p. 45).

These difficulties are, of course, exacerbated when English is not a second language, but a third or even fourth (Shohamy, 2013). For example, consider the plight of Filipino primary school children who speak a home language and a regional lingua franca (other than Tagalog, the language spoken in and around the capital, Manila) when they go to school. Until recently, when the new Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education Policy was passed (see <http://mothertongue-based.blogspot.com>), such children had to learn Maths and Science through English and other subjects through Filipino, which, despite the name, is based heavily on Tagalog. In other words, they were required to learn through their third and fourth languages from primary 1. It is not surprising that the drop-out rate for such children was so high (Kirkpatrick, 2010).

While it may be argued that students at university are likely to have at least some knowledge of English, after all most universities require some evidence of a certain level of proficiency in English as part of their entry requirements, the potential disadvantages for those for whom English is not a first language should not be underestimated. Sadly, however, this remains the case, even in English-speaking countries, where English language support is seldom an *integral* part of a student's curriculum. Students are offered pre-course language help and then support courses during their actual study, but seldom is ongoing English language development made an integral part of a student's degree. It is as if the university believes that the English language entry levels are sufficient to ensure successful study, no matter what the discipline, without any further systematic support. It needs to be stressed that these entry levels are just that – *entry* levels. In no way do they represent the level required to graduate from university. English language proficiency is a constantly ongoing process and all universities which insist on EMI programmes must ensure that they also provide systematic ongoing English development courses which are integral to a student's degree. The very fact that so few universities do provide such courses goes a long way to explaining the current controversy and concerns in Australia and in other English speaking countries over the low standards of English proficiency demonstrated by some international students.

The disadvantages that students may face when learning through a language that is not their first are exacerbated by two further common policies, the first being an insistence on the use of English only and the second being an insistence that the type of

English to be accepted is based on a native speaker model; and it is to these two issues that I now turn.

EMI means English-only

It is common to find that where English is the medium of instruction, the policy is that only English should be used in the class. It is equally common to find that, in practice, there is frequent use of the L1 in the classroom. Barnard and McLellan (2014) give telling examples of this gulf between official policy and actual practice in a variety of Asian settings. They themselves firmly advocate the use of code switching and the L1 in classrooms. There are several reasons for advocating the use of the L1 (or languages that students may share) (Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Swain, Kirkpatrick, & Cummins, 2011). Proponents for the English-only policy argue that students need to hear and use as much English as possible, especially when there is little opportunity to use the language outside the class. In actual fact, however, the L1 acts as an excellent bridge to the L2 (Benson, 2008). At the same time, if students do not understand the English they are hearing, there is no way they can learn from it.

The use of the L1 is fully justified when it can be shown that this use helps students with their learning of the L2. For example, it can help make the content comprehensible. Providing translations of difficult grammatical concepts and vocabulary items can be a much more efficient way of getting meanings across than by trying to explain them in English (Macaro, 2009). At the same time, allowing students to use their L1 during the *process* of working on a task will ensure that the final *product* is of a higher standard (Behan, Turnbull, & Spek, 1997). This use of the L1 in L2 learning has been called *linguaging* (see, for example, Swain & Watanabe, 2012) and needs to be encouraged.

The benefits of linguaging stand to reason. Imagine you have been learning a language for three years and you are then asked to write an essay in which you have to describe what drives and motivates you. Now imagine that (i) you can only use the language you are learning in which to plan this essay, or (ii) that you can use your L1 in planning this essay, even to the point of being able to write a first draft of the essay in your L1. Having written the first draft in the L1 you can then turn this into the required language, drawing on the linguistic skills of your peers and colleagues if needed. Which essay, the one written under the L2 only rule or the one written where the use of the L1 is allowed, is likely to be the better and more cognitively deep essay? The one in which the L1 was allowed during the *process* of working on the task. Students should therefore be allowed, if not encouraged, to use their linguistic resources in the *process* of completing L1 *products*.¹ Yet most EMI policies forbid this, insisting on an English-only policy (Barnard & McLellan, 2014).

In an earlier section, I quoted excerpts from the Nottingham Ningbo website where it proudly announced that all teaching was in English, including all course materials. But limiting course materials to those only available in English seriously disadvantages students who are multilingual, students who surely should be advantaged by being multilingual. In the context of a university in China it seems needlessly limiting to restrict course materials to those only available in English, when there is so much available in Chinese that would be of great benefit to the Chinese speaking (and reading) students. This policy comes dangerously close to a form of linguistic imperialism. An English-only policy may lead to students feeling they can only consult materials that are written in English. It may also lead them to believe that materials written in a language other than English are not as scholarly or as important as those

¹ For an example of this use of the L1 to produce L2 work, see the Dual Books Project <http://www.multiliteracies.ca/index.php/folio/viewProject/8>

written in English. Rather, therefore, than limiting students with the insistence on English-only, multilingual students should be encouraged and allowed to use their linguistic resources in the course of their studies.

Is the E in EMI a native speaker E?

The third concern with EMI and English-only policies is that the ‘English’ in the English-only policy is almost always based on a native speaker model. This ignores the well-attested fact that by far the greatest numbers of speakers of English in today’s world are multilinguals who have learned English as a second or additional language. It just so happens, that, of these, the greatest number are Chinese, with the total number of Chinese learners of English estimated at some 400 million (Bolton & Graddol, 2012). As I have argued elsewhere (Kirkpatrick, 2011), this huge rise in the number of English-knowing multilinguals means that the ownership of English is now shared. English is no longer the exclusive possession of native speakers. This ownership means that the multilinguals who use it can adopt and change it (Brumfit, 2001, p. 116). This shift of ownership has yet to be understood by many language education policy makers. As Jenkins points out, English language policy lags far behind English language practice (Jenkins, 2011, p. 926). Policy makers have yet to take into account the implications for language education policy from the developments of new varieties of English and the role of English as an international lingua franca. These implications are not yet understood. Ostler, in an otherwise erudite account of how lingua-francas survive and die argues that:

there is some principle...that only mother tongue speakers of a language have a natural right (given to them by their language community) to innovate in it. One implication of this is that it is impossible for those who have consciously learned a new language to establish a new dialect of it” (Ostler, 2010, p. 49).

This would appear to be the position of most language education policy makers, but it is a position that is simply untenable given the well-documented development of new varieties of English over the last century or so (see, for example, Kachru & Nelson, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2010; Schneider, 2007). The following are just three quotes from Indian scholars that testify to the existence of South Asian varieties of English. The first comes from the Indian author, Raja Rao, writing in 1963; the second from the Pakistani novelist, Sidhwa; and the third, which is replete with Indian rhetorical flourishes, including the use of extended metaphor, is taken from a survey of Indian English literature.

We shall have English with us and amongst us, and not as our guest or friend, but as one of our own, of our castes, our creed, our sect and our tradition....
We cannot write like the English. We should not. We can only write as Indians (Raja Rao, 1963, cited in Srivastava & Sharma, 1991, p. 190 and p. 205).

English... is no longer the monopoly of the British. We the excolonised have subjugated the language, beaten it on its head and made it ours (Sidhwa, 1996, p. 231).

Years ago, a slender sapling from a foreign field was grafted by ‘pale hands’ on the mighty and many-branched Indian banyan tree. It has kept growing vigorously and now, an organic part of its parent tree, it has spread its own probing roots into the brown soil below. Its young leaves rustle energetically in the strong winds that blow from the western horizon, but the sunshine that warms it and the rain that cools it are from Indian skies; and it continues to draw its vital sap from ‘this earth, this realm, this India’ (Niak & Narayan, 2004, p. 253).

Similar quotes can be found describing the development of other varieties of English around the world (see Kirkpatrick, 2007). These multilingual users of English routinely use English in non-Anglo-cultural settings and their use of English reflects their cultures and pragmatic norms. Their English also features the use of some non-standard linguistic forms – when judged against native speaker ‘norms’. As noted above, these developments have yet to be realized and their implications yet to be considered by universities. As Jenkins (2014) has asked, “Why, in an international university, should it be acceptable to require non-native English speakers (NNES) to replicate the national academic English norms preferred by native English speaker (NES) staff and students?” (p. 11). Universities world-wide need to take notice of the emergence of new varieties of English and the use of ELF by multilinguals, and to reflect these developments in their language policies. In the context of China where there is growing evidence that a new variety of English, Chinese English, is developing (Li, forthcoming; Xu, 2010), universities in China that are marketing themselves as offering EMI programmes need to re-consider what this really means and recognise the existence of Chinese English, ELF and the multilingual background of their students and staff.

EMI and/or multilingual policies

Although the discussion is relevant to other parts of Asia, the examples in this section are drawn mostly from Hong Kong where there is a well-documented history of decisions about language policies both in a broad sense from the government and more specifically within the universities. As is well-known, the Hong Kong government’s language policy is to ensure its citizens become trilingual in Cantonese, Putonghua and English and biliterate in Chinese and English. This policy is actually more accurately described as a slogan, as there are no guidelines available on how such a policy might be implemented, particularly in education. Currently, most primary schools are Cantonese medium, but there is increasing pressure on schools to offer Putonghua medium classes, and not only in the teaching of Chinese (Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2013). There is also constant pressure from parents and other stakeholders to increase the amount of English taught, especially in those schools that were classified as Chinese medium after the handover in 1997 (see Bolton, 2012 for a history of language planning in Hong Kong). The relentless pressure from the parents finally caused the government to concede. The 2009 Fine-Tuning document (Education Bureau, 2009) allowed Chinese medium schools to offer more classes in English provided they met certain criteria. The inevitable result of this was a substantial decline in the number of classes taught in Chinese, particularly but not exclusively, in maths and science, and a corresponding increase in these subjects being taught in English (Kan, Lai, Kirkpatrick, & Law, 2011). But why has there been this constant pressure from Hong Kong parents to have their children educated in English? A major reason is the language policies of the universities. As indicated above, six of the eight government-funded universities are English medium. It is hardly surprising then, that Hong Kong parents want their children to study as much as possible in English at school, as they naturally want to ensure that their children will be able to cope with university study in English. It would be hard to think of anything more likely to undermine the government’s bilingual-triliterate policy than allowing universities to set their own language policies, the great majority of which have adopted EMI. Again, as we saw earlier, even the Chinese University of Hong Kong has increased its EMI offerings. Needless to say, the private universities, which are not yet as plentiful in Hong Kong as in other parts of Asia, are

also EMI institutions. As Shohamy (2013) has pointed out, “the teaching of EMI at universities cannot be divorced from broader settings where MoI approaches are implemented” (p. 197). In effect, in Hong Kong, the EMI-dominated tertiary sector undermines the government’s language policy and the place of Chinese as a language of education and scholarship. This seems remarkably short-sighted when, in today’s multilingual world, one would have expected international students to flock to institutions in Hong Kong and China itself if they offered a truly bilingual education in Chinese and English. By adopting bilingual language policies, the universities would also ensure that Chinese remains a key language of education and scholarship. Such policies in which the role of ELF would be respected, would also be more in tune with the multilingual realities of today’s world. Such policies would also recognise the realities of the multilingual university. The regular incidences of code-mixing across East and Southeast Asian universities (Barnard & McLellan, 2014) illustrate this multilingual reality. People use the linguistic resources available to them, despite official language policy. Encouraging this would enhance the learning and teaching experience of staff and students, as well as increasing its effectiveness.

An interesting example of a relatively successful trilingual education policy comes from Ethiopia (Heugh, 2010) which, although outside the geographical region under discussion in this paper, is worthy of consideration here. The 1995 constitution framed a policy which saw the home and local language(s) as essential for “local horizontal socio-economic participation”, the national language, Amharic, as essential for “regional and inter-regional participation” and English for “higher education and international communication” (Heugh, 2010, p. 379). The local language is taught through the first 8 years of primary. Amharic, in areas where people do not have Amharic as an L1, is introduced as a subject from grade 3; and English is introduced as a subject from grade 9 (the first year of secondary school in the Ethiopian system). While there are practical problems – not all local languages are available as languages of education, for example, although 23 languages have been so developed – generally speaking the policy has been considered successful (Heugh, 2010). However, it has recently been undermined by incidences of what Heugh (2010) refers to as “reverse planning”, initiatives which interfere with the aims of the original policy (p. 381). These reverse-planning initiatives include the introduction of English language improvement programmes into teacher training courses which are now conducted entirely in English and the removal of the year-long English language foundation programmes for first year university students. Both these programmes were conceived by consultants from the United Kingdom and both have proved unsuccessful: local teachers needed training in how to teach in local languages, not just in English; and university students needed their foundation programme.

A further language education policy worthy of note is the one adopted in 2012, after several years of consultation, by the Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIED) (see Xu, forthcoming, for a full account). It is the only Hong Kong government-funded institution whose language policy stipulates the promotion of trilingualism and biliteracy, and thus is the only one which actually supports the government policy.

The HKIED policy requires students to reach exit standards in all three languages. As most HKIED students are Cantonese, the policy focuses on providing support for English, Putonghua and writing modern standard Chinese. The language exit requirements (LERS) for English and Putonghua are benchmarked against the *International English Language Testing System* (IELTS), and the *Putonghua Shuiping Ceshi* (PSC). The actual levels vary depending on whether the students are English or Chinese majors or not. Students are expected to take responsibility to ensure they meet

their pre-arranged LERs, although ongoing support in all three languages is available, depending upon their L1.

A further innovative aspect of the new policy is the way it distinguishes between the MOI and Classroom Language (CL).

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 (Xu, forthcoming).

The advice contained in the third paragraph illustrates that the new policy allows code-switching in the classroom and thus represents a breakthrough for regional university language policies. It is to be hoped that this encourages other universities to follow this lead.

The new policy also offers guidance on how to decide which language a course should be delivered in, recognising the increasingly diverse make-up of the students and staff. Factors to be considered include:

the nature of discipline; (b) the usual language of the workplace for graduates of a particular programme; (c) how comfortable the lecturer is and the students are in using Chinese (Cantonese/*Putonghua*) or English; (d) students’ and staff members’ proficiency in English, Cantonese, and *Putonghua*; and (e) mixed class, with different L1 backgrounds, including Cantonese-dominant local students, English-dominant international students, and *Putonghua*-dominant non-local Chinese (primarily Mainland Chinese) students (Xu, forthcoming).

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 as only natural peoples’ use of their available linguistic resources (see also Gu, 2013; Söderlund, 2013). Third, it recognizes that multilinguals are unlikely to be equally proficient in the languages they speak and makes allowances for this, as in the different language exit requirements for the different languages demanded of English and Chinese majors. In this it also recognizes the notion of functional trilingualism, whereby graduates will be able to function in the three languages according to their needs. These

needs will, of course, constantly change, so the graduates need to have adequate proficiency in all three languages in order to be able to build on them as needed. This policy therefore also recognizes the continual developmental nature of language proficiency. Finally, while recognizing the importance of English, the new policy gives equal consideration to both Cantonese and Putonghua and thus reflects a respect for Chinese as a language of education and scholarship.

Conclusion

The number of universities throughout East and Southeast Asia that are offering courses in EMI is constantly growing and one would expect these numbers to continue to grow, as universities in the regions seek to internationalise – and thus offer more EMI courses – and attract more international students – and thus more fees. At the same time the APEC commitment towards increasing student and staff mobility is likely to result in further EMI courses, if the increase in EMI across Europe as a result of the Bologna Process is replicated in the Asia-Pacific. This inexorable rise in EMI provision is, however, not yet matched by an understanding at university level, as evidenced by their language education policies (if indeed they even have these), of the new developments in new varieties of English, the role and nature of ELF and the multilingual settings on the universities themselves. As a consequence of this lack of understanding, the universities' EMI policies not only tend to insist on an English-only policy, they also take English to be represented only by a native speaker variety of English, based on American and/or British norms.

In this paper, I have argued for the need for universities to re-evaluate their language policies to take into account today's linguistic realities. This will involve recognizing the existence and legitimacy of new varieties of English; recognizing that multilinguals use ELF in ways that may differ from native speaker norms, but that this does not invalidate ELF use; that multilinguals, where appropriate, need to be allowed to use their multilingual skills in the course of teaching and learning; and that a university which aimed to develop bilingual programmes and bilingual graduates would not only help promote languages other than English as languages of education and scholarship, but would also prove attractive to people who want to operate successfully in a multilingual world. And, while the examples in this paper have been derived largely from Hong Kong and China, the EMI policies described here can be found across the region. The Hong Institute of Education's new language policy which was summarised above, while not perfect, might therefore represent a possible model from which other universities in the region might gain inspiration.

About the author

Professor Andy Kirkpatrick is in the School of Languages and Linguistics, Griffith University, Australia. His areas of research expertise are in: the development of new varieties of English and the role of English as a lingua franca in Asia; Language Education Policy in Asia (in multilingual settings); Chinese-English contrastive discourse analysis and rhetoric; and the internationalization of education. He has published widely in all these fields.

References

- Barnard, R., & McLellan, J. (2014). *Codeswitching in English medium classes: case studies and perspectives from East Asian contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Behan, L., Turnbull, M., & Spek, J. (1997). The proficiency gap in late French immersion: Language use in collaborative tasks. *Le Journal de l'immersion*, 20, 41-44.

- Benson, C. (2008). Summary overview. Mother tongue-based education in multilingual contexts. In C. Haddad (Ed.), *Improving the quality of mother tongue-based literacy and learning: Case Studies from Asia, Africa and South America* (pp. 2-11). Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Bolton, K. (2012). Language policy and planning in Hong Kong. In E. L. A. Hashim (Ed.), *English in Southeast Asia: features, policy and language in use* (pp. 221-240). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bolton, K., & Graddol, D. (2012). English in China today. *English Today*, 28(3), 3-9.
- Brumfit, C. (2001). *Individual freedom in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1981). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 132-149.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (Eds.). (2013). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Education Bureau. (2009). *Enriching our language environment, realising our vision: Fine-tuning of medium of instruction for secondary schools*. Hong Kong: Education Bureau.
- Education Commission. (2005). *Report on review of medium of instruction for secondary school and secondary school places allocation*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
- Gu, M. (2013). Language practices and transformation of language ideologies: Mainland Chinese students in a multilingual university in Hong Kong. In H. Haberland, D. Lönsmann & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 223-236). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Haberland, H., Lönsmann, D., & Preisler, B. (2013). *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Heugh, K. (2010). Productive engagement with linguistic diversity in tension with globalised discourses in Ethiopia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 378-396. doi: 10.1080/14664208.2011.541867
- Ho, E. S. C., & Man, E. Y. F. (2007). *Student performance in Chinese medium-of-instruction (CMI) and English medium-of-instruction (EMI) schools: What we learned from the PISA study*. Education Policy Studies Series no. 64. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 926-936.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kan, V., Lai, K. C., Kirkpatrick, A., & Law, A. (2011). *Fine-tuning of Hong Kong's medium of instruction policy*. Hong Kong: Institute of Education.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and ELT*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching*, 44(2), 212-224.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in East and Southeast Asian universities. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 15-29). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Gill, S. K. (2013). English in higher education in the postcolonial world. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- 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. (forthcoming). English in China and Hong Kong. In G. Leitner, A. Hashim & H. G. Wolf (Eds.), *Communicating with Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64-77.
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35-49). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Niak, M. K., & Narayan, S. A. (2004). *Indian English literature 1980-2000. A critical survey*. New Delhi: Pencraft International.
- Ostler, N. (2010). *The last lingua franca*. London: Penguin.

- Phillipson, R. (2009). English in higher education: Panacea or pandemic? In P. Harder (Ed.), *Angles on the English-Speaking World: English in Denmark: Language policy, internationalization and university teaching* (Vol. 9, pp. 29-57): Museum Tusulanum.
- Schneider, E. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shohamy, E. (2013). A critical perspective on the use of EMI at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: global challenges* (pp. 196-210). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Sidhwa, B. (1996). Creative processes in Pakistani English fiction. In R. J. Baumgardner (Ed.), *South Asian English: structure, use and users* (pp. 231-240). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Söderlund, H. (2013). Language choice and linguistic variation in classes nominally taught in English. In H. Haberland, D. Lönsmann & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 85-102). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Srivastava, R. N., & Sharma, V. P. (1991). Indian English today. In R. S. Gupta & K. Kappor (Eds.), *English in India: Issues and problems* (pp. 189-206). New Delhi: Academic Foundation.
- Swain, M., Kirkpatrick, A., & Cummins, J. (2011). *How to have a guilt-free life using Cantonese in the English class: A handbook for the English language teacher in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Research Centre for Research into Language Education and Acquisition in Multilingual Societies, Institute of Education.
- Swain, M., & Watanabe, Y. (2012). Languaging: Collaborative dialogue as a source of second language learning. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The picture in 2007*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Wang, L., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2013). Trilingual education in Hong Kong primary schools: A case study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(1), 100-116. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2012.689479
- Xu, Z. (2010). *Chinese English: Features and implications*. Hong Kong: Open University Press.
- Xu, Z. (forthcoming). Functional English and Chinese as mediums of instruction in a higher institution in Hong Kong. In K. Dunworth & G. Zhang (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on language education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Yip, D. Y., & Tsang, W. K. (2007). Evaluation of the effects of medium of instruction on science learning of Hong Kong secondary students: Students' self-concept in science. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 5(3), 393-413.