

Towards multilingualism in English-medium higher education

A student perspective

Emma Dafouz and Ute Smit

Universidad Complutense de Madrid | Universität Wien

Reflecting the global push for internationalisation, higher education institutions (HEIs) have experienced a surge in English-medium education in multilingual university settings (EMEMUS). Of the many topics and angles pursued in the equally vast research landscape, multilingualism has so far received comparatively less attention, especially when approached from the perspective of students. By combining recent conceptualisations of multilingualism and of EMEMUS, this paper offers a qualified literature review, discussing four research scenarios that foreground different student groups and some of their multilingual experiences and practices. Based on the ROAD-MAPPING framework, such discussions retain a level of detail that allows for a comprehensive interpretation across scenarios, offering insights into the complexity and fluidity of multilingualism within EMEMUS.

Keywords: multilingualism, EMEMUS, ROAD-MAPPING, students, higher education

Introduction

In the past two decades, higher education institutions (HEIs) have experienced a huge shift to English-medium education (EME) in line with more general internationalisation (Hultgren et al., 2015; Dafouz & Smit, 2020). Research on EME has taken a wide range of approaches, from examining policies and the motivations for its introduction to describing the implications for and of EME on the classroom level or exploring participants' attitudes and perceptions of this phenomenon. Given the crucial role teachers play as key agents in implementing EME, they have attracted more investigative interest than the other core, and numerically much stronger, group of students. In view of the educational mis-

sion of higher education (HE) to support the next generation in accessing and co-constructing our globalised knowledge societies, however, students certainly deserve focused research attention, investigating their experiences and language needs in EME not only in general terms (Kojima, 2021), but also more specifically from a disciplinary language perspective (e.g. Airey, 2017; Smit, 2010). Furthermore, and despite the increasing linguistic and cultural diversification of the university population, a monolingual English-only perspective has tended to prevail, both in institutional policies as well as in research into EME programmes.

Against this background, the aims of this contribution are twofold: on the one hand, to focus on students as key participants in the process of internationalisation of HE and how they perceive and experience EME, and, on the other, to put forward the case for EME settings as sites of multilingualism. While multi-layered, dynamic and potentially conflictual, EME combines global drivers such as the use of English as *lingua franca* in academia and in international trade and commerce, as well as local factors, such as the home languages used in particular HEIs or the educational and cultural models followed. Into this fluid glocal mix, students bring their own multilingual repertoires, which, educational theorising tells, should be envisaged and employed as a resource so as to facilitate learning and support pluriliterate development (Meyer et al., 2018). It is therefore a crucial empirical task to investigate to what extent and under what circumstances such multilingual educational practices are made possible and enacted.

As a first step along this path, we will provide an overview of EME research focusing on student views and experiences across countries and continents. Informed by relevant conceptualisations of multilingualism and English-medium education in multilingual university settings (EMEMUS, section below), this literature review identifies four scenarios of present-day EME research, foregrounding different student groups and takes on multilingualism. By underlining the complexity of multilingual constellations, use and learning, this four-fold presentation of the status quo opens up avenues for further research as well as suggestions for impact these might have for policy makers, lecturers, educational developers and students.

English-medium education and multilingualism through the ROAD-MAPPING lens

Reflecting the huge increase in university-level education offered in English in response to internationalisation endeavours world-wide, we have seen a surge in research turning to these educational developments, investigating them from various angles and for different research interests. Besides a wealth of empirical find-

ings, these concerted research efforts have resulted in a range of labels – most notably English-Medium Instruction (EMI) – whose interpretations have been varied and under some discussion (Macaro, 2018; Pecorari & Malmström, 2018). As argued in detail elsewhere (Dafouz & Smit, 2020, 2021), we propose the label “English Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings” (EMEMUS) instead, as we consider it semantically transparent and conceptually informative for what seems to be at stake.

Starting at the end of the phrase, “university settings” identifies the strong contextualised nature of the phenomenon as well as the educational level as tertiary, i.e. engaging cognitively developed, experienced learners who voluntarily dedicate important years of their (young) adult lives to studying at institutions that fulfil the joint missions of education and research. With the latter influencing the former, “education” in the label also subscribes to a sociocultural view of teaching and learning practices that take place between and within students and teachers in various constellations, thus going beyond forms of “instruction.” Finally, “English-medium” and “multilingual” capture the language-related characteristics at stake. The former pays tribute both to the privileged position of English as well as its educational function as explicitly identified medium. “Multilingual,” on the other hand, underlines the relevance of all languages that are part of the respective “university setting,” be it as national or regional languages or as elements of language repertoires which students and staff bring along. Seen in combination, these two language-related elements acknowledge that, reminiscent of language ecological considerations (Hornberger & Hult, 2001), language constellations are interrelated, complex and dynamic.

In other words, multilingualism, an integral element of EMEMUS, comes in a range of realisations, whose basic ingredients will be sketched here in preparation for the scenarios below. As indicated by its prefix, “multi-lingualism” refers to the coming together of two or more languages (Cenoz, 2013). While this inclusive definition thus caters for bilingual EME scenarios as well, it also takes into consideration the recent theoretical discussion in applied linguistics of the nature of language, extending the traditional essentialist understanding of languages as demarcated entities (e.g. Austrian German, Castilian Spanish or British English), by complementing it with a dynamic view of (trans)linguaging, that is, of drawing on all of one’s linguistic resources when communicating and making meaning in a situated and fluid manner (García & Wei, 2014; Paulsrud et al., 2021). As both views of language – as a product and as a process – find support in how we work with language(s) sociolinguistically and discursively, multilingualism encompasses both, diverse constellations of languages in a tertiary setting as well as communicational practices that draw on multilingual repertoires (Hawkins & Mori, 2018). Linked to this inclusivity, we do not make a terminological dis-

inction between individual and societal uses of various linguistic resources and employ multilingual(ism) irrespectively.

In view of our institutional focus, however, what is relevant are the complex roles language(s) play(s) in the power dynamics. Put briefly, “multilingualism *per se* is not neutral but rather hierarchical and ideologically invested” (Barakos & Selleck, 2019, p.364). At universities, for instance, established educational languages and English as the main international language of academia come with considerable symbolic and exchange value (Codó & Sunyol, 2019), while migrant languages tend to be reduced in their legitimacy to, for instance, informal exchanges among L1 speakers in class or outside educational settings proper. When zooming in on English in its clearly privileged position in EMEMUS, it is important to consider its roles in relation to the other languages – and translanguage practices – at play in a specific setting, ranging from the macro level of societal multilingual regulations, to the meso, institutional level of requirements, down to the micro pedagogical and communicational practices in a specific programme or course (Dafouz & Smit, 2017). Such a multi-level approach, while being analytically demanding, has the potential of providing a faithful rendering of the realities of multilingualism in EMEMUS.

A conceptualisation that allows for such a multi-level and fluid take is the ROAD-MAPPING framework, an integrative model, anchored conceptually in sociolinguistic and ecolinguistic approaches as well as language policy research. Since ROAD-MAPPING functions as the analytical lens for this paper (and will be sketched in the next section), suffice it to say here that it uses discourse as an “access point to the analysis of social practices” (Dafouz & Smit, 2016, p.406) and thereby gains an insight into the interplay of these practices across six dimensions, each of which views EMEMUS from a different perspective. Following the acronym, these dimensions are: *Roles of English (in relation to other languages; RO)*, *Academic Disciplines (AD)*, *(language) Management (M)*, *Agents (A)*, *Practices and Processes (PP)*, and *Internationalisation and Glocalisation (ING)* (for a full account of the model see Dafouz & Smit, 2020, ch. 3).

EMEMUS from the student perspective: Current conceptualisations of multilingualism

Given the wealth of recent studies into EMEMUS from the student perspective, our description relies on a broad selection of investigations that introduce us to EME realities and how they are perceived in diverse HEIs from around the globe. Although this approach draws on reported facts, practices and insights, and is thus once removed from the field itself, it allows for a second-level interpretation

of how multilingualism is covered from the students' points of view in present-day EMEMUS research, permitting insights into how multilingualism in the students' lives is constructed and handled across different EME sites. As, clearly, studies pursue their own research interests, our second-level reading can only work with the respective and by necessity partial views offered on our topic of interest. So, instead of aiming for a complete picture of what multilingualism means to students in its entirety (whatever this might look like), we work with the respective research lens and the selected aspects of multilingualism it provides access to, remaining well-aware that such an interface prevents us from directly accessing the actual multilingual practices students engage in. At the same time, this approach allows for an evaluation of what is currently being researched. While, as stated earlier, multilingualism is so complex that aiming for a comprehensive coverage would be a true challenge, it is something that actual investigations seem to avoid by restricting their focus in terms of either student groups and/or as regards languages or linguistic practices involved. As we consider these decisions on research focus not only pragmatically driven but also reflecting urgent research motivations when it comes to students and multilingualism in EMEMUS, they form the basis of the four EME selected scenarios that will be described below.

All four scenarios reveal the relevance and interconnectedness of the six ROAD-MAPPING dimensions, focusing on students as Agents (A) engaging in their EME realities in interdependence with other Agents, such as teachers or the HEIs themselves. Regarding Roles of English (RO), variation fitting to the complexity of multilingualism is found in our analysis of English as a foreign language and learning target (scenario 1), alongside further established educational language(s) (scenario 2) and other languages students bring along (scenarios 3 and 4). Such linguistic constellations are, in turn, established and enacted in the Practices and Processes (PP) dimension, which often stand in complex and potentially difficult relations to language Management (M) (as seen in scenarios 2 and 3). Finally, the respective HEIs' strategies on Internationalisation and Globalisation (ING) impact which student groups are in focus and what language(s) and language resources are supported for what purposes and in which ways (e.g. scenario 1's focus on increased use and proficiency in English in support of helping local students or scenario 3's identification of multilingualism as integral to the HEI and to its students' needs for their glocal lives).

Scenario 1: Focus on local students and bilingualism

When describing this first scenario, one of its most noticeable features is the wide-spread and diverse nature of the research conducted. Studies grouped within this heading cover very different geopolitical and sociolinguistic settings,

and while all of them share the use of English as medium of education coupled with the use of students' L1, at the same time, each one reveals noticeable local, regional and national differences in the concrete design and implementation of language policies.

Focusing on the Agents dimension, students in these settings are generally locals who enrol in specific EME courses rather than full programmes, for diverse reasons which range from higher levels of employment to study abroad opportunities, access to quality education, and/or updated resources in certain disciplinary areas (see e.g. Ekoç, 2020 in Turkey; He & Chiang, 2016 in China). Another common reason, and strongly pursued within national policies, is the enhancement of students' English proficiency often described as below the levels required to follow EME adequately. In this respect, problems in content comprehension are said to arise as well as lower levels of active student participation in the classroom (Lee, 2014) and weaker academic skills, particularly writing. In view of this situation, language entry levels have been set for student enrolment. While there is no common threshold level, many universities require a B2 for student entry (following the Common European Frame of Reference, CEFR). This level, nevertheless, largely depends on the English proficiency learners attain in prior stages of education, and on their socioeconomic background, with students from more privileged milieux frequently reported to develop higher English proficiency and thus face EME more comfortably (Byun et al., 2011; Macaro, 2018).

Regarding Roles of English (in relation to other languages), students in this scenario are commonly viewed as learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), rather than as actual users, operating under the underlying premise that the greater the student exposure to English, the higher their proficiency. In this immersion-like approach, standardised native-speaker norms of English are usually followed and valued in the classroom. Hence, the use of textbooks for the English-speaking market, and the recruitment of both native English lecturers or content-based professionals with a PhD from an Anglophone university are often the norm (see e.g. Williams, 2015 in Korea). Despite this English-only policy, EME programmes vary substantially in their percentage of English. In China, for instance, programmes range from 50% to 100% in their use of English depending on the type of university or urban and rural setting examined (Guo et al., 2018).

A study by Zhang & Pladevall-Ballester (2021) also set in China examined different EME programmes focusing on students' and lecturers' use of English and their L1/home languages in the classroom. The research revealed that while students were generally positive towards EME, their attitudes gradually worsened by the end of the semester. In one programme, the use of a Chinese student interpreter as mediator between the lecturer and the student body, together with the poor quality of interpretation, is put forth to explain students' less positive views

of their EME experience. In contrast, in another programme the lecturer's explicit rephrasing, use of synonyms, and use of supplementary examples, explanations and translations of key vocabulary was deemed very positively by the students surveyed.

What these examples reveal is that the single language ideology and pedagogy often prevailing in scenario 1, where languages are viewed as separate entities in permanent conflict, denies the true reality of bilingual speakers and bilingual teaching and learning. Thus, although in this scenario L1 use and translanguaging practices are usually perceived with a sense of guilt, as a sign of insufficient competence in the target language, the micro-practices described above can discover alternative solutions for resolving pedagogical tensions between national policies and institutional and classroom practices. Future research could examine home languages in a more conciliatory manner rather than viewing them as an obstacle for internationalisation.

Scenario 2: Focus on local and international students and trilingualism

The second scenario displays two fundamental differences with respect to scenario 1. Difference one is that English is added to contexts where two or more languages already coexist historically as established educational languages, and difference two relates to the lower number of HEIs in this category. Generally, prior to the arrival of English, most of these HEIs had developed their own official bilingual policies, so that regional or minority language(s) were protected and preserved in relation to the majority language (Vila & Bretxa, 2014).

In the case of Europe, the advent of English particularly in HE, under the umbrella of the European Higher Education Area, meant that the original balance (at least on paper) between the minority and the majority language was somewhat upset "mak[ing] matters even more complex" (Soler & Gallego-Balsà, 2019, p.30). A well-known and documented example of these trilingual scenarios is the Universitat de Lleida in Catalonia, which combines Spanish, Catalan and, most recently, English (Block & Khan, 2021; Cots et al., 2014; Soler & Gallego-Balsà, 2019). At this university, local students, by and large, envisage English in a positive light as an opportunity for career development and for international educational experiences. The expansion of English in this HEI, and in Catalonia in general, is linked to a regional government proposal whereby all students need to reach a B2 level (CEFR) in a foreign language by graduation. International students enrol in Spanish-medium courses by far more than in Catalan-medium subjects – a choice that often results in tensions since Catalan is largely the language preferred for institutional communication and teaching (Soler & Gallego-Balsà, 2019). Against this backdrop, some international students are said to find support and reassur-

ance in the local students, who act as linguistic mediators and support them in their academic use of Catalan. Other international students, however, view the use of Catalan as a “marker of unkindness ... lack of professionalism” (Soler & Gallego-Balsà, 2019, p. 91) and, even, Catalan dominance.

Moving on to Central Asia, the Republic of Kazakhstan is a more recent instance of “disrupted histories of educational language policies” (Smit, 2021, p. 174). The country recuperated Kazakht, a Turkic language, as the state language and language of education, whilst Russian “continues to be an official language, an interethnic language ... of wider communication” (Goodman et al., 2021, p. 235). The arrival of English in the early 2000s, as a means of integration in the global economy, has resorted in the development of a trilingual education policy in secondary schools and HEIs. Focusing on translanguaging practices and student views, it was found that students and alumni only perceived moderate utility of translanguaging approaches for learning academic skills in English. Three main reasons explain this: the mix of monoglossic and heteroglossic teacher beliefs, student idiosyncratic behaviour stemming from individual repertoires and conscious choices, and the view of translanguaging as a natural behaviour rather than a learning strategy. Despite this take, students at the same time reported fluid communicative practices among the three languages under scrutiny (i.e. English, Kazakh and Russian) and described the use of English genre structures, terms and even direct translating in their Kazakh and Russian texts. This transfer practice was questioned, however, by employers who stated needing professionals fluent in the local languages when dealing with local clients. All in all, what this study suggests is the need to increase the multilingual repertoire of students in EME programmes to address both the global but also the local needs of 21st century countries.

Scenario 3: Focus on local and international students and multilingualism

Turning to the third constellation of Agents and Roles of English, the research focus becomes broader in the sense that multilingualism is investigated in a more comprehensive way. By going beyond the established educational languages, the focus is on institutional multilingual regulations and/or practices on the meso level or it pertains to students’ linguistic repertoires and how they are (not) used in the educational process on the micro level. Such a widened research interest has, so far, been pursued in comparatively few studies undertaken recently in Northern Europe, which, as noted elsewhere (e.g. Dimova & Kling, 2020; Hultgren et al., 2015; Kuteeva et al., 2020), is the leading area for EMEMUS in terms of development, spread and research. Arguably, EMEMUS needs to have

reached a certain body of knowledge and degree of maturity before multilingualism can be tackled in its complexity.

A case in point is Holmen's (2020) report of the language policy developments at the University of Copenhagen (UCPH). Having focused their language policy interests on English and Danish as central to their institutional strategy in supporting parallel language use, the university management turned to their previously ignored commitment to multilingualism, instigating in 2012 a university-wide five-year language strategy project, called "More Languages for More Students" (Holmen, 2020, p.39). Based on a large-scale needs analysis, involving more than 7,000 students, 800 lecturers and 60 study-programme developers, students' language needs were established across all faculties, with an explicit focus on all (foreign) languages used at UCPH. Besides widespread concerns with academic English, smaller, but still sizable student groups voiced their problems with academic Danish; a language-support need that was expressed by L2, but also L1 speakers. Other languages were identified as important either for specific disciplines, such as German for theologians or Chinese for studying or working abroad. Based on these findings, 36 language-support activities were developed, largely integrated in content-focused programmes and targeting more than 4,000 students. While students tended to welcome these multilingual support activities, content lecturers showed more varied evaluations of the project, revealing an understanding of "language initiatives ... as nice-to-have rather than need-to-have" (Holmen, 2020, p.42). What made the project succeed nonetheless was the strong support from the university management, "its groundedness in the practices of academia, and its innovative strengths ... [enabled by] individual burning souls supported by language expertise" (Holmen, 2020, pp.46–47).

Regarding institutionalised multilingual practices on a micro level, Kaufhold and Wennerberg's (2020) innovative analysis focuses on how multilingual students perceive and experience their linguistic repertoires in Swedish HE. Based on in-depth interviews with three local students with migrant backgrounds, the analytical focus is on "individual speakers who acquire and use sets of linguistic resources through participating in several practices" (Kaufhold & Wennerberg, 2020, p.195). Besides detailed accounts of the personal "lived experience of language" (Busch, 2017, p.340), the findings reveal the hierarchy-sensitive, yet dynamic positioning of languages, with Swedish and English having legitimacy as academic languages, such as in lectures. Less privileged languages, on the other hand, are confined for interaction amongst students with overlapping linguistic repertoires. While such translanguaging practices are perceived as supportive, the usually monolingual expectations for academic activities can be highly challenging, such as when a thesis needs to be produced in academic Swedish, even by Swedish L2 speakers whose academic writing has so far been in their L1 and Eng-

lish (Kaufhold & Wennerberg, 2020). At the same time, the study also reveals that language-related challenges are usually dynamic and integral to a broader web of factors, such as previous academic experience.

With its focus on students' multilingualism going beyond the established educational languages, scenario 3 embraces multilingualism in its complexity, identifying possible practices, policies and dilemmas both for the individual student and the HEIs.

Scenario 4: Focus on international students and multilingualism

While continuing from the preceding scenario in terms of understanding multilingualism as inclusive of all language resources available, scenario 4 pursues a more specific Agent – international students that are increasingly put centre-stage in a still small but growing number of EMEMUS studies.

Investigating students' practices and experiences with the types of multilingualism integral to their HE realities from a meso-level perspective, Clarke (2020) focuses on the University of Helsinki (UH) and its published, explicitly multilingual Language Policy (LP). By engaging 11 international students of diverse L1s in focus-group discussions, she identifies the language ideologies students perceive at their host university and share themselves in relation to two continua: the first "relates to whether the students' language repertoires are excluded and ignored or included and valued. The second continuum refers to whether the participants experience language inequality or empowerment" (Clarke, 2020, p.177). While all students generally experienced UH as providing a multilingualism-friendly atmosphere, they reported on a clearly hierarchical order of values awarded to languages, with small languages, such as Greek or Croatian, gaining no recognition, while the wider potential of Spanish or Chinese was regularly acknowledged. Experiences of inequality or discrimination, if made at all, were caused by lecturers or local students occasionally using Finnish in English-medium classes, thus excluding the internationals from further explanations or elaborations. As such practices reflect the university LP of combining the two national languages – Finnish and Swedish – with English as *lingua franca* of academia, they also reveal that such multilingual LPs "are not written with international students in mind; for these students, such policies are monolingual in that they exclude their languages" (Clarke, 2020, p.173). In other words, even a multilingual LP can be experienced as *de facto* monolingual (Risager, 2012), thus requiring, as Clarke (2020) argues, a critical evaluation of implicit language hierarchies, with the aim to embrace multilingualism and multiculturalism more broadly.

When approaching international students and multilingualism on the micro level, an interesting focus is on how they experience the crucial role played by

English as generally shared in otherwise changeable language constellations. A comparatively early study on English, its realisations, roles and positionings in these dynamic multilingual settings was undertaken by Jenkins (2014, Chapter 7), who interviewed 34 international students at a UK university. Apart from a widely shared ideology of “native English is best,” students “were receptive to ELF. They were also critical of what the institution’s native English ideology meant for them” (Jenkins, 2014, p.201), in terms of academic achievements and self-esteem, but also in exchange with local students who revealed low levels of intercultural awareness. In other words, and in contrast to Clarke’s (2020) findings above, the UK setting showed little understanding for the multilingualism and multiculturalism of international students, prompting Jenkins (2014, pp.202–204) to demand “systemic changes” towards developing a truly internationalised HEI.

More recently and at a Swedish university, Kuteeva et al. (2020) interviewed five multilingual EME students on how they perceive English. By referring to their EMEMUS experiences, they construct three complementary conceptualisations: (a) standard English, which is highly prestigious in their study programme and relevant both internationally and nationally for Sweden; (b) English used as a lingua franca, which is important, but can become communicatively problematic when involving people with lower proficiency levels and diverse L1s; and (c) English and Swedish combined in translanguaging practices, which are commonly enacted, but are identified as exclusionary and thus problematic for non-Swedish speakers. Taken together, and in contrast to Jenkins’ (2014) findings, these views underline that English is experienced as combining various guises to fulfil different communicational and educational functions in complementary, but partially also contentious ways.

In sum, the focus on international students foregrounds the HE realities of those not familiar with the local educational culture and language(s), thus underlining, on the one hand, the local nature of LPs, while at the same time offering insights into the multilingual nature of their communicational practices even if they draw mainly on English in its various roles and functions.

Moving ahead in foregrounding multilingualism in EME research

Having described four different HE scenarios with a focus on students as Agents, and Roles of English (in relation to other languages), and by keeping all other ROAD-MAPPING dimensions in mind, this section will argue for future research avenues to explore multilingualism in EME in all its complexity. As discussed throughout this paper, research in EMEMUS still needs to integrate the diversity and fluidity of multilingualism in a much more comprehensive and dynamic

manner. To this end, our paper has advocated the use of the ROAD-MAPPING framework as a conceptual and analytical tool that can help researchers and policy developers stay aware of the central and complex nature of multilingualism. In this light, even if the prevailing rationale for EME is mainly English proficiency (as depicted in scenario 1), it should be remembered that students and academic staff are also users of other linguistic resources and repertoires which must not be overlooked.

From a macro-level perspective, HEIs are contingent on regional, national and sometimes also on supranational policies, which shape how multilingualism and language diversity are to be perceived and valued. In the case, for instance, of the European Higher Education Area, explicit policies advocating for societal and individual multilingualism as a defining feature of European identity have been in place since the early 2000s. These multilingual policies, at the same time, often conflict with the increasing number of EME programmes in European HEIs for the sake of internationalisation and higher positions in global university rankings. Against this backdrop, EMEMUS research needs to keep a watchful eye on the Englishisation of HE and examine the roles of other national and home languages in the learning process (see e.g. Wilkinson & Gabriëls, 2021).

At the meso-level, the examples described in the four scenarios above show that generally HEIs have developed language policies focusing mainly on their local students, but very often without incorporating the multilingual and diverse language repertoires that such students may bring to the classroom. Yet, as HE gradually becomes more widely available and more international, students' diversified language backgrounds can no longer be ignored (Dafouz & Smit, 2021; Van der Walt, 2013). Thus, policies that truly operationalise and value the roles of students' other languages are greatly needed. Additionally, such policies should explicitly include international students' linguistic constellations so that multilingual resources are seen as a means to enhance disciplinary learning by "broadening or deepening knowledge" (Palfreyman & Van der Walt, 2017, p.1). In this regard, EMEMUS research would benefit from adopting a pluriliteracies approach whereby students' literacy development in the L1 is coupled with literacy development in English as L2. This would be particularly relevant in scenarios where an English-only perspective traditionally prevails (scenario 1), or where professional practices in the local language have not been sufficiently developed, thereby forcing students to resort to EFL/EAP models that might not be appropriate in local settings (scenario 2). In other words, EMEMUS research at the institutional level would benefit from a broader understanding and support of multilingual practices in the curriculum so that graduate students are able to operate both locally but also globally in the institutions or companies they work for (scenario 3).

In the same vein, EME research in Anglophone universities has remained critically unaware of the linguistic diversity that both international students and local students contribute to the classrooms (see Jenkins, 2014 in scenario 3). The study by Preece (2019) in the UK is one of a few to point out the social divide between international and local students in how they view multilingualism. In the classrooms examined, the international students reported understanding their respective home languages very much as resources, while the working-class British students see them as obstacles in the way of education (see <https://multilingualuniversity.org>). Given the hierarchical nature of multilingualism, particularly in the case of languages traditionally excluded from education, there needs to be explicit institutional support to slowly change beliefs about languages by letting students draw on their respective repertoires and varieties.

Focusing on the micro-level, a wide range of multilingual classroom practices have been mentioned in the four selected scenarios. Different realisations have thus emerged such as the pedagogical uses of translanguaging practices, viewed under a positive light when enabling students with a common L1 to build their disciplinary knowledge, or, alternatively, under a negative light, when excluding international students with no shared L1 competence. Additionally, the use of scaffolding strategies that can help students to develop disciplinary biliteracies in EMEMUS is also an interesting path that the SHIFT research project¹ is currently investigating in EME Business degrees both in Spain and Austria. Identifying the different language repertoires and disciplinary practices at work in specific learning contexts will be key to support linguistically diverse international classrooms across subject-specific areas. Likewise, we believe that as the modalities of education evolve, consideration of the impact of several languages on the learning needs of our students and the teaching formats used need to take a much wider approach. Questions that might arise could include whether (monolingual) lecturing will remain the prototypical teaching format used at university or whether it will gradually be replaced by more interactive and digital practices where multilingual materials gain momentum. In this regard, university lecturers will need to recognise that the multilingual nature of a group is a resource for the development of intercultural competence, and that this can be leveraged with explicit attention to intercultural group dynamics and also to the way in which peer interaction and group work are organised. However, all these micro practices should be approached with careful reflection, given that in such multilingual contexts, attention, listening stamina and note-taking may be more fragile and, concurrently, interaction and student participation may be less spontaneous (Dafouz & Pagèze, 2021; Jenkins, 2014).

1. See <https://www.ucm.es/shift/> for more information.

Implications and final remarks

This last section attempts to illustrate how multilingualism and multilingual practices can be delivered to four key sets of agents in HEIs, namely policy makers, lecturers, educational developers and students.

As described throughout, language policies, be it at a macro, meso or a micro level, are still far from capturing the new multilingual and multicultural constellations of our glocal contexts in general and of present-day HEIs more particularly. To overcome such policy inadequacies, and a *laissez-faire* attitude about language, it is crucial that university management working in internationalisation embrace an applied linguistic perspective that factors in language(s) together with other relevant dimensions as captured in the ROAD-MAPPING framework. By thus foregrounding English-medium communication as an internationalisation strategy, it will be possible for HEIs to budget and implement teacher professional development measures beyond English language proficiency. Comprehensive measures that truly design and coordinate language-in-education strategies across institutional levels will be more sustainable and transformative in a mid- to long-term basis, and, simultaneously, will be supported more strongly by the university community as a whole rather than opposed or simply ignored (Dafouz, 2021).

Secondly, lecturers working in these settings need to be trained in the multilingual realities of current classrooms and in the pedagogies derived from such mixed linguistic, cultural and academic backgrounds. Content lecturers could benefit, for instance, from learning how literacy practices may be valued differently across languages and cultures (Palfreyman & Van der Walt, 2017). Additionally, they could reflect on how multilingual professional practices are useful for students in certain content areas where the use of the local language is fundamental to engage with local clients or patients, while English remains crucial for research and publishing. In this regard, educational developers have a very important role to play in paying due respect to discipline-sensitive language and pedagogies in EMEMUS and internationalised programmes more generally. With these needs in mind, the transnational project known as EQUiP² developed a set of six modules to support educational developers in providing for the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) demands of the lecturers involved in the delivery of international programmes. Amongst other findings, the EQUiP project concluded that educational developers, although often missing in policy planning, “play an instrumental role” (Dafouz et al., 2020, p.337) in supporting the multi-level exchange that EME and internationalisation truly amount to.

2. For a detailed account of EQUiP please go to <https://equip.eu/>.

Last, but definitely not least, EMEMUS students, as key participants in the educational process, need to realise that their multilingual repertoires are valuable and that translanguaging practices can help them in the construction of complex disciplinary knowledge. In practical terms, the use of online resources, clearly intensified by the COVID-19 pandemic, has facilitated the use of a wide range of multilingual digital tools to enhance students' conceptual understanding, word meaning, contextual information and comprehension scaffolds. The creation of multilingual online databases (Madiba, 2014) illustrates students' use of their own home languages, in addition to English, to collapse weighty concepts into more familiar terms. This measure has proved to be effective not only academically but also affectively, as a way to validate students' multilingual repertoires and identities. Such a strategy aligns with a pluriliteracies approach, whereby students are supported in developing disciplinary literacies across languages by transferring transferring L1 skills and gradually acculturating in the subject-specific practices of the target language.³

Summing up, this article aimed to focus on student views and experiences, as key agents in the process of internationalisation and EME, while, concurrently, arguing that EME settings should be viewed as sites of multilingualism. It is our belief that in our connected world, EME programmes need to attend to global drives, such as the use of English as lingua franca in academia and in international commerce, as well as to local factors, such as the home languages used in particular HEIs or the educational and cultural models followed. Even if potentially conflictual, the combination of these glocal forces needs to be acknowledged if we want EME programmes to be sensitive to the social, linguistic and cultural diversity of present-day universities.

Finally, just as the EMEMUS research of the four selected scenarios showed, there are still numerous challenges to be met in a nuanced understanding of the fluid and complex nature of multilingualism in HE and in the design and application of adequate language policies. In order to address such challenges, this paper argued for the use of the ROAD-MAPPING framework to examine EMEMUS in a more multilingual and comprehensive light. We see this paper as a first step in this direction, hoping that it will be followed by more such studies in the future.

3. For more information on Pluriliteracies see the Modern European Centre for Modern languages of the Council or Europe Pluriliteracies approach to teaching and learning at <https://pluriliteracies.ecml.at/>.

Funding

This work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation, and Universities (Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades, project number PID2019-103862RB-I00).

References

- Airey, J. (2017). The ability of students to explain science concepts in two languages. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 23(45), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.v23i45.97344>
- Barakos, E., & Selleck, C. (2019). Elite multilingualism: Discourses, practices, and debates. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(5), 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1543691>
- Block, D., & Khan, S. (Eds.). (2021). *The secret life of English-medium instruction in higher education: examining microphenomena in context*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Busch, B. (2017). Expanding the notion of the linguistic repertoire: on the concept of “Spracherleben” – the lived experience of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(3), 340–358.
- Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., & Jung, J. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education*, 62(4), 431–449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9397-4>
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051300007X>
- Clarke, D. C. (2020). Language ideologies and the experiences of international students. In M. Kuteeva, K. Kauffhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities* (pp. 167–192). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6_7
- Codó, E., & Sunyol, A. (2019). ‘A plus for our students’: The construction of Mandarin Chinese as an elite language in an international school in Barcelona. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(5), 436–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1543694>
- Cots, J. M., Llorca, E., & Garrett, P. (2014). Language policies and practices in the internationalisation of higher education on the European margins: An introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(4), 311–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.874430>
- Dafouz, E. (2021). Repositioning English-medium instruction in a broader international agenda: Insights from a survey on teacher professional development. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 34, 15–38. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2021.34.08>
- Dafouz, E., Haines, K., & Pagèze, J. (2020). Supporting educational developers in the era of internationalised higher education: insights from a European project. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(3), 326–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1651818>
- Dafouz, E., & Pagèze, J. (2021). The role of languages in internationalised higher education classrooms: From multilingual contexts to disciplinary language practices. In J. Gregersen-Hermans & K. Lauridsen (Eds.), *Internationalising programmes in higher education: an educational development perspective* (pp. 94–106). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429344503-7>
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2016). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(3), 397–415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu034>

- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2017). A sociolinguistic approach to the multifaceted roles of English in English-medium education in multilingual university settings. In A. Llinares & T. Morton (Eds.), *Language learning & language teaching* (pp. 287–306). John Benjamins. <https://benjamins.com/catalog/llt.47.17daf>
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2020). *ROAD-MAPPING English medium education in the internationalised university*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23463-8>
- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2021). English-medium education revisited: A need for a comprehensive conceptualisation in the age of internationalised universities. *European Language Policy Journal* 13(2), 141–159. <https://doi.org/10.3828/eljp.2021.9>
- Dimova, S., & Kling, J. (2020). *Integrating content and language in multilingual universities*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46947-4>
- Ekoç, A. (2020). English medium instruction (EMI) from the perspectives of students at a technical university in Turkey. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(2), 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1527025>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- Goodman, B.A., Kerimkulova, S.I., & Montgomery, D.P. (2021). Translanguaging and transfer of academic skills: Views of Kazakhstani students in an English-medium university. In B. Paulsrud, Z. Tian, & J. Toth (Eds.), *English-Medium instruction and translanguaging* (pp. 141–157). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927338-014>
- Guo, H., Tong, F., Wang, Z., Min, Y., & Tang, S. (2018). English- vs. Chinese-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A quasi-experimental comparison. *Sustainability*, 10(11), 4230. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10114230>
- Hawkins, M.R., & Mori, J. (2018). Considering ‘trans-’ perspectives in language theories and practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx056>
- He, J.-J., & Chiang, S.-Y. (2016). Challenges to English-medium instruction (EMI) for international students in China: A learners’ perspective. *English Today*, 32(4), 63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078416000390>
- Holmen, A. (2020). Integrating content and language: The role of other languages than English in an international university. In S. Dimova & K. Joyce (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in multilingual universities* (pp. 37–52). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46947-4_3
- Hornberger, N.H., & Hult, F. (2001). Ecological language education policy. In A. Fill & P. Muehlhäusler (Eds.), *The ecolinguistics reader: A selection of articles on language, ecology and environment* (pp. 280–296). Continuum.
- Hultgren, A.K., Jensen, C., & Dimova, S. (2015). English-medium instruction in European higher education: From the North to the South. In S. Dimova, A.K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education: English in Europe* (pp. 1–15). De Gruyter.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.
- Kaufhold, K., & Wennerberg, J. (2020). “I need to know this in Swedish because it’s the kärnspråk”: Language ideologies and practices of multilingual students. In M. Kuteeva, K. Kaufhold, & N. Hynninen (Eds.), *Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities* (pp. 193–216). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6_8
- Kojima, N. (2021). *Student motivation in English-medium instruction: Empirical studies in a Japanese university*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429286988>

- Kuteeva, M., Kaufhold, K., & Hynninen, N. (Eds.). (2020). *Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38755-6>
- Lee, G. J. (2014). Why students don't participate in English medium instruction classes in a Korean university: A case study. *English Teaching*, 69(1), 91–117. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.69.1.201403.91>
- Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.30687/978-88-6969-227-7/001>
- Madiba, M. (2014). Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries: a translanguaging approach. In L. Hibbert & C. van der Walt (Eds.), *Multilingual universities in South Africa* (pp. 68–87). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783091669-007>
- Meyer, O., Imhof, M., Coyle, D., & Banerjee, M. (2018). Positive learning and pluriliteracies. In O. Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia, G. Wittum, & A. Dengel (Eds.), *Positive learning in the age of information* (pp. 235–265). Springer. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-658-19567-0_15. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-19567-0_15
- PalFREYMAN, D., & Van der Walt, C. (Eds.). (2017). *Academic biliteracies: Multilingual repertoires in higher education*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783097425>
- Paulsrud, B., Tian, Z., & Toth, J. (Eds.). (2021). *English-medium instruction and translanguaging*. Multilingual Matters.
- Pecorari, D., & Malmström, H. (2018). At the crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 497–515. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.470>
- Preece, S. (2019). Elite bilingual identities in higher education in the Anglophone world: The stratification of linguistic diversity and reproduction of socio-economic inequalities in the multilingual student population. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(5), 404–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1543692>
- Risager, K. (2012). Language hierarchies at the international university. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2012(216), 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2012-0042>
- Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110215519>
- Smit, U. (2021). Epilogue. In B. Paulsrud, Z. Tian, & J. Toth (Eds.), *English-medium instruction and translanguaging* (pp. 173–181). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927338-016>
- Soler, J., & Gallego-Balsà, L. (2019). *The sociolinguistics of higher education: Language policy and internationalisation in Catalonia*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16677-9>
- Van der Walt, C. (2013). *Multilingual higher education: Beyond English medium orientations*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847699206>
- Vila, F. X., & Bretxa, V. (Eds.). (2014). *Language policy in higher education: The case of medium-sized languages*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092765>
- Wilkinson, R., & Gabriëls, R. (Eds.). (2021). *The Englishization of higher education in Europe*. Amsterdam University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5117/9789463727358>
- Williams, D. G. (2015). A systematic review of English medium instruction (EMI) and implications for the South Korean higher education context. *English Language Teaching World Online, Special Issue on CLIL*, 1–23.
- Zhang, M., & Pladevall-Ballester, E. (2021). Students' attitudes and perceptions towards three EMI programs in mainland China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1979576>

Zusammenfassung (German abstract)

English-medium education in multilingual university settings (EMEMUS, deutsch: englischsprachige Bildung in multilingualen universitären Kontexten) ist an Hochschulen stark angestiegen und spiegelt damit die globalen Bemühungen zu mehr Internationalisierung wider. Eines von vielen Themen und Blickwinkel, das in einer ebenso ausgedehnten Forschungslandschaft untersucht wird, ist der Multilingualismus, der allerdings bislang und besonders aus der Perspektive der Studierenden vergleichsweise wenig Aufmerksamkeit bekommen hat. Dieser Beitrag vereint die Konzeptualisierung von Multilingualismus und EMEMUS und analysiert anhand dieser die bestehende Literatur. Es werden vier Forschungsszenarien diskutiert, die verschiedene Studierendengruppen und einige ihrer multilingualen Erfahrungen und Praktiken in den Vordergrund rücken. Basierend auf dem ROAD-MAPPING Modell bietet diese Diskussion detaillierte Analysen, die eine umfassende Interpretation der Szenarien ermöglichen und die Komplexität und Fluidität von Multilingualismus in EMEMUS aufzeigen.

Address for correspondence

Emma Dafouz
Department of English Studies
Faculty of Philology
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Plaza de Menéndez Pelayo s/n
28040 Madrid
Spain
edafouz@ucm.es

Co-author information

Ute Smit
Department of English Studies
University of Vienna
ute.smit@univie.ac.at

Publication history

Date received: 4 September 2021

Date accepted: 28 October 2021