Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmmm20

EMI Teachers in a 'caught-between' situation? Insights from a case study of an internationalised Chinese university

Qi Chen, Ying Li, Yifang Xu & Zihao Guo

To cite this article: Qi Chen, Ying Li, Yifang Xu & Zihao Guo (2023) EMI Teachers in a 'caught-between' situation? Insights from a case study of an internationalised Chinese university, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 44:4, 339-354, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2023.2173212

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2173212

Published online: 06 Feb 2023.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 92

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rmmm20

JOURNAL OF MULTILINGUAL AND MULTICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
2023, VOL. 44, NO. 4, 339–354
https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2173212

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

EMI Teachers in a 'caught-between' situation? Insights from a case study of an internationalised Chinese university

Qi Chen [a], Ying Li [a], Yifang Xu[b] and Zihao Guo[a]

[a]School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China; [b]Institute for Education, Teaching and Leadership, Moray House School of Education, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

ABSTRACT

In view of the rapid growth of English-medium instruction (EMI) in higher education institutions (HEIs), we observe the need to account for the educational and linguistic consequences of HEIs' decision to 'Englishise' their curricula. Especially, EMI in Asian countries (e.g. China) are fuelled by state-level initiatives to internationalise the higher education sector and implemented top-down in local universities. Although empirical studies report on the (mis)alignments between policymaking and implementation of EMI, little is known about how the interplay between EMI and internationalisation of HEIs is contextualised and negotiated in local contexts. Using the ROAD-MAPPING framework [Dafouz, E., and U. Smit. 2016. 'Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings.' *Applied Linguistics* 37 (3): 397–415], we present a case study of an internationally-oriented Chinese university with five distinctive types of EMI. Triangulated documentary and interview data reveal: (1) contextualised policymaking of EMI, which takes into account the bi-directional internationalisation and the needs of the target student cohort, is crucial at the practitioner-level; (2) norms of language use are shaped both top-down and bottom-up, and the teacher-practitioners exercise their agency in enabling bi/multilingual language use and awareness toward Global Englishes from the bottom-up. We also shed new light on how the integration of language and content in EMI is negotiated and/or realised by presenting three special cases.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 7 October 2022
Accepted 28 November 2022

KEYWORDS
English-medium instruction; internationalisation of higher education; English as a lingua franca; language policy; integration of content and language

Introduction

During the past decades, the rapid transnational 'flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas' brought by globalisation (Knight and De Wit 1997, 6) has not only led to the established status of the English language as the world's lingua franca, but also drives Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) worldwide to internationalise. Consequently, the role of the English language in higher education (HE) settings is tightly interconnected with the process of internationalisation of HEIs, as reflected by trends of global student mobility and choice of medium of instruction (MoI). OECD statistics (2014, 2021) reveal that Asian countries 'send out' more than half of international students worldwide, whereas the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and Canada attract over one-third of these international students. Such a directional flow of international students could be attributed to the 'default' MoI at Anglophone universities, giving them a dominant

CONTACT Ying Li acs.cam@gmail.com School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University, 2318 Yuhangtang Road, Yuhang District, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, People's Republic of China

© 2023 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

advantage in attracting English-speaking global talents. Consequently, increasing numbers of HEIs in non-Anglophone contexts have started to address the talent 'deficiency' through internationalisation or 'Englishisation' (Galloway, Numajiri, and Rees 2020), that is, to switch the MoI from the first language to English in order to attract incoming international students. One large-scale survey has shown a ten-fold increase in English-medium Instruction (EMI) programmes offered by HEIs across European countries during 2001–2014 (Wächter and Maiworm 2014), while this trend soon spread to Asia-Pacific countries such as China, Japan and Indonesia, primarily seen in recent governmental initiatives seeking to internationalise both nationally and regionally (Fenton-Smith, Humphreys, and Walkinshaw 2017; Kirkpatrick and Liddicoat 2017).

Although the introduction of EMI closely aligns with internationalisation strategies of HEIs (e.g. Galloway, Kriukow, and Numajiri 2017), its 'educational and linguistic consequences … have been generally neglected' (Dafouz and Smit 2016, 398) by universities and researchers. Unsurprisingly, the recent rapid growth of EMI in Asian countries such as China largely outpaced empirical research representing such contexts. It is against such a complex backdrop that we conducted the present case study of an internationally-oriented university in China, i.e. *University S*. The research aim is twofold. First, we aim to depict the interplay amongst the three dimensions of local EMI context: (1) the roles of English in relation to other languages, (2) local and global driving forces to internationalise and 'Englishise' the curricula, and (3) institutional and practitioners' norms of language use, and therefore address the afore-mentioned 'invisibility' of language issues in the body of research on EMI and internationalisation of HE (e.g. Baker and Hüttner 2019; Bonacina-pugh, Barakos, and Chen 2020; Saarinen 2012). Second, we attempt to account for the under-explored Chinese context in EMI research and shed new light on contextualised policymaking and implementation of EMI to a wider audience in HE (Hu 2021; Jablonkai and Hou 2021; Rose, McKinley, and Curdt-Christiansen 2022). As such, we offer an in-depth contextualised view of conceptualisations and policy-implementation of EMI at the institutional-level and practitioner-level of the case university, by addressing the following guiding research question:

> How is EMI conceptualised and brought about by policies and practitioners at University S in China?

Literature review

Conceptualising and problematising 'EMI'

Unlike Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) with its explicit pursuit for learning subject content and additional languages, EMI can be highly context-dependent when implemented in local settings (Dearden 2015). By adopting Macaro's (2018, 1) definition of EMI, namely, 'the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English', we acknowledge 'the very controversies and research themes' (2018) triggered by this definition.

The first controversy is the extent to which English is used (as MoI) as opposed to other languages in local EMI contexts. On an institutional-level, EMI is often promoted as a monolingual endeavour, declaring an 'English-only' language policy (e.g. Joo-Kyung 2018) or making an explicit distinction between 'English-only' and 'bilingual' courses with regard to the use of L1 (e.g. Jablonkai and Hou 2021). On an individual-level, however, diversified findings are reported. EMI is thought to encourage a monolingual, native-speakerism ideology and adherence to standardised varieties of English, amongst teachers and students (e.g. Macaro, Tian, and Chu 2018; Qiu, Zheng, and Liu 2022; Sahan, Galloway, and McKinley 2022). As teachers and students often resort to their L1(s) as available meaning-making resources in EMI contexts, this is deemed as 'adulterated EMI' due to faculty and students' less-than-ideal command of English by some scholars (e.g. Hu and Lei 2014), or 'translanguaging practices and trans-semiotizing strategies' by others from a multilingual/Global Englishes perspective (e.g. Gu, Lee, and Jin 2022; Tai and Li 2020). The latter school of thought 'reimagines EMI instructional settings as sites of multilingual and multimodal meaning

making' (Gu, Li, and Jiang 2021, 2) and insisted that all languages/semiotic resources should be seen as available and legitimate affordances for teaching and learning. Macaro (2018) thus suggested an additive rather than subtractive approach to EMI implementation, that is, to teach the academic content partly in L1 and partly in L2 through collaboration between specialists, or to encourage 'translanguaging' in the classroom, echoing the multilingual/Global Englishes perspective.

The second controversy is the extent to which language learning can be integrated with content learning in EMI. Scholars (Airey 2016; Thompson and Mckinley 2018) suggest a language-content continuum, on which courses with mainly language learning outcomes (e.g. English for Academic Purposes) are placed at one end and those with largely content-focused learning outcomes (e.g. EMI) at the other; CLIL is placed in the middle for its balanced focus on both. Although many thought of the language-learning outcome a 'by-product' of EMI, in contexts where EMI courses/programmes are attended largely by home students in non-Anglophone settings, the language learning outcome is often stipulated on an institutional-level, whether explicitly or implicitly (e.g. Barnard and Hasim 2018). Little existing empirical evidence attests such a dual-focus of EMI yield to a dual-success (e.g. Rose et al. 2019; Yuksel et al. 2021), while other evidence contests it (see Airey 2016 for an elaborated discussion). Relevant ongoing discussions centre around: (1) how content teachers could be better supported to deliver EMI (e.g. Curdt-Christiansen, Gao, and Sun 2021); (2) how EAP/ESAP courses should be used to support students of EMI (e.g. Galloway and Ruegg 2020); (3) how language specialists and content teachers could collaborate effectively to deliver EMI (e.g. Galloway and Rose 2021).

EMI and internationalisation of HE in China

To date, a number of major endeavours were fuelled by the Chinese government to internationalise its HE sector as a whole, including: (1) the former 'Project 985' and 'Project 211', two state-level initiatives during the 1990s–2010s in building world-class internationalised universities in China (MOE 2005, 2006), and the new 'Double First-Class Programme' initiated in the mid 2010s in building world First-Class disciplines and universities nationwide, a rolling programme which now proceeds into the second round (MOE 2017, 2022a); (2) policies issued by Ministry of Education since the late 1990s to encourage the provision of transnational higher education (TNHE/中外合作办学) in China, i.e. higher educational services offered to home students in the form of Sino-Foreign collaborative and cooperative courses, programmes, colleges and universities (MOE 2003, 2004); (3) policies issued by Ministry of Education since 2000 to encourage bilingual education (双语教学) in HEIs in China (MOE 2001, 2007). Notably, internationalisation initiatives in the first strand considered the provision of English-taught courses/programmes to be a key performance indicator of internationalised universities, whereas the provision of TNHE in the second strand usually adopts an EMI language policy.

The above-mentioned top-down measures toward all HEIs in China contribute to their EMI implementation in one way or another, leading to a nationwide expansion of EMI provision. Yet, they also function as university-stratification schemes which unavoidably lead to favourable allocation of funding, resources and privileges toward the key universities, hence inequalities toward non-key universities excluded from the project/programme (Rose, McKinley, and Curdt-Christiansen 2022). This is evidenced by a large-scale survey conducted by Wu et al. (2010) in China, that out of the 135 HEIs sampled in 2006, accounting for 7% of HEIs nationwide, 132 HEIs offered EMI courses; albeit 83% EMI courses out of the totality were run by universities listed in 'Project 985/211'. We therefore call for the need that scholarly attention paid to non-key universities that account for over 95% of the totality of HEIs in China (MOE 2022b, 2022a), with regard to their status quo of internationalisation and EMI implementation.

The interplay between EMI implementation and internationalisation process of HEIs is also observable in China. Rose et al. (2020) looked into the EMI policies of Double-First Class universities and disciplines and observed that the language policies, on the whole, shifted from 'bilingual'

toward 'English-only' during 2003–2019. This corroborates Zhang's (2018) call for Chinese HEIs to have a more balanced-focus on both inward and outward internationalisation strategies. Nonetheless, little is known toward how such an interplay is contextualised and negotiated within the local contexts of HEIs due to the sheer lack of empirical evidence. A further glance at the small but recently growing body of research on EMI in China (see Jablonkai and Hou 2021 for a systematic review) also reveal that teachers' perspectives on EMI are seldom investigated, and only a handful of studies on language use in EMI contexts acknowledge a translanguaging pedagogy and the multilingual/Global Englishes perspective.

Theoretical considerations

Considering the diversity and multiplicity of HEI contexts where EMI is implemented, Dafouz and Smit (2016) put forward the ROAD-MAPPING framework that offers 'a holistic and dynamic theoretical account of the core dimensions' (p.125) of EMI. This framework affords a strong conceptual and methodological tool for undertaking the present case study. According to Dafouz and Smit (2017), the framework is conceptualised based on sociolinguistic, ecolinguistic and language policy considerations, that.

> … go beyond well-established but largely static and bounded concepts of language and society, and instead view 2lst-century societies as increasingly permeable and dynamic … [and] focus on the transnational flows … and superdiversity … of present-day migration and their impact on communication and language. (289)

Given that, this framework affords a view toward EMI implementation in multilingual, internationalised university settings as a social phenomenon constructed by discourse, through which researchers seize a 'point of access' to study such phenomena. The six relevant and intersecting dimensions of EMI are described in brief here. *Roles of English* (RO) are examined in relation to other languages as multilingual repertoire of an HEI, whereas the HEI's language policy constellation, including its management, practices, and educational aims, places English centrally as the medium to disseminate ideas, conduct teaching and learning as well as the lingua franca amongst staff and students. *Academic Disciplines* (AD) refer to the distinct differences in teaching and learning practices in various disciplines, alongside their associated academic literacies and academic (disciplinary) culture. *(Language) Management* (M) refers to declared language policies (or the lack thereof) imposed on institutions and people, seen as 'direct efforts to manipulate the language situation' (Spolsky 2004, 8) through managerial decisions in HEIs. *Agents* (A) refer broadly to all social players engaged in EMI implementation in the local contexts of HEIs, where they collectively or individually act upon certain values or beliefs, hence exercise their agency out of contextualised concerns and/or hierarchical status. *Practices and Processes* (PP) are manifested in the actual teaching and learning activities co-constructed by agents, who are then constructed by the realities in local HEIs. *Internationalisation and Glocalisation* (ING) explicate the driving forces on international, global, national, institutional and individual levels that operate with tensions and/or synergies in the EMI implementation at HEIs.

The study

The case university

University S is a non-key university located in South-eastern China. Although it was not listed in the former 'Project 985/211', it has developed into a major university in the local province, with a strategic plan to be enlisted in the new 'Double First-Class Programme' in the next round. Our rationale for choosing *University S* is thus twofold. First, we attempt to present 'an extensive and in-depth description' of how EMI is perceived and practiced locally at the under-represented non-key universities in China, thus chose *University S* as a 'common case' in point (Yin 2018, 33, 85). Second, one of the researchers of the present study participated in the roll-out of EMI at *University S*. It was

therefore made available to us (1) sufficient access to both documentary data and contacts of potential interview participants, and (2) an enriched account for the conceptualisation and implementation of EMI at *University S* over a longer span; both are crucial for conducting a case study as such.

Data collection and analysis

As part of its strategic plan for internationalisation, *University S* introduced EMI in the early 2010s. We observed altogether five types of EMI implemented at *University S* (Baker and Hüttner 2017); particularly, we deemed English for Academic Purposes (EAP)/English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP) courses an integral part of its EMI implementation as listed below:

(1) *Type A*: English-medium optional courses on traditional Chinese cultures and other academic subjects, in the form of general education available to all home and international students;
(2) *Type B*: English-medium subject courses (either optional or compulsory) available to all home students;
(3) *Type C*: offshore undergraduate programmes in collaboration with international partner-university in the form of TNHE for home students;
(4) *Type D*: English-medium programmes for international students;
(5) *Type E*: EAP/ESAP courses provided alongside *Type B* and *Type C* EMI, offering home students additional language support.

Two top-down policies were initiated during 2012–2013 and pushed the EMI roll-out at *University S* to full swing until 2015–2016. Up until 2016, *Type A* and *B* EMI on a course-level were the primary focus of the top-down policies. Afterwards, programme-level EMI of *Types C-E* gradually took shape, and the five types of EMI have been running actively since 2020. To account for the implementation of EMI at *University S* over a decade's timespan, data collection was conducted over two different periods of time, i.e. Phase I data collection during 2015–2016 and Phase II data collection during 2021–2022 (see Table 1). Being predominantly qualitative, our datasets consist of two types, i.e. documentary and interview data, which were collected from multiple sources for a triangulated view. Guided by the ROAD-MAPPING framework, both types of data are discourses constructed on institutional-level and practitioner-level at the university, through which we could gain rich insights into its EMI implementation.

All documentary data (both Phase I and II) and the focus group interview (Phase I) were original records documenting the roll-out and phased implementation of EMI at *University S*, which were collected by one of the researchers over time, whereas individual semi-structured interviews with EMI practitioners were conducted during Phase II data collection. Convenience sampling and purposive sampling methods were used for recruiting interview participants; it was made sure that insights were gained from managerial, administrative and teacher-practitioners' perspectives for all types of EMI (see Appendix). Full ethical guidelines of the researchers' university were followed to ensure anonymity and voluntary participation. An open-ended interview guide designed under the guidance of the ROAD-MAPPING framework was piloted with a non-participant EMI

Table 1. Description of datasets.

	Description of Data	Types of EMI
Phase I (2015–2016)	3 EMI-related documents issued by municipal government	A, B
	5 EMI-related documents issued by the university	A, B
	Focus group interview between senior managers and EMI consultants	A, B
Phase II (2021–2022)	University curricular documents	A, B, C, D, E
	Semi-structured individual interview with 10 EMI teachers, 2 senior managers and 1 administrative staff	A, B, C, D, E

practitioner to ensure reliability before putting into use. All interviews were conducted predominantly in Mandarin Chinese, i.e. the researcher's and participants' first language, for convenience purposes, whereas English was also used as a linguistic resource when needed.

All collected data were coded using the ROAD-MAPPING framework as an analytical scheme, while top-down codes were enriched by emerging codes during iterative data coding. Data extracts were then translated into English and checked by multiple researchers to ensure a faithful and consistent translation. According to the research foci, we utilised ROADMAPPING framework by 'analytically zooming in and out over sociolinguistic scales' (Dafouz and Smit 2020, 77) of selected dimensions, while other dimensions were not totally ignored but filtered into the findings wherever relevant. To provide an institutional-level view over the five types of EMI, we analysed documentary data by zooming-in on *(language) Management* (M) and considered how it primarily intersected with *Roles of English* (RO) and *Internationalisation and Glocalisation* (ING). To provide a practitioner-level view, we then analysed interview data by zooming-in on *Agents* (A) and considered how it intersected with *Roles of English* (RO), *Internationalisation and Glocalisation* (ING) and *(language) Management* (M).

Documentary data

Findings from documentary data offering an institutional view on conceptualisations and implementations of EMI are presented according to how the M dimension intersects with RO and ING.

During Phase I data collection, we obtained 8 documents issuing the two top-down policies on EMI implementation at *University S*: an institutional policy in 2012 aiming specifically at developing EMI courses to teach traditional Chinese culture ('中华传统文化全英语课程'), categorised as *Type A* EMI, and a policy issued by the local municipal government in 2013, aiming more generally at developing '*excellent bilingual courses* (双语精品课程)' in various disciplines, categorised as *Type B* EMI. Documents on the two policies align with one another on the rationale of implementing EMI at *University S*, that is, to '*facilitate the process of internationalisation of higher education*', '*enable student mobility and attract international students*' and '*to cultivate high-quality talents (at home)*'. Particularly, both specified that EMI courses should be developed with internationalised teaching philosophies, approaches and resources '*to be geared to international standards and conventions* (与国际接轨)'.

However, the two policies differ in teaching objectives, language policy and staffing requirements. The 2012 institutional policy does not explicate a language teaching objective, rather it regulates an 'English-only' (全英语) policy for teaching the subject content (i.e. traditional Chinese culture), possibly due to the fact that English is the only shared language amongst the target student cohort (i.e. both home and international students). The 2013 governmental policy uses the alternative wording 'bilingual courses (双语课程)', that is, 'non-language teaching courses in which the academic subject contents are taught in a foreign language, namely, languages other than the mother tongue'. Although language teaching is excluded in teaching objectives, both language and subject content learning outcomes are explicitly stipulated in the 2013 policy, resembling a dual-focus of EMI in existing research (Barnard and Hasim 2018). It also clarifies that the course 'should be delivered with no less than 50% use of the foreign language [as MoI], whereas 100% use of English is encouraged', which not only implies English is the 'default' choice of foreign language, but also requires teachers of *Type B* EMI to have sufficient language proficiency. By contrast, the 2012 policy requires teachers of the 'English-only' *Type A* EMI courses to have either overseas experience (i.e. study or work) and/or received formal training in English language teaching (ELT), plus a good command of English and a PhD degree. These can be seen as *University S*' measures to ensure that teachers are 'qualified' to teach EMI courses, which is a crucial premise for effective EMI implementation (Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra 2012). Taken together, the central position of English as the 'default' choice amongst other languages, and the distinction of English-

only vs. bilingual language policies discussed here closely resemble current findings (e.g. Jablonkai and Hou 2021; Joo-Kyung 2018).

More findings emerge from curricular documents, revealing how curricular documents (mis)align with policy documents regarding the distinction between 'English-only' and 'bilingual' courses: (1) all records show *Type A* EMI courses as 'English-only' throughout; (2) all *Type B* EMI courses are marked as 'English-only' in programme specification documents, whereas the record of active EMI courses include notes on '*proportion of use of the foreign language*' for each course entry, ranging from 50% to 100%, reflecting a more flexible 'bilingual' language policy in practice. With regard to the *Types C-E* EMI, we found across all curricular documents: (1) *Type C* TNHE programmes have no clear language policy regarding MoI, while programme objectives are set to cultivate 'internationalised talents', 'with an international outlook', 'being internationally-competitive'; (2) all Type D programmes are clearly marked 'English-taught', as they are intended specifically for international students; (3) none of the *Type E* courses are labelled as part of the EMI courses.

Interview data

Findings from interview data offering a practitioner-level view on conceptualisations and implementations of EMI are presented according to how the A dimension intersects with RO, ING and M.

Type A *EMI practitioners*

On policy-level, *Type A* EMI courses on traditional Chinese cultures were intended for both home and international students, thus a linguistically – and culturally-mixed cohort. On practitioner-level, we observe a discrepancy between what was intended and what was practised, in terms of rationale, staffing and student needs.

Senior managers and teachers all believed that Type A EMI courses aim to 'export Chinese culture to the international community' and is associated with 'enhancing China's cultural soft power' (M1, EA1), which aligns with an 'outward' internationalisation strategy of HEIs as well as China's internationalisation diplomatic strategy (Liu 2021). In practice, however, international students were taught in separate classes, resulting in a linguistically-homogenous home student cohort on *Type A* EMI courses. A *Type A* EMI teacher (EA1) noted that her students did not 'buy into' the use of English as medium for such courses on Chinese cultures; a senior manager (M1) also reflected:

> *I am yet to be persuaded that* [home] *students need to learn these* [content/knowledge] *in English, whether for the aim of learning English or cultivating internationalised talents. Do they have to know '盘扣[1]' and '前襟[2]' in English to be able to export Chinese culture?* (M1)

A 'triple-workload calculation' staffing measure for *Type A* EMI courses were put in place by the Office of Academic Affairs of *University S*; it ensures the implementation of the monolingual 'English-only' policy and incentivises teacher-practitioners. 'Bilingual' EMI courses are thus not taken into account, as a senior manager explicates, teachers are 'pushed' to teach fully in English in Type A EMI, whereas "bilingual' means you still have a way-out … as long as you use some proportion of English in the classroom … ' (M1). Collected curricular documents confirmed that more than half of *Type A* 'English-only' EMI courses are run by teachers specialised in English literature, language teaching and linguistics, who tend to have a good command of English due to their academic backgrounds.

However, some teachers had to deactivate their courses due to students' insufficient English proficiency for an 'English-only' policy; they urged language entry requirements for *Type A* EMI courses to be adopted. Yet the Office of Academic Affairs deemed it inappropriate as *Type A* EMI were intended to provide 'general education' for everyone. In other words, 'general education'

in the form of *Type A* EMI should ensure all students access to an 'Englishised' curriculum to some extent. As one admin staff (A1) noted:

> *it's important for the university because it's a performance indicator* [of universities]. *But I think it's not as important for students, as they don't have the motive nor the capacity to learn these courses through English … except for a small number of students who plan to study abroad …* (A1)

Overall, managerial measures implementing *Type A* EMI ensure qualified staffing and align with the afore-mentioned 2012 institutional policy on how EMI should facilitate the process of internationalisation of HE. Such measures foreground agency and responsibility on the part of teacher-practitioners to provide 'up-to-standard' EMI, while overlooking how *Type A* EMI itself mismatches the actual student cohort being largely home students with minimal subjective needs for EMI and internationalisation, thus largely restricting teachers' agency. While existing findings attribute such policy-practice misalignments to staff and students' the lack of language proficiency (e.g. Hu and Lei 2014; Zhang 2018), this finding points to the interrelation between the Englishisation of curriculum and target student needs for internationalisation.

Type B *and* C *EMI practitioners*

Institutional-level discourse conceptualised *Type B* EMI as a course-level 'add-on' Englishisation to mainstream Chinese-medium instruction (CMI) curricula, and *Type C* EMI as a programme-level internationalised curriculum, while both were designed for home students. We observe similarities and variances in teacher-participants' responses toward the two types.

In terms of rationales of EMI, participants of both types (i.e. EB1, EB2, EB3, EC1) all professed similar beliefs which centred around the role of English in HE with a close link to internationalisation of HE, attesting existing literature on this interconnectedness (e.g. Galloway, Kriukow, and Numajiri 2017). For instance, participants emphasised how students in HE need 'an international outlook for their long-term development' which could be afforded by the international language, i.e. English, a crucial linguistic capital for students. Another emerging theme is how their disciplinary knowledge production originated in, and continue to be centred on, the Global North; giving students access to such knowledge through English means referring them to 'first-hand', 'primary' sources. Such an understanding aligns with the 2012 institutional policy in terms of 'cultivating internationalised, high-quality talents' and adopting 'internationalised teaching resources'.

Facing inconsistencies and the lack of explicitly declared language policy for Type B and C EMI on institutional-level (see Section Documentary data), teacher-practitioners professed varying beliefs toward norms of language use, and enact a flexible contextualised bilingual language policy in their EMI teaching, reflecting their glocalised perspective on the internationalisation agenda promoted at *University S*. All three teachers of *Type B* EMI explicitly noted they are not English teachers and therefore not responsible for students' language learning outcome; although they all took measures to lower the language barrier for content learning, whether willingly or not, and expressed awareness toward Global Englishes. For instance, two teachers (EB2, EB3) willingly allowed 'non-standard Chinglish and sometimes incorrect English use in classroom conversations because what's more important is the exchange of ideas' (EB2) and believed that 'the title "bilingual course" means there's room for negotiation … student may not be able to conduct in-depth discussions in [correct] English-only, which affects their content learning' (EB3). Whereas the other teacher (EB1) was 'constantly forced to switch to Chinese' as students were usually 'non-responsive to questions asked in English', and she had to compromise and allow students to answer the English-written exam papers in Chinese. Arguably, these measures were *Type B* EMI teachers' own way of coping with the mismatch between the Englishised element in the curriculum and students' lack of needs, motivation and/or capacity for EMI and internationalisation. Indeed, students struggle on compulsory *Type B* EMI courses as they 'never experienced learning subject knowledge through

a foreign language', hence 'they felt burdened and pressured' (EB2) and few students willingly take the optional EMI courses with the extra language 'burden'. Another teacher (EB1) attributed this to students' lack of awareness and autonomy toward internationalisation at *University S*, as graduates do not usually go for job positions that require a good command of English, contrasting the rationales for EMI discussed earlier.

In comparison, students on *Type C* EMI (i.e. TNHE programmes) do not have an alternative to the Englishised curriculum. The *Type C* EMI teacher (EC1) taught Inorganic Chemistry as a compulsory undergraduate-level course collaboratively with an international teaching staff member, who had to teach remotely due to Covid-19 travel restrictions. This participant (EC1) was assigned as the on-site teacher to assist the overseas colleague and provide students 'language support'. Yet according to the participant (EC1), students' language issue was more of a psychological being and it is necessary to make clear that they have no alternative choice, because 'TNHE programmes aim to cultivate internationalised talents, which requires them to able to learn through English' (EC1). Contrasting the *Type B* EMI teachers, this *Type C* EMI teacher perceived the responsibility as well as the agency to develop students' discipline-specific academic literacy in English:

> *I then told them not to stop and look for translations frequently* [when listening to lectures or reading textbooks], *'when you see a terminology in English, you know it refers to a certain chemical reaction, and that's enough' … I also asked them to review every lecture by using mind-maps to list all the key terms in English … in classroom teaching I often stop and review the high-frequency terminologies …* (EC1)

This teacher enacted a bilingual spoken language policy and a monolingual written language policy. Chinese was used as the main MoI with frequent switches to English when referring to terminologies, whereas all written teaching materials, including exam papers, were in English. In addition, students were provided Chinese textbooks as additional learning resource for two reasons, according to the teacher (EC1): (1) crossreferencing between the imported EMI textbook and the local CMI textbook can be mutually complementary; (2) students should be able to communicate disciplinary knowledge through Chinese, especially if their further study is conducted through CMI in China.

Overall, we observe a step away from the monolingual, native-speakerism ideology to various extents in teacher-participants' language choices. *Type B* teachers all consider compromises and accommodations on students' language use a necessary measure to reduce the language barrier to effective content learning. This largely contrasts the monolingual-orientation in existing findings (e.g. Macaro, Tian, and Chu 2018; Qiu, Zheng, and Liu 2022; Sahan, Galloway, and McKinley 2022). The *Type C* teacher took a step further by acknowledging and addressing students' need for bilingual 'disciplinary literacy' (Airey 2011) through differentiated written and spoken language policies initiated from the bottom-up. This is in line with the translanguaging/Global Englishes perspectives encouraged by EMI researchers (e.g. Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra 2012) but only recently reported by studies on EMI classroom interactions (Gu, Lee, and Jin 2022; Tai and Li 2020).

A further look into the integration of language and content in *Type B* and C EMI revealed a differentiation between the two. *Type B* teachers believed that their responsibility lies solely with content teaching without attending to the stipulated explicit language learning outcome (see Section Documentary data). By contrast, even though the *Type C* teacher was paired up with an international teaching staff member to ensure quality of teaching in English due to a top-down managerial decision. This positioning somehow motivated and afforded this teacher to attend to the integration of content and language of this course following the additive approach to EMI discussed earlier (Macaro 2018). This special case sheds new light on this research topic, that given the proper institutional entitlement and available resources, content teachers could rise up to the challenge to ensure the dual-focused identity of EMI.

Type D *EMI practitioners*

At the institutional level, *Type D* EMI programmes provided to incoming international students were described as 'English-only', we thus interviewed a senior manager at the Office of International Affairs (M2) and two teacher-participants (ED1, ED2) to gain a practitioner-level view.

The three participants (M2, ED1, ED2) all highlighted EMI as the 'crucial means', 'impetus' and 'platform' for internationalisation of *University S* and all HEIs, and consistently referred to English as 'the most widely-used international language worldwide' and 'the only shared language between international students and Chinese teaching staff' despite the linguistic variety brought about by their international students. Teacher-participants of *Type D* EMI (ED1, ED2) also emphasised how English takes a central role in their academic disciplines and their graduates' workplace (e.g. IT industry, international business). Additionally, one teacher (ED2) explained that apart from the EMI subject courses, courses of Chinese language and culture were provided to international students, considering their needs stay in China and get employed, '… *so that when they graduate, their subject knowledge/skills plus understanding toward* [Chinese] *culture make them more employable* … (ED2)'.

The two teacher-participants (ED1, ED2) have shown awareness toward the multilingual repertoire alongside the international student cohort, as well as an accommodating attitude toward their 'non-standard' use of English. According to them, their international students mostly come from Arabic, African and Asian countries where English is used as a second/foreign language. Occasionally, Mandarin Chinese was within some students' linguistic repertoire and became an available language resource in-class, but was not seen as a 'legitimate' MoI by the teachers: '… some Malaysian and Philippine students chose to communicate with me in Mandarin … but I have to use English in class as some other students, such as Korean and Kazakhstan, have very limited Mandarin proficiency … ' (ED1). As a result, the two teachers adhered to the English-only language policy for classroom teaching, which aligns with institutional-level policy, while allowing students to use their own mother tongue in small group discussions. Participants further commented on norms of language use in their EMI classroom. One teacher-participant explained how having different accents sometimes cause communication difficulties in classroom:

> … *students from African tend to have a strong accent in English, sometimes I have to ask other students to help me understand them … but this is how they speak English, you have to be adaptive and get used to it …* (ED1)

While this teacher (ED1) made efforts to accommodate international students' English accents, the other teacher (ED2) accommodated students' non-standard use of English. According to him, comparing with his own standardised and formal way of using English 'possibly due to our previous schooling', his students tend to be more informal and colloquial that 'sometimes they speak a sentence without a predicative verb [in English]'. He did not correct students, but insisted that in such *Type D* EMI context, '*we don't always need to stick to it* [standardised language use]' and mutual understanding would suffice.

On the whole, what we have shown amongst teacher-participants and senior manager's views on *Type E* EMI is: (1) a consistent reflection on a departure from the long-established monolingual, native-speakerism ideology, (2) a welcoming attitude toward Global Englishes, and (3) an acknowledgement of the needs of international students considered both globally and locally. Although English is seen as the only legitimate medium language used by teachers, students can negotiate space for other languages amongst those with diversified linguistic resources (e.g. Bonacina-pugh, Barakos, and Chen 2020; Chen and Bonacina-Pugh 2021). The integration of content and language in EMI did not appear to be relevant neither on institutional-level nor on practitioner-level, possibly because there is no perceived need for students to learn English through EMI in this context; instead, some international students' future-prospects entail the need for learning Chinese as previously discussed. As such, attention is paid predominantly to content learning, where

English is used to the extent of ensuring mutual intelligibility, reflecting a 'prototypical ELF scenario with multilinguals fundamentally drawing on shared language resources' for institutional endeavours (Smit 2018, 387).

Type E *EMI practitioners*

At the institutional level, the EAP courses were intended to support the *Type B* programme-level internationalised curriculum in the form of TNHE, while ESAP courses to support the *Type C* 'add-on' Englishised element in mainstream CMI programmes. At the practitioner level, how staffing, rationale and student needs were perceived and/or practised differ greatly regarding the two types of language courses. We interviewed three *Type E* EMI teacher-participants, one (EE3) taught ESAP course on postgraduate level and two (EE1, EE2) taught EAP on undergraduate level at *University S*. Unlike the EAP teachers who have a background in ELT, the ESAP teacher specialises in Public Health and has no background nor prior training in ELT; she was deemed capable of teaching this course by head of the department considering the fact she uses English as an academic lingua franca, which also aligns with the institutional-policy (see Section Documentary data).

Both ESAP and EAP teacher-participants professed a strong rationale for such courses, despite the varying student needs toward EMI. According to the ESAP teacher (EE3), the objective of her course is to develop students' discipline-specific English language proficiency, especially to enable them to conduct academic research through the medium of English, which is 'considered a core skill-set for postgraduate students' (EE3). The teacher-participant emphasised the role of English in knowledge production of her academic discipline, resembling opinions of the afore-mentioned *Type B* and *C* EMI teachers; she specifically pointed out the bi-directional role of English as a medium of interaction in her discipline, which is in line with *Type C* EMI teacher's view on developing students' bilingual 'disciplinary literacy':

> *… public health practices in our country are developing rapidly … some more developed than the UK and the U.S., we need to showcase our latest research outcome on the international platform … and to theorise our best practices, which is good for disciplinary development.* (EE3)

According to the two EAP teachers, objective of their EAP courses was phrased to train students' general academic skills in English, enabling 'a study-abroad experience without actually going overseas' and 'training talents with crosscultural and internationalised capacities' through the TNHE programmes (EE1, EE2). They both remarked that such TNHE programmes are 'reasonable with good intentions, but when implemented locally, they tend to be problematic and unattainable' (EE1), leaving teacher-practitioners in a caught-between situation. According to one participant (EE1), her Year 1 students had below-average English proficiencies, mainly because entry requirements for these TNHE programmes were lower than the mainstream CMI ones. However, students were expected to reach advanced-level within a year and get ready for the EMI subject courses taught by international teaching staff starting in Year 2, which is 'a responsibility shouldered by us EAP teachers' (EE1). The other teacher (EE2) who taught advanced EAP courses in Year 2 also encountered a dilemma. She hoped to integrate disciplinary-specific content from students' subject courses into her EAP course, but discovered that her Chinese colleagues who taught such courses 'didn't make use of any English-written teaching materials at all' and 'most Chinese colleague who teach subject courses seldom speak English nor require students' academic skills in English in their classrooms'(EE2), which explains students' lack of external drive to learn EAP. This participant further disclosed that her students demonstrated a minimal interest in learning English, namely, to 'pass the College English Test 4 and 6', revealing their lack of intrinsic needs to learn English.

Regarding the practised norms of language use, we also observed divergence between ESAP and EAP teachers. As the ESAP teacher emphasised the need for her students to develop bilingual

'disciplinary literacy', she enacted a flexible bilingual language policy for herself and the students in her teaching. One the one hand,

> they need to learn 'authentic' structures and expressions in English-written journal articles without translating to Chinese'; on the other, students need both languages 'to understand terminologies and concepts in the discipline … [and] to conduct in-depth discussions without being discouraged due to language difficulties. (EE3)

This teacher also commented on how her ESAP course entails a 'natural' integration of subject content and language: ' … its's basically an introductory course to our discipline taught through English, with an additional focus on language skills' (EE3). Regarding such a dual-focus, the teacher felt confident in delivering the disciplinary knowledge through English, but slightly concerned that she may not be able to 'spot every language mistake students made like ELT experts could' (EE3). By contrast, the two EAP teachers also allowed students' mixed language use in their classroom teaching, but saw this as a compromise, that they had to 'lower the standards … as long as students open their mouth and speak [English] … even mixing English with Chinese' (EE1). They attributed this to the mismatch between the Englishised curriculum and students' lack of needs as well as proficiency in English, and both insisted on a monolingual English norm for themselves to ensure students' exposure to English in class.

Taken together, findings on *Type E* EMI show striking variances between ESAP and EAP courses, both in conceptualisations and in actual practices. The objectives of ESAP course not only align with students' subjective and/or objective needs toward the use of English as the academic lingua franca, but also matches the CMI curriculum with an 'add-on' Englishised component. The ESAP teacher-participant (non-ELT specialist) managed to deliver the ESAP course; she deemed the integration of content and language a 'natural' element of her course, and disciplinary literacy in both languages a necessity for her students. This highly resembles our findings on *Type C* EMI. We consider this a special case in which a non-language-specialist taught an ESAP course with a dual-focus on both language and content, as it is seldom reported in existing literature (e.g. Airey 2016). By contrast, the EAP courses largely mis-align with students' needs. The collaboration between language specialist and content teachers, as encouraged by scholars (e.g. Galloway and Rose 2021), was attempted by our participants but turned out to be challenging. The curriculum of the TNHE programmes were implemented with a somewhat reduced proportion of EMI, resulting in a 'caught-between' situation for the EAP teachers and largely restricted their agency in teaching EAP in support of the TNHE programmes despite their efforts. This could be attributed to the lack of a clear language-in-education policy in the curriculum documents of TNHE programmes (see Section Documentary data), and point to the need of more explicit, contextualised language policy and planning at *University S* alongside its implementation of EMI.

Conclusion

Up to this point, we have provided a multilayered view on the conceptualisations and implementations of *Type A-E* EMI in the case of *University S*. A further point of discussion here is how the university's internationalisation agenda intricately intertwines with EMI, as commented by the senior manager at the Office of International Affairs:

> *… the university is determined to open more EMI courses and programmes so as to attract international students … some schools have a higher capacity of hosting international students than others* [but] *the scale of our EMI is very limited now … there's a long way to go for us … when we negotiate with universities overseas to set up partnership or collaborative programmes, they felt the partnership is somewhat unequal due to our limited capacity to host overseas students* [through EMI]. (M2)

As such, the scale of EMI provision as a whole could be seen as a benchmark as well as an affordance for its capacity to set up various forms of TNHE, to foster international students and to accommodate a multilingual and multicultural campus, which in turn would affect staff and student experiences of EMI. Given the above, we wish to point out that in spite of the senior manager's comment

on a relatively small scale of EMI provision at *University S*, we have observed how EMI practitioners exercise a strong bottom-up agency within their seemingly 'caught-between' situations, in enabling bi/multilingual language use and awareness toward Global Englishes, cultivating a bi/multilingual disciplinary literacy driven by their disciplinary perspectives, as well as attending to home and international students' needs perceived globally and locally. Considering the scale of our dataset, we do not attempt to generalise our findings, but call for future work on this, especially to tell students' side of the story and to uncover classroom-level practices, which are both out of the scope of the present case study.

Methodologically, our case study adopted the ROAD-MAPPING framework (Dafouz and Smit 2016), which was proven to be a crucial conceptual and analytical tool that afforded us to address the multiplicity and dynamics of EMI contexts in a Chinese HEI. Although the authors of this framework primarily intended it for making multisite comparisons, our case study has not only revealed how EMI practices could vary even on a single geographical site, but also presented a systematic comparison of the five types of EMI within the case university. We therefore conclude how the present case study contributes to existing literature into three aspects, followed by suggestions for future work.

Firstly, we have shown how contextualised policymaking is crucial to EMI implementation and internationalisation of HEIs. The five types of EMI observed at *University S* conceptualised on institutional-level are in accord with a bi-directionality of internationalisation strategy, that is, *Type A* EMI for a mixed cohort of students, *Type B*, *C* and *E* for outbound home students, *Type D* EMI for inbound international students. Yet the managerial measures put in place to implement EMI were shown to account for the local contingencies (e.g. student needs for EMI and internationalisation, linguistic readiness of staff and students) to various extents, resulting in (mis)alignments in-between the institutional-level and the practitioner-level. We thus hope to provide rich empirical evidence to inform future practices in contextualised policymaking and support systems of EMI at HEIs in Chinese and similar non-Anglophone contexts. We also call for more scholarly attention paid toward the largely under-represented non-key universities with limited resources, capacities and distinctive student cohorts.

Secondly, we have provided new insights on the integration of content and language in EMI. Besides the commonalities between our case and existing findings, we have presented three particular cases, initiated both in a top-down and bottom-up manner in local contexts: (1) a Chinese content teacher paired up with an international content teacher, (2) a non-language-specialist subject teacher who taught ESAP course, and (3) a language specialist who taught EAP course in support of TNHE programmes. Our findings show that two types of measures are central to the realisation of the dual-focused identity of EMI: (1) managerial measures to make room for staff collaborations, (2) curricular-level and practitioner-level measures to necessitate students' development of bi/multilingual 'disciplinary literacy'. We also hope to open-up discussions on the 'unconventional' collaborations between Chinese and international teaching staff in EMI implementation (e.g. Airey 2016).

Finally, our research foci centred around the roles of English in relation to other languages, as well as the norms of language use at institutional and practitioner level. We were able to provide a multilayered view on (1) the top-down and bottom-up formation of language ideologies, and (2) language policies operating on the institutional – and practice-level. Through our empirical findings from a practitioner's perspective, our case study not only enriches existing literature on the monolingual vs. multilingual ethos in HE settings, but also calls for future research and practices to attend to the 'linguistic readiness' of HEIs in the process of internationalisation through language policy and planning.

Notes

1. Chinese frog, an ornamental braiding for fastening the front of a garment.
2. Forepart (of a traditional Chinese robe).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by Zhejiang Provincial Philosophy and Social Sciences Planning Project (浙江省社科规划课题), P. R. China [grant number 23NDJC275YB]; Hangzhou Normal University [grant number 4075C50221204105].

ORCID

Qi Chen http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3965-3538
Ying Li http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1323-4132

References

Airey, J. 2011. "The Disciplinary Literacy Discussion Matrix: A Heuristic Tool for Initiating Collaboaration in Higher Education." *Across the Disciplines* 8 (3): 19. doi:10.37514/atd-j.2011.8.3.18.

Airey, J. 2016. "EAP, EMI or CLIL?" In *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, edited by K. Hyland and P. Shaw, 71–83. London: Routledge.

Baker, W., and J. Hüttner. 2017. "English and More: A Multisite Study of Roles and Conceptualisations of Language in English Medium Multilingual Universities from Europe to Asia." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38 (6): 501–516. doi:10.1080/01434632.2016.1207183.

Baker, W., and J. Hüttner. 2019. "We are not the Language Police": Comparing Multilingual EMI Programmes in Europe and Asia." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (United Kingdom)* 29 (1): 78–94. doi:10.1111/ijal.12246.

Barnard, R., and Z. Hasim. 2018. *English Medium Instruction Programmes: Perspectives from South East Asian Universities*. London: Routledge.

Bonacina-pugh, F., E. Barakos, and Q. Chen. 2020. "Language Policy in the Internationalisation of Higher Education in Anglophone Countries : The Interplay Between Language Policy as 'Text', 'Discourse' and 'Practice'." *Applied Linguistics Review* 13 (6): 1103–1125. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0148.

Chen, Q., and F. Bonacina-Pugh. 2021. "Spotlights on 'Practiced' Language Policy in the Internationalised University." In *Meaningful Teaching Interaction at the Internationalised University: From Research to Impact*, edited by D. Dippold and H. Manion, 110–122. London: Routledge.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., B. Gao, and B. Sun. 2021. "How to Kill two Birds with one Stone: EMI teachers' Needs in Higher Education in China." *Applied Linguistics Review*. Ahead-of-Print.10.1515/applirev-2021-0178.

Dafouz, E., and U. Smit. 2016. "Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings." *Applied Linguistics* 37 (3): 397–415. doi:10.1093/applin/amu034.

Dafouz, E., and U. Smit. 2017. *A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Multifaceted Roles of English in English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings*. (January 2016), 287–306. doi:10.1075/lllt.47.17daf.

Dafouz, E., and U. Smit. 2020. *ROAD-MAPPING English Medium Education in the Internationalised University*. Gewerbestrasse: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dearden, J. 2015. *English as a Medium of Instruction – a Growing Global Phenomenon*. British Council. https://www.britishcouncil.es/sites/default/files/british_council_english_as_a_medium_of_instruction.pdf

Doiz, A., D. Lasagabaster, and J. M. Sierra. 2012. "Future Challenges for English-Medium Instruction at the Tertiary Level." In *English-medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*, edited by A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, and J. M. Sierra, 213–221. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Fenton-Smith, B., P. Humphreys, and I. Walkinshaw. 2017. *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy*. Gewerbestrasse: Springer.

Galloway, N., J. Kriukow, and T. Numajiri. 2017. "Internationalisation, Higher Education and the Growing Demand for English: An Investigation Into the English Medium of Instruction (EMI) Movement in China and Japan." *British Council ELT Research Papers* 17. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/H035%20ELTRA%20Internationalisation_HE_and%20the%20growing%20demand%20for%20English%20A4_FINAL_WEB.pdf

Galloway, N., T. Numajiri, and N. Rees. 2020. "The 'Internationalisation', or 'Englishisation', of Higher Education in East Asia." *Higher Education* 80 (3): 395–414. doi:10.1007/s10734-019-00486-1.

Galloway, N., and H. Rose. 2021. "English Medium Instruction and the English Language Practitioner." *ELT Journal* 75 (1): 33–41. doi:10.1093/elt/ccaa063.

Galloway, N., and R. Ruegg. 2020. "The Provision of Student Support on English Medium Instruction Programmes in Japan and China." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 45: 1–14. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100846.
Gu, M. M., C. K. J. Lee, and T. Jin. 2022. "A Translanguaging and Trans-Semiotizing Perspective on Subject Teachers' Linguistic and Pedagogical Practices in EMI Programme." *Applied Linguistics Review*, doi:10.1515/applirev-2022-0036.
Gu, M. M., Z. J. Li, and L. Jiang. 2021. "Navigating the Instructional Settings of EMI: A Spatial Perspective on University Teachers' Experiences." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–15. doi:10.1080/01434632.2021.1914064.
Hu, G. 2021. "English as a Medium of Instruction in Chinese Higher Education: Looking Back and Looking Forward." *Applied Linguistics Review*. doi:10.1515/applirev-2021-0182.
Hu, G., and J. Lei. 2014. "English-medium Instruction in Chinese Higher Education: A Case Study." *Higher Education* 67 (5): 551–567. doi:10.1007/s10734-013-9661-5.
Jablonkai, R. R., and J. Hou. 2021. "English Medium of Instruction in Chinese Higher Education: A Systematic Mapping Review of Empirical Research." *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1–30. doi:10.1515/applirev-2021-0179.
Joo-Kyung, Park. 2018. "English-medium Instruction in the Korean Higher Education Context: From an English as a Lingua Franca." In *English-Medium Instruction from an English as a Lingua Franca Perspective*, edited by K. Murata, 64–77. London: Routledge.
Kirkpatrick, A., and A. J. Liddicoat. 2017. "Language Education Policy and Practice in East and Southeast Asia." *Language Teaching* 50 (2): 155–188. doi:10.1017/S0261444817000027.
Knight, J., and H. De Wit. 1997. *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
Liu, W. 2021. "The Chinese Definition of Internationalisation in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 43 (2): 230–245. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2020.1777500.
Macaro, E. 2018. *English Medium Instruction: Content and Language in Policy and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Macaro, E., L. Tian, and L. Chu. 2018. "First and Second Language use in English Medium Instruction Contexts." *Language Teaching Research* 24 (3): 382–402. doi:10.1177/1362168818783231.
MOE. 2001. *Guanyu Jiaqiang Gaodeng Xuexiao Benke Jiaoxue Gongzuo Tigao Jiaoxue Zhiliang de Ruogan Yijian* [Guidelines for improving the quality of undergraduate teaching]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A08/gjs_left/s5664/moe_1623/201001/t20100129_88633.html.
MOE. 2003. *Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo Zhongwai Hezuo Banxue Tiaoli* [Regulations on Transnational Higher Education in People's Republic of China]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_sjzl/sjzl_zcfg/zcfg_jyxzfg/202204/t20220422_620494.html.
MOE. 2004. *Zhonghu Renmin Gongheguo Zhongwai Hezuo Banxue Tiaoli Shishi Banfa* [Measures for Implementing the Regulations of Transnational Higher Education in People's Republic of China]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A02/s5911/moe_621/200406/t20040602_180471.html.
MOE. 2005. "*211 Gongcheng*" *Xuexiao Mingdan* [List of Universities of "Project 211"]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/s7065/200512/t20051223_82762.html.
MOE. 2006. "985 Gongcheng" Xuexiao Mingdan [List of Universities of "Project 985"]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/s7065/200612/t20061206_128833.html.
MOE. 2007. *Guanyu Qidong 2007 Niandu Shuangyu Jiaoxue Shifan Kecheng Jianshe Xiangmu de Tongzhi* [Annoucement for Launching the 2007 Project of Bilingual Model Course Development]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A08/gjs_left/s5664/moe_1623/201001/t20100129_88633.html.
MOE. 2017. "Shuangyiliu" Jianshe Gaoxiao Mingdan [List of Universities of "Double First-Class Programme"]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A22/A22_ztzl/ztzl_tjsylpt/sylpt_jsgx/201712/t20171206_320667.html.
MOE. 2022a. Di'erlun "Shuangyiliu" Jianshe Gaoxiao ji Jianshe Xueke Mingdan [Second-round List of Universities and Disciplines of "Double-First Class Programme"].
MOE. 2022b. *Quanguo Gaodeng Xuexiao Mingdan* [List of Higher Educationa Institutions in China]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_xxgk/s5743/s5744/A03/202206/t20220617_638352.html.
OECD. 2014. *Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators*. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2013_eag-2013-en;jsessionid = 4qrj2lt4d2oge.x-oecd-live-01.
OECD. 2021. *Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators*. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/9869bdbf-en/index.html?itemId = /content/component/9869bdbf-en.
Qiu, Y., Y. Zheng, and J. Liu. 2022. "'So, Only Relying on English is Still Troublesome': A Critical Examination of Japan's English Medium Instruction Policy at Multiple Levels." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–18. doi:10.1080/01434632.2022.2100402.
Rose, H., S. Curle, I. Aizawa, and G. Thompson. 2019. "What Drives Success in English Medium Taught Courses? The Interplay Between Language Proficiency, Academic Skills, and Motivation." *Studies in Higher Education*. doi:10.1080/03075079.2019.1590690.
Rose, H., J. McKinley, and X. L. Curdt-Christiansen. 2022. "EMI in Chinese Higher Education: The Muddy Water of 'Englishisation.'" *Applied Linguistics Review*. doi:10.1515/applirev-2022-0015.

Rose, H., J. McKinley, X. Xu, and S. Zhou. 2020. "Investigating Policy and Implementation of English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education Institutions in China." *British Council*. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/K155_Investigating_policy_implementation_EMI_China_web.pdf

Saarinen, T. 2012. "Internationalization of Finnish Higher Education – Is Language an Issue?" *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 216: 157–173. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0044.

Sahan, K., N. Galloway, and J. McKinley. 2022. "English-only' English Medium Instruction: Mixed Views in Thai and Vietnamese Higher Education." *Language Teaching Research*. doi:10.1177/13621688211072632.

Smit, U. 2018. "Beyond Monolingualism in Higher Education A Language Policy Account." In *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, edited by J. Jenkins, W. Baker, and M. Dewey, 387–399. New York: Routledge.

Spolsky, B. 2004. *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tai, K. W. H., and W. Li. 2020. "Bringing the Outside in: Connecting Students' out-of-School Knowledge and Experience Through Translanguaging in Hong Kong English Medium Instruction Mathematics Classes." *System* 95: 1–32. doi:10.1016/j.system.2020.102364.

Thompson, G., and J. Mckinley. 2018. "Integration of Content and Language Learning." In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, edited by S. (volume ed) Liontas, JI (ed), M (project ed) DelliCarpini, and Abrar-ul-Hassan, 1–13. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Wächter, B., and F. Maiworm. 2014. *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education: the state of play in* 2014. https://www.lemmens.de/dateien/medien/buecher-ebooks/aca/2008_english-taught_programmes_in_european_higher_education_-_the_picture_in_2007.pdf3322.

Wu, P., S. Wang, X. Jiang, D. Zeng, Y. Guan, and X. Li. 2010. *Gaodeng Xuexiao Shuangyu Jiaoxue de Xianzhuang Yanjiu he Shijian Tansuo* [An Exploratory Study of English- Medium Instruction in Chinese Higher Education]. Beijing: Higher Education Press.

Yin, R. K. 2018. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. 6th ed. London: SAGE Publications.

Yuksel, D., A. Soruç, M. Altay, and S. Curle. 2021. "A Longitudinal Study at an English Medium Instruction University in Turkey: The Interplay Between English Language Improvement and Academic Success." *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1–20. doi:10.1515/applirev-2020-0097.

Zhang, Z. 2018. "English-medium Instruction Policies in China: Internationalisation of Higher Education." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 39 (6): 542–555. doi:10.1080/01434632.2017.1404070.

Appendix: Phase II Interview participant demographic information.

No.	Participant ID	Participant Role	Type of EMI	EMI Subject	School/Department at University S
1	M1	Senior manager	A	N/A	School of International Studies
2	M2	Senior manager	B, C, D, E	N/A	Office of International Affairs
3	A1	Admin staff	A	N/A	School of International Studies
4	EA1	EMI teacher	A	Traditional Chinese tea culture (undergraduate general education optional courses)	School of International Studies
5	EB1	EMI teacher	B	Administrative Ethics (undergraduate compulsory course)	School of Public Administration
6	EB2	EMI teacher	B	Intercultural communication (undergraduate compulsory course)	School of International Studies
7	EB3	EMI teacher	B	Brief introduction to Western social work theory (undergraduate compulsory course)	School of Public Administration
8	EC1	EMI teacher	C	Inorganic chemistry (TNHE undergraduate compulsory course)	School of Material, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering
9	ED1	EMI teacher	D	International Business Negotiation, Transnational Enterprise Management (undergraduate compulsory course)	Business School
10	ED2	EMI teacher	D	Principles of Computer Composition (undergraduate compulsory course)	School of Information Science and Technology
11	EE1	EMI teacher	E	EAP (TNHE undergraduate compulsory course)	School of International Studies
12	EE2	EMI teacher	E	EAP (TNHE undergraduate compulsory course)	School of International Studies
13	EE3	EMI teacher	E	ESAP for (postgraduate compulsory course) (MA in Social Medicine and Health Management)	School of Public Health