The Learning and Teaching of English as an International Language in Asia-Pacific Universities: Issues and Challenges

Author

Kirkpatrick, Andy

Published

2016

Book Title

Reforming Learning and Teaching in Asia-Pacific Universities

Version

Accepted Manuscript (AM)

DOI

10.1007/978-981-10-0431-5_16

Chapter 11
The Learning and Teaching of English as an International Language in Asia-Pacific Universities: Issues and Challenges

Andy Kirkpatrick

Abstract This chapter first provides a brief general review of the teaching and learning of English in Australian and Asian universities and shows that English is still primarily regarded as a native speaker product and that English, officially at any rate, is taught monolingually in English and English medium of instruction (EMI) classes and courses. The chapter then argues that the use of English as a lingua franca and the many Asian varieties of English need to be factored into university language policies and that multilingual students and staff be allowed to use their multilingual resources in English–medium education.

11.1 Introduction

The number of universities across the Asia-Pacific region which have introduced English as a medium of instruction (EMI) and/or increased the number of programmes they offer through EMI has risen significantly in recent years (see other chapters in this volume by Poon (2015), Gu (2015), and Ng (2015)). This increase in EMI courses in the Asia-Pacific region mirrors similar increases in EMI courses in other parts of the world, including continental Europe (e.g. Wachter & Maiworm, 2008; Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2013).

Reasons for this increase in the provision of EMI courses will be discussed below, but the decision at the 2012 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit in Vladivostok that member countries would explore ways of facilitating staff and student mobility between universities in APEC member countries echoes the Bologna Process established in 1999, which set up the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). This trend towards the internationalisation of the universities has crucial effects upon languages of education and the languages of scholarship. In particular, internationalisation tends to privilege English at the

A. Kirkpatrick (✉)
School of Languages and Linguistics, Griffith University, Nathan, QLD, Australia
e-mail: a.kirkpatrick@griffith.edu.au

C.-h.C. Ng et al. (eds.), *Reforming Learning and Teaching in Asia-Pacific Universities*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 33, DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-0431-5_11

expense of other languages. As Robert Phillipson has argued: "What emerges unambiguously is that in the Bologna process internationalisation means English-medium higher education" (2009, p. 37).

The implications of the emergence of English as the international language of education upon other languages is, however, seldom considered at the university level; neither are the significant changes to English itself. That there are, literally, hundreds of new varieties of English, many of which are spoken in the Asia-Pacific region, is ignored. At the same time the role of English as an international lingua franca is also overlooked. Despite the fact that the great majority of users of English today are multilinguals for whom English is a learned or additional language, and despite the fact that the greatest use of English in today's world is as a lingua franca between such multilinguals, universities still treat English as a single variety, whose norms are based on a native speaker model, most commonly standard British or American. Calls by scholars for university language policies to reflect the multilingual realities of the university (e.g. Xu, 2014) and for academic English policies "to be brought in line with and better reflect the sociolinguistic realities of the international university" (Jenkins, 2014, p. 2) remain in the minority and are only recently being voiced.

In this chapter, I shall first consider the teaching and learning of English in universities in Australia and argue that, despite the development of English as an international language and the multilingual and multicultural nature of Australian universities, the multilingual reality is not reflected in universities' policies towards English, where a native speaker model, including standard Australian, remains entrenched as the sole legitimate variety. I shall then consider the teaching and learning of English in selected universities in Asia, with a focus on Hong Kong (see also Gu (2015) in Chap. 4 in this volume). I shall argue that, generally speaking, universities in Asia also promote a native speaker variety of English at the expense of other varieties and at the expense of other languages. The chapter will conclude with practical proposals for accommodating other varieties of English and other languages within EMI programmes.

11.2 English in Australian Universities

It goes without saying that Australian universities use English as a medium of instruction. Students whose first language is not English need to provide evidence that they have adequate proficiency in English in order to successfully undertake university study through English. The best known method for demonstrating this proficiency is through international tests, such as TOEFL and IELTS, with IELTS being by far the most common test score used by Australian universities (Humphreys et al., 2012). Required scores may vary depending on level and the type of course, but, at undergraduate level, universities typically require an IELTS score of at least 6.0. What is less known, however, is that only a small percentage of international students actually enter the university using an IELTS score or a score from another

internationally recognised test. The majority enters through so-called pathway programmes. These cater for students who do not meet the university's entry requirements and provide subject and language courses that provide a direct pathway into the university, as long as the students fulfil the requirement of the pathway programmes. It is important to stress, however, that the students who enter via these pathway programmes do not need to provide an official exam score such as an IELTS. Instead, successful completion of the pathway courses is deemed sufficient evidence that the student has the requisite English proficiency to study at the university. Whether this is indeed the case, has been the subject of much debate in Australian universities over some years (Dunworth, 2009). Students may also enter if they have previously studied in EMI programmes at secondary or tertiary level for a specified number of years, usually a minimum of two. What this all adds up to is that students whose first language is a language other than English enter Australian universities via a variety of means, but with only a minority actually presenting an official score for an internationally recognised test system as evidence of their English language proficiency. Many universities therefore offer support classes in English of a variety of types, including pre-course units, generic programmes, both generic and subject-specific credit-bearing programmes, and a range of mentoring schemes.[1] None, however, systematically include or integrate English language criteria as part of assessment criteria for all subject areas. English language proficiency is viewed as something a student either has or has not; and if a student does not have it, remedial support courses are available.

[AU1]

The notion that language proficiency is developmental and all of us, including those for whom English is a first language, need to consciously learn how to develop academic English and literacy skills has not yet been accepted in Australian universities. Far from integrating language development into content subject curricula, therefore, English is treated as a skill that one either has or has not. In addition, 'English' is short-hand for a native variety of academic English. "There is a fixation on English and a monoglot ideology" and "the linguistic repertoires of bi- and multilingual students (are) problematized rather than being treated as multilingual capital" (Preece, 2011, p. 122). I shall return to how universities might make more use of this 'multilingual capital' later in the chapter, but stress here that the teaching and learning of English in Australian universities is treated as the teaching and learning of some definable finite product, which is the English used by native speakers in academic contexts. At the same time, the majority view is that students should have already acquired this before arriving at the university. If they have not, then they need some form of remedial English programme. This remediation needs to be undertaken by specialist English language teachers. It is not the task or responsibility of discipline academics to develop the English of their students so that it conforms to the discipline requirements. The integration of English language development into content teaching is likely to become a major issue and challenge for the Australian university-sector in the coming years (Arkoudis, 2011, October 12).

There is some irony that the view of English as an identifiable native speaker product that others have to learn, runs alongside a new government-inspired push

for Australians to become more Asia-literate. In October 2012, the then government released *Australia in the Asia Century*. This document promised that every Australian student would have significant exposure to studies of Asia across the curriculum and that "all schools will engage with at least one school in Asia to support the teaching of a priority Asian language" (i.e. Hindi, Indonesian, Japanese and Mandarin Chinese) (Commonwealth of Australia, 2012, p. 15). With regard to the university sector, the document states that the government will work with universities to "substantially boost the number of Australian students studying in Asia" and that it will "support universities to increase the number of students who undertake Asian studies and Asian languages as part of their university education" and that it will "encourage every Australian university to have a presence in Asia…" (2012, pp. 16–17).

Despite these noble high-sounding statements, the fact remains that very few Australian students study an Asian language at university. It is not a requirement for them to do so, unless they are taking a degree in Asian studies. While the numbers of students taking an Asian language unit in the first year of study may appear impressive, it needs to be stressed that the majority of these students only take one or two units of the language and then drop it; many of them are also 'background' speakers of the language rather than Anglo-Australians. The multilingual resources provided on campus by the many international students who speak Asian languages are not valued or used in any systematic way.

So, on the one hand, the Australian university plays host to thousands of international students, the majority of whom come from Asia. All speak English as a lingua franca and many speak established Asian varieties of English such as Malaysian, Singaporean or Filipino. Many also speak the very Asian languages identified as priority languages in the *Australian in the Asia Century* document referred to above. In addition, the university hosts thousands of multilingual Australian students who come from migrant families who may speak a variety of different Englishes. Yet the university gives no recognition to these varieties of English, and insists on using a native speaker norm as the sole arbiter of correctness. As Jenkins asks "Why, in an *international* institution, should it be acceptable to require non-native English speakers (NNESs) to replicate the *national* academic English norms preferred by native English speaker staff and students?" (2014, p. 11) (italics in original).

On the other hand, the current political rhetoric emphasises the importance of more Australians becoming Asia-literate and learning Asian languages. Yet, as indicated above, the university sector makes no systematic use of the multilingual and multicultural resources brought to the university by these international and migrant students. Some universities may try and set up some form of 'language buddy' system, but these tend to be ad hoc and voluntary.

The problem lies in the mismatch between the universities' claims that they are international spaces and the reality of their continued classification of English as a native speaker language best spoken by monolinguals. Were the universities to actually exploit their actual multicultural and multilingual identities, then both the teaching and learning of English and the teaching and learning of Asian languages would be greatly enhanced. I described specific ways in which this might be done in

the final section of this chapter. I now turn to a brief review of the rise of EMI programmes in universities in Asia.

11.3 English in Asian Universities

As noted above, and as discussed in chapters by Poon (2015), Gu (2015), and Ng (2015) in this volume, there has been a significant increase in the provision of EMI courses in universities across Asia and the reasons for this vary. Knight (2008) lists four possible motivations for universities to internationalise: political, economic, cultural and academic. While all these motivations may play a part, especially in the earlier years of internationalisation (Wilkinson, 2013), financial considerations have become increasingly important. Until recently, the internationalisation of higher education in Asia has been "characterised by Asian students travelling to 'western' countries to obtain degrees" (Kirkpatrick, 2011, p. 108). The Anglophone countries of the US, Britain and Australia are major receivers of these students (see also Poon this volume), although European countries such as France and Germany also receive substantial numbers (Howe, 2009). A consequence of this has been both intellectual and financial loss on the part of the Asian countries, and intellectual and financial gain on behalf of the receiving countries: intellectual loss/gain as many Asian students choose to remain in the country after obtaining their degrees, and financial loss/gain as these students pay international student fees (and also have to meet other living expenses). Not surprisingly, therefore, a number of Asian countries have decided to set themselves up as 'education hubs' in a bid to deter their own students from travelling overseas for further study, while, at the same time, attracting international students from overseas to study in their hub. And, in order to establish an education hub, it is considered essential to offer EMI courses. Again not unexpectedly, it is those Asian countries which have an institutional use of English inherited from their colonial history that have, to date, been the most successful, namely Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines. Hong Kong has also set itself up as an education hub, with education being promoted as one of the Hong Kong government's six pillar industries (Li, 2013a, p. 67).

It is not just about establishing education hubs. Many individual universities across Asia have also increased the number of EMI courses they offer (see Kirkpatrick, 2013). The China Universities and Colleges Admissions System (CUCAS) provides a website where prospective students can search for which degrees are offered in English and at which universities (http://www.cucas.edu.cn/).

As well as the increase in Chinese universities offering degrees in EMI (see Hayhoe, Li, Lin, & Zha, 2011), there are also a number of foreign universities which have set up campuses in China, of which the British universities of Nottingham and Liverpool are two examples. Melbourne's Monash University has also recently established a campus in Suzhou. These universities teach in English, with the English being understood as a native English model, something that is explicitly stated on the Nottingham Ningbo campus website: "All degree programmes are

taught in English and at the same high standards at Nottingham University in the UK" (http://www.nottingham.edu.cn/en/admissions/studywithus.aspx).

A financial motivation may be a key reason for Japanese universities' move towards internationalisation, as the current Japanese demographic shows an ageing population with fewer people and fewer people of the university age group. The 'Global 30 Project' aims to attract 300,000 international students to study at one of 30 universities in Japan, all of which now offer at least some programmes through EMI. The Global 30 Project website allows prospective students to download a booklet entitled *Study in English at Japanese Universities* (http://www.uni.international.mext.go.jp/global30). The Global 30 Project does not seem to be a success, with only 22,000 international students enrolled in 2011.

Korea has also seen a move towards EMI courses in higher education. In 2007, the prestigious Korean Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST) adopted a strict English-only policy. This, however, is now being reconsidered. As Kim (2013) has noted, the role of Korean as opposed to English or as well as English in delivering content knowledge is being re-evaluated.. Below, I shall move to consider the notion of allowing students and staff to use their linguistic resources and use more than one language in the classroom. I will do so when discussing the new language policy at the Hong Kong Institute of Education and by considering proposals for how English might best be taught in Asian HE.

This move towards the provision of EMI courses can thus be seen throughout Asia. Here, however, I want to focus on the situation in Hong Kong, where six of the eight government funded universities teach through EMI, with the exception of Chinese-related courses, including Chinese itself.[2] I focus on Hong Kong as it offers, I believe, some lessons (mainly negative) for the use of EMI in higher education. A brief introduction to the Hong Kong context is first provided in order to show how the language education policy and practices across levels, such as primary, secondary and tertiary, inevitably impinge on each other and cannot sensibly be treated separately.

The Hong Kong government wishes its citizens to be trilingual (in Cantonese, Putonghua [Mandarin] and English) and biliterate (in Chinese and English). With this aim in mind, it advocates the use of Cantonese – the mother tongue of over 95 % of the population – as the medium of instruction (MoI) in government primary schools. Some primary schools are also trialling the use of Putonghua as a MoI, especially for the study of Chinese itself. The use of the child's home language as the MoI in primary schools is supported by almost all research into multilingual education and by the several reports into language education which the various governments of Hong Kong commissioned over the years (Bolton, 2012). The situation at secondary school is more complex. During the colonial period, the government adopted a laissez faire policy which allowed schools to decide for themselves which MoI they would use. The great majority chose English, primarily because the universities taught in English. Even the Chinese University of Hong Kong, which was established in 1963 to provide a Chinese medium of instruction (CMI) education, insisted that students first had to pass an English exam in order to gain entry. So, even for entry to a CMI university, students had to have high proficiency in English.

With Hong Kong's handover back to China in 1997, the new government insisted that only those secondary schools which met certain conditions would be allowed to continue to offer EMI education; the remaining secondary schools, which accounted for some 75 % of the total, were required to use Cantonese as the MoI. This new policy for secondary schools occasioned much opposition and debate among parents (Bolton, 2012) with the result that the government finally agreed to 'fine-tune' the secondary policy and allow CMI schools to teach certain classes and certain subjects through English, as long as they fulfilled certain language-related criteria. The inevitable result of the fine-tuning was a decrease in the number of subjects taught in Cantonese and a corresponding increase in the number of subjects taught in English (Kan, Lai, Kirkpatrick, & Law, 2011). As students had been performing well in studying subjects like maths and science in Cantonese, it is hard to see why there was this dramatic shift to EMI, other than to recognise the influence of the universities' use of EMI as the primary driver.

As mentioned above, the Chinese University is the only university in Hong Kong that offers the full range of degrees in Chinese. The appointment, however, of a new Vice-Chancellor in 2004 who had ambitions to raise CUHK's status led to the implementation of a range of EMI courses in order to attract international students and staff. The motivation here, therefore, for EMI was to improve the international standing of CUHK. Despite being taken to court by a student who accused CUHK of breaching its charter (and who finally lost his case in the Court of Final Appeal), CUHK has successfully introduced a range of EMI courses (Li, 2013a).

This shows how the EMI policies of the universities of Hong Kong have managed to make the successful implementation of the government's objective of making the citizens of Hong Kong trilingual and biliterate extremely difficult. It also shows how important it is for any language education policy to be integrated across all levels and considered holistically. In the case of Hong Kong, the universities' desire for high international rankings has ensured that they will retain their EMI policies. This causes a washback effect down into secondary schools and, eventually, will also be felt in primary schools.

This also shows that a city of seven million with an overwhelmingly Chinese population has only one university which offers a CMI education, although even here EMI programmes are now available. While the promotion of Asian languages as languages of education and scholarship is not the subject of this chapter, (see Kirkpatrick, 2011, 2013), I feel that universities which have adopted EMI programmes underestimate how valuable and attractive most international students would find courses in the local languages. It seems odd, for example, given the rapidly increasing international importance of Putonghua (see Gu, 2015), that Hong Kong's universities do not routinely provide bilingual education which would see international students graduate proficient in Chinese. Of the eight government-funded universities, only the Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIEd) operates a trilingual education policy, and I next briefly review its MoI policies.

The HKIEd is instructive as it is the sole tertiary-level institution which has a language policy that mirrors the government's aim of producing trilingual and biliterate citizens. The aim of the HKIEd language policy is to produce graduates who

are functionally trilingual (see Xu, 2014). Students, in consultation with staff, identify the levels of proficiency that they will achieve in each of the three languages when they graduate. These will vary depending on the first language of the student. Although the majority of HKIEd students have Cantonese as an L1, there are several from Mainland China whose L1 is Putonghua. There are also a few local students whose L1 is English. Given the multilingual nature of the student and staff body, the HKIEd policy also draws an important distinction between the official medium of instruction of a particular course and actual classroom use. This is explained below.

> The MOI, to be adhered to strictly in all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, bears on the following: (a) the course outline, including synopsis, aims and objectives, main assigned readings, teaching and learning activities, and the course's intended learning outcomes; (b) formative assessment in writing, including major assignments and quizzes; and (c) summative assessment such as the final exam. Accordingly, all assessed activities of an EMI course should be in English, while those of a CMI course should be in Chinese.
>
> 'Classroom language' (CL) refers to the language of interaction between teacher and students and among students in the classroom (lectures, tutorials, labs and so on). While the CL of an EMI courses is English by default, a CMI course may be conducted in Cantonese or Putonghua, subject to the teacher's reference after consulting all relevant factors, such as the students' language backgrounds and abilities. Subject to moment-by-moment classroom learning and teaching needs, the teacher of a CMI or EMI course may find it necessary to switch to some other language(s). It should be noted that classroom code-switching, which is typically justified by students' enhanced learning outcomes, do not constitute a breach of the Institute's new LLT policy. (Xu, 2014, p. 218) (see also Kirkpatrick, 2013, p. 14)

The HKIEd language policy is unusual in explicitly allowing the use of classroom code-switching. As I shall argue below, this is a brave and innovative policy, which is to be applauded. As Barnard and McLellan have recently reported in their collection of studies of classroom code-switching across Asia (2013), the official policy typically prescribes the use of one language only in the classroom. Code-mixing is expressly forbidden. As they also show, however, in practice all teachers, for a variety of reasons, engage in classroom code-switching. Not surprisingly, given that this transgresses official policy, they feel uncomfortable and guilty about it. This is why Macaro notes that "classroom code-switching research is desperately in need of some theorizing" (2013, p. 10). The teacher's dilemma is to decide when and why to use the L1 and/or the L2 (Li, 2013b).

The 'one language at a time' principle is also adopted in the teaching and learning of English and content subjects in Australian universities. The multilingual resources which might be available to students and staff are typically ignored. The official position is that the courses are all EMI and therefore only English should be used. The distinction between official policy and actual classroom behaviour which the HKIEd policy so importantly and innovatively makes has yet to be considered in Australian universities.

In the previous two sections of the chapter I have briefly reviewed how the teaching and learning of English is viewed and undertaken in Australian and Asian universities. I have also considered some of the possible reasons for the trend found in many Asian universities to adopt EMI in higher education. As a general rule, despite

the universities in both Australia and Asia being multilingual sites populated by many multilingual staff and students, these multilingual resources are not harnessed in a systematic way. EMI is, officially in any event, taken to mean that only English can be used. At the same time, despite the presence of many varieties of English on campus and the use of English as a lingua franca across universities, English is largely considered to be a native speaker product to which all others should aspire. The idea that native speakers might need to accommodate to other varieties and uses of English remains foreign to the native speakers themselves. In the final section of this chapter, I review a number of initiatives which have been implemented in Europe and also present a number of proposals which I feel may enhance the teaching and learning of English across universities in Australia and Asia.

11.4 Teaching English and Content Multilingually

The fundamental premise presented here stems from common sense: if the university wishes to be genuinely international then it needs to respect and adopt the multilingual and multicultural resources of its staff and students. It also needs to develop and then promote an understanding of the use of English as a lingua franca. It then needs to explore ways in which the use of multilingual resources and the use of English as a lingua franca can enhance the EMI experience.

To first consider the multilingual resources of universities, we need to distinguish between different types of multilingualism and multilingual contexts. As Lønsmann and Haberland (2013, p. xiv) point out it is very important to distinguish between countries where English today plays a large role as a lingua franca and where proficiency in English is quite high (such as Denmark and Sweden) and countries where English is used to a lesser extent and where English proficiency is limited (e.g. mainland China and Spain). Given this, it is not surprising that EMI programmes are far more prevalent in northern Europe than in southern Europe (Wachter & Maiworm, 2008). Indeed, the prevalence of EMI courses in the five Nordic countries was one of the motivations for the 2006 Declaration on a Nordic Language Policy which seeks to implement bilingual language policies in higher education (see http://www.norden.org/en/publications/publikationer/2007-746).

This concept of bilingual education has had a number of iterations. For example, scholars in Sweden promoted the idea of 'parallel language use' where both Swedish and English "are used in practice and seen as natural in the domain in question" (Lønsmann & Haberland, 2013, p. xvi). It is not clear how this actually works in practice, but would appear to indicate that the languages are used separately. An alternative model of bilingual education, 'complementary languages', has been proposed by Preisler: "The two languages will be functionally distributed within the individual programme according to the nature of its components, i.e. the national or international scope of their language content and orientation of the students" (2009, p. 26). In the Danish context, this means, in practice, "that English is used when not

all interlocutors know Danish but Danish is used where all interlocutors are proficient in that language" (Lønsmann & Haberland, 2013, p. xvii).

This may work well in bilingual settings, but even here it should be noted that privileging two languages in this way may result in other languages becoming marginalised. Doiz et al. (2013) report on attitudes to EMI courses in a trilingual setting, namely the University of the Basque Country, where English shares linguistic space with Basque and Spanish. Here again it appears that the languages are treated separately. The respondents, comprising local students, and academic and administrative staff, all valued the EMI courses but, recalling Lønsmann and Haberland's point above, had concerns about their low levels of English proficiency.

These are interesting studies but do not really come to grips with the complex multilingual reality of today's 'international' university where, literally, hundreds of different languages might be represented across a single campus or in enrolments in a single large online course. Below I want to consider how different languages and ELF might be used in EMI courses.

We use language to solve problems and understand concepts. The most powerful cognitive tool we have for this is our first language, the language which we feel is our strongest. Scholars have long shown how important it is for children to be able to use their first language as the medium of instruction in the early years of primary school, supporting UNESCO's official position favouring multilingual education which uses the first language of the child for as long as possible (e.g., Benson, 2008; Garcia, 2009; Kosonen & Young, 2009). Cummins (2000) has also drawn an important distinction between two types of linguistic proficiency. The first he calls Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills and Communication (BICS) and the second Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). It takes a child about 3 years to develop BICS, after which the child is ready to start developing CALP. If, however, a second language is introduced, the child has to start to develop BICS in that language, interfering with the development of CALP in the first language (Chumbow, 2013). Furthermore, a person needs at least 5 years learning the second language before he/she is able to develop CALP in the L2.

In contrast, if a person is working in a second language but is allowed to use his or her L1 in the understanding of concepts and while working on a cognitive demanding task, research shows that they will perform better in the final task than if they were required to work on the problem using only the L2 (e.g. Behan, Turnbill, & Spek, 1997; Cummins, 2007; Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011). This stands to reason. Imagine, for example, you are a native speaker of Japanese who has been learning English for 4 years. You are asked to write an essay in English about your views on the advantages and disadvantages of education. Do you think your final essay would be better if you were allowed to make notes in and write drafts in the essay in Japanese while researching the problem, with the requirement that the final product had to be in English? Or do you think your essay be better if you were entirely restricted to using English while researching and writing initial drafts of the essay? I suspect that most readers would feel that being allowed to use Japanese while working on the essay would result in a better essay. After all, this allows you to use the first language while working on a cognitively demanding problem. And

this is indeed what the research shows. For this reason, I suggest that students should be allowed, where practical, to use their first language in the *process* of solving problems or working on tasks, but that the final *product* should be presented – whether in oral or written form – in the L2.

In the context of an EMI university, this means allowing students to use their first language in the preparation of tasks, but insisting that the final product is in English. This form of bilingual education is therefore not comparable to the parallel or complementary language models mentioned earlier, but rather one that allows the use of the multilingual resources of students. This technique of allowing people to use the multilingual resources available to them has been called languaging, co-languaging or translanguaging (see Garcia, 2009; Swain et al., 2011).

Staff can also be allowed to use their multilingual resources. As noted above, the series of studies collected by Barnard and McLellan (2013) showed that while official policy did not allow the use of other languages in the EMI classroom, all the teachers studied reported that they actually did use other languages. There is a serious disconnection therefore between official policy and actual practice and I believe that this disconnection exists across most of the university sector in both Australia and Asia with regard to EMI policy and practice. The use of languages other than English in the EMI classroom needs to be validated, as has been done in the HKIEd language policy. It is important that the other languages are used in systematic ways which are aimed at helping the student learn English and complete the relevant tasks. Some guidelines for using other languages in the EMI class include providing translations for difficult vocabulary and concepts and using cross-linguistic comparisons (see Swain, Kirkpatrick, & Cummins, 2011).

As a personal example of using cross-linguistic comparisons, when teaching a university course to international students in writing academic essays in English, I asked them to select essays written in their own languages that had received high marks. I put students in 'same language' groups (Japanese in one group, Koreans in another group, for example) and then asked them to translate the L1 essays into English. Students were allowed to seek advice from speakers of English if needed. Once the L1 essays had been translated into English, the students were then asked to rework them rhetorically so that they would meet the expectations of the Australian university. Part of their task was to explicitly note the changes they had to make and then discuss the rhetorical differences between the good LI Japanese or Korean essay and the good English essay. Incidentally it was common for Japanese students to say that they found the three-part English structure represented by the popular aphorism, 'tell them what you are going to tell them, tell them, tell them what you have told them' to be embarrassingly simple and the sort of structure they would be likely to find in a Japanese primary school composition. It should go without saying, therefore, that the major aim of this use of contrastive rhetoric and cross-linguistic comparisons is to draw students' conscious attention to difference and not to claim the 'English' structure is 'better' than any other.

At the same time as allowing, if not encouraging, the use of the available multilingual resources to be used, the university needs to understand the nature of English as a lingua franca. In the Asian context, the primary use of English is as a lingua

franca between Asian multilinguals for which English is a learned language (Kirkpatrick, 2010). It is, apart from anything else, the sole official working language of the Association of Southeast Asian nations (ASEAN). Thus, English is typically the language of choice between a group of educated Chinese, Indonesians, Thai and Vietnamese, for example. It is important that this is understood by the Australian university. English is now an 'Asian' language through which Asian cultural values and pragmatic norms can be expressed. We also need to take on board that there are several established varieties of Asian English (Bruneian, Filipino, Hong Kong, Malaysian and Singaporean) and that these are, in many ways, equivalent to Australian English in that they are norm developing varieties of postcolonial English. They are not inferior varieties which have no place in the academy. Monolingual speakers of Australian English should take courses in English as a lingua franca to help them acquire the intercultural communication skills required for dealing in English with multilingual Asians and across Asia. The Australian university, if it is to be genuinely international, must adopt a multilingual ethos in which ways of using the multilingual resources of its staff and students can be adopted. At the same time, it must come to understand the changing roles of English; above all the role of English as an international lingua franca and the implications of intercultural communication that this entails. Australian universities therefore need language policies that accurately reflect and make use of the linguistic complexities of the campus. These need to be informed by actual practice. By the same token, Asian universities which are promoting EMI courses also need to take on board the role of English as an international lingua franca. They also need to recognise the immense 'added value' they can offer to international students by encouraging them, if not insisting, to take courses in the local language as an integral part of the programmes.

In conclusion, the main issues and challenges facing the learning and teaching of English in universities in the Asia-Pacific are twofold (see also Huang, 2015, Chap. 2 in this volume). First, it is important that the new varieties and roles of English are recognised and the universities move away from an insistence on a native speaker model and accept the notion of English as an Asian and multilingual language. Second, the universities need to explore ways in which they can value and adopt the multilingual resources they have at their disposal. These ways include allowing the use of other languages in EMI classrooms, and for Australian universities to explore means through which they can systematically make use of the expertise in Asian languages possessed by so many of their international and migrant students.

Notes

1. A useful website which summarises the language policies and entry requirements of Australian universities is the recently developed 'Degrees of Proficiency' website (http://www.degreesofproficiency.aall.org.au).

2. It is interesting to note, however, how English as a lingua franca is now being used, albeit unofficially, in the teaching of Chinese as an international language (Wang, 2013).

References

Arkoudis, S. (2011, October 12). English language development facing some testing challenges. *The Australian*.

Barnard, R., & McLellan, J. (2013). *Codeswitching in English medium classes: Case studies and perspectives from East Asian contexts*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Behan, L., Turnbill, M., & Spek, J. (1997). The proficiency gap in late French immersion: Language use on collaborative tasks. *Le Journal de l'Immersion, 20*, 41–44.

Benson, C. (2008). Summary overview. Mother tongue-based education in multilingual contexts. In C. Haddad (Ed.), *Improving the quality of mother tongue-based literacy and learning. Case studies from Asia, Africa and South America* (pp. 2–11). Bangkok, Thailand: UNESCO.

Bolton, K. (2012). Language policy and planning in Hong Kong. In E. Low & A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia* (pp. 221–240). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chumbow, B. S. (2013). Mother tongue-based multilingual education: Empirical foundations, implementation strategies and recommendations for new nations. In H. McIlwraith (Ed.), *Multilingual education in Africa: Lessons from the Juba language-in-education conference* (pp. 37–56). London: British Council.

Commonwealth of Australia. (2012). *Australia in the Asian century.* Retrieved from http://asian-century.dpmc.gov.au/white-paper

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional categories in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée, 10*(2), 221–240.

Doiz, A., Lasagabsater, D., & Sierra, J.-M. (Eds.). (2013). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dunworth, K. (2009). An investigation into post-entry language assessment in Australian universities. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning, 3*(1), A1–A13.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gu, M. (2015). Identity re-construction in a new habitus: An investigation of the language-related educational experiences of immigrant Mainland Chinese students in a multilingual university in Hong Kong. In C. Ng, B. Fox, & M. Nakano (Eds.), *Reforming learning and teaching in Asia-Pacific universities* (pp. 77–94). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Hayhoe, R., Li, J., Lin, J., & Zha, Q. (2011). *Portraits of 21st century Chinese universities*. Hong Kong: Springer.

Howe, E. R. (2009). The internationalization of higher education in East Asia: A comparative ethnographic narrative of Japanese universities. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 4*(4), 384–392.

Huang, F. (2015). International mobility of students, academics, educational programs, and campuses in Asia. In C. Ng, B. Fox, & M. Nakano (Eds.), *Reforming learning and teaching in Asia-Pacific universities* (pp. 29–47). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Humphreys, P., Haugh, M., Fenton-Smith, B., Michael, R., Lobo, A., & Walkinshaw, I. (2012). International student English proficiency changes: Tracking international student proficiency over the first semester of undergraduate study. *IELTS Research Reports, 14*, 1–41, IELTS Australia.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university*. London: Routledge.

Kan, V., Lai, K. C., Kirkpatrick, A., & Law, A. (2011). *Fine-tuning Hong Kong's medium of instruction policy*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education Strategic Planning Office and Research Centre into Language Acquisition and Education in Multilingual Societies.

Kim, H. J. (2013). Codeswitching by Korean students in New Zealand and lecturers in Korea: Commentary. In R. Barnard & J. MccLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in English medium classes: Case studies and perspectives from East Asian contexts* (pp. 186–203). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a Lingua Franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as a medium of instruction in Asian education (from primary to tertiary): Implications for local languages and local scholarship. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2*, 99–119.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2013). English as a medium of instruction in East and Southeast Asian universities. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies of languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 15–30). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Knight, J. (2008, March 17–21). *Crossborder higher education*. Paper presented at the 52nd annual conference of the comparative and international education society, New York.

Kosonen, K., & Young, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Mother tongue as a bridge language of instruction: Policies and experiences in Southeast Asia*. Bangkok, Thailand: The Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organisation.

Li, D. C. S. (2013a). Linguistic hegemony or linguistic capital? In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J.-M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 65–83). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Li, D. C. S. (2013b). Codeswitching in a Taiwanese university: Commentary. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in English medium classes: Case studies and perspectives from East Asian contexts* (pp. 32–42). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lønsmann, D., & Haberland, H. (2013). Hybridity and complexity: Language choice and language ideologies. In D. Lønsmann, H. Haberland, & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. xiii–xxiv). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Macaro, E. (2013). Where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research? In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in English medium classes: Case studies and perspectives from East Asian contexts* (pp. 10–23). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ng, C. (2015). Crafting an intrinsically motivating course environment for language learning: A Japanese pedagogical innovation. In C. Ng, B. Fox, & M. Nakano (Eds.), *Reforming learning and teaching in Asia-Pacific universities* (pp. 267–287). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Phillipson, R. (2009). English in higher education: Panacea or pandemic? In P. Harder (Ed.), *Angles of the English speaking world* (Vol. 9, pp. 32–57). Copenhagen, Denmark: Museum Tusculanum Press and the University of Copenhagen.

Poon, A. Y. K. (2015). A global challenge: Overseas immersion as an effective means to enhancing English proficiency? In C. Ng, B. Fox, & M. Nakano (Eds.), *Reforming learning and teaching in Asia-Pacific universities* (pp. 241–266). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Preece, S. (2011). Universities in the Anglophone centre: Sites of multilingualism. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2*, 121–146.

Preisler, B. (2009). Complementary languages: The national language and English as working languages in European universities. In P. Harder (Ed.), *Angles of the English speaking world vol 9* (pp. 10–28). Copenhagen, Denmark: Museum Tusculanum Press and the University of Copenhagen.

Swain, M., Kinnear, P., & Steinman, L. (2011). *Sociocultural theory in second language learning: An introduction through narratives*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Swain, M., Kirkpatrick, A., & Cummins, J. (2011). *How to have a guilt-free life using Cantonese in the English class*. Hong Kong: Institute of Education, Research Centre into Language Acquisition and Education in Multilingual Societies.

Wachter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English taught programmes in European higher education*. Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.

Wang, D. (2013). The use of English as a lingua franca in teaching Chinese as a foreign language: A case study of native Chinese teachers in Beijing. In D. Lønsmann, H. Haberland, & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 161–180). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Wilkinson, R. (2013). English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges and pitfalls. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J.-M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 3–24). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Xu, Z. (2014). Functional English and Chinese as medium of instruction (MOI) in a multilingual educational context: A case study of two courses in a higher institution in Hong Kong. In G. Zhang & K. Dunworth (Eds.), *Issues and perspectives in multilingual education* (pp. 209–228). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.