

9 Toward an effective transition to adopting English as the medium of instruction

A case from Hong Kong

Tae-Hee Choi and Bob Adamson

Introduction

In 2014, the Education University of Hong Kong (EdUHK), which is the main provider of teacher education in Hong Kong, introduced a new language policy that marked a major shift in practices away from the existing model dominated by Classical Written Chinese and spoken Cantonese as the medium of instruction (MoI). Approximately 80% of undergraduate courses were now to be delivered through English as the medium of instruction (EMI), with a transitional period of five years envisaged for the change to be enacted. The new policy caused some anxiety and curiosity among staff and students as to how the change might be implemented in ways that would facilitate effective learning. A working group of academics specializing in applied linguistics and language policy concluded that teaching courses through EMI would require very thorough preparation. The content provided in the new MoI might be unfamiliar to the students, so it was necessary to ensure that the concepts were made as clear as possible and that the students were taught the relevant language at the micro-level (e.g., vocabulary) and the macro-level (academic genres).

The shift to EMI in a place of learning where the local linguistic practices and landscape are predominantly characterized by other languages (in this case, the southern Chinese topolect, Cantonese, and the national language, the northern variety of Mandarin known as Putonghua) is an increasingly familiar phenomenon in higher education institutes (HEIs). Global trends associated with the ideology of neoliberalism have impacted the vision and mission, student body, curriculum, pedagogy, and academic work of many HEIs (Adamson, 2012), and processes of internationalization coupled with the criteria of different ranking systems have promoted the use of EMI (Cho, 2012). This move has proved controversial in Hong Kong, with findings showing the dangers of diluting students' learning (Taguchi, 2014), as well as prompting discussions of the issues of educational equity and lack of relevance to the multilingual reality (Kirkpatrick, 2014). The policy led to

students with higher English proficiency being prioritized for college admittance and learning opportunities. For an institute that exists primarily for the purposes of preparing teachers for the Hong Kong education system, where many of the professional activities require a high degree of competence in the local and, to a lesser extent, the national language, questions were raised over making English the primary medium of instruction.

This chapter analyzes the decision by the HEIs to adopt EMI, the response of various policy actors to the move, and the strategies that were put in place to support it. Our qualitative study comprises an analysis of the policy documents and responses to two surveys, one conducted at the institutional level and the other carried out by a constituent faculty. It highlights some outcomes that were deemed positive and others that were identified as significant challenges. The theoretical argument underpinning this chapter is that institutional isomorphism (labelled in this paper as “metamorphosis”) can be linked to forces such as globalization, whereby international trends result in HEIs becoming broadly similar in orientation and practices, with local variations according to context.

Knight (2015, p. 3) proposes a definition of globalization as “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values and ideas ... across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities.” This chapter adopts Knight’s definition, with an adaptation to take account of the fact that Hong Kong is not a country, but a Special Administrative Region (SAR)¹ of the People’s Republic of China. The Basic Law of Hong Kong acknowledges Hong Kong’s distinct history and permits it to maintain its own education system. We link globalization with the forces of neoliberalism, an ideology that seeks to break down international barriers to trade and which views education as a commodity rather than a public good (Adamson, 2012). The globalization ideology has impacted HEIs in a number of ways. Direct impact on HEIs include producing the massification of higher education and tightening the public financing of higher education. The indirect impacts are via the resulting new context of the ideology, such as arousing concerns over national economic competitiveness and creating new geopolitical blocs. Common manifestations of globalization that HEIs have either accepted, resisted or appropriated include their reconceptualization as business entities; competition in the form of, *inter alia*, international university ranking systems; the development of quality assurance systems that tend to be based on quantitative metrics; the proliferation of technical and utilitarian curricula and programs; internationalization of student bodies, curricula and campuses; and the increasing involvement of the private sector in the financing, management, and provision of higher education (Adamson, 2012).

This chapter starts by examining the rationale behind the move to EMI, and suggests that the decision was driven by socioeconomic rather than educational motives, which aroused the concerns of the lecturing staff and students. It then describes, analyzes, and evaluates the pedagogical ideas and

processes set out in the facilitative strategies (which included a staff handbook on implementing EMI written by the chapter authors, who were both recruited to groups set up to support the move). It presents an analysis of the feedback collected from staff and students concerning the enactment of the curriculum reform and identifies facilitators and barriers to effective change. It shows that an EMI initiative that is based on socioeconomic or political motives, as is often the case for many HEIs, engenders pedagogical consequences, but more importantly, HEIs considering such a move should prepare both students and staff thoroughly to minimize the processes of trial and error, for which a structured approach may be necessary. The insights, though situated within a university in Hong Kong, may have relevance to institutes in other contexts that are considering switching the MoI or which are already undergoing such a transition.

Language-in-education policies and globalization in Hong Kong HEIs

Language-in-education policies in Hong Kong have been influenced by its colonial and post-colonial status, by its current aspiration to be the “world city of Asia” (Hong Kong Government, n.d.) and by its strategic location as a gateway to mainland China (Bolton, 2011; Pennycook, 1998). Located off the coast of southern China, Hong Kong was administered by a British colonial government from 1841 to 1997, which led to English, spoken Cantonese, and Classical Written Chinese being the major languages taught in the schools (Kan & Adamson, 2010). In the 19th century, one role of education was to establish a bridge comprising an educated indigenous elite, who served as intermediaries between the colonial and local groups. This group received a schooling in which English was taught as the main language, complemented by studies of classical Chinese literature (Sweeting & Vickers, 2005). Otherwise, traditional village and community schools followed the curriculum of the Imperial Civil Service examinations in China that remained in place until the early 20th century. In these schools, pupils learned a highly stylized form of spoken Cantonese that was unlike the daily vernacular (Sweeting, 1990).

As Hong Kong developed its economy as an entrepôt port, a center for light industry (such as plastics and garments), and later, an international financial, commercial, and tourist hub, the linguistic complexities increased. Vernacular Cantonese became commonplace in many schools to help prepare the workforce for light industry, in line with the recommendations of the Burney Report (Burney, 1935). Several decades later, interactions with the rest of China enhanced the value of spoken Mandarin, the northern variety of Chinese that differs greatly from Cantonese, and of the use of simplified characters that are used in the People’s Republic of China, as the 1997 retrocession approached. Meanwhile, prestigious schools preferred to use EMI despite the problem of pupils having to learn through a linguistically distant language, and other schools endeavored to follow suit in order to enhance

their reputation with parents. One result was the proliferation of a mixed code (which would be labelled translanguaging in current terminology) in the classroom, and a concern that students were not developing as additive bilinguals (or, as the post-1997 government specifies, biliterates and trilinguals).

The general public has unique perceptions of these different languages and dialects. EMI is viewed as privileging an elite politically, socially, and economically, and (ironically) also as providing a pathway to social and international mobility. Cantonese is valued by some as a language that serves as a marker of Hong Kong identity, but is looked down on in some quarters as “a mere dialect” (Lo, 2014). Putonghua also carries some negative connotations. In colonial times, it was stigmatized by Hong Kong people as the language of poverty-stricken mainlanders, but this was later transformed into stigmatization of people who were perceived as boorish *nouveaux-riches* as China’s economy developed. It was also seen by some as the language of the Chinese government whose political ideology and designs on Hong Kong were viewed as incompatible with those that had made Hong Kong wealthy and stable.

One of the first official policies introduced by the new administration after the retrocession of Hong Kong to China was the encouragement of schools to use Chinese/Cantonese as the MoI. Tung Chee Hwa, the first chief executive of Hong Kong after the retrocession, laid out a language policy of fostering biliteracy and trilingualism, which involves Classical Written Chinese and written English, as well as spoken Cantonese, Putonghua, and English. The latter was retained on the basis that it is the major international language (Tung, 1999). Tung backed the use of mother-tongue education in schools, on the grounds that it would bring about more effective learning, but the idea was unpopular with school leaders and parents who feared that the prestige associated with EMI would be lost and students would be placed at a disadvantage when seeking admission to HEIs (Kan & Adamson, 2010; Poon, 2000). In 1998, the government was forced to accept a compromise whereby 114 (30%) secondary schools were allowed to retain their EMI policies and, from 2010 to 2011, schools were granted greater autonomy in determining their MoI (for details of policy development around the MoI in Hong Kong, see Choi, 2016; Choi & Kan, in press). This brief overview (which does not include discussion of ethnic minority groups from South Asia and Southeast Asia *inter alia* and other non-Chinese sections of the population) shows the politically fraught nature of discussions around the MoI.

Tertiary institutions have not entirely escaped controversies. Hong Kong University, established in 1911, is an EMI institution (Poon, 2003). The Chinese University of Hong Kong (whose name in Chinese represents a focus on Chinese language and culture) was set up in 1963, at a time when the Chinese language was gaining increased recognition in the education system (Sweeting, 1992). This university has wavered in its language policy, causing a controversy that started in 2005 when it announced a shift to EMI for a significant number of courses (Choi, 2010)—a shift that was reversed after a long campaign led by students, prominent alumni, and other public

figures. Such debates demonstrate how language-in-education policies have engendered tensions. A mixture of colonial practices and the socioeconomic value of English has resulted in six out of the eight government-funded universities declaring that their courses were delivered in EMI. The other two have adopted a bilingual or trilingual policy, but whether the policies have actually been implemented as intended is disputed (Yeung & Lu, 2018).

Meanwhile, social, political, and economic changes in Hong Kong have reshaped the HEIs in areas beyond the MoI, with global forces being most evident in recent decades. According to Cheung (2012), globalization has created at least four consequences for HEIs around the world:

- 1 ***“Follow the fashion or perish”***—Globalization is a growing and irresistible trend. Whether one likes it or not, one has to “follow” the trend in order not to lag behind or become sidelined.
- 2 ***“Competition and survival”***—Globalization has brought about a more competitive world because national boundaries nowadays can no longer deter the flow of people, expertise, and capital. Education, in particular higher education, is seen as crucial to nurturing the human capital necessary for international competition.
- 3 ***“Quality assurance and relevance”***—National education systems have been driven toward greater international involvement. Internationalization in terms of benchmarking against some world “standards” is seen as the key to the quality of education and to assuring alignment with global trends.
- 4 ***“Education sells”***—The advent of the new knowledge society and knowledge-based economy has spurred greater investment by national and global capital, both public and private, in knowledge industries including higher education. Internationalization has become a business opportunity as higher education turns into a foreign exchange-earning export.

This chapter uses a case study in order to capture the transition process of the MoI at the intersection of these two main streams of change—that is, language-in-education policy and globalization.

Case study: Transition of MoI within a globalizing HEI

The focus of this study is the leading provider of teacher education in Hong Kong. It used to be a teaching-intensive, local institute focusing on teacher preparation (University Grants Committee, 2015), but has transformed itself into a research-oriented, internationally focused university with a broad multidisciplinary remit that extends its main concentration on education (The Education University of Hong Kong, n.d.b). The metamorphosis to university status is part of a process that stretches back more than 150 years, covering the colonial and post-colonial eras in Hong Kong. The Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIED) was founded in 1994, when four Colleges of

Education, one of which dates back to 1853, plus the Institute of Language in Education merged as part of an attempt by the Hong Kong government to raise the quality of education in schools. The new institute offered undergraduate and postgraduate diplomas in education programs, whereas the former colleges only offered sub-degree programs. As the institute matured, it declared its intention to seek university status, which was bestowed, after a decade of endeavor, in 2016 and it was renamed the Education University of Hong Kong (The Education University of Hong Kong, n.d.a).

An expansion of higher education took place in Hong Kong in the 1990s in response to growing demand from the middle-class and from the business community who wanted an upgrade in the quality of human resources emerging from the education system. City Polytechnic, Hong Kong Polytechnic, Lingnan College, and Hong Kong Baptist College all went through the process of being retitled as universities. This trend created an opportunity for the institute, as it provided precedence for its own retitling. A further significant breakthrough in the development of HKIED was the granting of self-accrediting status for teacher education programs in 2004. This event represented the trigger for the metamorphosis of the institute, as it permitted the development of higher degrees. The closer alignment and integration with the mainland post-1997 and the development of self-funded programs, facilitated by self-accrediting status, enabled the institute to enter the competitive Chinese market. However, marketing initiatives were hampered by the Chinese rendering of its name. “Institute of Education” may have had resonance with the prestigious Institute of Education in London, but, when translated into Chinese (教育學院), the name indicated (in the context of the mainland) a minor college rather than one aspiring to a prestigious international status. The senior management therefore decided that a change of name incorporating a university title was desirable. This change would require government approval.

Senior management put in place a number of strategies to achieve university status. There was a move to boost the number of staff with doctorates and to encourage more research output. Also, self-funded postgraduate programs, such as a Master’s degree in Education and a Doctorate in Education, were established. Corresponding quality assurance mechanisms were introduced to demonstrate that the research and teaching by the staff met international standards (University Grants Committee, 2015). The recruitment of professorial staff of international repute was another strategy. Hitherto, there were only a handful of professors in the whole institute, out of around 400 staff. The international recruitment boosted the number to 30, including some very prestigious chair professors. Having staff of this caliber meant that high-quality research would also need to be fostered and given greater attention, particularly in terms of winning external grants that would reflect creditably upon the university. Supportive financial and procedural measures were instituted to facilitate this process, as international research performance was a criterion used by the University Grants Committee.² Other incentives

included the desire to improve the institute's position in international university ranking exercises, and approaches made by HEIs outside of Hong Kong equally driven by the discourse of globalization and internationalization and looking for strategic partners.

The development of the mainland market, the recruitment of international staff and internationalizing the profile of the university meant that a rethink of the language policy (which had favored Cantonese as the MoI) was necessary. Putonghua and English were now significant languages in the institute, and a new language policy was adopted in 2009, based on the principles of functional biliteracy and trilingualism, which also matched the language competences encouraged by the Hong Kong government. The university policy document outlined different pathways that students could follow, according to how students identified their first, second, and third languages (L1, L2, and L3 respectively), with the expectation that they should reach set requirements for each language—the students should acquire a high level of competence in social, professional, and academic domains in their declared L1, good competence in the three domains in their L2, and developing competence in their L3. In practice, the flexibility in providing sufficient courses delivered across the three languages proved to be economically unviable, so the previous arrangement (largely Cantonese medium courses) was retained. However, a target of 25% of courses to be delivered through EMI was set for the 2011/2012 academic year and language exit requirements (LER) were established for the following academic year, set at IELTS 6.0 for English and 3B for the Putonghua Shuiping Ceshi (PSC). Exit requirements for students taking an English Language Education or Chinese Language Education major were set higher in the specialist language. A further target of 50% of courses to be taught through English was set for 2013/14 as part of an enhanced EMI scheme. The language policy further changed in 2014. To strengthen the institute's positioning in the final stages of its quest for university status, the senior management announced that English should be the major MoI. The move would be phased in gradually, with 80% of courses to be delivered through EMI by 2016/2017.

The transition

The switch to EMI, though gradual, created tensions among both students and staff. The university, to manage, monitor, and support the transition, created two policy bodies, one to design the policy and the other to implement it.³ These were led by senior members of the university, with representatives from each of the three faculties (education, liberal arts and social sciences, and humanities) and from the language center and independent advisors.

The policy bodies, in collaboration with the faculties and the language center, provided support for student learning, including courses to help students develop English proficiency in listening, reading, speaking, and writing, and to prepare them for the high-stakes International English

Language Testing System (IELTS) test. Other schemes and events aimed at motivating students to improve their language competences were established, such as an English Cafe, a buddy program which linked local students with international students, one-on-one tutorials with native-speaking teachers, and monetary rewards for achieving milestones in English proficiency. There was regular monitoring of students' proficiency development through a cross-institute English assessment program, and a database of the IELTS scores of the graduating students.

However, the support systems had limitations in addressing the concerns of students and of some staff members, as revealed in the surveys and a case study on the transition. After the new target of 80% EMI courses was set, the university took the initiative to assess the success of the transition. The EdUHK conducted a university-wide survey of approximately a third of the teaching staff at the time ($n=92$) and 5% of students ($n=205$) (EdUHK, 2014). The survey focused on whether the respondents agreed with the switch of the main MoI from Chinese to English and whether the LER for English should be made a requirement for all full-time undergraduate programs, so as to bar those who failed to reach a certain standard from obtaining a degree. The majority of both staff and students supported the MoI switch and the proposal to turn the English LER into a graduation requirement. The top two reasons given for these positive responses were the perceived benefits for the competitiveness of Hong Kong and for students mastering English as a key tool for social mobility. The majority of students (60%) reported no problem in learning in an EMI course.

When announced, this result was perceived to misalign with general concerns expressed by staff and students. Accordingly, one faculty conducted its own survey in the same year. The survey was conducted with students from all the departments of the university ($n=205$, again 5%), though for convenience of sampling, only the staff of that faculty was surveyed ($n=13$). While the university-level survey items focused on general perceptions, the items of the faculty-led survey asked more about students' learning experiences. Perhaps partly because of the differing foci, in contrast to only 40% of students reporting challenges in learning through EMI in the university-led survey, the majority (86%) expressed their concerns about learning through EMI in the faculty-level survey. When asked explicitly about the areas needing support, the students identified the following three needs:

- developing deep understanding of the content;
- developing skills for writing English, as the main mode of assessment is written essays; and
- mitigating anxieties experienced during the EMI classes.

The survey also revealed another important yet problematic area in terms of providing support for an effective transition, that is, support for teachers.

In order to establish ways to support the identified learning needs, follow-up interviews with students with different self-reported English proficiencies were conducted. The original survey included an invitation to participate in the follow-up interview. Out of nine volunteers—all with Cantonese as their mother tongue—six students, two each from each level of English proficiency, were approached. It was expected that their experience with EMI may have been affected by their English proficiency (e.g., Cho, 2012).

In the interviews, several useful teaching strategies were mentioned, many of which emphasized the importance of using the mother tongue as a “learning resource” (Choi & Leung, 2017). The first strategy was for the students to switch to Cantonese or Mandarin when dealing with abstract or complex theories, or concerning local topics, in lectures as well as during tutorials. One student noted their practice of code-switching and the reasons:

If we can discuss in Cantonese then it’s easier for us to understand what people want to say, because some students are not very good at English and if they must speak in English we cannot understand what [they are] trying to tell us.

An argument put forward by another student was that certain subjects should be taught in Chinese anyway, such as those that are more personal and less academic:

I have heard that some GE [General Education] courses are about daily life and I think that these courses should be conducted in Chinese and Cantonese since topics will be related to ourselves.

Some instructors seemed to agree with this argument, as the same student observed:

In my major, there are some foreigners, so all their courses are in English. But sometimes, other professors might [speak in] Cantonese or sometimes Putonghua.

A common request from the students interviewed was for the provision of materials and instruction in a bilingual mode, especially a glossary of key words, to help themselves or their peers to link the new content to their existing knowledge. Although the students had attained the proficiency standards in English for university admission and had attended mandatory language courses in their first year, many struggled to get to grips with academic discourse in the language. They felt that a bilingual approach would be beneficial for both motivation and effective learning. Some requested supplementary written Chinese materials for the same reasons. A psychology major reflected on a recent class, stating:

...in English I just cannot understand at all. And I had no time to check each word because there were 60 slides in the PowerPoint, and on each slide there were five to ten words that I didn't understand.

Another student felt that a bilingual approach would not only provide better learning support for the students, it would also be more equitable:

I think bilingualism is necessary. Because actually ... although I came from an EMI secondary school, there are some students who received their secondary education in Chinese, so those students might be relatively weaker at English. ... And I think full EMI shouldn't be a hard rule because it's not fair [to them].

Teachers' performance was also problematized. Some teachers were perceived by the students as needing support, because EMI constrained their range of teaching strategies:

The class duration is three hours and I see [the professor] every Tuesday evening from half past six to half past nine, and she just holds the paper and reads her script for three hours.

One of the measures taken to support the shift in language policy was the production of a handbook (Choi & Adamson, 2015) and other resources to support staff teaching courses through EMI. The handbook linked two dominant ideas in Hong Kong education at the time: task-based learning and outcome-based learning. Task-based learning was introduced into the primary school curriculum (known as the Target Oriented Curriculum) in 1995, in English, Chinese, and Mathematics. Although controversial at the time in Hong Kong (Adamson et al., 2000) as well as elsewhere (Choi, 2017a), the approach persisted in subsequent curricular reforms at both the primary and secondary levels. The design of the materials set out in the EMI handbook thus sought to take advantage of the familiarity of many staff in EdUHK with local school curricula. Outcome-based learning was an initiative emanating from the University Grants Committee and had been adopted by the university as a policy to sharpen the focus of course curricula by aligning intended learning outcomes, teaching and learning arrangements, and assessment (Kennedy, 2011).

The handbook, which was published online as well as in hard copies distributed to all staff, outlined a process using a genre-based pedagogy, with principles derived from social constructivist theories of learning. These principles suggest that students construct knowledge most effectively when the new learning falls within their zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978), comes through interactions with peers, structured in supportive ways (Wilson & Yang, 2007), and is delivered with judicious use of

the mother tongue (Choi & Leung, 2017). The handbook laid out a four-step approach:

- 1 linking intended course learning outcomes to language;
- 2 presenting intended learning outcomes through appropriate text-types;
- 3 presenting the content with a focus on relevant language;
- 4 scaffolding the students' active learning of the content and language.

A range of other resources was also produced, gathered, and made available online. These reflected the two principles which also informed the handbook, that is, promotion of student autonomy and use of the mother tongue as teaching resources. They included a handout listing key expressions for students' use in the EMI learning process, covering topics such as sharing learning challenges with teachers and asking for clarification; academic phrases for essay writing; and sample bilingual lists with key words in Chinese (for sample resources, see <http://eduhk.hk/moi/>).

To help both teachers and students learn about these resources, annual sharing sessions were conducted introducing the resources and pedagogic approaches for three successive years. Meanwhile, other changes at a more macro-level were suggested by the task force on language policy implementation to the senior management, including documenting all initiatives undertaken at the sub-university level and circulating the information centrally. Another move was integrating the students' language portfolios into their existing learning portfolios which are developed throughout the degree program, so that they can actively plan out and self-assess their language learning and the language center can provide systematic, coherent, and customized support.

All the initiatives brought about positive outcomes for the university. During the regular university review exercise conducted by the University Grants Committee, the university was congratulated on a successful transition regarding the MoI with thorough language policy planning and implementation, which resulted in the university receiving favorable newspaper headlines. For senior management sensitive to public image, this represented a major step forward from the previous negativity in the media on this subject. The university, having recruited international students and high-performing scholars locally, regionally, and internationally, attained elevated positions in different HEI ranking indexes, which had a knock-on effect in attracting better-quality doctoral students and staff. The rise in international profile strengthened the policy momentum for EMI.

However, new issues arose with the changes. With a more prominent international profile and most courses being offered in English, the university's connections with, and commitment to, the needs of the local education sector have come under scrutiny. From time to time, students have questioned the justification for teaching and learning mainly in English when they will mostly

likely work at local or mainland schools which use Chinese as the medium of instruction and deal with issues with parents and the community in Chinese. Collegial discussions on professional issues are also more likely to be in Cantonese or Mandarin. In terms of learning, it is debatable whether the university's language policy is actually helping student teachers to fully develop as professionals, given that professionalism is strongly connected with identity formation (Choi, 2017a), which in turn requires the students to probe and reflect on their own thoughts and emotions, as well as acquiring deep understanding of relevant content and pedagogical skills. There is an ongoing discussion arising from making the language exit requirements a requirement for graduation, and this policy change has been put on hold. The policy, if adopted, might end up unduly rewarding students who are gifted in languages, while penalizing the rest.

Such phenomena associated with adopting EMI are obviously not unique to this university. Indeed, when a society emphasizes English proficiency disproportionately, similar initiatives are bound to find themselves on the policy agenda, even though they require sacrificing other important elements of teaching and learning. For instance, when the Teaching English in English in-service certification scheme in South Korea was first trialed, the English proficiency of teachers was emphasized to the extent that their other teaching competences, such as their ability to engage students in learning, were not considered. As a consequence, fresh recruits with high English proficiency benefitted (Choi, 2015), though later the limitation of the scheme was revised to assess teachers' competencies more holistically (Choi, 2017b).

Discussion and conclusion

This chapter has shown how internal forces driven by the aspiration to seek university status and market teacher education programs in the mainland became entangled with the complex external forces of globalization. This resulted in a metamorphosis of the university that began the initiative. The new policy involved significant repositioning, in addition to the main MoI, including moves

- from a local to regional/international sphere of activity;
- from a local to regional/international staffing profile;
- from single-discipline to multi-discipline;
- from teaching-focused to research-focused; and
- from non-commercial to commercial enterprises.

These shifts essentially redefined the nature of the university and have produced a number of tensions, in both intended and unintended areas. The new sphere of regional/international activity is in conflict with the traditional role of serving the local education community; a fine balance needs to be achieved to maintain the university's efficacy as a provider of teacher education. The

recruitment of university staff from outside Hong Kong and the move toward multi-disciplinary studies have raised questions in some quarters about the ability of such staff and programs to make a relevant contribution to local teacher education, especially as some of the new staff have neither a degree in education nor previous teaching experience. For instance, staff were assigned to assess students' teaching performance during their attachment to schools, an integral part of most degrees in education. However, since some of them had no relevant training, experience or knowledge of the local educational system, the reliability and validity of their assessment was questioned, which led to the decision that only people with a local teaching certificate or relevant substantial experience should be assigned to assess teaching, and those without were asked to participate in in-service training. Some long-serving colleagues and members of the community accordingly raised concerns about the possibility of "mission drift." They suggested that the university is moving away from its core mission of teacher education because of the demands of achieving university status. Associated with this are tensions among staff concerning budget allocation, with the new professors being generously resourced to undertake research in their fields, while staff in the teaching track have felt marginalized. The changes in the MoI that have emerged in this process of metamorphosis have presented linguistic challenges to some staff. There is also the necessity of making linguistic and cultural changes to the campus environment and student support to cater to non-Cantonese speakers. The recent branding of the institute repositions it as a commercial entity and suggests a new relationship between "service providers" and "customers" rather than between "teachers" and "students."

The process for this case university to adopt EMI as its main MoI policy, mostly driven by its motivation to survive and flourish in the nexus of diverse forces generated by globalization, as well as an institutional socio-political drive, required a pedagogical readjustment. Indeed, the decisions made by senior management in the HEIs reflect these factors. The measures engendered some welcome successes, but also raised some new questions. Although these questions about the nature and role of the university were generated in a single small university in a specific set of circumstances in Hong Kong, they nevertheless have implications in many HEIs around the world facing the similar challenge to follow the trends of globalization or perish. The outcomes of the process described in this chapter emphasize the iterative and organic nature of education reforms, and, therefore, the need to examine the reform context thoroughly in advance, and evaluate the reforms continuously given the creative nature of the actual interpretation and translation of reforms to suit contextual features. Implementers of these processes might be advised to draw on a systematic framework of analysis to minimize the reform costs (see Choi, 2018, for a language-in-education reform analysis framework). While an EMI policy is a glittering symbol of a modern, international HEI, there are consequences that threaten the local relevance and, indeed, the original *raison d'être* of some institutes, and that require circumspection in implementation.

Notes

- 1 SAR is a legal arrangement established to facilitate the retrocession of Hong Kong at the end of the British colonial era.
- 2 The University Grants Committee is an agency set up by the government to manage university affairs in Hong Kong, including determination of the annual budgets for the eight government-funded universities.
- 3 The latter was integrated into the Steering Group on Undergraduate Common Curriculum in 2018.

References

- Adamson, B. (2012). Beyond the East-West dichotomy. In B. Adamson, J. Nixon, & F. Su (Eds.), *The reorientation of higher education: Challenging the East-West dichotomy* (pp. 284–299). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Adamson, B., Kwan, T., & Chan, K. K. (2000). *Changing the curriculum: The impact of reform on primary schooling in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Bolton, K. (2011). Language policy and planning in Hong Kong: Colonial and post-colonial perspectives. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 51–74.
- Burney, E. (1935). *Report on education in Hong Kong, 1935*. Hong Kong: Crown Agents for the Colonies.
- Cheung, A. B. L. (2012). How Hong Kong universities balance the global and the regional: The challenge of internationalization. In B. Adamson, J. Nixon, & F. Su (Eds.), *The reorientation of higher education: Compliance and defiance*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Cho, D. W. (2012). English-medium instruction in the university context of Korea: Tradeoff between teaching outcomes and media-initiated university ranking. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(4), 135–163.
- Choi, P. K. (2010). ‘Weep for Chinese university’: A case study of English hegemony and academic capitalism in higher education in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(2), 233–252.
- Choi, T.-H. (2015). The impact of the ‘teaching English through English’ policy on teachers and teaching in South Korea. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(3), 201–220.
- Choi, T.-H. (2016). Glocalization of English language education: Comparison of three contexts in East Asia. In C. M. Lam & J. H. Park (Eds.), *Sociological and philosophical perspectives on education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 147–164). Singapore: Springer.
- Choi, T.-H. (2017a). Identity, transnationalism, and bilingual education. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 175–189). Encyclopedia of language and education (3rd ed.). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Choi, T.-H. (2017b). Hidden transcripts of teacher resistance: A case from South Korea. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(4), 480–502.
- Choi, T.-H. (2018). Implementation and impact of language-in-education policies: Insights from South Korea and Hong Kong. In K. J. Kennedy & J. C.-K. Lee (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook for schools and schooling in Asia* (pp. 518–524). London: Routledge.

- Choi, T.-H., & Adamson, B. (2015). *Teaching with English as a medium of instruction*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Choi, T.-H., & Kan, V. (in press). Language ecology in Hong Kong and Macau: History, context and language policy. In Adamson, B. & Feng, A. (Eds.), *Multilingual China*. China: Routledge.
- Choi, T.-H., & Leung, C. (2017). Uses of first and foreign languages as learning resources in a foreign language classroom. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(4), 686–703.
- The Education University of Hong Kong. (2014). Report on the survey of the current language policy and related issues. Hong Kong: Author.
- The Education University of Hong Kong. (n.d.a). *Milestones for the university*. Retrieved September 20, 2019, from www.eduhk.hk/main/about-us/history-and-campus/milestones/
- The Education University of Hong Kong. (n.d.b). *Vision & mission*. Retrieved January 13, 2020, from www.eduhk.hk/main/about-us/vision-mission/
- Hong Kong government. (n.d.). *Asia's world city*. Retrieved February 3, 2020, from www.info.gov.hk/info/sar5/easia.htm
- Kan, V., & Adamson, B. (2010). Language policies for Hong Kong schools since 1997. *London Review of Education*, 8(2), 167–176.
- Kennedy, K. J. (2011). Conceptualising quality improvement in higher education: Policy, theory and practice for outcomes based learning in Hong Kong. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33(3), 205–218.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). The language(s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism? *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 4–15.
- Knight, J. (2015). Updated definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2–3. doi:10.6017/ihe.2003.33.7391
- Lo, A. (2014, February 4). Why Cantonese is a real language in Hong Kong. *South China Morning Post*. Retrieved from www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1420098/why-cantonese-real-language-hong-kong
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Poon, A. Y. K. (2000). *Medium of instruction in Hong Kong*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Poon, S. (2003). *Colonialism and English education at the University of Hong Kong, 1913–1964* (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Hong Kong.
- Sweeting, A. (1990). *Education in Hong Kong, pre-1841–1941: Fact and opinion*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Sweeting, A. (1992). Hong Kong education within historical processes. In G. A. Postiglione (Ed.), *Education and society in Hong Kong: Toward one country and two systems* (pp. 39–81). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Sweeting, A., & Vickers, E. (2005). On colonizing 'colonialism': The discourses of the history of English in Hong Kong. *World Englishes*, 24, 113–130.
- Taguchi, N. (2014). English-medium education in the global society. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 89–98.
- Tung, C. H. (1999). *Quality people. Quality home. Positioning Hong Kong for the 21st century*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
- University Grants Committee. (2015). *Report of the review group on the application for university title by the Hong Kong Institute of Education*. Hong Kong: Author.
- Vygotsky, L. F. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological principles*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Wilson, K., & Yang, L. R. (2007). A social constructivist approach to teaching reading: Turning the rhetoric into reality. *CELEA Journal*, 30(1), 51–56.
- Yeung, M., & Lu, V. (2018). English-medium instruction in self-financing tertiary institutions in Hong Kong: Views and practices from the students. *English Language Teaching*, 11(8), 28–39.